Dear colleagues,

I am pleased to share with you the final report of the external review of coordination in Lebanon that was undertaken by an external team of consultants in 2015.

The coordination review was commissioned to articulate how the coordination architecture could be adapted to the new situation that arose from the launch of the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan in December 2015. The review team was tasked with recommending the optimal structure for the response in Lebanon for four themes identified in the review: Leadership and accountability; Delivery structure; Information Management; and Donor Coordination.

The findings of the review were discussed within the Humanitarian Country Team, whose members reconfirmed their commitment to strengthening the coordination of the humanitarian response to the Syria crisis and noted a number of inaccuracies in the report. In particular, the HCT noted that UNHCR’s leadership and coordination role relative to the refugee response was not accurately represented. Several recommendations highlighted in the review were found relevant and are already being implemented while others will need to be reviewed in light of the ongoing planning process for the 2016 iteration of the LCRP.

The HCT noted that the current coordination structure, stressing the strategic role and accountability of the HC and HCT, as well as those of UNHCR and UNRWA in leading the refugee response is aligned with the “Joint UNHCR- OCHA Note on Mixed Situations – Coordination in Practice” established within the framework of the Inter Agency Standing Committee in April 2014, the OCHA-UNHCR Joint note dated 29 September 2015 as well as other relevant Transformative Agenda dispositions.

Going forward, our work will continue to be guided by the commitment to a continuously enhanced and more efficient coordination of the response in Lebanon.

Best Regards,

Philippe Lazzarini
Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator for Lebanon.
Lebanon Crisis Response Plan 2015 - 2016
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the conflict in Syria enters its fifth year Lebanon continues to host over a million people who have fled the war. With a population estimated at about four million people, this represents a unique act of generosity in modern times.

The hosting of such a large population has in part been made possible by one of the largest humanitarian aid operations globally. As the situation has become protracted however, both government and its international partners have recognised that a new approach is needed.

In 2014, in response to the evolving situation the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) was developed. This aims to unite humanitarian efforts and longer term assistance to host communities and the institutions of state.

As part of the LCRP transition, a coordination review was commissioned to look at how emergency arrangements could be reconfigured for the new situation. It was tasked with recommending the optimal structure to deliver the response in Lebanon.

The review has been highly participatory. Over 180 people have been interviewed, across all aspects and areas of the response. Both government and international agencies have been intimately involved in the findings. There have also been several key stages of feedback through the course of the review, in an attempt to find consensus on the changes needed. Whilst it has not been possible to find consensus, this report nevertheless represents the closest possible set of solutions to existing coordination challenges.

The recommendations are structured around six themes that emerge from the findings and consultations. These are briefly; leadership, sector and inter-sector coordination, field coordination, information management and donors.

The leadership of the response is currently split three ways. Government is increasingly taking the lead in key sectors and through the crisis cell. The Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) has led on the development of the LCRP, and chairs important strategic groupings. The UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) continues to have the largest operational presence and de facto leads much of the day-to-day work. This three-way split has the potential to cause confusion and lessens the possibility of policy coherence. Clarity on what the different roles are will help speed the transition to a better functioning system. Making the LCRP steering committee function as intended will also help.

The sectors are the key mechanism for overseeing delivery. Of the nine in existence currently there is a great diversity in how they function. Education and Health have progressed furthest, with clear government lead and a strategic advisory group that consists of donors and implementing agencies. This is beginning to function well at national level, although much less so at the field level. Other sectors are much less advanced, in part because there are too many. The Ministry of Social Affairs is being asked to chair five, which is not possible in terms of capacity.

There is weak inter-sector coordination, both within government and within the international system. Partly this is about capacity, partly about clarity. The added value of this function needs to be clearer so that busy partners understand the need to invest time. It is also about the shifting leadership arrangements with inter-sector coordination at times perceived as being about who is in charge of the response.

Local coordination is similarly weak for some of the same reasons. Capacity is an issue, with many local coordinators also busy with full-time implementation jobs. Local coordination also suffers from proximity geographically to Beirut meaning structures are not properly empowered by the centre. There has also been a tendency to organise international assistance along geographical lines that do not correspond to Lebanese governance structures, making alignment challenging. Getting local coordination right is one of the most important aspects for ensuring the success of the LCRP – better organised delivery will ensure the most vulnerable get the help they need, and will retain the support of the local communities. This can be achieved through the introduction of properly tasked, neutral, field coordination with a clear link to the new leadership structures and a clear set of work-plans.
Information management has a key role in supporting the coordination structures. It is key to good decision making and understanding needs and priorities. Lebanon has seen truly innovative work on information management and has excellent capacity. This needs to be properly aligned to policy making structures to have maximum impact.

Finally, retaining the support of donors is vital in ensuring success. This can be done through a set of inclusive structures, ensuring donors are part of key decision making bodies.
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are set out in detail at the end of the report (p.19). The following is a summary of the key points:

Leadership

- Policymaking should be led by the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan steering committee.
- Within government, strategic leadership should lie with the line Ministries.
- Strategic leadership for international efforts should be with the RC/HC and HCT.
- Refugee protection should be led by UNHCR.

Sectors

- All sectors should migrate to government leadership at national level with operational delivery (and coordination) delegated to the most efficient and effective service providers, including NGOs.
- UN support to government leadership of sectors should be streamlined, and the total number of sectors reduced.
- Social cohesion should become a key part of ‘inter-sector’ led by UNDP.

Inter-sector

- There should be an integrated sector coordination mechanisms nationally, acting as a key strategic support body to the LCRP steering committee and the HCT.
- There should be two technical inter-sector groups, one representing the Government and the other representing the international partners.
- The RCO/OCHA should provide secretariat functions to the various inter-sector bodies.

Local coordination

- Inter-agency consultation meetings should move to government leadership by the Governors.
- Sub-national inter-sector should be convened and chaired by Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA) supported by neutral coordination.
- Sector coordination at the sub-national level should move to reflect the new national arrangements. A detail plan should be worked out and endorsed by the HCT and steering committee.

Information Management

- The reporting line of the Information Management Working Group (IMWG) should be to the inter sector coordination groups and their work be based on the needs of the leadership, inter-sector and sectors (linked to the HCT work-plan).

Donor Coordination

- The RC/HC should facilitate strategic dialogue and coordination with donors through Bi-monthly Lebanon Development Forum (LDF) meetings with Ambassadors and through donors standing participation in the HCT and the LCRP steering committee.
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. This study was a commitment in Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) for 2015. At the time of the launch, December 2014, the Government of Lebanon and its international partners decided to conduct a review of coordination structures for potential adjustment. This was in light of the development from a response model focused on providing protection and assistance to refugees, to a wider system that addresses the different needs of vulnerable female and male, young and elderly refugees as well as the stabilisation needs of the host country.¹

2. The core purpose of the review is to recommend the optimal structure for delivering the response in Lebanon. The review was tasked to assess the mechanisms in place to meet the objectives of the plan, from a coordination perspective, across different levels (nationally and locally), thematic operational areas (sectors) and lines of responsibility.

3. Beyond structure, the review was asked to consider and make recommendations on the roles, responsibilities and practices of the different mechanisms. This should help clarify and strengthen coordination and accountability between partners and the Government, as well as accountability to vulnerable individuals and communities, in line with different actors’ mandates.

4. The review seeks to build on the excellent work by UNHCR in coordinating the response to date, as well as the gradual shift toward government leadership. Additionally, it seeks to build on the years of experience and more recent efforts of UNDP at national and local levels to enhance national delivery capacity.

5. Two key issues that must be clear; this is not an evaluation of the quality of the (pre) existing coordination structure. The review does not attempt to judge the quality of the work carried out by individuals with roles and responsibilities within the existing structure. The methodology section outlines the review team’s approach to data gathering and analysis. The review is also an independent undertaking in the sense that the review team was not bound to any particular institutional loyalty. As a result, the team felt empowered to express findings and subsequent recommendations not all supported by a consensus within the humanitarian community/leadership.

Methodology

6. This review was highly participatory, using primarily qualitative enquiry to inform analysis and conclusions. In practice, the review consisted of a large number of interviews with key stakeholders structured around three key areas of enquiry. These key areas of enquiry (derived from the terms of reference, and a short inception mission) are:
   - Leadership and accountability
   - Delivery structures
   - Information management

7. The findings are structured against the key areas of enquiry.

8. Three international consultants, seconded by three donor organisations to the office of the RC/HC, undertook the review. They were supported by occasional additional national team inputs, mostly to organise interaction with government entities and organise field visits. The review took place from February to June 2015 and conducted in three phases.

¹ The LCRP is designed to ensure protection and assistance to Syrian refugees, to assist the most vulnerable Lebanese, to strengthen national and local capacities, and to reinforce economic and social stability (Ref. LCRP 2015-2016, p. 5).
Phase one included preliminary data gathering and preparation of a short inception report. The second phase involved interviews with more than 180 stakeholders in the five coordination hubs of the country: in the South (Tyre and Sida), in the Bekaa (Zahle), in Tripoli, in Mount Lebanon and Beirut. The findings were triangulated in part using responses from people previously and presently involved in coordination in Lebanon, but additionally with the wealth of secondary data and research that exist on coordination, both in the region and globally.

In April 2015, as part of the second phase, a short report reflecting emerging findings was circulated to key stakeholders in support of verification of initial findings. It is worth noting that feedback on this ‘verification report’ highlighted significant differences in views and understanding of the purpose and scope of the review among key stakeholders. In particular in relation to sharing of information on identified challenges.

The third phase involved, upon the request of the UNCT, further deliberation with key government partners on the emerging findings (‘verification report’), a second round of consultation with key stakeholders within the UN, NGO and donor community and the preparation of the final report. The intention of the phased review process was to be practical and to form the first step in a process of adaptation.

There has also been an extensive review of available literature and documents including evaluations, reviews and analysis already carried out in Lebanon on coordination, as well as best practices for other, similar, contexts.

**Constraints**

This review was supposed be carried out within a three-month period. Its intention was to be practical and to form the first step in a process of adaptation. Given an ambitious ToR and the interest of key stakeholders to increase number and scope of consultations both on early findings and initial recommendations, the limited time assigned to the review presented a challenge. As a result, the review team identified and prioritised key issues considered to be the most important, and focused on how these may be addressed. Further limitations resulted from a high staff turnover and limited institutional memory among staff with coordination responsibility in the operation.

---

The ToR for the review was drafted and approved by the UNCT.


2. RAPID REVIEW OF COORDINATION TYPOLOGIES

14. The humanitarian situation in Lebanon is changing. The development of the LCRP is an acknowledgment of this change. The Syrian refugee presence in Lebanon will be prolonged and external financial resources for the response are dwindling. Leaving the Government of Lebanon and international partners with a situation where more will need to be done with potentially considerably fewer resources.

15. One of the objectives of the review was to recommend and develop the description of the optimal structure for delivering the overall response in Lebanon in light of these changes. This was done using information from the interviews, as well as looking at different coordination modes in a literature review. Broadly the review in the end chose two ways of describing the optimal coordination mechanism – by function (i.e. what overarching strategic objectives the operation is supposed to achieve, and the activities needed to get there, including mode of leadership and cooperation) and structure (form). The principle being that the structure of the coordination mechanism should be based upon its intended function. Only that which needs to be coordinated should be coordinated.3 The coordination approaches are briefly reproduced below to set the context for the discussions on coordination structures, roles and responsibilities. The modes of coordination correlate well, reflecting the critical interdependency between form and function to achieve the best possible effective and efficient coordination.

Defining coordination

16. The review adapted the most commonly used definition of coordination when addressing coordination in humanitarian and development operations:

17. “Coordination is the systematic utilization of policy instruments to deliver humanitarian assistance in a cohesive and effective manner. Such instruments include: (1) strategic planning; (2) gathering data and managing information; (3) mobilizing resources and assuring accountability; (4) orchestrating a functional division of labour in the field; (5) negotiating and maintaining a serviceable framework with host political authorities; and (6) providing leadership. Sensibly and sensitively employed, such instruments inject an element of discipline without unduly constraining action.”4

18. This definition provides a range of key instruments that can be employed in support of implementing a well-structured coordinated response. Briefly the objectives and the key issues related to the coordination of the stabilisation and humanitarian response in Lebanon to these six instruments are:

- Strategic planning: the need for the sector specific objectives of the response to be aligned and connected to the objectives of the overall response (the LCRP) and the wider development goals of the country.
- Gathering data and managing information: the need for information management to be consolidated so that is serves decision-making.
- Mobilising resources and assuring accountability: the need for clear leadership and lines of accountability for the response put in place.
- Orchestrating a functional division of labour in the field: the need for i) connecting the national and local level reflecting the different needs for a policy setting structure at the national level and an operational implementation focused structure locally, and ii) slimming down the burden of coordination by reducing number of sectors.

---

3 Sharing of information is per se not coordination and meetings are rarely needed for effective and efficient information sharing. Information sharing is however key for successful coordination.

• Negotiating and maintaining a serviceable framework with host political authorities: the need to establish government *de facto* leadership of the response.
• Providing leadership: establish consensus on the leadership of the response i.e. the role of the LCRP steering committee, the UNCT vs. the HCT and the role of the RC/HC vs. the Refugee Coordinator.

19. The fact that following and making use of these coordination tools may or may not actually lead to the desired outcome, makes us add another dimension to coordination that help shed light on some structural variants and coordination modes that is known to influence coordination – also in Lebanon.

### Coordination types

20. Broadly, coordination can be seen and understood practically conducted in three ways:

- **Coordination-by-command** – under strong leadership accompanied by some sort of authority, whether carrot (ex. funding) or stick (ex. project proposal manager/approver, policy maker);
- **Coordination-by-consensus** – a result of agreed leadership following a function of the capacity to orchestrate a coherent response and mobilise key actors around common objectives and priorities. Consensus in such situations is normally achieved without any direct assertion of authority;
- **Coordination-by-default** – coordination that in the absence of a formal coordination entity involves only the most basic ad-hoc exchange of information and possibly division of tasks and activities among engaged actors.

21. The most commonly reflected perceived leadership style by the interviewees was coordination-by-command and coordination-by-default.

### 3. FINDINGS

22. The aid operation in Lebanon is in transition. This is clear from the move to an integrated crisis response plan, and clearly the intent of the coordination review. It is also the case objectively however, when one steps back from the minutiae of technocratic aid delivery and looks at the wider picture.

23. Since early 2012 when the first Syrians were displaced into Lebanon by the civil war, an enormous emergency relief operation has been mounted. Communities across Lebanon welcomed Syrians, and together with the Government (both local and national) a plethora of civil society organisations, international aid agencies and UN structures have delivered billions of dollars worth of assistance.

24. In 2014 the Lebanese government, with the help of its international partners, started to make tentative steps toward managing a more protracted situation of displacement. The war in Syria has not abated and the majority of Syrians are not able to return home. Their prolonged stay has consequences however, both for them and for the municipalities and villages where they have temporarily settled. Services are stretched, labour patterns changed and understandable social tensions have emerged. Remarkably, given the fractured nature of Lebanon’s own society, these have not turned into anything more serious.

25. The emergency operation was largely coordinated by the UNHCR. They have done an excellent job of scaling up quickly to the challenge; registering the displaced Syrians, delivering assistance and establishing coordination structures to bring many different agencies together. This was done with the acquiescence and participation of the Lebanese government, in part because they

---

5 Coordination is a process, which by definition cannot guarantee a coordinated outcome. Minear’s list of coordination functions may or may not actually lead to the desired outcome.

needed help to deal with the overload, in part because the political situation made a more robust response difficult.

26. In acknowledging the protracted nature of the crisis, government has also acknowledged its own duty to manage the crisis. It has established a crisis cell to oversee all aspects of the Syria response, and appointed the Ministry of Social Welfare (MoSA) as the coordinating agency within government.\(^7\) A joint steering committee has been set up to manage the implementation of the joint crisis response plan.

27. Necessarily this involves a move away from the original emergency response structures. Almost certainly the end point of this transition will be total government management of assistance and service delivery. In the interim – which may be some time – there is a need for an adapted structure. One that facilitates this shift, drawing on the best of what exists and creating space for the new elements.

28. As set out in the method section, this review talked extensively to all those concerned and through a number of challenging processes sought to find common ground on what an adapted system might look like. This report sets out both the evidence from the interviews, and proposed solutions.

29. Whilst there was clear consensus across the spectrum of those interviewed on what the challenges were (whether government, or NGO, or UN, or donors, or those coordinating, issues identified were remarkably similar), this was less the case in terms of solutions. This is inevitable given the nature of change and the reality that there will be winners and losers. Most of these solutions are self-evident, and many are already formatively in place, or in planning. Some are contested. All however, are grounded in the analysis of months of observation and discussion.

---

\(^7\) Crisis cell/Inter Ministerial Committee composition: Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour and the Prime Minister.
Leadership and accountability

30. The issue of leadership is both straightforward and one of the biggest challenges. In the emergency operation UNHCR clearly led the operation, and still retains by far the biggest operational infrastructure to deliver on this. UNHCR either ran, or joint led all of the sectors, hosted the inter-sector coordination, produced the appeal and planning frameworks and had the most senior staff in the field. UNHCR has also attracted the lion’s share of the finance, meaning it can *de facto* coordinate through the allocation of resources.

31. The shift envisaged in the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP) is to a more familiar system of an RC/HC leading overall, with specialised UN agencies overseeing much of the implementation. In this structure the HCT and sometimes the UNCT play a strategic coordination role, bringing together the agencies and their civil society partners. UNHCR still retains a unique role in the protection of refugees, but shares the operational coordination.

32. As set out in the opening paragraphs to this findings section, there is also an increasing – and increasingly rapid – move to the government leading aspects of the response. Whilst the practical realities of this move are uneven, the political intent is crystal clear. Lebanon has a legitimate government, is a middle-income country with significant capacity, and it is less and less tolerant of parallel coordination and implementation structures.

33. These shifts are almost unanimously endorsed by the interviews for this review. Respondents felt strongly there should be a joint government/UN led coordination structure where the RC/HC leads for the international side of the response. Within this, there is also a clear desire for the leadership of sectors and localised coordination to be shared more equally. There is clear consensus on the need for a strategic group to support this leadership on the international side (in the current structure the HCT is envisaged as playing this role) and that these structures are increasingly either integrated into government, or superseded by them.

34. Whilst the broad outline of a revised leadership model is well supported and understood, the interim is messy. For the time being, it has led to three separate centres of leadership, all overlapping and whilst not exactly in competition, certainly not working seamlessly.

35. On the government side, the crisis cell sets policy for the overall response, primarily through a security lens. The LCRP steering committee exists on paper but has met infrequently, and has not been a centre of gravity for policy making. Within government the individual ministries neither completely accept the MoSA coordinating role, nor do they completely know what they might want from it. MoSA itself is tasked with coordination of several sectors as well as being a link between sectors and the overall policy lead. In addition it has an implementation role through its social welfare centres, as well as a role in local coordination.

36. The RC/HC has made good progress in establishing an overall coordination capacity. The planning for the LCRP was jointly led by the office of the RC/HC (both the RCO and OCHA), and the HCT is regularly convened on this set of issues. The RC/HC provides a strong interface with government. The office of the RC/HC is jointly involved in inter-sector coordination with UNDP and UNHCR. This capacity has been evolving however, and is certainly not either at the strength a ‘regular’ OCHA operation in this sized context would be.

---

* Protection, shelter, basic assistance, livelihoods and social stability.
37. For UNHCR the trajectory is the opposite. They have held the de facto coordination role from early in the response, in particular on the operations side, and whilst they are trying hard to facilitate the shift envisaged in the LCRP someone still has to do the day-to-day job. As they still have the people in place, naturally this means that UNHCR still de facto coordinate a lot of the day-to-day operations (until new arrangements bed in, and new people take over permanently).

38. UNDP are also important in the coordination set up, leading a couple of sectors and perhaps more importantly managing their long standing relationships in the municipalities. UNDP have also historically supported many experts within government, meaning they have both good access and good understanding. They are appreciated and trusted by government inter-locators, and with global experience in transition situations and a regional agreement with UNHCR, they are also a part of the coordination solution. UNDP are also providing some of the coordination capacity at the local level.

39. These three different centres of leadership create some confusion for those tasked with implementing. It also has the potential to add to transaction costs, with agencies having to effectively report into three different structures (or at least ensure they are engaged with them). Whilst respondents to this review are keen to support the transition, they also (very strongly) desire clear, straightforward structures that add value.

Role of Government

40. The evidence for this review clearly indicates people want government to lead. This does not mean people want to surrender all authority to government uncritically however. There are several issues where civil society does not agree with government policy, or where UN agencies seek to influence policy, or protect groups that are especially vulnerable.

41. This review has interviewed people within government and within the international assistance structures and the views on what government should do are quite similar. Primarily, the overwhelming majority of those interviewed, see government's role as policy setting. This means developing the framework in which assistance is delivered, and helping to prioritise. Key policy choices such as access to work and to services are arguably of far greater importance to displaced Syrians and the Lebanese hosting and helping them than assistance packages. Frequency and types of assistance, levels of benefits, modalities of delivery, data collection – all of these and more require policy decisions. This has already been done effectively in several key areas, such as education and now health.

42. This does not mean that government should be involved in every aspect of day-to-day delivery. Lebanon has a highly developed market in infrastructure, and most services are delivered through non-government mechanisms. This principle of separating policy and delivery has effectively been the practice in the first phase of dealing with the Syrian crisis, and has been an effective way of creating lots of additional capacity quickly.

Role of the RC/HC

43. The UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) is seen by most as the natural person to represent the international assistance effort in Lebanon. This works for both the Government, who want to have a senior inter-locator, and for agencies who want to have a neutral intermediary. Leadership in this context is seen primarily as a ‘coordination by consensus’ model rather than ‘coordination by command’ (see above section on typologies).

44. The types of roles ascribed to this function in interviews are similar to other contexts; nor surprisingly given that people are used to seeing this system work elsewhere. They see the RC/HC as leading on planning processes, prioritisation, resource mobilisation, convening the main stakeholders (including donors and government) and providing strategic guidance to the international effort. This is not dissimilar to the definition of coordination outlined above.

45. In interviews for the review, respondents also see this role extending into sector and field based coordination (see section below on delivery). This is not to suggest that the RC/HC should be involved in delivery mechanisms, but that there is a desire for neutral and dedicated coordination in these areas too – effectively for the RC/HC to lead a coordination team. The precise configuration and provenance of this team is less clear to those interviewed than in other contexts.
Role of UNHCR

46. There is a special role reserved for UNHCR in the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP), with the refugee coordinator quite naturally leading on issues of refugee protection. In the LCRP an advisory committee on Syrian displaced is envisaged as additional to the steering committee and the more delivery focused structures.

47. There is strong support amongst those interviewed for the review for an enhanced UNHCR refugee protection role. This is seen as especially important as the situation becomes protracted; as resources dwindle and attitudes to hosting harden, and as potentially security concerns reduce the space formerly afforded to this population.

48. The exact nature of this type of leadership – how it fits with the convening role of the RC/HC, how the advisory committee works in practice and how it relates to the HCT and the steering committee is unclear.

Role of UNDP

49. UNDP has increasingly become involved in the coordination structures for the LCRP. It has a regional agreement with UNHCR to deliver resilience aspects of the refugee response, and in Lebanon has a long-standing, well-respected presence. As touched on above, they have deep roots in government and are trusted.

50. It is this ability to bridge the gap between ‘normal’ and ‘crisis’ structures that makes UNDP important in transition contexts. There is also considerable institutional expertise in this area. It is important that UNDP plays an active role in helping municipalities and other government structures gradually take over from emergency arrangements. UNDP also supports the important social stability sector, something that is central to the idea of the LCRP.

Role of donors

51. As with most humanitarian operations the donors are extremely influential in determining how response arrangements are configured. In Lebanon, donors have backed UNHCR with the largest amount of funding, effectively reinforcing their coordination and lead role. Simultaneously, through mechanisms such as the IASC Emergency Directors Group (EDG) donors have pushed for the deployment of HCs, or a comprehensive regional approach and other such initiatives. This has in part added to the coordination confusion.

52. Part of the issue is clearly that ‘donors’ are not one homogenous group, but representatives of a diverse group of member states. This inevitably leads to differences between donors, both in terms of emphasis but also substance. The more donor perspectives can be harmonised, the easier it is to have consistent policy and systems.

Role of affected people and communities

53. Accountability to affected people emerged strongly during the course of the review as an area requiring more attention. Whilst it is not strictly part of coordination structures – or rather is not at present – respondents to the review saw the opportunity for a powerful shift in the way the response is run. Principally there should be consideration given to incorporating the voices of those affected into coordination structures. UNHCR has traditionally organised camp committees – with a non-camp policy this has logically not happened. However, if a formula can be found in Lebanon it has the potential to not only improve the LCRP but also to serve as an example for other contexts.

54. Opportunities exist for the formation of advisory committees at different levels of the Lebanon response, and for consulting both Lebanese and displaced Syrians. UNDP already convene groups at a municipal level to look at local development; this type of work could easily be extended into the coordination structures of the LCRP. An Accountability to Affected Populations Plan, as specified in the L3 protocols would be a starting point for establishing such structures.
Delivery structure

55. Evidence from the coordination review suggests that it is at the level of delivery structures that the most work needs to be done. Whilst the leadership level is evolving, and people have a reasonable idea about what the structures are, for the delivery level the transition is proving disabling. This is particularly true at the local level, where programme operations are being implemented.

56. Delivery is organised along sector lines, meaning that operational coordination takes place both nationally and locally within technical sector groups. As with the national level, and leadership of the overall structures, at the delivery level there is a partial transition underway from exclusively UNHCR structures to government and wider UN-led structures.

57. For the last 2-3 years UNHCR has provided most of the capacity for coordination, based around five regional ‘hubs’; Akkar and Qbaiyat in the north, Tripoli, Bekaa, Mount Lebanon (including Beirut) and Tyre in the south. UNHCR has led inter-agency meetings and provided the sector coordinators. This has been changing as the LCRP has gained some traction, and as UNHCR resources have been stretched. UNDP is now providing some of the coordination capacity, as are other UN agencies such as UNICEF. Largely, however, sector coordination resides with UNHCR staff.

58. Respondents to the review identified a number of issues with the current set up. UNHCR is managing the implementation of a large programme of its own. This means that sector coordinators manage the implementation of the UNHCR programme, and then have coordination responsibilities on top of this. This in turn means a challenging workload, and a tendency to use coordination meetings as an extension of the UNHCR programme, rather than something broader, serving the interests of all those involved in the response (i.e. those not receiving UNHCR funding). This is an issue long recognised in other contexts, with a push in recent years toward dedicated sector coordinators, operating as neutrally as possible.

59. Inter-sector coordination is perceived as particularly weak, and in many cases absent. Even within the same office, UNHCR coordinators interviewed for the review would not know what their colleagues were doing, far less what other agencies were working on (in sectors other than their own).

60. Currently however, other agencies are not providing the resources to relieve UNHCR of the burden of leadership. Neither has government got this capacity. This creates a catch-22 situation whereby everyone wants to move to a different situation, but the status quo makes it difficult to do so. In the meantime capacity is becoming difficult to maintain consistently further weakening field based coordination structures.

61. Another complication is the relationship between Beirut and the hubs. Because of the relatively easy traveling distance between the capital and the regional towns, there is a tendency to mix to the two levels. Zahle in the Bekaa, where arguably the largest ‘field’ operation is concentrated, is only an hours’ drive from Beirut. This means that many agencies manage operations from Beirut and there is a mix of centralisation and decentralisation for all.

62. The problem with this approach is that whilst the ‘levels’ of coordination appear to be geographical, it is in fact more about complexity. The Lebanon operation is huge in financial terms and in terms of the population being served. It has an annual budget in excess of $1bn US and over a million refugees being directly assisted. Such a large-scale operation has lots of ‘moving parts’ and really demands a hierarchy of organisation. There needs to be a policy setting level.
and then underneath this an operational level. It is not possible for national level committees to deal with the detail of an individual settlement, or solve a problem with a broken water pipe. Conversely, it should not be the place of people employed to oversee practical delivery systems to have to spend hours looking at national level planning documents.

63. Respondents to the coordination review overwhelmingly desired a more reliable delivery coordination structure. The ideal was seen as dedicated sector coordinators at the hub level, with clear reporting lines to sector leads at a national level. Neutral, and dedicated inter-sector coordination was also seen as a desirable ideal. The following sub-section describe this in more detail.

**Sectors**

64. The leadership of sectors at the national level, as outlined above, has moved very clearly for some areas to government. For other sectors it is clear that government are keen to lead, but perhaps have less capacity to do this. For all sectors the capacity – and the desire – of government at a sub-national (hub) level to ‘lead’ is less certain.

65. Currently there are nine sectors (see figure 6). Most respondents to the review thought that this was too many, and many in the international agencies were unhappy with their configuration.

66. The current sector configuration is loosely based on the original UNHCR coordination structure. It follows a reasonably standard pattern of sector-based coordination, although it is not quite in line with the cluster model that has been almost universally applied in recent times.

67. In education and health there is clear agreement across the agencies involved that current arrangements are working. There is strong government involvement and leadership; a strategic steering committee at the national level compromising most stakeholders and clear UN support agencies for supporting government in their role. The water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector is increasingly also working well with recent agreements in place on who leads within government.

68. There are other sectors where there is dissatisfaction with the current arrangements and no clear consensus on the way forward. This is most evident in the food security and livelihoods sectors. WFP and FAO are extremely unhappy about UNDP leadership of – and in fact the very existence of – the livelihoods sector, with FAO feeling this cuts across part of their remit (agricultural livelihoods).

69. For other agencies sectors such as basic assistance are unsatisfactory, especially as so much of the assistance package in Lebanon is delivered through cash transfers of some form. They argue there is a logic in combining this with food security, or perhaps shelter as well.

70. Finally there is near consensus that having a social stability sector does not make sense; that it is not a stand-alone area of technical delivery, but rather a policy goal that should be a part of every sectors work. It is also acknowledged however, that this has been one of the most vibrant sectors in practice – that it has been well run and well attended and respondents for the review were keen that any changes would not lose this energy and commitment.

71. The sectors where there is some potential for change all fall under the leadership of the Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA). One of the internal issues for MoSA is having dedicated capacity to manage this large portfolio – in practice some consolidation will be advantageous simply from a management perspective.
72. Currently the sectors are almost all still co-led by UNHCR. This again relates to former arrangements and the on-going transition. Over time this should continue with other agencies increasingly filling these co-lead roles, including NGOs.

**Inter-sector**

73. Inter-sector coordination was highlighted in the review as the area that has been least satisfactory. This is especially true in the field, as highlighted elsewhere in this findings section.

74. This role is traditionally challenging, and is often one of the areas highlighted in operational evaluations as not working optimally. Whereas sector coordination can be quite focused, inter-sector coordination can sometimes appear to be trying to do everything. And it can be hard to make obvious links between sectors that seem quite different.

75. In Lebanon this has been further complicated by the inter-sector function also playing the role of partnerships coordinator within UNHCR. As there is a lot of grant making, and therefore lots of sub-grantee partners in the UNHCR operational model, inevitably the coordination function is dealing with issues relating to partnerships as well as the more technical aspects of technical planning and prioritisation.

76. Following the introduction of the LCRP, and the regional refugee and resilience plan, the inter-sector function was broadened to include UNDP, supported by the RCO and OCHA. This has been dubbed the ‘quartet’ within the coordination structures and although it has served well as an interim function it is unwieldy in the long term.

77. Within government, inter-sector coordination is the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA). This has been a difficult function for MoSA to establish for many of the same reasons that it proves challenging in the ‘normal’ international humanitarian and stabilisation coordination architecture. In interviews for the coordination review, the initial feedback from line ministries was that there was a limited role for MoSA. Over time this has changed, as the line ministries have come to appreciate that there are issues that often cut across technical areas.

78. Bureaucratic rivalries are a fact of life in all large organisations and especially governments. In Lebanon, the confessional system often makes such divisions more acute as different ministries are aligned with different political parties. This makes the task of MoSA even more delicate in trying to ‘coordinate’.

79. Despite the challenges associated with inter-sector, both within government and within the UN system, there is a clear need for this function. This is the consistent feedback to the review, including from within government. There is also a clear need to make it as straightforward as possible – clear roles and responsibilities and a clear set of tasks.

**Field based coordination**

80. The sections above have already highlighted that field coordination emerges as a consistent issue in the review. Interviews suggest that a lack of dedicated capacity means that coordination is inconsistent, and often is narrowly focused on the implementation of the UNHCR programme. Whilst UNHCR is a major and important part of the operation, it is not its entirety and this risks missing other aspects.

81. Another issue with field based coordination, also highlighted above, is that there is confusion between the ‘levels’. Beirut – the centre – has delegated certain coordination responsibilities to the field level, but because of geographical proximity is often involved.

**Cash**

82. The coordination of cash based responses presents a particular challenge. A major part of the response has been delivered through cash transfers, especially if vouchers are included. Lebanon has well functioning markets and a good banking system meaning that cash is a particularly effective way of delivering assistance. Efforts have been made over the last 18 months to harmonise delivery systems, with the introduction of ‘one card’ for refugees (combining UNHCR and WFP).
83. In addition to the efforts of WFP and UNHCR however, many of the large NGOs have been delivering a variety of inputs using cash. This is also true of some of the regional NGOs and foundations. Whilst there has been a cash-working group for some time, this has focused more on standardisation and policy issues rather than day-to-day coordination (although there has been some of this too).

84. Incorporating the cash working group into the formal coordination structure would allow for better visibility of all of the different cash programmes. Currently there is no overview of the different benefits people are receiving; consolidating this information would allow for better decisions on need.

**Information management**

85. The Lebanon response is complex and multi-faceted, as already set out in this report. With the addition of the ‘stabilisation’ component to the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan there is an even more complicated picture of needs and responses.

86. To facilitate good decision making there have been efforts from early in the response to develop good information management tools. Under the leadership of UNHCR, supported by UNICEF, a reporting system was developed to draw together as close to real time information about what was being delivered as possible. ActivityInfo is a web portal that has evolved into a powerful tool for tracking assistance being delivered.

87. Simultaneously, there have been a variety of efforts to track needs. UNHCR has maintained a database of all Syrians displaced into Lebanon via its registration system. This initially provided the principal mechanism through which eligibility for aid was determined. WFP developed a vulnerability mapping system (VaSyr) that has now conducted two rounds of analysis using a food security lens. Several NGOs conducted their own assessments, later consolidated into a multi-sector needs assessment (MSNA). UN OCHA commissioned REACH/IMPACT to look at community impacts of hosting refugees.

88. In 2014 UNICEF produced, initially for their own programme needs, a map that looked at where refugees and poor Lebanese were geographically concentrated. This showed there were approximately 250 cadastres that had a high concentration of both populations, proving an excellent tool for concentrating assistance efforts. UNICEF also started to gather data on their own programme harmonisation, tracking how their programme was adapting to this new system of targeting. There has also been an increasingly sophisticated consolidation of this information as well as risk and donor tracking by the RCO and UNDP.\(^9\)

89. In addition to these UN efforts, there are several highly credible and well respected independent information management projects or programmes. The ACAPs run Syria Needs Analysis Project (SNAP) is probably the best known of these.

**Coordination of IM**

90. Whilst all of these efforts are individually excellent and many of them highly innovative, the sum is less than the parts. There is still no real, reliable overview of needs and no in-depth, definitive calculation of gaps and priorities.

91. The coordination of information management has been overseen for the last year or more by a working group (the IM working group). This seems well run and highly expert. However, its links to the HCT, the LCRP, the RC/HC and related structures appear tenuous.

92. More recently the office of the RC/HC has established a Joint Analysis Unit (JAU), largely run by OCHA. This was envisaged in the LCRP, and is now beginning to produce analytical information products. However the exact configuration of how the IMWG links to the JAU, and how the JAU and IMWG link to the HCT and their role in the LCRP is still not completely resolved.

93. Lebanon is a sophisticated country, and the crisis response has struggled to match this level of sophistication. In an environment where goods and services are easily available, there is a relatively permissive social, security and policy environment; markets and financial services

---

\(^9\) Lebanon Information Management and Analysis Support (IMAS): http://www.4wslebanon.net/imtoolbeta/
function and there is a skilled work force, it should be easier to deliver quality, targeted, relevant and appropriate assistance. This has to be driven by high quality information and analysis, however, and this has been lacking. The ‘evidence’ is not driving the response; instead it has defaulted to mostly doing what the big agencies do elsewhere in the world.

94. Partly the lack of an evidence driven response – needs based, thoughtfully targeted, efficient, contextual – is a system issue. The humanitarian system is not terribly adaptive and tends to deliver what it is used to delivering. Partly though, it is a failure of good information management. In the Lebanon context there is a lot of collection of data, and a lot of info-graphic production, but this seems primarily targeted to donor reporting. Policy makers are not demanding evidence to inform decisions, and information managers are not demonstrating how serious analysis could improve delivery. An improvement in either demand or supply could make a dramatic difference to the practical effectiveness of the Lebanon operation.

4. CONCLUSIONS

95. The central theme of this review was to recommend the optimal structure for delivering the overall response in Lebanon. From the interviews, subsequent analysis and consultations, set out in the findings section above there are a number of conclusions that emerge. The conclusions are structured around five themes that emerge from this analysis:

- Leadership of the overall response
- Leadership and streamlining of the sectors
- Improved inter-sector coordination
- Better connections between national and local coordination, and;
- Information management.

Leadership of the overall response

96. The findings of this review clearly highlight a need for greater clarity on leadership. Specifically, several clear messages emerge.

97. The first clear message is that government should lead both the policy setting, through the medium of the steering committee, and the sectors (see below for more on this). The Steering Committee has not been active since the LCRP was agreed, and there should be additional effort to make this a functioning and important body. A new integrated sector coordination should be established nationally, acting as a key strategic support body.

98. The second clear message is that the RC/HC should lead the international effort at a strategic level. This means co-convening the LCRP steering committee, convening the HCT and similar bodies around strategic issues, and overseeing planning and prioritisation processes. The RC/HC should also have sufficient coordination capacity – either in his or her office, or in the agencies – to extend this convening authority into the field.

99. In addition to making these leadership arrangements work better, there is clear acknowledgement of the need for a separate voice on refugees. The refugee coordinator should exercise the High Commissioner’s supervisory responsibility in advocating for the protection of and assistance and solutions for refugees.

Sectors

100. There are several evolutions that need to take place in the way the sectors are currently configured. The findings section sets out the main issues.

101. The education and health sectors have developed a sensible working model that should be replicated for others. Government leads, with a strategic advisory committee comprising the main donors and implementing partners. One UN agency with the requisite technical capacity provides support.

102. In the other sectors there is a need for consolidation to maximise efficiency. Some sectors, such as protection, cannot be merged for obvious reasons. Others, such as WASH are probably
sufficiently evolved and stand-alone to also continue as they are. Social cohesion should become a part of inter-sector coordination. The rest of the sectors can easily be merged, or their responsibilities organised differently. The cash working group should either become a sector or be properly incorporated into one of the revised groups. As consensus cannot be found amongst the international agencies it will fall to government to make these judgements.

103. In practical terms it is important to have dedicated sector coordination capacity. From the international side the lead supporting agency should make at least one post full time, dedicated at a national level for this task. Sectors need clear work plans aligned to the LCRP goals and objectives.

What makes sector coordination successful?
What “works” differs from sector to sector depending on objectives and activities, context, partners involved, the role of international actors versus host government etc. Years of research and evaluations have shown that there is no one ‘magic formula’ for succeeding with coordination however, the following factors are all important:

- Common goals for the sector response aligned with the overall goal of the response.
- Common understanding on the objective and priorities of the sector.
- A clear focus on sector activities with direct operational relevance for the sector members and the sector objective (less focus on information gathering for reporting to others).
- Independent knowledgeable, experienced sector coordinator (at national/central level).
- A clear division between sector lead agency priorities (needs) and those of the sector.
- Effective information management: mutually agreed, understood and respected procedures for information management and decision-making.
- Agreed Terms of Reference clearly expressing the different roles and responsibilities of the sector members and the sector coordinator.
- When applicable, good linkages between national and sub-national sectors guided by mutually agreed Terms of Reference.

Making inter-sector coordination work

104. Inter-sector is the most complex part of the coordination structure, as respondents simultaneously desire more, and that it is less burdensome. There is a desire for this function nationally to support strategic decision-making, but also to facilitate practical, day-to-day operations.

Core functions of inter-sector coordination
Inter-sector core functions include the following:

- Responsible for informing strategic decision-making of the RC/HC/HCT. Providing the link between the strategic work and policy development of the HCT with the operational focus and activities of the sectors. Including monitoring of the overall strategic objectives of the operation.
- Consolidate and support work done by the sectors around the programme cycle, e.g. on coordinated assessments, planning and monitoring.
- Ensure that sector strategies and objectives are in line with the overall strategic direction of the response, and that operational objectives and indicators complement each other and duplications and gaps are avoided.
- Facilitate the design and implementation of common approaches to information management tools.
- Support sectors in strengthening their accountability to affected people.
- Ensure that crosscutting issues (stabilisation, gender, cash based response etc.) and risks are identified and addressed in a coherent and effective manner; responding to the distinct needs of girls, boys, women and men.
- Identify core advocacy concerns and resource gaps, and prepare advocacy messages or recommendations for resource mobilisation.
- Develop and update contingency plans and advocate for preparedness activities.
105. Inter-sector coordination must report to the leadership of the LCRP, in this case the steering committee and the crisis cell, and to the RC/HC. It needs to deliver against a clear set of objectives, demonstrating added value.\textsuperscript{10}

106. By clarifying what the main purpose of inter-sector coordination is and what the lines of accountability are it should be possible to improve on the current interim arrangement. Improved needs analysis, standard setting and prioritisation have been consistently noted as desired outputs from inter-sector coordination efforts in interviews, as has common planning.

**Field coordination**

107. Field coordination is not working well. There is confusion about whether it is delegated or not, and often the sector leads are too busy with their own jobs to spend sufficient time on the coordination role. There is little or no inter-sector coordination, with inter-agency meetings seen as playing this role. On the government side MoSA is theoretically in charge, but lacks capacity and is also not clear how to delegate internally. The ‘hubs’ established by UNHCR and now the de facto field coordination structure are artificial and do not correspond to Lebanese regional or local government structures, meaning it is hard to establish a reliable interface between the two systems.

108. The practical upshot of this is that most agencies are working independently. There is a limited overview of the response at the field level, and meetings are poorly attended.

**Information management**

109. There is widespread recognition of the capacity and skill in the information management sector. However, there is also a clearly expressed desire for information flows to improve, and for products that are better aligned with the needs of operations rather than just reporting. Most importantly, IM is not seen as serving the needs of the operation but more about reporting.

110. There is a feeling that the various structures are not being tasked effectively, meaning lots of initiatives but not all of equal relevance. There is a desire to see the various efforts consolidated, with a clear structure for governance and for implementation. Following the logic of leadership and accountability developed above, this suggests a reporting and tasking line to the RC/HC, potentially through the inter-sector structure.

**Donor coordination**

111. Donor coordination happens informally and through participation in the HCT.\textsuperscript{11} There is also the Lebanon Development Forum at the level of Ambassadors. In addition to these structures, donors should be represented within the LCRP steering committee. They are already, increasingly, participating in the sector strategic advisory groups at national level.

112. Donor coordination is more difficult at a policy level – aligning funding decisions amongst states with their own priorities can only happen up to a point. Where donors can find common ground, it will be important to speak with one voice. This will help the system to be more coherent.

\textsuperscript{10} See paragraph 122 – 128 under recommendations for the different roles and responsibilities of the inter-sector and inter-agency fora.

\textsuperscript{11} DFID and ECHO represent the donors at the HCT.
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Leadership and accountability

113. Policymaking should be led by the LCRP steering committee. The LCRP steering committee should meet quarterly. It should be the leadership body, where main issues of strategy and policy are decided. It is co-chaired by MoSA and the RC/HC (supported by his office), and should be attended by a small, manageable number of key ministries and agencies. There should be international and national NGO/civil society and donor representation. The integrated sector coordination group should set the agenda and prepare the substantial discussions (i.e. be the secretariat). Indicator of success:

- MoSA and RC/HC co-chairing LCRP steering committee meetings every quarter.

114. Strategic leadership for international efforts should be with the RC/HC and HCT+. The RC/HC is ultimately accountable for the delivery of the international elements of the LCRP (supported by his office). Sector support agencies are accountable for their sector to the RC/HC through the HCT. The international inter-sector coordination group supports the RC/HC to assure coherence in achieving common objectives; avoiding duplications and ensuring areas of need are prioritised. The HCT would be a strategic body for the international effort in support of government (on humanitarian and stabilisation efforts), and a space in which issues of difference can be safely aired. Indicators of success:

- HCT work-plan aligned to the work-plan of the UNCT and the international inter-sector group developed and endorsed.
- At least 50 per cent of the HCT meeting agenda reflecting policy discussions relevant for the implementation of the LCRP and crisis response plan.

115. Refugee protection should be led by UNHCR using the advisory group on Syrian displaced as a separate and distinct mechanism to raise sensitive issues. The RC/HC should use every means to preserve this separate ‘humanitarian space’. Indicator of success:

- HCT protection strategy endorsed ensuring strong partnership around a common concern.

116. All sectors should migrate to government leadership at national level. This should happen as quickly as possible. Health, Education and WASH are already well underway in terms of migration. Government leadership should be strategic, with operational delivery (and coordination) delegated to the most efficient and effective service providers, including NGOs. Indicator of success:

- All relevant line Ministries leading de facto the strategy and policy work of the sectors by the end of 2015.

117. Accountability to affected people (AAP) should be brought to the centre of the crisis response. The HCT should develop an overall AAP framework which clearly expresses how the humanitarian community ‘takes account, gives account and is held account’, significantly increasing the level of importance given to the issue of accountability to affected people within the

---

12 The RC/HC should be supported by the RC/HC office (RCO/OCHA) in his overall accountability for the delivery of the LCRP. The RC/HC office has capacity in strategic planning, communications, analysis and reporting. It leads on general oversight/support to UN system wide coordination efforts and donor consultations.

13 Currently in the evolving LCRP coordination structure there is a technical committee that serves this function. The review is recommending this technical committee become the integrated sector coordination body, comprising key line ministries and UN agencies.

14 It may be necessary to expand the membership of the HCT as the LCRP looks to address more stabilisation aspects. The HCT is chosen over the UNCT as a key coordinating body because of its inclusive membership, and to allow space for other issues within the UNCT.
crisis response in Lebanon.\(^{15}\) This plan should then be included in the revised LCRP for 2016 / the humanitarian response plan. **Indicator of success:**

- Accountable to Affected People framework developed and included in the 2016 LCRP / humanitarian response plan.

**Delivery structure**

**Sectors**

118. Government leadership will require shifting resources: so that staffing is not overwhelmingly concentrated within the international sector. Staff and expertise will need to be boosted short term within key coordinating Ministries. **Indicator of success:**

- An HCT action plan ensuring a coordinated and joint UN/HCT approach to government capacity building developed and included in the revised LCRP / humanitarian response plan for 2016.

119. UN support to government leadership of sectors should be streamlined, and the total number of sectors reduced. There are a number of principles that can help inform the exact configuration of this rationalisation:

- There should be one designated agency per sector (in support of government), rather than the current system of co-leads. e.g. UNICEF in education.
- Leadership support should be based on technical and operational capacity. Global mandates necessarily bring technical capacity.
- Health, Education, WASH and Protection should stay as separate sectors. The first three because there are now clear Ministry leads, the latter for policy reasons.
- All national sectors must have a dedicated (fulltime) coordinator.

**Indicators of success:**

- Sector composition agreed upon and endorsed by the LCRP steering committee.
- UN sector support agencies identified and endorsed by the HCT.
- Dedicated (fulltime) agency sector support coordinators identified for all the sectors.

120. Clarify the division of roles and responsibilities between the different coordination groups and fora at the national and regional level. Develop a strategy that clarify the lines of accountability between national and regional levels addressing how coordinator resources, responsibilities and decision-making power are distributed between the different levels and how the levels relate to each other. The national sector should act as an enabler, facilitator and coordinator for the regional based sectors. Depending on their capacity, regional sectors should be provided with more responsibility and decision-making power and coordination resources should focus on the regional level where the real coordination work - should – take place. **Indicators of success:**

- A strategy clearly laying out the relationship between the respective roles and responsibilities of coordinators and fora at the different levels developed, supported by a diagram explaining the humanitarian architecture.
- The strategy endorsed by the HCT and effectively communicated as a ‘whole of HCT’ decision to all actors involved in or impacted by the crisis response.

121. Social stability should become a key part of ‘inter-sector’ led by UNDP as part of their inter-sector duties, and closely connected to work with municipalities. **Indicators of success:**

- Social stability is a key part of the work of the ‘inter-sector’ coordination group ensuring a streamlined approach to ‘stability’ activities across sectors.

---

\(^{15}\) In December 2011, the IASC Principals endorsed the five Commitments on Accountability to Affected People/Populations (CAAPs). The Operational Framework for Accountability to Affected People (one of the Transformative Agenda protocols) was also approved November 2013.
- Social stability focal point identified by all sectors both at the national and regional level.

Inter-sector

122. A new integrated sector coordination should be established nationally, acting as a key strategic support body. It should be chaired by MoSA, and jointly supported by UNHCR and UNDP. This body would prepare decisions for the LCRP steering committee, and guide on common norms and standards for sectors. A number of aspects pertinent to this arrangement need consideration:
- This can only work if UNHCR and UNDP inter-sector coordinators genuinely see their lines of accountability to the RC/HC and the HCT rather than their respective agencies.
- There should be a phased transition to this new arrangement (from the current ‘quartet’).
- MoSA should consider carefully the other Ministries that need permanent representation on this body.
- A detailed TOR, including secretariat functions and roles and responsibilities would need to be developed.
- It is proposed this body would meet quarterly, in advance of the LCRP steering committee.

Indicator of success:
- A ToR for this group developed and endorsed by the LCRP steering committee.

123. There should be two technical inter-sector groups, representing government and international partners. These two groups would meet separately, probably monthly, on an alternate basis. These groups should prepare issues for the integrated meeting.

Indicator of success:
- LCRP steering committee meetings jointly prepared by the chairs of these two groups.

124. The ‘international’ inter-sector technical meeting: co-led by UNHCR and UNDP should report to the RC/HC and prepare issues for the HCT. There should be a division of labour between UNHCR and UNDP, for instance with UNHCR leading where issues of protection and displacement are concerned, and UNDP leading on institutional support and social cohesion. The group should have a strong operational focus.

Indicators of success:
- A ToR clearly expressing the roles and responsibilities of the two co-leads as well as the core functions, lines of accountability and responsibilities of the group (in relation to the humanitarian planning cycle, funding mechanisms, information management, field operations etc.) developed and endorsed by the HCT.
- Analysis and evidence are presented as standing items on the HCT and the inter-sector group agenda; incorporating the analysis of this information (as well as bottlenecks) based on a broader, systematic consultation with sector leads and NGO partners.

125. The RCO/OCHA should provide secretariat functions to the various inter-sector bodies: and dedicated capacity where needed for agenda setting, information gathering and reporting.

Field coordination

126. Inter-agency consultation meetings should move to government leadership: The Governor should convene inter-agency meetings on a monthly basis at a governorate level, with the most senior UN official regionally co-chairing and MoSA and RC/HC office in support. The focus of these meetings should be information sharing.

Indicator of success:
- Inter-agency consultation meeting held monthly in all eight governorates.

127. Sub-national inter-sector should be convened and chaired by MoSA supported by neutral coordination: dedicated capacity should be established in each of the hubs to be responsible for facilitating inter-sector coordination, reporting to the national inter-sector coordination group, MoSA and the HCT via the inter-sector coordination group. Some options are:
- The current UNHCR/UNDP arrangements could be ‘double hatted’.
- OCHA or the RCO or some combination of the two could deploy additional capacity in this role. An option here could also be roving – dedicated – inter-sector coordinators. *Indicators of success:*
  - *Field inter-sector leadership, lines of accountability and reporting endorsed by the integrated inter-sector group and the HCT.*
  - *Monthly inter-sector coordination meetings held in each of the field coordination hubs.*

128. Leadership of sectors at regional level should be on a pragmatic basis in support of the relevant line ministry: agencies should support government leadership where they are in a position to dedicate a coordinator, or have the greatest regional presence or capacity. This can be an international NGO if they are in that situation. The sector leads will report to and take guidance from the national sector coordinator. *Indicator of success:*
  - *Field sector leadership identified by national sector support agencies and endorsed by the HCT.*

**Information Management**

129. The Information Management Working Group (IMWG) should work to support the HCT, sector and inter-sector coordination, and the Joint Analysis Unit (JAU). A common work-plan for the implementation of the LCRP, that integrates sector work plans as well as IM should be developed by the integrated sector coordination, and endorsed by the HCT and the steering committee (linked to the work-plan of the HCT). This must be a short, practical document that can be easily updated. It should use the programme cycle as its basis, building from the LCRP. The implementation of the work-plan should be overseen by the integrated sector coordination and the HCT, and there should be a sensible division of labour amongst agencies that comprise the IMWG. The IMWG should include reporting, monitoring and evaluation. *Indicator of success:*
  - *A common IM work-plan explicitly describing which tools, work streams and products that are produced in facilitation of strengthened sector and inter-sector coordination and HCT decision-making developed and endorsed by the HCT.*

130. The Joint Analysis Unit (run by OCHA/RCO) should provide strategic information for decision making to the LCRP steering committee, RC/HC and HCT: Primarily this should be around needs, gaps and prioritisation, and should draw on the work and capacities of the IMWG. The RC/HC should oversee the development of a work-plan for the JAU, in close liaison with the integrated sector coordination and the IMWG. *Indicators of success:*
  - *A work-plan supporting strategic decision-making and operational planning and coordination endorsed by the HCT and regularly reported on.*
  - *High quality analysis presented regularly to the HCT and the wider humanitarian and development community as relevant – ensuring that the humanitarian and stabilisation narrative for Lebanon is well documented and communicated.*

**Donor Coordination**

131. Bi-monthly Lebanon development forum meetings with Ambassadors. Key tasks should include strategic engagement of international partners with government, and key opportunities/challenges in the implementation of the LCRP. *Indicators of success:*
  - *Bi-monthly Lebanon development forum meetings with a strategic focus held.*

132. The informal donor group is a useful mechanism. On an occasional basis the RC/HC should be able to convene this group for LCRP related technical matters. *Indicators of success:*
  - *The RC/HC convening a technical meeting with donor representatives at least every quarter.*