



**FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**  
**LEBANON HOST COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROJECT**  
**(LHSP)**  
**2015-2017**

**Prepared By**

**Antoine Mansour**

**Jean Dib Haj**

**Knowledge Development Company (KDC)**

**20 November 2018**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>List of Acronyms</b> .....   | 3    |
| <b>Executive summary</b> .....  | 4    |
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....  | 9    |
| A. The socio-economic context.....  | 9    |
| B. Project Background.....  | 9    |
| <b>II. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES</b> .....  | 11   |
| A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation.....   | 11   |
| B. The evaluation matrix, evaluation criteria and key evaluations questions.....  | 12   |
| <b>III. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS</b> .....   | 13   |
| A. Data sources and data collection procedures.....   | 13   |
| B. Major limitations of the methodology.....  | 14   |
| C. Performance standards and ethical considerations.....  | 14   |
| <b>IV. KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION</b> .....   | 15   |
| <b>A. Relevance</b> .....   | 15   |
| <b>B. Effectiveness</b> .....   | 16   |
| 1. Effectiveness of LHSP in improving livelihoods and increasing economic opportunities in affected areas.....  | 17   |
| 2. Effectiveness of LHSP in strengthening the capacity of local and national actors to deliver basic services in a participatory and conflict sensitive manner..... | 19   |
| 3. Effectiveness of LHSP in reducing local tensions and improving community security.....   | 22   |
| 4. Effectiveness of LHSP in strengthening the capacity of the Lebanese government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrians.....                                | 24   |
| 5. Effectiveness of LHSP in integrating monitoring, knowledge management and risk management in the project implementation.....                                     | 26   |
| <b>C. Efficiency</b> .....  | 27   |
| <b>D. Sustainability</b> .....  | 28   |
| <b>E. Impact</b> .....  | 29   |
| <b>V. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....   | 29   |
| <b>VI. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....  | 30   |
| <b>VII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR LHSP NEXT PHASE</b> .....   | 32   |
| <b>ANNEXES</b> .....  | 36   |
| ANNEX 1: Evaluation matrix.....   | 36   |
| ANNEX 2: List of reviewed documents.....  | 43   |
| ANNEX 3: List of key informants and list of participants of focus groups.....   | 44   |
| ANNEX 4: Evaluation sub-questions.....  | 48   |
| ANNEX 5: Guidelines for focus groups.....   | 50   |

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| BPRM  | Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration – US Department of State |
| CDR   | Council for Development and Reconstruction                            |
| CPR   | Crisis Prevention and Recovery  |
| CTA   | Chief Technical Adviser   |
| CV    | Curriculum Vitae  |
| DAC   | Development Assistance Committee                                      |
| DFID  | United Kingdom Department for International Development               |
| GoL   | Government of Lebanon   |
| ILO   | International Labour Organization                                     |
| IoF   | Institute of Finance  |
| KDC   | Knowledge Development Company   |
| KFW   | Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau ("Reconstruction Credit Institute")    |
| LCRP  | Lebanon Syrian Crisis Response Plan                                   |
| LHSP  | Lebanon Host Communities Support Project                              |
| LRF   | Lebanon Recovery Fund   |
| M&E   | Monitoring and Evaluation   |
| MEHE  | Ministry of Education and Higher Education                            |
| MoA   | Ministry of Agriculture   |
| MoE   | Ministry of Environment   |
| MoET  | Ministry of Economy and Trade   |
| MoEW  | Ministry of Energy and Water  |
| MoIM  | Ministry of Interior and Municipalities                               |
| MoPH  | Ministry of Public Health   |
| MoL   | Ministry of Labour  |
| MoSA  | Ministry of Social Affairs  |
| MoWA  | Ministry of Women Affairs   |
| MRR   | Maps of Risks and Resources   |
| MSR   | Mechanisms for Stability and Resilience                               |
| MSS   | Mechanisms for Social Stability                                       |
| NEO   | National Employment Office  |
| NCRS  | National Council for Road Safety                                      |
| NGO   | Non-Governmental Organization   |
| OECD  | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development                 |
| PMC   | Project Management Committee  |
| PMO   | Prime Minister Office   |
| RDDP  | European Regional Development and Protection Programme                |
| SC    | Steering Committee  |
| SDC   | Social Development Centre   |
| SDGs  | Sustainable Development Goals   |
| SLD   | Social and Local Development  |
| SMEs  | Small and Medium Enterprises  |
| TG    | Technical Group   |
| ToR   | Terms of Reference  |
| TOT   | Training of Trainers  |
| UNDP  | United Nations Development Programme                                  |
| UNEG  | United Nations Evaluation Group                                       |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees                         |

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In view of the deterioration of the socio-economic conditions in host communities affected by the Syrian crisis, the Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA) jointly with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) launched in 2013 the "Lebanese Host Communities Support Project" (LHSP) as a comprehensive, coordinated and durable response towards the Syrian Crisis and its implications on the 251 most vulnerable communities. LHSP aims to achieve the following outputs: (1) Increase the livelihoods and economic opportunities mainly in affected areas; (2) Strengthen the capacity of local and national actors to assess and respond to the needs and risks in a community participatory driven and conflict sensitive approach; (3) Improve the local level dispute resolution and community security; and (4) Strengthen the capacity of the Lebanese Government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrians.

The main objectives of this evaluation report are to: (i) Assess the level of progress made towards achieving the outcome of the project; (ii) Capture lessons learned and best practices from the implementation of the project; and (iii) Provide concrete and actionable recommendations; and (iv) define future interventions for LHSP.

The evaluation team relied on various sources of information: (1) desk review of existing primary and secondary sources; (2) key informant interviews with UNDP officials, government representatives, donors, UN agencies and local stakeholders including municipalities, Social Development Centres (SDCs), governors, mayors, MSS working groups, etc.; and (3) Focus groups with beneficiaries of livelihood projects and of the municipalities' basic services.

### **KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION**

#### **Relevance**

1. LHSP main partners strongly express ownership of the project while beneficiaries strongly perceive LHSP as meeting their priority needs. The outcomes of LHSP remained relevant throughout the period of implementation, as the reduction of tensions and the achievement of social stability and cohesion continue to be a priority with the continuous presence of displaced Syrian in the country, though an update of the vulnerability map is needed. The analysis of the problems - root causes of conflicts and conflict dynamics - is well developed in the project design and are well related to the outcomes of the project.

#### **Effectiveness**

2. LHSP livelihood programme focused on support to cooperatives, vocational training and paid internship, and job creation, start-up entrepreneurial initiatives, market development, strengthening new and existing SMEs, value chains and women economic empowerment. For the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation team prioritised two major interventions: vocational training and cooperative support.

LHSP was effective in the support provided to cooperatives as most of them achieved positive results in terms of job creation and income generation, particularly for women, improvement of production efficiency and quality and improved marketing. The results achieved in LHSP support to vocational training, internship and job placement for unemployed youths varied between regions. The courses identified in the vocational training were based on the labour market assessment without taking into consideration job competition with displaced Syrians.

3. LHSP was effective in the preparation of the Maps of Risks and Resources (MRR) in vulnerable communities through the involvement of all stakeholders and the instilment of a democratic culture, leading to a consensus on the action plan and the identification of priority projects. The MRR process is a

methodology based on the assessment of needs resulting from the negative impact of the Syrian crisis on local communities and the identification of risks and resources through the participation of all stakeholders in the community. Some communities were, however, frustrated for having gone throughout the process of the MRR but without getting funding for any of the identified projects.

4. LHSP was also effective in enhancing the capacity of municipalities in the identification and planning of priority basic services projects. LHSP support to vulnerable communities has resulted in the reduction of pressure on basic services of municipalities and in meeting the urgent needs of the communities, as evidenced by the great satisfaction expressed by the beneficiaries. LHSP has proved ability to learn from experience and adapt to changing context by starting MRR at the cluster level and the implementation of related projects.

5. Positive results were achieved by most of local committees of Mechanisms for Social Stability (MSS) which were effective in identifying activities that contributed to the reduction of tensions. The MSS methodology is based on the assessment of factors generating tensions and negatively affecting social stability. This process involved representatives of local communities' components through local social stability task groups.

6. LHSP was effective in strengthening the capacity of municipalities and MoSA/SDCs in facilitating MRR and in enhancing their competencies and their positive and effective role which are evidenced by their improved image within the local communities. LHSP was also effective in building the capacity of MoSA/SDC in the MSS process and enhancing their skills in data analysis and planning, facilitation and conflict prevention, thus enabling them to facilitate the work of local committees in the reduction of tensions. Despite LHSP efforts to increase the interaction between the local and national ministerial levels, there is still a disconnection between the interventions implemented at the local level and the national policy level with regard to government response to the Syrian crisis in vulnerable host communities.

### **Efficiency**

7. LHSP has proved to be efficient in engaging in the MRR process all stakeholders of different views and achieving consensus in a relatively short period of time, though LHSP suffers from delays in the approvals process and the implementation of projects, exceeding one year in some cases. LHSP efficiency was seriously affected by the governance structure and institutional arrangements, particularly the challenges faced in the operation of the Technical Group (TG) which was replaced by the Project Management Committee (PMC). The TG which is led by MoSA and UNDP was supposed to discuss thematic issues and comprised of the Prime Ministry Office (PMO), the Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR) and the Ministry of Interior and Municipalities (MoIM) as well as relevant line ministries when needed. The PMC which is led by MoSA and UNDP approves the proposed projects and handles all the management responsibilities of LHSP.

### **Sustainability**

8. LHSP sustainability is reflected in the increased capacity of municipalities and SDC/MoSA to facilitate the MRR and MSS process, as evidenced by the results achieved in most of the vulnerable communities. The changes observed in the attitudes of the municipal councils towards the involvement of all local stakeholders in decision making will be difficult to sustain without enhancing the capacity of both the municipal councils and civil society actors in the community.

### **Impact**

9. While it is difficult to capture impact on projects implemented in 2017 since impact can be measured in the long-term and few years after the completion of project implementation, LHSP contributed to the reduction of tensions through the basic services projects implemented in the most vulnerable communities,

while the impact was less perceived in communities where the competition for jobs with displaced Syrians remains the major cause of tensions.

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

1. The update of the LHSP project document to reflect the evolving of the project during the period 2015 - 2017 as well as the review of indicators would have provided a more solid base for monitoring and evaluation.
2. The cultural and social changes in the vulnerable host communities reflected in consensus- building among local stakeholders under a difficult environment, that of local tensions, would not have been possible without LHSP successful implementation of a process of participation of local stakeholders in decision-making.
3. A comprehensive integrated capacity development plan of municipalities together with the development of capacity of local civil society actors will enhance the sustainability of the process of community participation in decision making.
4. LHSP would have had higher impact if funds would have been made available on a multi-year basis for the expansion of the project on livelihood, SMEs and sustainable job creation, as competition for markets and jobs constitutes a major source of tensions.
5. Initiating two parallel tracks within LHSP (MRR and MSS) have resulted in duplication of efforts as well as confusion among the MSS members about the type of proposed activities. The integration of MRR and MSS into the Mechanisms for Social stability and resilience (MSR) would streamline the process and ensure the mainstreaming of conflict-sensitivity into all interventions. The MSR is a new methodology that aims to strengthen factors of stability and to increase resilience of host communities.
6. The government response to the Syrian crisis at the policy level would be more relevant and more effective if positive interaction between the local, regional and national level is enhanced through the participation of relevant regional representative of line ministries in the discussion of sectoral proposals identified in the MRR process at the community or cluster level (and MSR in the next phase). Some successful interventions of LHSP involving representatives of line ministries at the regional level proved that coordination at the regional/governorate level if enhanced can streamline the process related to the proper communication between the local and the national levels.
7. Environmental projects in particular (solid waste and waste water) would need to be implemented at the cluster level as well to ensure their feasibility and consistency with the national strategies, while scaling-up livelihood projects at the cluster level would have higher impact.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT PHASE**

### ***1. Enhance the relevance of LHSP by updating the selection of targeted communities and reviewing the selection criteria***

The criteria for the selection of the vulnerable communities are to be reviewed to take into consideration the changes occurred in the distribution of displaced Syrians among the different locations in Lebanon and to include communities with little Syrian presence but are severely affected by the presence of displaced Syrians in neighbouring communities. Though the update of the vulnerability map is the responsibility of MOSA/LCRP, UNDP has to advocate for such update in order to enhance the relevance of the next phase of LHSP.

## ***2. Enhance livelihood programme through comprehensive livelihood projects that contribute to the short, medium and long-term job creation with particular emphasis on women and youths through working with micro, meso and macro actors***

The competition for jobs and markets has proved to be a major root causes of tensions in host communities affected by the Syrian crisis. The scaling-up of LHSP livelihood programme to respond to these challenges would contribute to the strengthening of local economic development and more particularly the creation of income generating opportunities and sustainable job creation.

Investing into the demand side will ensure short and mid-term job creation through investment in labour intensive activities related to infrastructure, agriculture process, green jobs and community/ social activities with linkages to specific value chains. Capacity building support to existing non-profit employment service centres, business development service centres and the partnership with existing or new social enterprises are recommended.

Impacted by the new resilience programming, the livelihood projects should stress and include components related to build the capacity of all stakeholders involved at micro-meso and macro level. LHSP should support income generating projects in areas where local businesses can compete.

## ***3. Support locally-based area approach to scale-up LHSP***

UNDP has long experience in area-based programming and implementation that needs to be enhanced to scale-up interventions from the community to the cluster level. The cluster approach has several advantages: (1) It would allow the implementation of some priority projects that are not feasible at the community level; (2) It would allow large-scale interventions with higher impact, particularly in livelihood; (3) The decision-making at the cluster level would enhance the long-term sustainability of LHSP. The cluster approach, in fact, would reduce the risk of control of few stakeholders on the decisions; and (4) The cluster approach would encompass communities where the presence of displaced Syrians is minimal but are bearing negative effects from neighbouring communities.

## ***4. Enhance LHSP sustainability through the formulation and implementation of an integrated and comprehensive capacity development strategy for local actors including municipalities, SDCs and civil society***

An integrated and comprehensive capacity development strategy for local actors is needed to ensure LHSP sustainability. The strategy is to differentiate in its capacity development approach between medium and large municipalities with small ones. Creating a culture of specialization and continuous learning within municipalities will contribute to the institutionalization of the built capacities. Strengthening the capacity of the civil society at the community level would enhance sustainability, since the civil society can constitute a driving force in community mobilisation and participation and remedy any negative changes that may occur in the future election of municipal councils.

## ***5. Review of the LHSP governance structure***

In line with government vision and objectives, LHSP should support more engagement at the regional level, which has also the advantage to improve LHSP efficiency in the next phase. This would require, however, a review and refinement of the current governance structure. In view of the fact that the Technical Group was not operational since more than one year and the fact that the PMC was a temporary arrangement needed to sustain the LHSP operations, it is recommended to:

(1) Activate the Steering Committee (SC) as a dynamic instrument for strategic decision making and expand its role to include all concerned line ministries and donors. UNDP will co-lead with MOSA the SC.

(2) Municipalities to continue to play the major role of identification of needs at the community and cluster levels (through MSR) and the mobilisation of stakeholders.

(3) Enhance the role of governorates and establish an **Advisory Board** at the regional/ Governorate level that includes UNDP and MoSA/SDCs representative and representatives of the relevant line ministries. The board will be chaired by the governor; municipalities and UOMs may be invited to the meetings if needed. The advisory board representing the line ministries at the governorate level will have the following tasks:

- Review all projects identified at the community/cluster level and share lessons learned from the implementation of similar projects in other areas
- Inform the municipalities about the national strategy/policy of the related line ministries
- Ensure that identified projects are consistent with the national strategy/policy of related line ministries
- Feed the national level with interventions carried at the regional/local level, especially success stories
- Act as intermediary with the line ministry to speed the approval process

#### ***6. Enhance the participation of donors in strategic issues and involve donors in the formulation of the next phase of LHSP***

More efforts are needed from UNDP to engage the donors, as a group, in the discussion of strategic issues related to LHSP. There is currently an opportunity to involve donors in the formulation of the next phase of LHSP. Special emphasis should be given in the project design of the next phase to gender mainstreaming. The involvement of donors is likely to increase their ownership and may result in better understanding by the donors of the problems encountered by LHSP.

#### ***7. Enhance the effectiveness of LHSP Information management tool and facilitate its access to donors***

The formulation of SMART indicators in the next LHSP phase would improve the reporting system and enhance the effectiveness of the LHSP Information Management tool. The involvement of the donors in the next LHSP project formulation (as indicated above) could lead to agreement between donors and LHSP on joint development of indicators which would allow for one reporting mechanism, instead of the current reporting system which is done for each donor separately. This should go in parallel with facilitating and sharing the Information Management Tool with the donors, thus keeping donors informed about the progress made and difficulties encountered in project implementation.



## **I. INTRODUCTION:**

### **A. The socio-economic context**

The Syrian crisis has had a severe impact on the Lebanese economy at all levels, negatively affecting key sectors such as trade, tourism, energy, environment and construction. The presence of an estimated 1.5 million displaced Syrians<sup>1</sup> has increased demand on infrastructure and social services, particularly water, sanitation, waste management, education and health services. Local authorities are faced with increased pressure to meet the increasing pressure on basic services, while the local structures are not equipped to deal with the new context. The distribution of the displaced Syrian population in areas with a high concentration of poor Lebanese has also compounded an already problematic economic situation, increasing unemployment, poverty and social tensions between different communities. The increase of the workforce due to the presence of displaced Syrians has increased competition for low-skilled jobs, and worsened work conditions.

Regional disparities became more significant with the displacement of Syrians; while the national poverty rate reached 28 percent, the poverty rate jumps to 42 percent in the South and 52 percent in North Lebanon<sup>2</sup>. By 2016, 251 of the most vulnerable communities in the four regions of Lebanon were hosting the largest number of displaced Syrians. Tensions at the national and local levels have thus increased in view of the competition for jobs, high poverty rates and pressure on basic services.

### **B. Project Background**

#### **1. Project strategy**

The Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA) jointly with the United Nations Development Programme launched in 2013 the "Lebanese Host Communities Support Project" (LHSP) as a comprehensive, coordinated and durable response towards the Syrian Crisis and its implications on the country. The project was intended to support national and local institutions through capacity building to respond to the impact of the Syrian crisis in Lebanon by targeting most vulnerable host communities; ensuring stakeholder participation in the affected areas in the identification, implementation and monitoring of interventions in a transparent manner; treating social stability as both a targeted activity as well as a cross cutting theme; and developing local capacities to operate and maintain the Interventions after completion to ensure sustainability<sup>3</sup>.

The project will further strengthen the capacity of national and local government and civil society actors for inclusive priority setting and conflict mitigation, and participatory service delivery as well as enhancing business skills and marketing opportunities in vulnerable areas.

The LHSP's expected impact is the reduction of community tensions. The "LHSP Project Document 2015-2017" states that "the Project seeks to help increase stability, specifically in the areas affected by the Syrian crisis, through improving livelihood and service provision in a conflict sensitive manner. It aims at contributing to improved community security, economic recovery and social stability in the affected areas through a community-based approach which will increase livelihood options and local level service delivery."

LHSP aims to achieve the four following outputs:

---

<sup>1</sup> LCRP, 2017 – 2020; see also: European Commission European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, Fact sheet (Lebanon), [https://ec.europa.eu/echo/where/middle-east/lebanon\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/echo/where/middle-east/lebanon_en)

<sup>2</sup> UNDP, Country Programme Document 2017-2020

<sup>3</sup> UNDP, LHSP Project document 2014-2017

- (1) Increase the livelihoods and economic opportunities mainly in affected areas
- (2) Strengthen the capacity of local and national actors to assess and respond to the needs and risks in a community participatory driven and conflict sensitive approach.
- (3) Improve the local level dispute resolution and community security.
- (4) Strengthen the capacity of the Lebanese Government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrians

The project is consistent with 2015-2016 LCRP strategic priorities 2 and 3:

Strategic priority 2: “strengthen the capacity of national and local delivery systems to expand access to and quality of basic public services”; and

Strategic priority 3: “reinforce Lebanon’s economic, social, environmental, and institutional stability by:(i) expanding economic and livelihood opportunities benefiting local economies and the most vulnerable communities; and (ii) promoting confidence-building measures within and across institutions and communities to strengthen Lebanon’s capacities”<sup>4</sup>.

LHSP is also consistent with LCRP 2017-2020 strategic objectives (SO): SO 3: Support service provision through national systems; and SO 4: Reinforce Lebanon’s economic, social and environmental stability.

It directly contributes to two LCRP sectors’ outcomes (LCRP 2015 – 2016 and LCRP 2017-2020) for which UNDP is the coordinator: Social Stability and Livelihood, as well as to Energy which was added in LCRP 2017 - 2020.

#### *Social Stability*

- Outcome 1: Strengthen municipalities, national and local institutions’ ability to alleviate resource pressure;
- Outcome 2: Strengthen municipal and local community capacity to foster dialogue and address sources of tensions and conflict; and
- Outcome 3: Enhance LCRP capacities on early warning and conflict sensitivity.

#### *Livelihood*

- Outcome 1: Stimulate local economic development and market systems to create income generating opportunities and employment;
- Outcome 2: Improve workforce employability; and
- Outcome 3: Strengthen policy development and enabling environment for job creation<sup>5</sup>.

#### *Energy*

- Outcome 1: Increase energy production through implementation of renewable energy sources
- Outcome 2: Reduce energy demand due to implementation of energy efficient initiatives
- Outcome 3: Improve access to electricity through rehabilitation and reinforcement works on the transmission and distribution networks

LHSP contributes to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It contributes more particularly to the following SDG goals: reduction of poverty, gender equality, clean water and sanitation, affordable and clean energy, reduced inequality, sustainable cities and communities and peace, justice and strong institutions.

---

<sup>4</sup> LCRP 2015 - 2016

<sup>5</sup> LCRP 2017 - 2020

## **2. Key LHSP partners**

The Ministry of Social Affairs is the key partner of UNDP, as MoSA is mandated by the Lebanese government with the coordination of the response to the Syrian crisis. Other partners include: MoIM, CDR, PMO which were part of the Technical group and the Steering Committee. UNDP has also partnership with line ministries that are involved in support to host communities which consist of: Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW), Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE).

LHSP forged also partnerships with a dozen of donors which contributed a total amount of US\$ 167.9 million during the period 2014-2019. The major donors are: UK, Germany-KFW, the Netherlands, US-BPRM, Italy, Norway, The European Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDDP), The European Union (EU) and the International Labour Organization (ILO). Recently, Canada donated US\$ 7,7 million for the period 2018 – 2022.

## **II. Evaluation scope and objectives**

### **A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation**

The main objectives of the evaluation are to:

- (i) Assess the level of progress made towards achieving the outcome of the project.
- (ii) Capture lessons learned and best practices from the implementation of the project with special focus on consolidated results, including outcomes and impact, of the different interventions.
- (iii) Provide concrete and actionable recommendations (strategic and operational), taking into consideration the 2016 LHSP Evaluation and other lessons learnt.
- (iv) Based on evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations, the evaluation will delineate how in its next phase the LHSP could improve, inter alia, its relevance, delivery of results and engagement with stakeholders, including local communities, Lebanese authorities and donors

### **B. The evaluation matrix, evaluation criteria and key evaluations questions**

The evaluation will assess project performance through the analysis of the five commonly used OECD - Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria, namely, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The assessment of the evaluation criteria will take into consideration gender issues and vulnerable groups by disaggregating the results (data) by gender and vulnerability when relevant and possible.

Ten key evaluation questions linked to the evaluation criteria have been developed. The evaluation questions will be assessed on the basis of a number of indicators. The assessment will not be only based on the indicators formulated in the Results and Resources Framework of the Project document, since these indicators are quantitative indicators (number and percentages) lacking often to be specific in terms of results and quality of interventions. The evaluation team formulated additional indicators, mostly qualitative ones, in accordance with the objectives of the project.

For that purpose, an evaluation matrix has been prepared. The Matrix is constructed in a hierarchical manner, consisting of the evaluation questions, the related indicators, data collected, data sources and answers to the evaluation questions. The analyzed data collected through the Desk review and all other data collection tools - entered into the Matrix - provides the basis to reply to the evaluation questions. The

answers to the evaluation questions will constitute the main body of the report, in addition to lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluation matrix consisting of the key evaluation questions with their related indicators is presented in Annex 1.

### **Key Evaluation questions**

The following key evaluation questions are formulated for the following evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

#### ***Relevance***

1. To what extent the outcomes and results of the project address the problems, needs and priorities of the intended direct and indirect beneficiaries, particularly women and vulnerable groups?
2. To what extent the design of the project took into consideration existing conflict dynamics and fragility as well as its adaptation to changing context?

#### ***Effectiveness***

3. To what extent the project has been effective in improving livelihoods and increasing economic opportunities in affected areas?
4. To what extent the project has been effective in strengthening the capacity of local and national actors to deliver basic services in a participatory and conflict sensitive manner?
5. To what extent the project has been effective in reducing local tensions and improving community security?
6. To what extent the project has been effective in strengthening the capacity of the Lebanese Government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrian?
7. To what extent monitoring knowledge management and risk management have been integrated in the project implementation?

#### ***Efficiency***

8. To what extent the project was managed efficiently, and outputs were produced efficiently with respect to cost and timeliness?

#### ***Sustainability***

9. What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from the previous and current LHSP interventions will continue at national and subnational level through adequate ownership, commitment, willingness displayed by the government and other stakeholders?

#### ***Impact***

10. To what extent the project is contributing to social stability and reduction of community tensions?

### **III. Evaluation approach and methods**

#### **A. Data sources and data collection procedures**

The team of consultants conducted the evaluation relying on various sources of information: existing primary and secondary sources, key informant interviews with various stakeholders and focus groups. A quantitative survey that covers the beneficiaries in the four regions of Lebanon was not carried out in view of the limited time and resources available for the preparation of the evaluation report. The sources of data are as follows:

(1) Review of existing primary and secondary sources, including relevant annual reports, perception analysis reports, previous evaluation report, progress and final reports on donors' contributions, etc... The list of reviewed documents is presented in Annex 2.

(2) Key informant interviews with key UNDP officials including the Resident Coordinator, Country Director, Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) of Social and Local Development Portfolio, Programme managers of Social and Local Economic Development (SLD), Energy and Environment, Crisis Prevention and Recovery (CPR), CTA of Stabilization and Recovery Programme, Coordinator of Livelihoods and Local Economic Development, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Reporting officer, head of Communication Unit, head of Engineering unit, and the four area managers together with their respective team.

(3) Key informant interviews with key government actors: MoSA, SDC coordinators and SDC staff in the four regions of Lebanon, CDR, PMO, line ministries (MoIM, MEHE, MoE), governors of South Lebanon and Akkar, Union of Municipalities (UoM) and mayors.

(4) Key informant interviews with major donors including: DFID, KFW, The Netherlands, Norway, BPRM, Italian Cooperation, and Global Affairs Canada.

(5) Key informant interviews with two UN agencies; UNHCR and ILO.

(6) Key informant interviews with the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture in Zahle, MSS working groups and cooperatives.

A total of 60 key informant interviews were conducted. The list of key informants is presented in Annex 3. Semi-guided interview questionnaires (evaluation sub-questions) have been developed for the different types of stakeholders on the basis of the key evaluation questions and related indicators (Annex 4).

(7) Focus groups: A total of 12 focus groups were conducted with beneficiaries in the four geographical areas. Beneficiaries included: cooperatives, MSS working groups, Municipalities as part of the Union of Municipalities, SMEs, graduates of vocational training courses and beneficiaries of the basic services delivered by the municipalities. The list of the participants of the focus groups is presented in Annex 3. A set of questions (guidelines) have been prepared for the focus groups (Annex 4).

## **B. Major limitations of the methodology**

(1) Limitation due to the size of the sample that will be selected in the four regions of Lebanon: Key informant interviews and focus groups are covering only very few stakeholders and beneficiaries as compared to more than 220 communities targeted by LHSP. Key informant interviews, in fact, were conducted with only seven mayors and three unions of municipalities (where a total of 6 municipalities attended the meeting with the evaluators) as well as with four MSS working groups. The evaluation team will be careful to generalize some of the results without conducting adequate triangulation of the data with other sources for the purpose of validation.

(2) Efficiency criteria: The assessment of the efficiency will focus on the extent to which LHSP processes & procedures are flexible and timeliness, and the extent to which LHSP governance structure and institutional arrangements were adequate. The assessment related to the value for money will not be carried out in this evaluation in view of: (1) the limited time available to conduct such a complex exercise for a large project that include large number of projects; and (2) External factors that are not under the control of the project which are related to the efficiency of multiple stakeholders.

(3) Evaluation criteria: Impact. Some limitations of the assessment of the impact are to be expected in the evaluation, since impact can be measured in the long-term and few years after the completion of project implementation. The evaluation team will however assess the extent to which the results achieved by the project could contribute to the long-term goal (impact), will attempt to capture some “emerging impacts”, and identify the factors affecting the achievement of impact.

### **C. Performance standards and ethical considerations**

Knowledge Development Company (KDC) will ensure high quality of the evaluation on the basis of OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) principles related to evaluation quality standards. The quality standards will be used during the different stages of the evaluation process. KDC will ensure that the final report complies with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports.

KDC will ensure the evaluation is undertaken with highest level of confidentiality and integrity as well as with respect of differences in culture, customs, religious beliefs and practices of all stakeholders.

It will ensure that all stakeholders, including partners and donors, as well as beneficiary organizations and other relevant ones are consulted during the evaluation process and given the opportunity to contribute.

KDC will ensure that the judgment made in the analysis of the information collected is objective and not biased. The second step will be a cross checking of the information gathered from different sources under each of the indicator. To the extent possible, KDC will ensure the triangulation of findings through different evaluation methods. In case of conflicts in the data, the team of consultants will contact again the concerned stakeholders to clarify the issue. Finally, KDC will ensure that the recommendations are concrete and actionable.

## **IV. KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION**

### **A. RELEVANCE**

The analysis of relevance will focus on the extent to which the design of the project and its objectives address the problems, needs and priorities of the intended direct and indirect beneficiaries, particularly women and vulnerable. The analysis of relevance will assess the extent to which the design of the project took into consideration existing conflict dynamics and fragility as well as its adaptation to changing context. It will assess whether the target beneficiaries have ownership of the project interventions and perceived the project as relevant to their needs.

***1. Outcomes of LHSP remained relevant throughout the period of implementation, as the reduction of tensions and the achievement of social stability and cohesion continue to be a priority with the continuous presence of displaced Syrian in the country, though stakeholders requested an update of the vulnerability map***

The outcomes of LHSP on livelihood and social stability are still relevant to the priority needs of the host communities affected by the influx of displaced Syrians. They are also consistent with the 2017 – 2020 LCRP strategic objectives and outcomes related to social stability and livelihood. A change in the communities that can be considered as vulnerable has been noticed by several stakeholders, particularly in the Bekaa region where movement of Syrians from one area to another was observed. Several donors met by the evaluation team also requested an update of the vulnerability map. It was also observed that communities with little or no presence of displaced Syrians are severely affected by the negative effects of

the environment (i.e. solid waste) originating in neighbouring vulnerable communities, as well as by job competition. The best example is the pollution of the Litani river which increased with the influx of displaced Syrians as it is affecting several communities not necessarily considered as part of the vulnerability map. Competition for jobs is observed when displaced Syrians in a vulnerable community move to work essentially in a different one.

***2. LHSP main partners strongly express ownership of the project while beneficiaries strongly perceive LHSP as meeting their priority needs***

LHSP empowers the local stakeholders and build their capacities to be able to play a bigger role in implementing the tools and processes. The main LHSP partner, MoSA, considers it has full ownership of the project, while local partners such as the municipalities and civil society organizations expressed also ownership through the MRR and MSS process. Other line ministries and the governorates expressed the need to be more involved in LHSP. The Adam Smith evaluation of LHSP in 2016 has also concluded that “it is not clear that Government agencies in the Technical Group feel the same degree of ownership as MoSA does”<sup>6</sup>.

The beneficiaries of the project perceive LHSP as meeting their priority needs, particularly in the relative absence of other means of support. Beneficiaries consider LHSP as a “catalyst” by converting the Syrian refugees’ crisis into opportunities for the host communities, as indicated by several mayors met by the evaluation team in the four regions of Lebanon. Two mayors indicated that “if we didn’t have displaced Syrians, nobody would have taken care of our needs”.

***3. Analysis of the problems - root causes of conflicts and conflict dynamics - is well developed in the project design and are well related to the results/outcomes of the project, while the intervention logic is not well articulated***

LHSP project document has analysed well the problems which are related to the influx of more than one million Syrians to Lebanon, constituting thus around 25 per cent of the population in Lebanon. The Syrian crisis has exacerbated the socio-economic conditions in the country in terms of unemployment, especially among women and youth, and increased the pressure on basic services and livelihood. The increased tensions created because of the Syrian crisis is having negative impact on social stability and cohesion.

The analysis of the root causes of conflict is consistent with the outcomes formulated in LCRP document and the intended impact. There is, however, some confusion between the two first outputs and the third one. The impact of the two first outputs and the effectiveness of the third output are similar, as both are expected to contribute to social stability and reduction of community tensions. This discrepancy has been overcome by LHSP which is continuously evolving, as recently and based on Adam Smith Evaluation of 2016, the MRR and MSS are now integrated in one process, the Mechanisms for Stability and Resilience (MSR). In other terms, the third output will be integrated in the livelihoods and basic services components of the project. The MSR is a new methodology that aims to strengthen factors of stability and to increase resilience of host communities. It is based on the assumption that the protracted crisis that Lebanon is facing requires increased support to stabilization in host communities with a view to transitioning towards sustainable resilience through longer-term interventions. Broadening the focus to prevention in view of new dynamics of tensions being witnessed will be considered in the MSR<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Adam Smith, LHSP Evaluation, 2016

<sup>7</sup> UNDP, Stability and Resilience Dynamic, General Methodology

Based on experiences in the various host communities, the LHSP management realised the need to modify the ambitious outcome related to solving dispute, since the achievement related to solving dispute cannot be under the “control” of the project, rather the project can launch interventions to prevent conflict and create the enabling environment and the conditions for the national partners to prevent conflict.

The formulated indicators do not always provide the basis for monitoring and evaluation. While they can be considered as consistent with the intervention logic, they are in several cases not specific in terms of expected results; they are formulated in general terms though consistent with the four other SMART indicators. There is complete absence of qualitative indicators that can help in the assessment of the intended outcomes.

## **B. EFFECTIVENESS**

The assessment of effectiveness will look at extent to which the project results have been delivered as planned and progress made in the achievement of specific objectives. Focus will be on issues such as: whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received by the target groups and to the satisfaction of the beneficiaries. More particularly, the effectiveness will look at the extent to which LHSP has:

- Improved livelihoods and increased economic opportunities in affected areas
- Strengthened the capacity of local and national actors to deliver basic services in a participatory and conflict sensitive manner
- Reduced local tensions and improved community security
- Strengthened the capacity of the Lebanese government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrians
- Integrated monitoring, knowledge management and risk management in the project implementation

### **1. Effectiveness of LHSP in improving livelihoods and increasing economic opportunities in affected areas**

The purpose of the livelihood component of the LHSP is to reinforce the stabilization of host communities through sustainable social and economic development at the local level and to mitigate tensions between host communities and displaced Syrian. The Support to Livelihood and Local Economic Development opportunities to host communities is expected to restore livelihoods, especially for youth and women and most vulnerable groups, through activities linked to longer term development outcomes. Four main initiatives were planned in LHSP: Rapid Employment Schemes; Support to MSMEs and Development of Start Ups; Support to Workforce Employability; and Promotion of local plans supporting job creation for hosting communities<sup>8</sup>.

LHSP livelihood programme focused on support to cooperatives, vocational training and paid internship, and job creation, start-up entrepreneurial initiatives, market development, strengthening new and existing SMEs, agricultural development through the rehabilitation of irrigation canals. In 2017, LHSP initiated interventions in value chains and women economic empowerment, the results of which can be assessed in the coming years. For the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation team prioritised two major interventions: vocational training and cooperative support. It is worth mentioning that the majority of beneficiaries of the livelihood programme were women (53% of total beneficiaries)<sup>9</sup>

Though LHSP objective is to support livelihood projects that could contribute to mitigate tensions and reduce conflict, such support was in several cases not directly linked to the presence of conflict or tensions,

---

<sup>8</sup> UNDP, LHSP Project document 2015 - 2017

<sup>9</sup> LHSP, Annual report 2017



but more as a means to change perception of the Lebanese host communities that they are not neglected by the international community, while the displaced Syrians are being provided with cash and in-kind support. The basic assumption is that if the livelihood of the Lebanese in hosting communities improve, it is most likely that tensions will not escalate. This is the case, for example, of the support provided to some SMEs (Shoemakers in Mount Lebanon) or to several cooperatives. Some interventions that were directly linked to the reduction of tensions are those that supported job creation and market development.

***1. LHSP supported vocational training, internship and job placement for unemployed youths in several communities severely affected by the competition of Syrians for jobs in semi-skilled jobs in the construction sector and for jobs in other areas where Syrians are not allowed to work. Results varied between regions and were not always as intended, as a low percentage of youth found jobs. The courses identified in the vocational training were based on the labour market assessment that didn't take into consideration job competition of Syrians in areas where they are not allowed to work.***

LHSP supported vocational training and paid internship for 680 youths (323 females and 357 males) in the Bekaa, North, South, and Mount Lebanon<sup>10</sup>. LHSP support was relevant to the needs of unemployed who are facing harsh competition of low-cost job of displaced Syrians. LHSP support has contributed to enhance the morale of the youth and provided them with skills, thus enhancing their employability.

Despite LHSP efforts in this regard, only 17% of youths found jobs<sup>11</sup>. This could be related to the economic recession in Lebanon and to the fact that the identification of the vocational training courses was based on a labour market assessment that didn't take into consideration job competition of Syrians in areas where they are not allowed to work. Other reasons are related to the relative short duration of the project, as the implementing consulting company or NGOs has to carry out, in less than one year, several activities including labour market assessment, selection of trainees, implementation of the courses through vocational training centres, placement of internships and finally job placement.

Evidence shows that some drop-out from the courses was observed in some areas in view of the lack of careful screening of candidates or the fact that the courses or internships were in locations far from the residence of the trainees. This observation is related to the project implemented by two NGOs in Mount Lebanon, on behalf of UNDP. Better results, however, were achieved in Zahle (Bekaa) by UNDP partner, the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture.

***2. Most of the cooperatives supported by LHSP have achieved positive results in terms of job creation and income generation for women in particular, improvement of production efficiency and quality and improved marketing***

Evidence shows that when asked about the existence of tensions in their area, the cooperatives met by the evaluation team didn't relate LHSP support to existing tensions, but more to their urgent need for improvement of production efficiency and quality, improved marketing and income generation. They greatly appreciated LHSP support. Among the beneficiaries of the project were women, as 56 women benefitted from the development of 3 community kitchens and 91 women benefitted from initiatives supporting cooperatives.

The Fishermen cooperative in Sarafand was supported with the rehabilitation of the fish market which was in extremely bad conditions. In the focus group conducted with members of the cooperative, it was indicated that 111 members of the cooperative benefitted directly from the LHSP project, as their income has

---

<sup>10</sup> LHSP, Annual report 2017

<sup>11</sup> Ibid...

increased by at least 50 per cent. The cooperative which manages the fish market was also able to increase its financial resources. The members benefitted also from the capacity-building provided by UNDP in several areas, such as accounting, food safety, the operation of a cooperative, etc...; unfortunately, the cooperative does not charge any membership fee on their members.

UNDP supported Atayeb Al Rif with a food truck that would serve 45 cooperatives in selling their products. The food truck aims at creating a marketing channel for food products “Mouneh”. Atayeb Al Rif will cost-share 15% of the cost.

The agricultural Cooperative of Kfarmeshki has 12 members and operate in the Caza of Rashaya. The main products are: grapes, olive and olive oil and apple. LHSP supported the cooperative with equipment that resulted in reducing cost for the cooperatives, increased production and improved product quality.

LHSP supported the Kfardebian women cooperative which has 11 members (women) and employ 20 women. The cooperative processes agricultural products. LHSP provided the cooperative with equipment including zaatar and sumac crusher, air pressor to increase production, improve quality and reduce time and effort, in addition to gas storage with its installations. Despite the difficult economic situation, the women were able to increase their monthly income by 30-40% and make around \$350 per month.

## **2. Effectiveness of LHSP in strengthening the capacity of local and national actors to deliver basic services in a participatory and conflict sensitive manner**

Under this result, LHSP aims to develop the capacity of the municipalities, SDCs and the civil society to identify priority needs in basic services in a participatory approach, which are likely to ease pressure exerted by displaced Syrians, and thus reduce possible conflicts.

*1. LHSP was effective in the preparation of MRR in vulnerable communities through the involvement of all stakeholders and the instilment of a democratic culture, leading to a consensus on the action plan and the identification of priority projects. Some communities were, however, frustrated for having gone throughout the process of the MRR but without getting funding for any of the identified projects.*

The Mapping of risks and resources (MRR) was carried out in 221 communities representing 88 per cent of the 251 communities that were considered vulnerable. The percentage varies between regions from 76.1 per cent in Mount Lebanon to 98.4 per cent in the Bekaa. In Beirut area where 6 vulnerable communities were identified, none has witnessed the implementation of the MRR.

| Region        | Number of target vulnerable communities | Number of communities where MRR was conducted | Per cent of communities covered by MRR | Number of communities where at least one project was implemented | Per cent of target vulnerable communities where at least one project was implemented |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Beirut        | 6                                       | 0   | 0                                      | 0  | 0  |
| Bekaa         | 65                                      | 64  | 98.4                                   | 47   | 72.3   |
| Mount Lebanon | 46                                      | 35  | 76.1                                   | 27   | 58.7   |
| North Lebanon | 65                                      | 62  | 95.4                                   | 49   | 75.4   |
| South Lebanon | 69                                      | 60  | 87.0                                   | 65*  | 94.2   |
| Total         | 251                                     | 221   | 88.0                                   | 188  | 75.0   |

\* Projects were implemented in areas where MRR was not completed while a quick needs assessment was conducted. This explains the fact that the number of communities where at least one project was implemented is higher than the number of communities which went through the MRR process.

Source: UNDP

The MRR process resulted in the creation of a culture of participation at the local community level, while the partnership between municipalities, SDC and the local stakeholders generated positive results. LHSP succeeded in increasing awareness of the mayors in engaging all local stakeholders with often conflicting views to take part in the MRR and agreed on an action plan. Municipalities became more aware of their responsibility to respond to the needs of the community according to the priorities identified in the MRR process. The LHSP methodology has resulted, in fact, in the improvement of the image of municipalities in the community. For example, the President of UOM of Beirut Southern Suburbs stated that municipalities in this area are very satisfied with the LHSP participatory methodology and the partnership between UNDP-MOSA-Municipalities & UOM.

LHSP was able to implement at least one project in 75 per cent of total vulnerable communities; this average varies between 58.7% in Mount Lebanon to 94.2% in South Lebanon. All projects identified in the action plans are uploaded on MoSA website. While UNDP is regarded by most communities as an organization that can be trusted and committed, donors' priorities, however, have created frustration in some communities which went throughout the process of the MRR, but no projects were implemented.

***2. LHSP was effective in enhancing the capacity of municipalities in the identification and planning of priority basic services projects, though municipalities are requesting more capacity building in the delivery of basic services.***

Municipal members and employees do not have enough capacity to carry out their work, while they lack a municipal culture and vision that would allow them to identify, plan and deliver basic services in an effective way. Municipalities also face the challenge of transparency and accountability, as well as sharing information with citizens about municipal decisions and budgets. The LHSP supported capacity-building project of the newly elected municipal councils through a partnership between UNDP, MoIM and the Institute of Finance – IoF - (Irada Baladiya). Though the training was beneficial as indicated by several mayors, it was short in duration and without follow-up and coaching. Municipalities requested to be exposed to additional training. The training was not also part of a formal capacity development process that entails: capacity assessment, design and implementation of capacity development interventions to address the identified capacity gaps and evaluation and institutionalization of the developed capacity. It is worth mentioning that capacity-building of municipalities was not considered as priority by donors.

Environmental management is another area that needs to be introduced in capacity development of the municipalities. The Ministry of Environment, with the support and partnership with LHSP, has developed and tested a training curriculum for municipalities on Environmental management. The LHSP will support the implementation of this training programme of the municipalities to ensure that municipalities have the needed knowledge to manage their environment. The development of a training curriculum for municipalities was initially started as a collaboration with MoE/LHSP in early 2017.

***3. LHSP support to vulnerable communities has resulted in the reduction of pressure on basic services of municipalities and in meeting the urgent needs of the communities, as evidenced by the great satisfaction expressed by the beneficiaries.***

Municipalities consider the support provided by UNDP as meeting priority needs in basic services, particularly that municipalities have limited financial resources while government funding is facing budget constraints. The support to municipalities contributed effectively to the reduction of pressure on basic

services in view of the influx of displaced Syrian and the fact that the communities, particularly in rural areas, were neglected for a long period of time.

Beneficiaries in several communities highly appreciated the benefits they gained from LHSP projects. To mention a few examples: the lighting project in Qrayeh has resulted in monthly saving of the municipality of an average amount of L.L. 3-5 million per month (US\$ 2,000 – US\$ 3,000), which was spent on maintenance and frequent change of the lamps; the waste water project in Tel Abbas Gharbi in Akkar solved a major problem for the community; the rehabilitation of irrigation canals and the construction of agricultural roads, and which benefitted the farmers of Al Mohamara; the irrigation canal in Qab Elias which resulted in the reduction of the costs for farmers by 50% and the plantation of 5,000 additional hectares while more than 1,000 families benefited, and temporary jobs were created for Lebanese and Syrians; the rehabilitation and operation of the Aytaneet waste water treatment plant (a successful model of PPP because a private sector company is operating the plant).

Some constraints were, however, faced by the communities in the sorting of solid waste. Despite the awareness and training provided to the Lebanese communities and Syrian refugees in several areas on the issue of sorting the solid waste to prevent the accumulation of waste and their impact on the environment, the implementation turned out to face several problems. One of these problems is the difficulty to change the culture of both host communities and displaced Syrian towards respect of the environment through training and awareness campaigns only. In addition to enhancing awareness, change of behaviour and attitudes towards the environment is to be undertaken through activities and interventions that will bring together host communities and displaced Syrians. It is worth mentioning that UNDP team in South Lebanon is considering the organization of Training of Trainers (TOT in each community on awareness of sorting solid waste).

LHSP supported also the construction of recreational projects to reduce tensions and bring together Lebanese and displaced Syrians in joint events and activities. For example, the construction of a football playground and a basketball playground in Baysour, Mount Lebanon, that attracted Syrians and Lebanese from Baysour and from the neighbouring villages to play together and establish friendships , thus reducing the tensions. The playground in Qab Elias is another example where activities and competition among groups of youth on Mini-football and basketball were carried out. The sports activities were instrumental in providing the children and youth with a positive and useful alternative and brought together Lebanese and Syrian to compete in games.

***4. LHSP was effective in enhancing the ability of municipalities to get funding for priority projects identified in the MRR process from other sources than LHSP.***

The MRR process and related action plans resulted also in unintended positive effects, as several communities were able to get funding for projects identified in the action plans from sources other than LHSP. This is the case of Tal Abbas Al Gharbi in Akkar where Concern Worldwide through a UNICEF Fund will construct a Waste Water Treatment Plant in the village. Also, the LHSP project on the rehabilitation of irrigation canals in Mohamara resulted in additional support provided by Concern Worldwide and Save the Children which both worked as well on some parts of the irrigation canals. . Such involvement of the other organizations would not have been possible without LHSP initial support. This is also the case of Baysour whereby the municipality was able to get a grant from a wealthy member of Baysour to support the additional works of the sports playground.

***5. LHSP has proved ability to learn from experience and adapt to changing context by starting MRR at the cluster level and the implementation of related projects***

LHSP is evolving through learning from past experiences and adapting to changing context. The implementation of some projects in the areas of treatment of solid waste, waste water management and drinking water has proved to be ineffective at the community level without being linked to a network at the regional or cluster level. The cluster approach also aims to increase the impact of the project by benefitting larger number of the population as well benefitting municipalities that are not part of the 251 communities, but indirectly affected by the presence of displaced Syrians in the cluster.

The implementation of MRR at the cluster level that brings together a number of communities started with 12 clusters by using the same methodology of the MRR at the community level and bringing, in addition, experts for each of the identified priority sectors to participate in the consultations.

This approach is expected to be modified as follows: In the first meeting, consultations will be conducted with the governor and Union of municipalities; then stakeholders from each local community will be invited to the cluster meeting. Depending on sectors identified, representatives of line ministries and relevant experts are to be invited. Then sectoral analysis is conducted according to priorities identified.

### 3. Effectiveness of LHSP in reducing local tensions and improving community security

This result is expected to be achieved through strengthening local mechanisms for reducing local tensions related to the influx of displaced Syrian at the local level. The purpose is to improve the capacity of the local leaders to take leadership on conflict mitigation and prevention in the targeted areas<sup>12</sup>.

For this purpose, LHSP established the Mechanisms for Social Stability (MSS) that took the shape of working groups or committees with the mandate to monitor tensions and intervene whenever needed, creating a positive environment in the village through dialogue and activities. Promoting social stability by addressing social and cultural challenges faced by both Lebanese communities and displaced Syrians and enhancing local actors and local authorities' role as inside mediators in their communities<sup>13</sup>.

***1. Though LHSP built the capacity of local MSS committees/working groups in peace building and conflict prevention, there is still a need to work on changing the attitudes of the committees towards displaced Syrians as a pre-requisite for changing the attitudes of the community.***

LHSP established MSS working groups or committees in 105 communities representing 47.5 per cent of the 221 targeted communities. The lowest percentages were recorded in Mount Lebanon (22.9%) and South Lebanon (38.3%) while the highest percentages were in North Lebanon and Akkar ( 61.3%) and the Bekaa (56.3%). The highest percentages can be explained by the highest concentration of displaced Syrians in these two regions coupled with the existence of more local tensions.

| Region | Number of target vulnerable communities | Number of communities where MRR was conducted | Number of communities where MSS was conducted | Communities where MSS was conducted as % of MRR |
|--------|---|---|---|---|
| Beirut | 6                                       | 0   | 0   | 0   |

<sup>12</sup> UNDP, LHSP Project document 2015-2017

<sup>13</sup> UNDP, LHSP Annual Report, 2016

|                         |     |     |     |      |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Bekaa                   | 65  | 64  | 36  | 56.3 |
| Mount Lebanon           | 46  | 35  | 8   | 22.9 |
| North Lebanon and Akkar | 65  | 62  | 38  | 61.3 |
| South Lebanon           | 69  | 60  | 23  | 38.3 |
| Total                   | 251 | 221 | 105 | 47.5 |

Source: UNDP

According to the evaluation conducted in 2017 on the MSS achievements, the majority of individuals engaged in the MSS process were Lebanese (93.9 %.), while only 6.1 % were Syrians. The findings of this evaluation are based on a quantitative survey of a sample of two groups of individuals, those who are part of the MSS committees with those who are not. The survey covered three regions: Bekaa, Akkar and South Lebanon. The survey which compares these two groups concludes that the MSS group has much better understanding of aspects related to human rights and the way of solving problems through cooperation and consensus. The individuals who were engaged in MSS were convinced that the MSS was effective in enhancing social cohesion and reducing conflicts and confirmed that those activities contributed to creating a positive enabling environment by encouraging community groups to work and cooperate towards one common peace building goal<sup>14</sup>.

The targeted individuals (who included members from the local community, civil society, and local actors) strongly acknowledged that the adopted approach to design and develop the MSS was comprehensive and participatory with the municipality, local actors, and civil society where it contributed in building trust between all parties.

The municipality was recognized as an important entity responsible for the success of the MSS where its commitment and collaboration played a major role. However, committee members complained of the limited engagement of municipal members in the work of the committees in some targeted areas<sup>15</sup>.

The team of evaluators found that the composition of the MSS committees/working groups was adequate, as all local major actors, in addition to interested individuals, were participating. The committees indicated they benefitted very much from LHSP training, learned about the preparation of conflict mapping and the analysis of tensions and their roots; they also acquired skills on how to deal with tensions in the local community. One of the committees indicated that it gained skills in various areas: Networking and building relationships with each other, accepting diversity, leadership and team building, and communication. In some communities, MSS has activated or supported the establishment of municipal committees (on women, child, environment, health, etc...) with the objective to reduce tensions.

MSS committees met by the evaluation team indicated they need LHSP to continue building their capacity and to provide them with coaching. Despite the skills gained by MSS committees, it was found, however, that more efforts are needed from LHSP in changing the attitudes and behaviour of some local committees/working groups towards displaced Syrians, as a pre-requisite to enable the committees reduce tensions in the community.

***2. Positive results were achieved by most of local MSS committees which were effective in identifying activities/projects that contributed to the reduction of tensions, though some confusion has been observed regarding the nature of the projects which often fall under the MRR process.***

<sup>14</sup> KDC, Evaluation of the Mechanisms for Social Stability in Conflict-Affected Communities in Lebanon, 2017

<sup>15</sup> Ibid...

The MSS committees/working groups met by the evaluation team have been active in identifying and implementing activities in the community to diffuse and mitigate tensions, between Lebanese themselves and between Lebanese and Syrian displaced. The participation of Syrians in these activities varies from one community to another. The activities conducted include the cleaning of the littoral and the organization of a theatre on the sorting of solid waste in Chekka North Lebanon; the organization of a kermess in Sarafand and a marathon in Chebaa (South Lebanon); the activation of the sport club in Tal Abbas Gharbi in Akkar and a marathon activity in Takrit in in Akkar In Baysour (Mount Lebanon), the MSS committee organized a three days camp for the youth (30 young male and female). According to the committee, the results were positive: Increased cohesion among the youth from various political backgrounds; several changes were observed in the behaviour of the youth during the camp; talents among the youths were discovered and youths were thus encouraged to volunteer and get engaged in community activities.

In the North of Lebanon, a committee for disabled of 12 people was formed between two areas that witnessed heavy fighting in recent years: Jabal Mohsen and Al Tebbaneh. The committee aims to help those who have been affected by the Tripoli events and who are suffering some disability. They were supported through various activities including sport (basketball). As part of Peace Building activities, the Tripoli Women Platform, a MSS working group, invited 50 business women in Tripoli to a 3-day workshop on development of their businesses with the purpose to enhance women's role in social stability.

There is, however, confusion among some MSS committees regarding the nature of activities to be identified and implemented. The MSS committees are in some cases identifying projects in basic services and livelihood that fall under the MRR process. This explains one of the reasons LHSP is integrating MRR and MSS into one unified methodology, the MSR. The MSS committee in Hourtaala, Bekaa seems not aware of the difference between the projects resulting from the MRR and the activities that could be implemented by the MSS to enhance social stability, for instance when asked about what activities they are planning for, they answered the establishment of a health center. The evaluation team found that in Qrayeh (South Lebanon), the committee identified a rural tourism (eco-tourism) project and will start soon implementing the preparatory work using the fund provided by LHSP (around US\$ 20,000). Furthermore, in South Lebanon, two activities were identified and implemented through MSS committees: training of women on business skills to start a business and vocational training.

#### **4. Effectiveness of LHSP in strengthening the capacity of the Lebanese government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrians**

This component aims at building linkages between development/ stabilization and humanitarian responses, as well as between the activities being carried out at the local level and the government response to the Syrian crisis at the national level. The purpose is to support the national actors and to strengthen their capacity in responding to the crisis and coordinating the response in a conflict sensitive way.

*1. LHSP was effective in strengthening the capacity of MoSA/SDCs in facilitating MRR and in enhancing SDC staff competencies in communication, analytical thinking, leadership and negotiation which enabled them to deal with different communities and a wide array of stakeholders. The enhanced capacity of SDCs and their positive and effective role are evidenced by their improved image within the local communities.*

UNDP conducted training for MOSA area coordinators and SDC staff on the MRR process. While in the beginning of the implementation of LHSP, SDC staff were coached by UNDP in carrying out the MRR and consultations with the community, they became able to conduct the process on their own starting early 2016 and without UNDP support.

The SDC staff that the evaluation team met with in the four regions of Lebanon were unanimous in expressing their appreciation to UNDP and the extent to which they benefitted from the training on the MRR methodology, especially in data gathering and analysis. They feel that they have now more self-confidence, better communication, presentation, leadership and negotiation skills that enable them to deal with different stakeholders. The implementation of MRR has also enhanced their team work spirit.

According to the mayors and other stakeholders, the participation of SDCs in the beginning of LHSP implementation was not welcomed, as there was also doubt by the community about their effectiveness. The involvement of SDCs is seen now as very positive. SDCs were able to build trust with the community, improve their image and have more credibility. There is evidence of SDCs having now better coordination and enhanced partnership with the municipalities. Furthermore, SDCs started to facilitate MRR at the cluster level. Following the selection of sectors, experts and government representatives participated in the identification of projects.

***2. LHSP was effective in building the capacity of MoSA/SDC in the MSS process and enhancing their skills in data analysis and planning, facilitation and conflict prevention, thus enabling them to lead local committees in the reduction of tensions.***

The assessment conducted on SDCs staff in the fourth quarter of 2016<sup>16</sup> shows the following capacity gaps: research and data analysis, planning skills, weak capacity to design an intervention in conflict prevention and implement mitigation techniques, weak capacity to develop training content and transfer knowledge.

LHSP supported capacity building of SDCs staff in the three phases of the MSS process: conflict mapping and analysis, mediation of conflict, and interventions through activities that constitute the mechanisms for social stability.

LHSP was effective in developing the capacity of SDCs in project design and implementation, conflict analysis, stakeholders' engagement, communication and facilitation. SDCs have increased ability to conduct activities at the community level and build relationships with a network of Municipalities, NGOs and community groups.

SDCs staff met by the evaluation team acknowledged that LHSP helped them to look at problems in the community in different ways than in the past, as this was their first experience in conflict prevention. They feel they have acquired the knowledge and skills to identify root causes of conflict, analyse and manage tensions and act towards conflict prevention and mitigation. They have gained credibility and the trust of the people. Several SDCs staff requested more capacity building to be able to conduct conflict analysis and address tensions at the local level, promote diversity and assist other to reach common grounds.

The participation of MoSA/SDC in LHSP resulted therefore in:

- Enhanced trust and positive image
- More communication and interaction with people
- Enhanced partnerships with municipalities

The rehabilitation of several SDC centres was crucial in enabling the Centres to deliver services to the local communities, including the organization of events that contribute to the reduction of tensions and social stability and cohesion. LHSP has implemented 13 projects to rehabilitate and equip SDCs. For example,

---

<sup>16</sup> Nabil Hassan, MoSA SDCs and the mechanisms for social stability, MoSA personnel needs assessment report. November 2016



the SDC in Al Qobbeh was able with the new facilities to organize several events: training, MSS meetings, the provision of additional services (health...) and daily interaction with the community.

***3. Despite LHSP efforts to increase the interaction between the local and national ministerial levels, there is still a disconnection between the interventions implemented at the local level and the national policy level with regard to government response to the Syrian crisis in vulnerable host communities.***

Despite the progress made by LHSP in facilitating the relation between the local level and the line ministries, difficulties were faced in having the projects identified by the MRR process approved by the line ministries, particularly when they are not feasible if not implemented as part of a regional network. This was more related to projects in solid waste, waste water and drinking water. The rejection of projects by line ministries has created tension with local actors.

The above problem can be related to two major issues: (1) the MRR committees often identify the project in the absence of a sectoral expert who can provide his (her) initial advice on the feasibility of the project; (2) the fact that LHSP didn't give often an adequate role to a national partner at the regional level, such as the governor or representatives of the line ministries at the governorate level, who can play the role of intermediary and feed the national actor (line ministries) with the local projects with the view to share information, best practices and success stories and ensure the projects are in line with the national priorities. The full picture has also the advantage to enable the line ministry to become more aware of the needs and challenges faced by the host communities and may result in a more adequate ministry's response to the Syrian crisis at the policy level.

A good example of how a local intervention fed the national policy and resulted in the adoption of the line ministry of a successful experience to be implemented at the national level is the LHSP project on road safety in Borj Al Barajneh public schools. LHSP provided support to 6 public schools on Road Safety through the development of training materials, capacity-building for the teachers and awareness sessions for secondary students. The project was implemented in collaboration with the National Council for Road Safety (NCRS) and the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE). The produced training materials and handouts are expected to be part of the civil education curricula, thus institutionalizing the effort and feeding into national plans

## **5. Effectiveness of LHSP in integrating monitoring, knowledge management and risk management in the project implementation**

### ***1. UNDP was effective in the development of an Information Management tool as a means for a continuous monitoring of the projects in close coordination with UNDP area teams***

M&E procedures are well elaborated while risks and mitigation measures are well analysed.

LHSP has set several tools for monitoring and evaluation of activities and expected results. These are: (1) the quarterly progress reporting, a quality assessment shall record progress towards the completion of key results; (2) Risk Log: A risk log shall be activated in UNDPs project management system (Atlas) and will be regularly updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation; (3) Field visits and quarterly reports; (4) Annual Project Report that will cover lessons to help in assessing the various implementation modalities; (5) Annual Work-Plan and Budget; (6) Monitoring visits by UNDP; (7) Lessons Learnt: A project Lesson-learned log shall be activated and regularly updated; (8) Review of project performance upon completion of the project; and (9) Evaluation and Audit

The M&E unit of LHSP and in coordination with UNDP teams in the four regions of Lebanon closely monitors the implementation of LHSP. The unit produced monthly progress reports, project completion

reports for donors and the LHSP annual report. The annual report mainly focuses on activities and outputs according to the four objectives of the project. In addition, UNDP relies on the perception reports produced by Aktis which provide an understanding of the factors influencing perceptions around social stability, municipal legitimacy and social tensions, as well as propose recommendations for future direction of LHSP.

The UNDP teams in the regions monitor the implementation of the project and report to the M&E unit. The M&E has now an Information Management tool in which data are filled in by the UNDP teams on a daily basis.

## ***2. UNDP was effective in integrating risk management in project implementation***

LHSP took into consideration the various potential risks/conflicts that may hinder project implementation. The areas of potential risks that were identified by LHSP are: political, financial, management, environmental/physical, institutional and the high expectations from the public. For each of these areas, risks are identified while mitigation measures are formulated.

UNDP was effective in managing risks during project implementation. In view of the increased influx of Syrians in the last five years and which was accompanied by increased tensions, UNDP teams in the regions in partnership with SDCs have encouraged continuous dialogue at the local level with various stakeholders and enhanced activities through the MSS process to bring together host communities and Syrian displaced.

In view of the shortfalls in funding which resulted in several priority projects identified by the communities but not implemented because of shortage of donors' funds, UNDP exerted increased efforts to mobilize donors' funding, bringing recently an additional donor (Canada) whereby funds will contribute to bridge the gaps in the livelihoods programme and job creation through women economic empowerment programme.

The long delays of projects' approval and implementation which were due to time consuming for government approvals and procurement procedures were mitigated by increased coordination of UNDP with line ministries and local authorities, and the increase in number of staff in UNDP in the procurement unit. For example, the coordination UNDP Tyre did with the Water Authority and Ministry of Agriculture in the South, as elaborated in the next section.

## **C. EFFICIENCY**

The assessment of efficiency will look at the extent to which the various activities of the project transformed the available resources into the intended results, in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness. It will also look at the efficiency of the project management, governance structure and institutional arrangements.

***1. LHSP has proved to be efficient in engaging in the MRR process all stakeholders of different views and achieving consensus in a relatively short period of time, though LHSP suffers from delays in the process of approvals and the implementation of projects, exceeding one year in some cases.***

The MRR process, the mobilisation of all stakeholders at the community level and the preparation of the action plan together with the identification of priority projects have been achieved in a relatively short period of time, given the great efforts needed by LHSP to instil a culture of participation, bring together stakeholders with conflicting points of view and achieve consensus. This view was also shared by the stakeholders the evaluation team met with in the four regions of Lebanon.

Efficiency is affected, however, by the long delays occurred with the approval process of the targeted projects for funding, particularly the projects that are not within the prerogatives of the municipalities. Projects take sometimes up to six months to be approved by MoSA and the line ministries. The long time

needed is a challenge for LHSP since donors provide funds for 12-18 months maximum which make it difficult to program for multi years activities.

UNDP has been successful, in several cases, to reduce the approval time by the line ministries, when it coordinated with the representatives of the line ministries at the governorate level. For example, UNDP team in South Lebanon coordinated first with the Water Authority to ensure the selected project is consistent with their strategy, before requesting UNDP approval of the project at the national level. It coordinated also with the office of the Ministry of Agriculture in Nabatieh for reforestation project in Kfarreman in Nabatieh. Such coordination expedited the approval of the line ministry.

## ***2. LHSP efficiency was seriously affected by the governance structure and institutional arrangements, particularly the challenges faced in the operation of the Technical Group which was replaced by the PMC***

LHSP was launched with MoSA as the Government of Lebanon (GoL) focal partner who was supposed to coordinate with Lebanese line ministries, however, inter-ministerial sensitivity caused delays. As part of its evolution, LHSP was able to deal with a changing context and environment and to adjust its governance structure to enable smooth and functional operations, thus the PMC was established to replace the Technical Group. However, this flexibility may have caused a weakened sense of ownership among the national stakeholders.

The initial governance structure and institutional arrangements of LHSP included the following:

- The steering committee (SC): The SC which is led by MoSA and UNDP is supposed to set the strategy and provide overall guidance and supervision. The members of the SC are: PMO, CDR, MoIM and MoSA, and donors' representatives.
- The technical group (TG): Led by MoSA and UNDP, the TG was supposed to discuss thematic issues and ensure that LHSP projects are in compliance with the national policies and plans. The members of the TG are: UNDP, MoSA, PMO, CDR, MoIM and relevant line ministries. The TG became "inactive" in view of the difficulties faced in the coordination between line ministries with different mandates. No meetings have taken place since more than a year.
- The PMC (replaced the TG): implements the strategy set by the steering committee and approves the proposed projects and handles all the management responsibilities of LHSP. The members are: MoSA, UNDP/SLD program manager and LHSP/CTA. The PMC is "active", as decisions are taken faster than the TG, although it is facing some difficulties in the approval process.
- UNDP area offices: Coordinate the work at the local and regional level, support municipalities and SDCs and design and implement the approved projects. The area offices are "very active": weekly meetings at UNDP and regular meetings at the Governorate and local level with Municipalities and SDCs.

Furthermore, UNDP has a coordinator working in the governorates of Akkar and South Lebanon with the role of providing the governor with information on all projects being considered and implemented. The presence of the coordinators is having a positive effect, as it helped in increased support from the Governor to LHSP when problems arise in project implementation.

## **D. SUSTAINABILITY OF LHSP**

The assessment of sustainability will look at the extent to which the benefits of the project are likely to continue after funding is withdrawn. It will also look at the areas of the project that are likely to be sustained

and those that still needs future support. It will discuss the conditions for sustainability of future UNDP interventions.

***1. LHSP sustainability is reflected in the increased capacity of municipalities and SDC/MoSA to facilitate the MRR and MSS process, as evidenced by the results achieved in most of the vulnerable communities.***

SDCs became able to facilitate the MRR process and the MSS on their own, and with little UNDP support, and started the implementation of MRR at the cluster level. SDCs/MoSA are best placed to sustain the operations of LHSP in view of the fact that SDCs are present in all regions of Lebanon and have experience working with the local community on social issues and local development and the provision of social services, in addition to the fact that their image and credibility have drastically witnessed positive change. SDCs can be considered as key elements of the project. They have permanent facilities that can be used to support interventions in host communities.

The challenge is for SDCs to prove their competencies and ability to conduct the MSR at the community and cluster levels. The improved performance of SDC in recent years and their ability to mobilize the community are a good sign of their potential to learn and implement the new methodology.

***2. The changes observed in the attitudes of the municipal councils towards the involvement of all local stakeholders in decision making will be difficult to sustain without enhancing the capacity of both the municipal councils and civil society actors in the community.***

LHSP interventions resulted in positive changes in the attitudes and behaviour of the mayors and municipal councils towards the necessity to engage all stakeholders in decision-making related to community's priority needs in basic services. Though some capacity-building of the newly elected municipal councils was undertaken, they were not followed by coaching and increased capacity in various areas of municipal work. Little was done on the strengthening of the Unions of Municipalities which can play a more sustainable role than individual municipalities.

## **E. IMPACT**

The assessment of impact will look at the extent to which the results of the project are contributing to social stability and reduction of community tensions.

***LHSP contributed to the reduction of tensions through the basic services projects implemented in the most vulnerable communities, while the impact was less perceived in communities where the competition for jobs remains the major cause of tensions***

The impact of LHSP is assessed by its contribution to social stability and reduction of community tensions. It is, however, difficult to measure the impact on the reduction of tensions only through the key informant interviews and focus groups. The regular perception surveys conducted by Aktis provide good indication of the impact of LHSP on the reduction of tensions. The last report of Aktis (June 2018) considers that the level of tension remains significant within the Lebanese population, but recorded some decrease. Among the 6 municipalities that were part of the baseline research in February 2017, the share of respondents who believe there are tensions has declined from 74% to 68%. In governorates where there is competition in the labour market with displaced Syrians, tensions are still high. The main reasons behind these tensions remain the same as two years ago, where competing businesses and competition over low skilled jobs are reported as the main reasons for tension by both Lebanese and Syrians.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> AKTIS Strategy, Endline Report, LHSP, 11 June 2018

Ark perception survey report provides also some indication on the level of tensions. According to Ark report, there is no doubt that international assistance has mitigated the erosion of social stability in the most-vulnerable areas while inter-community interaction is one of the primary factors reducing Lebanese prejudice towards Syrian refugees<sup>18</sup>. The evaluation team found that apart from the short-term jobs created by the basic services projects of municipalities, there is little evidence that livelihood projects had impact on the reduction of tensions for two major reasons: (1) Reluctance of donors to increase their investment in livelihood projects; and (2) the interventions proposed do not address structural problems in job creation and thus the youth employment through vocational training has limited impact.

## **V. LESSONS LEARNED**

1. The update of the LHSP project document to reflect the evolving of the project during the period 2015 - 2017 as well as the review of indicators would have provided a more solid base for monitoring and evaluation.
2. The cultural and social changes in the vulnerable host communities reflected in consensus- building among local stakeholders under a difficult environment, that of local tensions, would not have been possible without LHSP successful implementation of a process of participation of local stakeholders in decision-making.
3. A comprehensive integrated capacity development of municipalities together with the development of capacity of local civil society actors will enhance the sustainability of the process of community participation in decision making.
4. LHSP would have had higher impact if funds would have been made available on a multi-year basis for the expansion of the programme on livelihood, SMEs and sustainable job creation, as competition for markets and jobs constitutes a major source of tensions.
5. Initiating two parallel tracks within LHSP (MRR and MSS) have resulted in duplication of efforts as well as confusion among the MSS members about the type of proposed activities. The integration of MRR and MSS into MSR would streamline the process and ensure the mainstreaming of conflict-sensitivity into all interventions.
6. The government response to the Syrian crisis at the policy level would be more relevant and more effective if positive interaction between the local, regional and national level is enhanced. Some successful interventions of LHSP involving representatives of line ministries at the regional level proved that coordination at the regional/governorate level if enhanced can streamline the process related to the proper communication between the local and the national levels. The participation of relevant regional representative of line ministries in the discussion of sectoral proposals identified in the MRR process at the community or cluster level (and MSR in the next phase) is crucial to ensure compliance of the projects with national policies and plans and assess their potential feasibility.
7. Environmental projects in particular (solid waste and waste water) would need to be implemented at the cluster level as well to ensure their feasibility and consistency with the national strategies, while scaling-up livelihood projects at the cluster level would have higher impact.

## **VI. CONCLUSIONS**

---

<sup>18</sup> Ark, Narrative report, Regular Perception Surveys on Social Tensions throughout Lebanon, Wave I: Narrative Report, August 2017

***Relevance: UNDP was able to take advantage of its unique position and comparative advantage to achieve results and strengthen its leadership role among the donors' community. LHSP was unique in the mobilization of all stakeholders at the national and local level and adapt to changing context, though the update of data on displaced Syrians and special emphasis on sustainable job creation will enhance the relevance of LHSP.***

UNDP is considered as a strategic partner by donors as well as by stakeholders at the national and local levels, in view of its political neutrality and credibility, and its filling in an important gap in host communities. UNDP added value stems from its long experience in implementing local development in Lebanon; in addition, they have been able to forge excellent relationships with donors and demonstrated the capacity to transfer its experience to partners and stakeholders.

Despite the adaptation of LHSP to the changing context and its continuous learning from experience, the fact that data on Syrian presence in host communities was not updated constitute a challenge for LHSP, should LHSP remains relevant to the needs of newly affected host communities.

Donors support to livelihood programme and long-term job creation needs to be enhanced as LHSP is no more operating within a context of short-term crisis but under a protracted crisis that would require a different approach. The fact that competition in the labour market with displaced Syrian is a major source of tensions implies the necessity for LHSP to give special emphasis on livelihood projects and job creation.

***Effectiveness: Though LHSP succeeded in changing the culture of the municipal councils towards the participation of all stakeholders in the decision making thanks to the MRR process, the formulation and implementation of a formal capacity development strategy and the strengthening of MSS working groups would not enhance LHSP effectiveness without forging strong relations between the local, regional and national levels.***

Capacity-building of the newly elected municipal councils which was beneficial and appreciated by the municipalities should have been complemented with other capacity development interventions. The partnership between UNDP, MoIM and IoF could be used as an appropriate mechanism to provide additional support to municipalities to enable them to sustain their operations. The effectiveness of the capacity-building of municipalities would require LHSP to improve the selection of trainees and ensure they have common needs and that training groups are more homogeneous according to services provided: municipal services, project development, municipal financial management and municipal community engagement. LHSP would also need to devise an innovative approach when building the capacity of small municipalities.

Despite the skills gained by MSS committees and their enhanced capacity in identifying and implementing activities in the community to diffuse and reduce tensions there is still a need for LHSP to continue building their capacity and to provide them with coaching. The awareness campaigns that were conducted among Lebanese and displaced Syrians particularly in respecting the environment would not be effective in changing their behaviour and attitudes towards the environment without the implementation of activities that will bring together host communities and displaced Syrians.

The capacity-building of local actors and interventions at the local level through the MRR and MSS processes would have limited impact if not accompanied with increased linkages between the local and national levels. The strengthening of the relation between the local level and the line ministries would contribute to increase awareness of the line ministries of the needs and challenges faced by the host communities and which may result in a more adequate ministries' response to the Syrian crisis at the policy level.

***Efficiency: The current governance structure has some shortages that requires finetuning and adjustment to streamline the efficient implementation of LHSP***

Though the MRR process was efficiently achieved given the time needed for the mapping and for bringing together various stakeholders with conflicting views to agree on an action plan, efficiency was affected by the long delays occurred with the projects' approval process. The review of the governance structure is to be undertaken should the next LHSP phase operates in a more efficient way.

***Sustainability: The strengthening of the partnership between municipalities and SDCs, as well as with the representatives of the line ministries at the governorate level is likely to enhance sustainability of LHSP.***

The challenge is for SDCs to prove their competencies and ability to facilitate the MSR at the community and cluster levels. The improved performance of SDCs in recent years and their ability to mobilize the community and enhance their relations with municipalities are a good sign of their potential to learn and implement the new methodology.

***Impact: Though it is difficult to assess impact in the short-term, the perception survey conducted by Aktis and the findings of our evaluation confirm that tensions have somewhat declined. The reduction of tensions could not be reduced significantly without increased funding to the livelihood programme since the main reasons for tensions are competing businesses and competition over low skilled jobs.***

## **VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT PHASE**

### ***1. Enhance the relevance of LHSP by updating the selection of targeted communities and reviewing the selection criteria***

The selection of the vulnerable communities is to be updated to take into consideration the changes occurred in the distribution of displaced Syrians among the different locations in Lebanon since the last vulnerability map of 2015. The selection criteria are to be reviewed to include communities with little Syrian presence but are severely affected by the presence of displaced Syrians in neighbouring communities, in terms of job competition and negative effects of the environment. Though the update of the vulnerability map is the responsibility of MOSA/LCRP, UNDP has to advocate for such update in order to enhance the relevance of the next phase of LHSP.

### ***2. Enhance livelihood programme through comprehensive livelihood projects that contribute to the short, medium and long-term job creation with particular emphasis on women and youths through working with micro, meso and macro actors***

The competition for jobs and markets has proved to be a major root causes of tensions in host communities affected by the Syrian crisis. The scaling-up of LHSP livelihood programme to respond to these challenges would contribute to the strengthening of local economic development and more particularly the creation of income generating opportunities and sustainable job creation.

Investing into the demand side will ensure short and mid-term job creation through investment in labour intensive activities related to infrastructure, agriculture process, green jobs and community/ social activities with linkages to specific value chain such honey, Zaatar, Freekeh, Renewable Energy and others. These value chains had demonstrated local market opportunities with job creation opportunity.

Capacity building support to existing non-profit employment service centres, business development service centres and the partnership with existing or new social enterprises are recommended.

Impacted by the new resilience programming, the livelihood projects should stress and include components related to build the capacity of all stakeholders involved at micro-meso and macro level including local government, cluster of municipalities building on UNDP Lebanon strong historical experience in facilitating and supporting local development initiatives.

LHSP should support income generating projects in areas where local businesses can compete. In view of the fact that Lebanese firms have preference to employ low-cost foreign labour without respecting the regulations of the Ministry of Labour regarding the employment of foreigners, unemployed Lebanese have difficulty to find work. Social enterprises have the advantage to employ significant number of people and provide them with on-the-job training, while running on commercial basis and compete in the market. Social enterprises can in fact integrate the four following dimensions: development aspect (along the value chain), social aspect (employment and income generation for the poor, particularly women and youth), skills development (on-the-job training) and business aspect (no loss or minimal profit). UNDP could provide a grant, on competition basis, to social entrepreneurs or NGOs that can present a viable business plan with high job creation content, whereas special consideration to be given to the identification of priority areas that reflect and address these four dimensions.

### ***3. Support locally-based area approach to scale-up LHSP***

UNDP has long experience in area-based programming and implementation which needs to be enhanced to scale-up interventions from the community to the cluster level. The cluster approach has several advantages:

- (1) It would allow the implementation of some priority projects that are not feasible at the community level and need to be linked to the cluster, such as solid and water waste projects.
- (2) It would allow large-scale interventions with higher impact, particularly in livelihood (value-chains, agro-food projects, etc..)
- (3) The decision-making at the cluster level would enhance the long-term sustainability of LHSP. The cluster approach, in fact, would reduce the risk of control of few stakeholders (such as municipalities) on the decisions when projects are identified at the community level. Stakeholders at the cluster level will have to compromise and agree on common priorities.
- (4) The cluster approach would encompass communities where the presence of displaced Syrians is minimal but are bearing negative effects from neighbouring communities.

### ***4. Enhance LHSP sustainability through the formulation and implementation of an integrated and comprehensive capacity development strategy for local actors including municipalities, SDCs and civil society***

LHSP developed the capacity of local actors (municipalities, SDCs and local stakeholders) in the MRR and MSS process, and is expected to apply in the next phase the MSR as a new methodology that would integrate MRR and MSS.

An integrated and comprehensive capacity development strategy for local actors is needed to ensure LHSP sustainability. The strategy is to differentiate in its capacity development approach between medium and large municipalities with small ones. Training of municipalities which is needed, more particularly in; governance, financial management, procurement, M&E and environmental management. It has to be complemented with; the provision of user- friendly work tools and procedures manuals, the provision of



guidance and the formation of peer support groups. Creating a culture of specialization and continuous learning within municipalities will contribute to the institutionalization of the built capacities.

Sustainability is not only enhanced through increased capacity of municipalities and SDCs. Strengthening the capacity of the civil society at the community level would enhance the sustainability of the MRR and MSS approaches and processes (and recently MSR), since the civil society can constitute a driving force in community mobilisation and participation and remedy any negative changes that may occur in the future election of municipal councils.

### **5. Review of the LHSP governance structure**

In line with government vision and objectives, LHSP should support more engagement at the regional level, which has also the advantage to improve LHSP efficiency in the next phase. This would require, however, a review and refinement of the current governance structure.

In view of the fact that the Technical Group was not operational since more than one year and the fact that the PMC was a temporary arrangement needed to sustain the LHSP operations, it is recommended to:

(1) Activate the Steering Committee (SC) as dynamic instrument for strategic decision making (quarterly meetings) and induce more communication with donors that are part of the SC and expand its membership to include, in addition to the current government agencies (MoIM, CDR, PMO), the MoEW, MoA, MoE, MoET, MoWA and MoL. UNDP will co-lead the SC with MOSA. The Steering Committee will be tasked to provide overall direction and strategic guidance to LHSP, set criteria and guidelines for thematic projects, review the current LHSP funding, and ensure balanced allocation of funding according to priorities identified by the local communities and call upon other stakeholders to attend session (s) of the SC whenever needed.

(2) Municipalities to continue to play the major role of identification of needs at the community and cluster levels (through MSR) and the mobilisation of stakeholders.

(3) Enhance the role of governorates and establish an **Advisory Board** at the regional/ Governorate level that includes UNDP and MoSA/SDCs representative and representatives of the relevant line ministries. The board will be chaired by the governor; municipalities and UOMs may be invited to the meetings if needed.

There are several reasons for enhancing the role of governorates in LHSP:

- The need to link the interventions at the regional level to the national policy level, thus improving the government response to the Syrian crisis
- The presence of representatives of line ministries in the governorates and the role they can play in streamlining the communication between the Micro and the Macro level
- The leverage the governor has on the municipalities and the role the governor can play in solving problems that LHSP is facing at the community level
- The LHSP necessity to support the identification and implementation of projects at the cluster level

The advisory board representing the line ministries at the governorate level will have the following tasks:

- Review all projects identified at the community/cluster level and share lessons learned from the implementation of similar projects in other areas
- Inform the municipalities about the national strategy/policy of the related line ministries
- Ensure that identified projects are consistent with the national strategy/policy of related line ministries

- Feed the national level with interventions carried at the regional/local level, especially success stories
- Act as intermediary with the line ministry to speed the approval process

***6. Enhance the participation of donors in strategic issues and involve donors in the formulation of the next phase of LHSP***

Though UNDP has close relations with donors and has kept them informed on progress made in the implementation of the projects and ensured donors' visibility in all UNDP communication (press release, printed materials, etc...), more efforts are needed to engage the donors, as a group, in the discussion of strategic issues related to LHSP. There is currently an opportunity to involve donors in the formulation of the next phase of LHSP. Special emphasis should be given in the project formulation of the next phase to gender mainstreaming and include it in the project design. The involvement of donors is likely to increase their ownership and may result in better understanding by the donors of the problems encountered by LHSP with regard: (1) the donors' one-year funding that does not take into consideration the long approval process of projects and the time needed for the procurement process and implementation; and (2) the need to support interventions (such as livelihood projects and capacity development of municipalities) which some donors are not funding.

***7. Enhance the effectiveness of LHSP Information management tool and facilitate its access to donors***

The formulation of SMART indicators in the next LHSP phase would improve the reporting system and enhance the effectiveness of the LHSP Information Management tool and its use by project management to assess progress made in the achievement of expected results and make the necessary adjustments to the activities of the project as well as to the inputs and resources.

The involvement of the donors in the next LHSP project formulation (as indicated above) could lead to agreement between donors and LHSP on joint development of indicators which would allow for one reporting mechanism, instead of the current reporting system which is done for each donor separately. This should go in parallel with facilitating and sharing the Information Management Tool with the donors, thus keeping donors informed about the progress made and difficulties encountered in project implementation.

**ANNEX 1 : EVALUATION MATRIX - LHSP**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>RELEVANCE</u></b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 1: To what extent the outcomes and results of the project address the problems, needs and priorities of the intended direct and indirect beneficiaries, particularly women and vulnerable groups?</b> |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 1:</b>  |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.1</b>   | Project’s objectives are consistent with LCRP’s outcomes related to social stability and livelihood, as well as to SDGs and national strategies                                       |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.2</b>   | The outcomes of the project are consistent with priority and needs of host communities’ beneficiaries, particularly women and youth, as expressed in the national priorities and LCRP |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.3</b>   | Outcomes and outputs of the project remain relevant throughout the period of implementation   |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.4</b>   | Objectives and intended results of the project took into consideration the necessity for the participation of various stakeholders  |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.5</b>   | Perception of beneficiaries as to whether the project reflected their priorities and met their needs  |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 1.6</b>   | The key partners express ownership of the project   |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b><u>RELEVANCE</u></b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 2: To what extent the design of the project took into consideration existing conflict dynamics and fragility as well as its adaptation to changing context?</b>                                       |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 2:</b>  |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Indicator 2.1</b>  | Analysis of the problems is well developed in the project design and are well related to the results/outcomes of the project  |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.2</b>  | Gender issues and women empowerment are well addressed in the project design  |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.3</b>  | Implementation modalities are suitable for the achievement of social stability and reduction of conflicts   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.4</b>  | The basic assumptions on root causes of conflicts, conflict dynamics and risks taken into consideration in the project's design are credible and articulate a convincing intervention logic |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.5</b>  | The formulation of indicators is consistent with the intervention logic and provide the basis for monitoring and evaluation   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.6</b>  | The available human and financial resources are appropriate (sufficient) for the achievement of the outcomes and results of the project   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.7</b>  | Institutional arrangements for the long-term sustainability of the Project results are adequately described   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 2.8</b>  | The management (governance) structure of the project is appropriate and adequate for the distribution of tasks and implementation of activities   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></b>   |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 3: To what extent the project has been effective in improving livelihoods and increasing economic opportunities in affected areas?</b> |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 3:</b>   |   |
| <b>Indicator 3.1</b>  | Number of short-term job opportunities created  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources (the references for the narrative)  |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.2</b>   | Extent of improvement of income of beneficiaries, particularly women and youth, from livelihood projects,  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.3</b>   | Extent of indirect benefits to the host communities resulting from the implementation of livelihoods projects  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.4</b>   | Per cent of beneficiaries who were placed on internship, found job or start their self-employment as a result of vocational training courses                 |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.5</b>   | Extent to which vocational training courses respond to the needs of the labour market  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.6</b>   | Extent and kind of benefits gained by small enterprises as result of BDS provided  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Related facts, figures, and dferences  |  |
| <b>Indicator 3.7</b>   | Extent of benefits gained by vulnerable women, in particular, thanks to the establishment and/or support to cooperatives or other forms of business entities |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></b>  |  |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 4: To what extent the project has been effective in strengthening the capacity of local and national actors to deliver basic services in a participatory and conflict sensitive manner?</b> |  |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 3:</b>  |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.1</b>   | Number of action plans produced and implemented from the MRR needs assessment  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.2</b>   | SDC staff have increased capacity to conduct MRR   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.3</b>   | Extent of satisfaction expressed by the participants in the MRR process  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.4</b>   | Municipal councils have increased capacity in identifying, planning, implementing and monitoring the service delivery projects |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.5</b>   | Degree of satisfaction of beneficiaries on the basic services provided   |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.6</b>   | Extent of direct and indirect benefits of the projects for the host communities  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 4.7</b>   | Extent of implementation of projects at the cluster level  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></b>  |  |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 5: To what extent the project has been effective in reducing local tensions and improving community security?</b> |  |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 5:</b>  |  |
| <b>Indicator 5.1</b>   | SDC staff and local actors have increased capacity to conduct MSS  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 5.2</b>   | Extent of participation of relevant stakeholders in the MSS committees   |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 5.3</b>   | Percent of communities' committees formed out of the ones that LHSP intervened in  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Indicator 5.4</b>   | Percent of targeted communities covered in conflict analysis reporting out of the ones that LHSP intervened in    |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 5.5</b>   | Extent of satisfaction expressed by the stakeholders in the MSS process   |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 5.6</b>   | Extent of contribution of the MSS committees in the prevention of conflicts                                       |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 5.7</b>   | Extent of contribution of LHSP in the reduction of tensions and conflicts in host communities                     |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 6: To what extent the project has been effective in strengthening the capacity of the Lebanese Government to respond to the influx of displaced Syrian?</b> |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 6:</b>  |   |
| <b>Indicator 6.1</b>   | Extent of proved capacity of MoSA and SDC staff to coordinate and monitor projects implemented at the local level |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 6.2</b>   | Extent of proved capacity of Municipalities to coordinate and monitor projects implemented at the local level     |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 6.3</b>   | Extent of involvement of the relevant ministries in supporting projects in host communities                       |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>Indicator 6.4</b>   | Extent of interaction and mutual feeding between sectoral national plans and local community plans                |
| Data collected   |   |
| Data sources   |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 7: To what extent monitoring, knowledge management and risk management have been integrated in the project implementation?</b>                              |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 7:</b>  |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Indicator 7.1</b>  | LHSP systematically includes knowledge management (evaluations, reviews, etc.) for relevant projects during project implementation  |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 7.2</b>  | Extent of management of risks during project implementation   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b><u>EFFICIENCY</u></b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 8: To what extent the project was managed efficiently, and outputs were produced efficiently with respect to cost and timeliness?</b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 8:</b>   |   |
| <b>Indicator 8.1</b>  | Degree of flexibility and timelines of LHSP processes & procedures  |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 8.2</b>  | Governance structure and institutional arrangements of LHSP promote cost-effectiveness and accountability   |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b><u>SUSTAINABILITY</u></b>  |   |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 9: What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from the previous and current LHSP interventions will continue at national and subnational level through adequate ownership, commitment, willingness displayed by the government and other stakeholders?</b> |   |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 9:</b>   |   |
| <b>Indicator 9.1</b>  | Degree of institutional sustainability of the structures created by LHSP  |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |
| <b>Indicator 9.2</b>  | Degree of willingness of the relevant stakeholders (municipalities, MoSA and SDC in particular) to continue implementing and updating the MRR process when project funding ends |
| Data collected  |   |
| Data sources  |   |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Indicator 9.3</b>   | Extent of readiness of MoSA and other agencies to continue the provision of support to the most vulnerable groups in host communities                            |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 9.4</b>   | Extent of Readiness of MoSA to design and implement Crisis Response Projects through Municipalities and SDCs   |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 9.5</b>   | Steps taken by the Project management towards sustainability, including mitigation strategy towards possible risks that may jeopardise sustainability of results |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b><u>IMPACT</u></b>   |  |
| <b>EVALUATION QUESTION 10: To what extent the project is contributing to social stability, reduction of community tensions and mitigation of the deterioration in the economic conditions of host communities?</b> |  |
| <b>EVALUATION ANSWER 10:</b>   |  |
| <b>Indicator 10.1</b>  | Extent of positive changes achieved by LHSP on social stability in the host communities  |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |
| <b>Indicator 10.2</b>  | Extent of benefits gained by host communities in terms of improvement of the socio-economic conditions and quality of life                                       |
| Data collected   |  |
| Data sources   |  |

## **ANNEX 2: LIST OF REVIEWED DOCUMENTS**

Adam Smith, LHSP Evaluation 2016

ARK Group DMCC, Regular Perception Surveys on Social Tensions throughout Lebanon, Narrative, July 2017

AKTIS, Impact Evaluation Report, Lebanon Municipal Support Project, 31 March 2015

AKTIS, Additional Analysis Report, Lebanon Host Communities Support Project, 6 May 2016

AKTIS, Endline Report, Lebanon Host Communities Support Project, 11 June 2018

Beyond Reform and Development, The implementation and proceedings of the Mechanism for Social Stability, Final Report, April 2016 (Submitted to UNDP, Peace Building in Lebanon Project)

Dylan O’Driscoll (2018): Donor Response to Refugee Tensions in Lebanon

KDC, Evaluation Report, Evaluation of the Mechanisms for Social Stability in Conflict-Affected Communities in Lebanon (Presented to UNDP Peace Building in Lebanon Project), 2017

LCRP 2015-2016 (Lebanon Crisis Response Plan)

LCRP 2017-2020 (Lebanon Crisis Response Plan)

Nabil Hassan, MoSA SDCs and the Mechanisms for Social Stability, MoSA Personnel Needs Assessment Report, November 2016 (Presented to UNDP Peace Building in Lebanon Programme)

Sahar Tabaja, Analysing Southern Conflict Dynamics, UNDP Peacebuilding Project, Mechanisms for Social Stability, South Lebanon, First Phase Report, January 2018

UNDP, LHSP Project document, 2015-2017

UNDP, LHSP Annual Report 2015

UNDP, LHSP Annual Report 2016

UNDP, LHSP Annual Report 2017

UNDP, Lebanon Stabilization and Recovery Programme, 2017

UNDP, Country Programme Document (CPD) for Lebanon, 2017-2020

UNDP, MRR Guidelines, Methodology and tools

UNDP, MSS process

UNDP, Project Document (2011-2014), Livelihood and Local Economic Development Strategy

UNDP, Annual Report 2015-2016

UNDP, “Peace Building in Lebanon”, Project’s newsletter, Issue No. 16, 2017

UNDP/LHSP, Final Report, Italian Agency for Development Cooperation, August 2016– December 2017

UNDP/LHSP, Final report, DFID, August 2016 – March 2017

UNDP/LHSP, Final report, KFW II, December 2015 – March 2018

UNDP/LHSP, Netherlands Final report, January 2016 – March 2017

UNDP/LHSP, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Norway II – Final Report, May 2016 – December 2017

UNDP/LHSP, USA-BPRM Quarterly Final Report, August 2015 – March 2017

UNDP, Stability and Resilience Dynamic, General Methodology, First Draft, June 2018

### ANNEX 3: LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

| Name                     | Position   | Email Address                   |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>UNDP</b>              |  |                                 |
| Philippe Lazarini        | Resident Coordinator   |                                 |
| Celine Moyroud           | Country Director   | celine.moyroud@undp.org         |
| Raghd Assi               | Program manager, Social and Local Development Programme (SLDP) | raghd.assi@undp.org             |
| Marina Lo Giudice        | CTA, Social and Local Development Portfolio                    | marina.logiudice@undp.org       |
| Nada Sweidan             | Program Officer/Youth Focal Point, (SLDP)                      | nada.sweidan@undp.org           |
| Fadi Abilmona            | Program manager, Crisis Prevention and Recovery (CPR)          | Fadi.Abilmona@undp.org          |
| Wassim El-Chami          | Program Officer, Crisis Prevention and Recovery                | wassim.el-chami@undp.org        |
| Joanna Nassar            | Peace Building, Crisis Prevention and Recovery                 | joanna.nassar@undp.org          |
| Marat Murzabekov         | M&E Officer, CPR   | marat.murzabekov@undp.org       |
| Jihan Seoud              | Program manager, Energy and Environment Programme              | Jihan.seoud@undp.org            |
| Leon Chammah             | Senior Livelihood and Local Economic Development Coordinator   | leon.chammah@undp.org           |
| Tom Thorogood            | CTA, Stabilization & Recovery Programme                        | Tom.thorogood@undp.org          |
| Nicole Mitri             | M&E and Reporting Officer                                      | nicole.mitri@undp.org           |
| Ahmad Serhal             | Senior Civil Engineer - Social & Local Development Portfolio   | Ahmad.serhal@undp.org           |
| Antoine Maalouf          | Head, Communication Unit                                       | antoine.maalouf@undp.org        |
| Abdallah Muhieddine      | Area manager – Mount Lebanon                                   | abdallah.muhieddine@undp.org    |
| Nathalie Wehbe           | Deputy Area manager – Mount Lebanon                            | nathalie.wehbe@undp.org         |
| Garo Haroutunian         | Area Manager, Bekaa – Social & Local Development Programme     | garo.haroutunian@undp.org       |
| Salam Eid                | Deputy Area manager – Bekaa                                    | Salam.eid@undp.org              |
| Alain Chatry             | Area manager - North   | alain.chatry@undp.org           |
| Hussein Nasrallah        | Area manager - South   | hussein.nasrallah@undp.org      |
| Checrallah Abou Jaoude   | Deputy Area manager – South                                    | Checrallah.abou-jaoude@undp.org |
| UNDP Teams               | UNDP teams in Mount Lebanon, Bekaa, South and North Lebanon    |                                 |
| <b>GoL</b>               |  |                                 |
| Pierre Bou Assi          | Minister/MoSA  |                                 |
| Abdallah Ahmad           | Director General/MoSA  |                                 |
| Ibrahim Chahrour         | Director of Planning/CDR                                       | ibrahimc@cdr.gov.lb             |
| Khalil Gebara            | Advisor to the Minister/MoIM                                   | khalil.gebara@gmail.com         |
| Iman Assi                | Education Project Coordinator/MEHE                             | Iassi@mehe.gov.lb               |
| Lamia Mansour            | Coordinator, LCRP Environment Task Force/MoE                   | Lamiamansour1@gmail.com         |
| Marie Louise Abou Jaoude | Senior Urban Planner/PMO                                       | maboujaoudeh@pcm.gov.lb         |
|                          |  |                                 |
| <b>DONORS</b>            |  |                                 |
| Stephen Este             | Regional Refugee Coordinator, BPRM, Lebanon/US Embassy         | EsteSJ@state.gov                |
| David Kunze              | Senior Project manager KFW                                     | david.kunze@kfw.de              |
| Klaus Kirchman           | KFW  | klaus.kirchmann_extern@kfw.de   |

|                    |   |                                    |
|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Raymond Tarabay    | Senior Humanitarian Aid Officer/German Embassy  | Wz-2@beir.diplo.de                 |
| Monique Morissa    | German Embassy  |                                    |
| Aly-Khan Rajani    | Counsellor (Head of Cooperation), Global Affairs Canada   | Alykhan.rajani@international.gc.ca |
| Aicha Mouchref     | Senior Development Officer, Embassy of Canada   | Aicha.mouchref@international.gc.ca |
| Vida Hamd Daou     | Senior Policy Officer/Embassy of Netherlands  | vida.hamd@minbuza.nl               |
| Sara Love          | Economic Advisor Middle West & North Africa Dep. DFID/ UKaid                                    | s-love@dfid.gov.uk                 |
| Paul Waller        | CSSF Stability Programme Manager - British Embassy. DFID/ UKaid                                 | Paul.Waller@fco.gov.uk             |
| Alain Waked        | Policy and Programme Manager, DFID  | A-Waked@dfid.gov.uk                |
| Manal Kortam       | Senior Development Program Officer/ Norwegian Embassy   | Manal.Kortam@mfa.no                |
| Corrado Di Dio     | In charge of coordination of Italian Cooperation Programme on Syrian Crisis/Italian Cooperation |                                    |
| <b>UN Agencies</b> |   |                                    |
| Mireille Girard    | Representative / UNHCR  | girard@unhcr.org                   |
| Emmanuel Gignac    | Deputy Representative (Operations) / UNHCR  | gignac@unhcr.org                   |
| Tomas Stenstrom    | Chief Technical Advisor, EIIP/ILO   | stenstorm@ilo.org                  |
| Joumana Karame     | Programme Officer, Regional Programming Service Unit/ILO  | karame@ilo.org                     |

| <b>LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS</b>        |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Organization</b>              | <b>Name</b>                                      | <b>Position</b>                        |
| <b>SOUTH LEBANON</b>             |  |  |
| South Lebanon Governorate        | Mansour Daou<br>Mansour.adaou@gmail.com          | Governor                               |
| El Qrayeh Municipality           | Maroun Abdo Antoun<br>marounantoun@qrayeh.gov.lb | President                              |
| Community Kitchen, Saida         | Zaher Abu Zahr                                   |  |
| SDC (South Lebanon & Nabatieh)   | Fatima Khalil                                    | Coordinator, South Lebanon             |
|                                  | Nawal Chaaban                                    | Coordinator, Nabatieh                  |
|                                  | Fouad Al Amin                                    | Staff, South Lebanon                   |
|                                  | Jaqueline Younis                                 | Staff, South Lebanon                   |
|                                  | Hanan Sleiman                                    | Staff, South Lebanon                   |
| El Qrayeh, MSS committee         | Hanan Hleyel                                     | Member                                 |
|                                  | Joseph Hleyel                                    | Member                                 |
|                                  | Jean Chalhoub                                    | Member                                 |
| <b>NORTH LEBANON AND AKKAR</b>   |  |  |
| Akkar Governorate                | Imad Labaky<br>imadlabaki@gmail.com              | Governor                               |
| SDC North Lebanon and Akkar      | Hassan Trabulsi<br>trabulsihasan@hotmail.com     | Coordinator / Head of Akkar Department |
|                                  | Alia Chaaban                                     | SDC Akkar                              |
| Municipality Tal-Abbas Al Gharbi | Walid Metri<br>walidmetri@yahoo.com              | Mayor                                  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Agricultural Cooperative in Akkar El Atika | Mohamad El Khatib                                   | President   |
| MSS Committee of Chekka                    | Hind Haddad   | Member of Chekka Municipal Council                  |
|  | Juliette Bou Sleiman                                | Chekka community                                    |
| Mohamara Municipality                      | Abdelmonem Ossman                                   | Mayor   |
| SDC Qobbeh                                 | Rouba Sourani                                       | Director of the Centre                              |
|  | Souheir Darwish                                     | SDC staff   |
|  | Mona Metwari  | MSS member  |
| <b>MOUNT LEBANON</b>                       |   |   |
| SDC Mount Lebanon (ML)                     | Nesrin Abdul Samad                                  | Coordinator, South ML                               |
|  | Bahieh Sulayman                                     | Coordinator, North ML                               |
|  | Fatmeh Zbeeb  | Coordinator, Middle ML                              |
| Atayeb Al Rif                              | May Traboulsi                                       |   |
|  | Gaby Rahme  |   |
| Kfardebian Coop                            | Samira Zougheib                                     |   |
| Baysour Municipality                       | Nadim Al Aridi                                      | Mayor   |
| UOM Beirut Southern Suburb                 | Mohamad Chafik Dergham<br>Mohamad.dergham@gmail.com | President   |
| <b>BEKAA</b>                               |   |   |
| MoSA/SDC Bekaa                             | Khaled Dalloul                                      | Governorate Coordinator                             |
|  | Pascale Breidi                                      | SDC staff   |
| Agriculture Coop of Kfarmeshki             | Kamal Saykaly                                       |   |
| Qab Elias Municipality                     | Jihad AL Moualem                                    | Mayor   |
| UOM, Bouhaira                              | Yehya Daher   | President   |
| CCIA, Zahle                                | Alin Slim   |   |
|  | Fady Bou Fayad                                      |   |
| Municipality of Hourtaala                  | Ali Mahmoud Al Masri                                | Mayor   |
| Municipality of Brital                     | Ali Mazloun   | Mayor of Brital                                     |
|  | Ali Youness   | Deputy Mayor - Brital                               |
|  | Hussein Saleh                                       | Staff person in-charge of local development- Brital |

## List of Participants of Focus Groups

### MOUNT LEBANON

| List of shoemakers  | List of VTP graduates at Al Majmouaa Centre  | List of teachers at Borj Al Barajneh public school on Road Safety  |
|---|--|--|
| Ibrahim Chrayteh<br>Said nassar<br>Hassan Hamadeh<br>Mohamad Karneeb<br>Mohamad Mouzanar<br>Hussain Bechara | Mohamad Cheaito<br>Madih Mahmoud<br>Aya Itani<br>Hasan Abbas Zaiter<br>Mohamad Ali Zaiter<br>Juliano Ayoub | Zahra Awad<br>Hussain Al Attar<br>Salwa El Jammal<br>Maha Kanj<br>Nadia Haidar<br>Hanan Ibrahim<br>Kamel Ibrahim |

| List of MSS Committee of Baysour                      | List of Beneficiary from the playground Baysour               |
|---|---|
| Mona Al Aridi<br>Hanadi Al Aridid<br>Rabiah Al Aridid | Fadi Youssef Al Aridi<br>Talal Amine Al Aridi<br>Kamal Malaeb |

|  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Manal Malaeb<br>Talal Malaeb<br>Kamal Malaeb | Abbas Al Aridi<br>Mokbel Al Aridi |
|--|-----------------------------------|

#### BEKAA

| <b>Agricultural Cooperative Kfarmishki / Rashaya</b>   | <b>List of Municipality of Qab Elias Beneficiary of project</b>   | <b>List of MSS Committee Hourtaala</b>   | <b>List of Union of municipalities of Al Bouhayra</b>  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Kamal Al Saykali<br>Bassim Hammoud<br>Samih Hammoud<br>Nasralla Nasralla<br>Reslan naas<br>Nehme Zoght | Ibrahim Layoun<br>Abd El Karim Abou<br>Akroush<br>Mohamad Abou Nassif<br>Tareq Al-Moualem<br>Abdalla Alouli<br>Ali Hafez<br>Ahmad Chakar<br>Maher Nader<br>Jihad Al-Moualem<br>Jihad Azar<br>Ali Khaled | Mustapha El Masri<br>Zainab El Masri<br>Rajaa El Masri<br>Mohamad El Masri<br>Nayef El Masri | Abdul Hassan Houssain<br>Mohamad Abbas<br>Ali Ahmad<br>Massoud Madi<br>Mohamad Muheiddine<br>Bahij Rahal<br>Rabih Joumaa<br>Maroun Saab<br>Yehya Daher<br>Hasan Hachem |

#### SOUTH LEBANON

| <b>Union of Municipalities of Sahel Al Zahrani</b>   | <b>Fishermen Cooperative of Sarafand</b>  | <b>Beneficiaries of project of Qrayeh municipality</b>  |
|--|---|---|
| Ali Mohamed Matar<br>Salam Badreddine<br>Ali Dib Jarmaki<br>Fares Fadel<br>Hassan Al Dur<br>Nazih Ali Eid<br>Mohamed Ahmed Younis<br>Sekna Khodr Saleh | Youssef Khalife<br>Hussein Mohamed Slim<br>Chalhoub Mohamed Chalhoub<br>Qassem Sleiman Younis<br>Abdul Karim Slim<br>Mohamed Hussein Slim | Joelle Abou Greish<br>Wassim Jabbour<br>Aida Kassab<br>Rose Tannous<br>Pierre Tannous<br>Elias Makhoul<br>Elias Abdallah<br>Milad Makhoul |

## **ANNEX 4: SEMI-GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES**

### **Common questions to all stakeholders**

To what extent the LHSP project reflects the needs and priorities of host communities?

To what extent the project still relevant to the needs of host communities?

To what extent there are any other priority areas that should have been introduced in this project?

To what extent there is any other strategy you would have preferred LHSP to adopt to meet your needs and priorities?

What would you like future projects to focus on?

To what extent you are consulted and/or engaged (ownership) by UNDP or by the key partner (MoSA) in the design and/or implementation of the interventions that are relevant to you?

What projects have been implemented to improve the livelihoods of the community, particularly vulnerable and women?

How these projects have improved the economic conditions of the beneficiaries and the community?

What are the fields of the vocational training courses offered? How the fields were identified? Any labour market assessment conducted?

What business development services have been provided to small businesses? How the needs of the businesses were identified?

Any sectoral study conducted on the identification of priorities for interventions?

### **Municipalities**

Are you in need of any other competencies and skills for the delivery of services? Elaborate

How the municipal councils were involved in the MRR process?

Are you in need of any other competencies and skills for the delivery of services? Elaborate

Are there any criteria for the selection of the stakeholders taking part in the MRR process? Who select them?

Did you produce an action plan? Are priorities identified, and projects implemented according to the priorities?

If so, does the action plan take into consideration the available human and financial resources? Any focus on the most vulnerable groups as beneficiaries of the projects?

Do you have a system to monitor the implementation of the projects?

Do you engage, or coordinate with the Directorate General of Municipalities & Local Authorities and other relevant ministries (Ministry of Energy and Water,...) in the implementation of the projects? If so, how the coordination is carried out, and what are the problems faced?

Any project implemented at the cluster level (among several communities)? What are the challenges to implement such projects?

## **Cooperatives**

Type of cooperative and type of products

Number of members (by gender) benefitting from LHSP support to the cooperative

What support UNDP provided to the cooperative?

How did you benefit from UNDP support? (job creation, improving/expanding production, improving production process and design, improving marketing and reaching new markets, etc...)

In what ways does the members of the cooperative benefit? Joint purchase of raw material, joint production, joint marketing, participation in fairs, etc...

What are the main challenges?

How UNDP can increase its support? In which areas?

## **SDC coordinators and MSS committees**

Can you give us a brief on the issues you discussed in the MSS committees?

To what extent were you able to reduce tensions at the community level?

To what extent are you inclusive on nationalities and gender in your activities undertaken by MSS?

How do you assess the contribution of the Peace Building projects in your area?

## **DONORS**

What are the reasons behind supporting LHSP?

To what extent do you think the LHSP is relevant to the reduction of dispute and conflict in affected areas?

Do you think there are other priorities that need to be taken into consideration in LHSP?

What kind of projects are you supporting?

Are the projects short in duration and quick impact, or medium and long-term?

Do you intend to support long-term job creation?

Are you satisfied with the results of LHSP interventions?

What are the challenges faced in the implementation?

Do you think the governance structure of LHSP is effective and efficient to achieve the intended results?

What was UNDP able to accomplish through the project that could not as well have been achieved by alternative projects, other donors, or other stakeholders?

To what extent UNDP project was unique in the reduction of conflicts?

How do you assess your communication with UNDP? Is there room for improvement? If so, how?

What are your recommendations for the future?



## **ANNEX 5: GUIDELINES FOR FOCUS GROUPS**

### **Youths, beneficiaries of vocational training, internship and placement**

How did you know about the vocational training courses?

Were the courses relevant to your needs? In which field you got the course?

To what extent did you learn from the courses?

Were you interested to get internship?

Did you get employed or placed in internship? How long the duration of the job or the internship?

Do you feel you have the skills to find a job?

What skills you still need to be employable?

Is there any competition in finding a job? In which areas are this competition?

### **Beneficiaries of the municipalities' projects**

Are projects implemented by the municipalities considered as meeting your priority needs?

If not, what are the most important services needed?

To what extent the community was consulted in the selection of the projects?

What benefits did you gain from these projects?

To what extent are you satisfied with the services provided?

To what extent do you feel the projects have reduced tensions in the community?

### **SDC staff**

Capacity of SDC staff (MRR) to be conducted with capacity of SDC in MSS

To what extent did you benefit from the MRR training? Are you able to conduct the MRR with little assistance?

Are there any criteria for the selection of the stakeholders taking part in the MRR process? Who select them?

Did you produce an action plan? Are priorities identified, and projects implemented according to the priorities?

If so, does the action plan take into consideration the available human and financial resources? Any focus on the most vulnerable groups as beneficiaries of the projects?

To what extent did you benefit from the MSS training? Are you able to conduct the MSS with little assistance?

To what extent are you in need of any other competencies and skills for conducting the MSS committees? Elaborate

To what extent there are criteria for the selection of the stakeholders taking part in the MSS process?