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A. Executive Summary

The UNICEF programme focuses on reaching the most vulnerable populations, both among the Syrian refugees in IS and the Lebanese host communities. The expected results are for girls, boys and women to have protected and reliable access to sufficient and safe water, gender-appropriate sanitation and hygiene facilities.

The aim of the evaluation is to generate substantial knowledge and learning on the results of the WASH programme to strengthen UNICEF and national strategies in order to improve national systems capacity, water quality, water supply, sanitation services, and public health behaviour in Lebanon. Its objectives are to learn from previous implementations of the WASH Programme on the impacts on targeted children, women and the vulnerable population, learn from UNICEF’s partnership with Ministries and local authorities addressing WASH vulnerability, and provide specific recommendations on the basis of lessons learned in order to improve planning and implementation for better delivery of results for the most vulnerable. UNICEF will be the primary user of the evaluation report, ministries, local authorities and implementing partners will be the secondary users.

The evaluation methodology consisted in drawing up a detailed evaluation matrix in order to break down the main evaluation questions by four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability). For the data collection method, document review, focus group discussions, one-to-one discussions with host communities, site visits, and individual interviews with municipalities, Water Establishments (WE) and the Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW) were done. The triangulation analysis method was then used to gain a detailed and balanced picture of the situation, and information was crosschecked to produce more accurate results.

Several findings and conclusions could be drawn from the evaluation:

The activities from the capacity-building component are fully aligned with the National Water Strategy and are a step forward for the sector. However, they do not include the municipalities, despite there being strong demand for technical and institutional support.

No or few activity overlaps have been identified for both the stabilisation and emergency components of the programme.

The shift in partnership from the WEs to the MoEW in 2016 for the stabilisation projects allowed for a better implementation of the Water National Strategy but hindered effective handover and caused operation and maintenance difficulties.

For the stabilisation component, the most vulnerable people are targeted through the most vulnerable areas of Lebanon, in which UNICEF selects the projects to be implemented. However, this does not necessarily result in the most vulnerable people inside the area being reached, as they are not directly targeted in the project design and implementation.

For the emergency component, depending on the NGO and IS, not all refugees have access to the same quality of WASH services, with some having access to greywater treatment or regular desludging for example, while others not.

Although the water delivery service benefits women and children as they no longer have to walk long distances to get water, the men remain the primary users of the water. In addition, women and children are in charge of dealing with the rubbish, water and cleaning, whereas men are not involved in WASH activities. There is thus a gap between the intended and final results.

There has been no strong improvement in hygiene practices among the refugees following the implementation of hygiene promotion sessions.
Overall, the FGDs and interviews with the host community showed that the refugees recognise the positive changes resulting from improved sanitation and that the host communities are satisfied with the project’s results, although they consider that more should be done.

There is a monitoring system in place (third party monitoring system and the implementing partner assessments) which makes it possible to verify the implementation quality of a partner and take corrective measures if necessary. However, the data don’t exist in a comprehensive table resuming all existing data on the programme which makes it difficult for any external actor to get clear and complete information on the programme.

The key recommendations following this evaluation are:

- to consolidate the coordination mechanisms, coordinating with the WEs for the stabilisation projects and with municipalities for emergency and stabilisation components;

- to support host communities along with refugees through stabilisation projects and capacity-building activities, by working closely with the municipalities to define their needs in a precise and equitable way, providing them with technical input and institutional support, and thus reinforcing their capacities on water, sanitation and solid waste collection;

- to improve the stabilisation projects selection process, by asking for detailed information on the WEs and MoEW selection criteria, by conducting assessments to determine the project’s ability to reach the most vulnerable people and by including relevant aspects other than vulnerability in the UNICEF selection criteria.
# B. Programme Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Programme Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>- UNICEF (Beirut headquarters and zone offices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ministry of Environment (MoE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ministry of Public Health (MPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ministry of Municipalities (MIM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The four Regional Water Establishments (RWEs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sector partners implementing or financing WASH activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO partners (ACF, Concern, CISP, World Vision, Solidarités International, Mercy Corps, LOST and LRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consulting firms implementing stabilisation projects (WET, BTD and Kredo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Syrian refugees in Informal Settlements (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Donors</strong></td>
<td>- BMZ (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DFID (Department for International Development, UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KfW (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau / German Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BPRM (Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Budget</strong></td>
<td>- 2013: US$3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2014: US$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2015: US$40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2016: US$50 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic scope of the programme</strong></td>
<td>- In all governorates of Lebanon (Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck-Hermel, Beirut, Mount-Lebanon, South and Nabatiyeh), in urban and rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme timeframe</strong></td>
<td>- The programme started in 2013 and is still ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended beneficiaries of the programme</strong></td>
<td>- Syrian refugees living in IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Host communities from the 251 most vulnerable municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local authorities from the 251 most vulnerable municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regional and national authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The content of this chapter (as well as some sections) largely comes from the initial ToRs which have been updated (when needed) to reflect decisions or changes made during the inception and data collection phases.
B.1. Programme Context

B.1.1. WASH issues in Lebanon

Lebanon’s water resources are under stress. Available water, including from rivers and springs, storage dams and groundwater, exceed projected water demand. In addition, widespread pollution and substandard water infrastructure are restricting the Government’s ability to meet water demands in the future. Currently, water in Lebanon, defined by “present renewable resources per capita”, is just over $1,100\text{m}^3$/capita/year, dangerously near the international benchmark of $1,000\text{m}^3$/capita/year, below which indicates water stress (WB 2009a).

Lebanon is also generating ever increasing quantities of domestic and industrial wastewater, all of which requires treatment. The country has invested heavily in wastewater facilities over the last two decades, with investment in the sector since the early 1990s exceeding US$1.4 billion. As a result of this investment, about two-thirds of the population is connected to sewer networks but only 8% of wastewater reaches the operational wastewater treatment plants and is treated. A considerable amount of the installed treatment capacity is not being exploited.

The environmental costs of this situation are severe. Most wastewater collected is discharged raw, without treatment, into watercourses and the sea. Where there is no network, cesspits are used with considerable seepage into groundwater. Few industries pre-treat their effluent, so harmful waste is discharged into the sewer system or the environment. While all the water resources are being impacted by bacteriological contamination, in agricultural areas, the runoff and infiltration of fertilizer and pesticide residues is exposing these water resources to further environmental degradation. Furthermore, runoff from urban areas may contain heavy metals and hydrocarbons, which could impact the quality of receiving waters.

The negative environmental impacts of poor wastewater collection and treatment have the knock-on effects of increasing health costs, polluting water resources and soils, and reducing income from amenities and tourism. This situation is the result of years of political instability, poor planning and scattered responsibilities within the sector.

B.1.2. Legal and institutional framework of the water sector in Lebanon and the 2010-2020 Water Sector Strategy

a) The legal framework

Before 2000, the water sector in Lebanon was fragmented and lacked management. Thanks to the institutional changes introduced by Law 221/2000 (the responsibilities under which are cited in Article No2; amendment 377/2001), the Ministry of Energy and Water has been active in leading the implementation of sector reform.

The roles of the MoEW, as set out by Law 221/2000, are to:

- Monitor, control, measure and study water resources, and estimate water needs;
- Monitor the quality of surface and groundwater and set quality standards;
- Develop and update a national master plan for the allocation of potable and irrigation water resources, and develop a wastewater master plan;
- Design and implement large water infrastructure projects;
- Perform artificial recharge of ground water aquifers and monitor extractions;
- Develop a legal framework and procedures to protect water resources from pollution and improve water quality;

---

2 State and trends of the Lebanese Environment, MOE/UNDP/ECODIT, 2011
3 State and trends of the Lebanese Environment, MOE/UNDP/ECODIT, 2011
- Issue permits for water prospection and use of public water and property;
- Conduct and update hydro-geological studies and research, and collect technical water data;
- Monitor and regulate WEs and other entities working in the water sector;
- Enhance and monitor WE performance based on the indicators set out in their business plans;
- Set standards and regulations for studies and project execution, surface and groundwater exploitation and wastewater, and water quality monitoring;
- Perform expropriation transactions for MoEW and WEs;
- Provide opinion on permits related to mines and quarries and their impact on water resources;
- Manage public relations and provide relevant information on water conservation.

Moreover, Law 221/2000 created new regional public operators, the Water Establishments, which are based in the four main regions of Lebanon: Bekaa, North, South and Beirut Mount Lebanon⁴.

Under Law 221/2000, these establishments are:
- Responsible for the study, implementation, exploitation, maintenance, monitoring and renewal of water, wastewater and irrigation projects.
- Empowered to propose tariff levels that can achieve cost recovery and reasonable profits, in order to encourage private sector participation in the establishments’ operations.

The specific roles and responsibilities of the Water Establishments are defined as follows:
- Design, implement, operate and maintain potable and irrigation distribution projects based on the national master plan and resources allocated by MEW;
- Collect, treat and dispose of wastewater using treatment and outfall sites approved by MEW;
- Propose water supply, irrigation and wastewater tariffs;
- Monitor water quality for distributed water supply and irrigation;
- Lead policy making, national planning and water resource management;
- Ensure service provision.

**Figure 1: Allocation of roles between MoEW and WEs⁵**

⁴ The Litani office remains in action and still ensures water management for the Litani basin.
⁵ From the MoEW official presentation of the National Water Sector Strategy 2010-2020
This major reform was intended to enable national and local institutions to improve sector management and people’s access to sustainable and effective services. However, a large number of weaknesses and limitations still remain and these are hampering sector management:

- The lack of the WEs’ institutional capacity is preventing operational efficiency, adequate planning and prioritization of the investments;
- Law 221-2000 does not go far enough to grant these authorities full autonomy;
- Major reforms are still required to make the sector more efficient and self-sustaining (viable tariffs, social tariff policy and financial scheme has to be defined);
- The WEs remain understaffed and do not have the appropriate resources to operate at an acceptable level;
- The WEs are not financially sustainable in the long term, mainly because water and sanitation tariffs do not cover the costs of operation and maintenance (especially for the sanitation sector);
- Coordination between the different institutions is inadequate and causes major difficulties throughout the handover of the CDR-built facilities to the WEs (no O&M forecasts, no anticipation of the users willingness to pay, no clear organisation for the facilities management, and lack of staff recruitment in the WEs to prepare the O&M of the facilities);
- Local stakeholders, especially the municipalities and users, are not involved in the projects and are the main cause of the blockages encountered during the project implementation phase;
- Sector development is mainly based on an infrastructure approach, rather than on a service approach, and this tends to marginalize the WEs and local stakeholders during project implementation phases (when projects are led by the CDR or the MoEW) and causes severe issues for facility operation and maintenance (no O&M cost forecasts, no anticipation of the users willingness to pay, etc.).

Furthermore, the Law 221 has been amended by two laws, and especially the Law 377/2001 which article 6 states that the clauses of the Law 221 “do not reduce the competencies of municipalities or Union of municipalities each within their respective area of competence contained in the Municipal Law (118/77) and the Law on municipal taxes (60/88)“.

Law 118/77 states that the Municipal Council is in charge of any project linked to water issues and of sewer networks construction (article 49) and Law 118/77 set two different taxes collected by municipalities for implementing and managing the sidewalks and sewer networks: a tax on building permits and a tax exclusively dedicated to the “sidewalks and sewer maintenance”.

It therefore follows that municipalities and union of municipalities can legally take action in the construction and maintenance of sewer networks. In that framework, most of the municipalities manage the sewer network in their territory and some of them have gone further in constructing and managing outside the legal framework wastewater treatment plants (for instance Ablah and Forzol in the Bekaa Valley, Rihan and Jeżzine in the South of Lebanon, Bcharre in the North of Lebanon and Remhala in the area of Beirut Mont Lebanon). Some of them work in collaboration with the WEs and the Ministry (and even sometimes the CDR - like Bcharre Union of Municipalities), others built their own treatment plants through specific programmes and manage the facilities in collaboration with the WEs (like in the Higher Chouf where the union of municipalities transferred the facilities to the Water Establishment of Beirut Mount Lebanon) and lastly some municipalities manage the facilities with no specific contact or collaboration with the WEs (like Forzol or Rihan).

Lastly, according to Article 47 of the Municipal Law “any intervention of general or public interest implemented in the municipal boundaries is with the competence of the Municipal Council”. Municipalities should then be involved or at least well informed of any project of public interest implemented on their territory and could receive support through capacity-building activities.

In this context, any intervention in sanitation sector should assess the opportunity to involve municipalities for specific issues (the network management in the municipal territory, the households’ connexion to the network, the information of inhabitants and sometimes the discussion with the population in order to avoid any blockage of the works – mostly if they include pumping stations construction). Depending on the local context, the WEs will be inclined to work with these stakeholders or not (if they are subscribers of the WEs, if members of the municipal council have good relationship
with the WEs’ CEO and have the political will to work in collaboration with them, etc.). For water supply projects, municipalities should be informed and could be associated in part of the activities (for instance soft activities like public information).

b) The 2010-2020 National Water Sector Strategy

In order to address the sector challenges, in 2010, the MoEW adopted a ten-year strategy to develop and improve the sector.

For water, the strategy objectives are as follows:

- Optimise surface water resources: an additional 38MCM over the period 2011-2015 and an additional 30MCM over the period 2016-2020;
- Artificial groundwater recharge: 120MCM over the period 2011-2015 and 80 MCM over the period 2016-2020;
- Increase the capacity of surface storage for each region;
- Increase and improve water supply transmission: full/partial replacement of 2,550km of pipes and additional 156,000m³ of storage in 465 tanks over the period 2011-2015 and replacement of 250km of pipes and additional 35,000m³ of storage in 96 tanks over the period 2016-2020;
- Increase and improve water supply distribution: full/partial replacement of 6,900km of pipes with household connections and installation of 640,000 water meters over the period 2011-2015 and 2,700km of pipes with household connections and 365,000 water meters over the period 2016-2020.

For wastewater management, the objectives set are as follows:

- Collection and treatment to at least preliminary level of 80% of wastewater by 2010 and 95% by 2020;
- Pre-treatment of all industrial wastewater by 2020;
- Reuse of 20% of treated wastewater by 2015, and 50% by 2020;
- Secondary treatment and reuse of all inland wastewater by 2020 and secondary treatment by 2020 of coastal wastewater where reuse is economically justified.

The strategy also includes performing all priority actions to be undertaken:

- Complete the restructuring of WEs and address potential limitations, mainly:
  - Develop revised and improved organization structures for WEs based on roles and responsibilities;
  - Draft revised WE organization bylaws, support the approval process and follow up on their enactment;
  - Implement the WE restructuring process;
  - Evaluate the potential for outsourcing certain non-core functions;
  - Provide the support required to enable WEs to gradually reach full administrative and financial autonomy.

- Improve on the operating model between WEs and MEW, through:
  - Ensuring an integrated management of water resources;
  - Ensuring the WEs are involved in project planning and implementation for water supply, irrigation and wastewater;
  - Improving coordination;
  - Ensuring operational and financial empowerment of WEs together with proper mechanisms for performance management.

- Improve on the performance efficiency of WEs to ensure:
  - More focus is placed on irrigation and wastewater responsibilities, in addition to current water supply activities;
  - The most suitable organization set-up is in place for technical functions;
  - Improvements to support functions.

- Develop the WE performance monitoring and evaluation process, including setting up a monitoring body, performance indicators, tools and procedures.
- Provide the required manpower levels and capabilities to ensure the appropriate operation and maintenance of assets and the delivery of water at optimal service levels, through the:
  - Reduction of current vacancies (over 81% at MEW and 67% in WEs) to the required manpower levels set out in the recommended organization structures;
  - Continuous development of staff through proper training.
- Implement a new consumption-based tariff which includes fixed and variable (volumetric) charges for connections equipped with customer water meters.

These ambitious objectives have not yet been reached (especially those for 2015), and the sector still needs large-scale support from foreign partners (technical and strategic advice, financial support, training, etc.). The WEs are on the frontline of service operation and maintenance and should therefore be the primary beneficiaries of technical and strategic support.

**B.1.3. The Syrian crisis**

The Syrian conflict began in 2011 leading to a massive influx of refugees to nearby countries. As of 30 September 2016, 1.02 million Syrian refugees were registered in Lebanon (UNHCR website), a figure that includes 550,000 children (54%). The actual number of refugees may be higher as, since May 2015, UNHCR Lebanon has temporarily suspended new registrations as per the Government of Lebanon's instructions. The map in Annex 8 shows the location of Syrian refugees registered in Lebanon.

The arrival of such large numbers of refugees has put a heavy strain on Lebanon’s already weak and underfunded public services, thus adversely affecting marginalised Lebanese host communities. The number of Lebanese poor has risen by 61 per cent since 2011 and there has been a twofold increase in the Lebanese unemployment rate with one-third of Lebanese young people without jobs. With the majority of those displaced from Syria settling in the most impoverished regions of Lebanon, an ever-increasing burden is being placed on poor host communities and their public services. The capacity of the public services to absorb the ever-increasing demand has already stretched beyond breaking point, leading to deprivation and social tensions. The lack of financial stability, social services and safety nets in Lebanese host communities, as well as perceptions of a lack of support for vulnerable host populations, have fuelled inter-community resentments and these are exacerbating existing stressors among those struggling to provide for their basic needs.

In terms of basic service delivery and infrastructure in the most vulnerable communities across Lebanon, both displaced and host communities have difficulties in accessing shelter, WASH, education and health services. Many of the challenges are of a financial nature. However, other trends highlight structural challenges predating the Syrian crisis, such as the distance to the closest health centres and frequent water shortages or unpredictable delivery schedules.

Both host and displaced communities face the same challenges in accessing water for drinking or domestic use. The most frequent challenges encountered include the high demands placed on water resources as a result of the increase in population, drought or environmental disasters, supply shortages, and access-related expenses. Similarly, both host and displaced populations use the same sources for drinking water, namely bottled water and tap water. In addition, both host and displaced populations rely primarily on public water connections for water for domestic purposes. The majority of both communities have access to showers and washing facilities inside the shelter. Most host community members have flushable toilets in their homes, but less than half of the displaced
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population have access to a toilet of this type. The majority of both populations are connected to public sewerage networks but a larger proportion of displaced persons rely on private pit emptying, open air or pit latrine systems, or no consistent method at all. The primary solution for solid waste disposal for both displaced and host populations, is the public solid waste collection system.

The influx of Syrian refugees has exacerbated the effects of chronic under-investment in Lebanon’s water, sanitation and solid waste management systems and services, reflected in an estimated 10 per cent increase in total water demand, a 16 per cent increase in solid waste generation, and 11 per cent more wastewater produced.

A 2013 World Bank assessment identified deficiencies in Lebanon’s water supply networks that are contributing to chronic water shortages across the country. Although water network coverage is high (80 per cent), water losses due to leakages average 48 per cent of supply. Both supply continuity and water quality are insufficient, especially during the dry season, when shortages are common and water salinity increases due to over-extraction of groundwater and faecal contamination from wastewater discharge. Additionally, the country’s sanitation services (wastewater and solid waste) are failing, leading to unsafe water supplies and environmental and health problems for children. Lebanon’s wastewater network coverage of 60 per cent is higher than the average for the region; however, wastewater treatment is poor, at less than 8 per cent of total consumption, far below the regional average of 32 per cent.

B.1.1. Social aspects on WASH issues

Refugees in IS come from different areas of Syria and thus from various social and cultural backgrounds. Some people come from semi-urban areas where refugees are educated, several having a bachelor’s degree, while others come from Bedouin ancestry and are less educated. These differences mean different needs and different approaches to provide relevant WASH services to the refugees.

The Chawich is an important person to take into consideration in the social organisation of the IS: he has political power or holds a socially dominant position within the IS population. International NGOs that need a single focus point in the IS usually rely on this Chawich, which gives him even greater power as he makes decisions on behalf of and rules the IS. In this situation and regarding WASH services, the IS depends on the Chawich when it comes to distributing water or kits, as they decide which tent is to benefit from sanitation or water facilities or select the participants for training sessions. Thus, the most vulnerable people who are not close to the Chawich can become increasingly neglected and vulnerable.

Regarding gender inequalities on WASH issues, women and children are in charge of dealing with rubbish, water, and cleaning although men are the primary users of the water. Polygamy exposes women to more work cleaning and fetching water and the high density of many of the IS means higher use of the services, which reduces the availability of water and leads to the overuse of latrines, septic tanks or rubbish disposal facilities, which becomes a burden for women. When a man marries a second or third wife or more, there is not enough water for the whole family, as the family grows quickly and the newly married spouses need more water to clean the house, wash laundry and bathe. The first wife and her children are in charge of fetching water, whereas the new spouse is in charge of cleaning the house and washing the laundry. Cases of very young adolescent girls getting married also happen (the “norm” is 14 years old but participants also mentioned girls as young as 12). Early marriages make girls prone to more disease, especially STDs, and means they are put in charge of fetching water, tank cleaning, toilet cleaning and waste collection. These same girls are also not aware of how to take care of their children once they are born to ensure good hygiene.

---

REACH/OCHA/UNICEF, Defining Community Vulnerability in Lebanon, 2015
B.1.2. Programme rationale

The influx of Syrian refugees has placed further strain on Lebanon’s already stretched water, wastewater and solid waste management systems and services, which were underfunded and underperforming even before the crisis. All host and refugee populations, rural and urban, are affected by the lack of WASH services to some degree depending on their wealth status and geographic location.

Syrian refugees living in temporary settlements make up a disparate category of vulnerable people whose needs are not considered in government planning and must therefore be prioritised, especially with regard to providing appropriate and clean water and sanitation facilities. Moreover the local and national authorities do not have the financial capacity and human resources to cope with the increase in people and provide good water, wastewater and solid waste services to the host community, and the refugees.

UNICEF reactivated its WASH programme in 2012, and significantly scaled up its WASH activities targeting the most vulnerable areas and children, both among Syrian refugees and host communities. In order to contribute to the overall outcome, three separate but interlinked components were designed to address the major gaps identified for water, sanitation and hygiene provision in Lebanon: strengthen the capacities and information systems of authorities in Lebanon; improve access to WASH services for Syrian refugees in ISs (WASH in Emergencies); and improve WASH infrastructure to ensure better service delivery to host communities (WASH in urban areas/stabilisation interventions).

B.2. Programme Objectives

B.2.1. Programme Objectives

The UNICEF programme focuses on reaching the most vulnerable populations, prioritising those in IS and collective shelters (UNICEF LCO WASH Strategy Draft 18 June). The expected results are for girls, boys and women to have protected and reliable access to sufficient and safe water, gender-appropriate sanitation and hygiene facilities. For the stabilisation component of the programme, UNICEF follows the National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategies of the Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW).

As shown in Table 2, the objectives of the programme for 2013, 2014 and 2015 are to assure access to water and sanitation and introduce good hygiene practices. In 2016, a number of other objectives were added to these: provide access to drainage services, as well as mitigate the impact on the environment and ensure preparedness of the sector response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable and gender appropriate access to safe and equitable water is</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensured for the target population in sufficient quantities for drinking,</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooking, personal and domestic hygiene.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to improved, sustainable, culturally and gender</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In italics: the outcomes added in 2016.*
appropriate sanitation and drainage services for target population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target populations are aware of key public health risks and are capacitated to adopt good hygiene practices and measures to prevent the deterioration in hygienic conditions and to use and maintain the facilities available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensure improved preparedness and efficiency of sector response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.2.2. Programme Results

The intended results are presented in the table below. For the first three years of the programme, the results remained the same and several modifications were introduced in 2016 to adapt the programme to changing sector needs and the specific requests of the MoEW:

- Results for access to water were divided into three in 2016 to differentiate between permanent locations, temporary locations and health facilities. The results on quality and storage of water were removed;
- Results for water and wastewater management systems were merged together with the reference to the National Water Sector Strategy removed. The result on management systems for solid waste was removed;
- Results for sanitation were separated into temporary locations and health facilities;
- Results for municipal sludge and wastewater management remained the same for the four years of the programme;
- Results for solid waste management remained the same, with the addition of better equipment for individuals and service providers, compensating for the removal of the result on management systems for solid waste;
- Result on drainage and flood risks was redefined to be more general;
- Results on vector control, diarrhoea monitoring and capacity-building of frontline workers were removed;
- Results on support to MoE and other institutions, the enhancement of community participation and the preparedness for contingency response were added in 2016.
Table 3: Expected results of the WASH programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Outcome 1 ■ Outcome 2 ■ Outcome 3 ■ Outcome 4 ■ Outcome 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply: Safe and equitable access to a sufficient quantity of water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable access to a sufficient quantity of safe water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene at temporary locations (collective centers, gatherings and ITS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and equitable access to a sufficient quantity of water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene at permanent locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and equitable access to a sufficient quantity of water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene at public health facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: Water is palatable and of sufficient quality to be drunk and used for cooking and personal and domestic hygiene without causing risk to health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage: Adequate facilities to collect, store and use sufficient quantities of water for drinking, cooking and personal hygiene, and to ensure that drinking water remains safe until it is consumed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management systems for solid waste: National to local level systems strengthened and harmonized in line with national integrated solid waste management plans to increase access to quality solid waste management services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management: National to local level systems strengthened and harmonized in line with the National Water Sector Strategy to increase access to quality water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management systems for wastewater: National to local level systems strengthened and harmonized in line with the National Water Sector Strategy to increase access to quality wastewater services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and wastewater management: National to local level systems strengthened and harmonized in line with regulatory framework to increase access to safe and sufficient drinking water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation facilities: Adequate, appropriate and acceptable toilet facilities, sufficiently close to dwellings/institutions, to allow rapid, safe and secure access at all times, day and night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation: Adequate, appropriate and acceptable sanitation conditions, to ensure a safe environment at temporary locations (collective centers, gatherings and ITS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation: Adequate, appropriate and acceptable sanitation conditions, to ensure a safe environment at public health facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Municipal sludge and wastewater management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected results</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid waste management: An environment not littered by solid waste, including medical waste, with means to dispose of domestic waste conveniently and effectively.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid waste management: An environment free of solid waste and medical waste, with means to dispose of domestic waste conveniently and effectively. Individuals and service providers are better equipped to provide solid waste management services.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage: An environment in which health risks and other risks posed by water erosion and standing water, including stormwater, floodwater, domestic wastewater and wastewater from medical facilities, are minimized.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of stormwater drainage and management of flood risks.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vector Control: Disease-causing and nuisance vectors are kept to a reduced level in the immediate environment and the target population have the knowledge and means to protect themselves from the corresponding risk to health or well-being.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene promotion: Target population are aware of key public health risks and are mobilised to adopt measures to prevent the deterioration in hygienic conditions and to use and maintain the facilities provided.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene items: Target population has access to and is involved in identifying and promoting the use of hygiene items to ensure personal hygiene, health, dignity and well-being.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target population is under Acute Watery Diarrhea surveillance and immediate WASH response undertaken in case of outbreak.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output: Frontline workers have the necessary knowledge and skills to raise awareness and to facilitate behaviour and social change (subject to implementation of cascade training by sections by inclusion in PCAs).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to MoE and other concerned government institutions to strengthen the management and enforcement of measures that mitigate environmental impacts.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced community participation in the identification, planning, implementation and monitoring of WASH related Public Health projects (C4D).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparedness materials for contingency response and data for targeting and prioritisation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.3. Programme Stakeholders

The WASH programme activities are split into three components, each of which involves working with different key stakeholders and defining specific decision-making and follow-up procedures.

B.3.1. Strengthen the capacities and information systems of authorities in Lebanon

Stakeholders in charge of defining and approving the activities: UNICEF and Ministries (MoEW, MoE, MPH)

Stakeholders in charge of implementing the activities: Consultants and staff recruited in the MoEW and RWEs

Stakeholders in charge of monitoring activity implementation: UNICEF, Ministries and RWEs

Beneficiaries of the activities: Ministries, Regional Water Establishments, and all sector stakeholders

B.3.2. WASH in Emergencies

Stakeholders in charge of defining and implementing the activities: NGOs: ACF, Concern, CISP, World Vision, Solidarités International, Mercy Corps, LOST and LRC

Stakeholder in charge of approving and funding the activities: UNICEF

Stakeholders in charge of monitoring activity implementation: NGOs, UNICEF Zone offices\(^9\), Third Party Monitoring (TPM)

Beneficiaries of the activities: Refugees\(^10\)

B.3.3. Urban/stabilisation WASH activities

Stakeholders in charge of targeting and approving the activities: UNICEF and MoEW for water and sanitation projects / UNICEF and MIM for solid waste project

Stakeholder in charge of funding the activities: UNICEF

Stakeholders in charge of designing the works: The consultancy firms (WET, BTD or Kredo)

Stakeholder in charge of recruiting the public works companies: UNICEF

Stakeholders in charge of monitoring the works: The consultancy firms (WET, BTD or Kredo), UNICEF zone offices, Regional Water Establishments

Beneficiaries of the works: Refugees, host communities, Regional Water Establishments, local authorities\(^11\)

---

\(^9\) In the Inception Report, the RWEs were indicated as being in charge of monitoring activity implementation, but the data collection phase revealed that this was not the case.

\(^10\) In the Inception Report, the host communities, the RWEs and local authorities were indicated as being beneficiaries of the activities, but the data collection phase revealed that this was not the case.

\(^11\) In the Inception Report, the most vulnerable population was indicated as being beneficiaries of the activities, but the data collection phase revealed that this was not the case.
C. Evaluation Description

C.1. Purpose of the evaluation
UNICEF Lebanon is commissioning a WASH evaluation to generate substantial knowledge and learning on the results of the WASH programme to strengthen UNICEF and national strategies in order to improve national systems capacity, water quality, water supply, sanitation services, and public health behaviour in Lebanon. UNICEF will be the primary user of the evaluation report. Ministries, local authorities and implementing partners will be the secondary users.

C.2. Specific objectives
The evaluation will explore how the WASH Programme has contributed towards improving access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene to host communities and refugee populations in Lebanon. More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation are to:
- Learn from previous implementations (2013-2016) of the humanitarian WASH Programme on the impacts on targeted children, women and the vulnerable population;
- Learn from UNICEF’s partnership with Ministries and local authorities addressing WASH vulnerability;
- Provide specific recommendations on the basis of lessons learned in order to improve planning and implementation for better delivery of results for the most vulnerable. These recommendations will be utilised by UNICEF to feed into future strategies for the Syrian crisis response.

C.3. Scope of the evaluation
The scope of the evaluation (including areas of exclusion) can be summarised as follows:

**Table 4: Scope of the evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Included in the evaluation scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>- Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regional Water Establishments (RWEs) - except Beirut-Mount Lebanon as decided with the WASH unit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Municipalities (Bourj Hammoud, Majdel Anjar, Tripoli (Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen), a municipality to be determined in Bekaa, Kamed el Laouz, Kfar Dabach, Akkar Woudi Jamous, a municipality to be determined in the North and Ras el Ain (Tyre district));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO partners (ACF, Concern, CISP, World Vision, Solidarités International, Mercy Corps, LOST and LRC);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF staff from Beirut Headquarters and zone offices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Syrian refugees in Informal Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded from the evaluation scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Included in the evaluation scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect I included in the evaluation scope</td>
<td>(IS): ▪ Host communities; ▪ Consulting firms implementing stabilisation projects (WET, BTD and Kredo) ▪ Donors ▪ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic boundaries</td>
<td>▪ Governorates of Lebanon including Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck/Hermel, Mount Lebanon and South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time boundaries</td>
<td>▪ Period of Lebanon Country Office WASH programme 2013-2016 ▪ 2016 has been included in the evaluation because of the delay in undertaking the evaluation (it was supposed to be carried out in 2016). Moreover, the stabilisation component is increasing in 2016 which shows an evolution of the WASH programme that has to be taken into account in the recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population groups covered</td>
<td>▪ Syrian refugees living in IS ▪ Host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components evaluated</td>
<td>▪ Strengthening the capacity of water authorities in Lebanon to address WASH vulnerability (capacity building component) ▪ WASH in emergencies (emergency component) ▪ WASH in urban interventions (stabilisation component)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation methodology</td>
<td>▪ Qualitative methodology by gaining insights from a range of stakeholders and analysing available quantitative data and other relevant documents ▪ Participatory methodology by ensuring that the various social groups including the most marginalised will be involved and their opinions elicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of evaluation</td>
<td>▪ The programme will be evaluated at the national level. However, municipal and regional level stakeholders will be interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of analysis</td>
<td>▪ The evaluation will focus on assessing the coverage, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of specific outputs under the main outcomes ▪ The data collected on beneficiaries through FGDs and one-to-one interviews will not be representative and will only provide qualitative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. The Evaluation Methodology

D.1. The Evaluation Matrix

A detailed evaluation matrix has been drawn up in order to break down the main evaluation questions by four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance**: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner’ and donor’s policies.

- **Effectiveness**: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

- **Efficiency**: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

- **Sustainability**: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits is measurable and the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

The continuity of benefits was treated as a separate criterion but has been viewed in connection with relevance and effectiveness (especially in question Q.1.2).

As requested by UNICEF team and in accordance with the ToRs, the **Impact** criterion (positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended) was not taken into account by the Consultant.

The equity, gender and human rights cross-cutting aspects have been viewed in connection with relevance and effectiveness (especially in question Q.2.4).

In order to cover all these criteria, the evaluation team modified some of the evaluation questions listed in the ToRs and converted others into indicators of broader questions to draft a more comprehensive evaluation matrix. For this reason, and to cover other important aspects of the programme, the evaluation team also added extra questions and indicators. The evaluation questions are not separated into components to allow for an evaluation of the programme as a whole. The changes made to the evaluation questions can be found in Annex 3.

The complete evaluation matrix is presented in Annex 2.

D.2. Evaluation Methods

D.2.1. Data collection and sampling method

   a) **Document review**

Application and purpose of the document review

The document review enabled the evaluation team to conduct a triangulation analysis with data collected in the field. It helped inform the questions from the evaluation matrix for all three programme

---

12 From the OECD-DAC Criteria for International development evaluation – website (http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/dcdndep/)
components. In the data collection column of the evaluation matrix, specific documents that will be used to answer the questions are indicated.

The aim of the document review is to identify specific qualitative and quantitative aspects of the evaluation. This was used to carry out either partial or in-depth document analysis.

**Documents and methodology for review**

For the three components of the programme, the document review focused on the documents provided by the UNICEF team. In order to ensure an accurate data analysis, the full review of the documents was carried out using a traditional methodology in which our professional judgment was applied: key documents were gathered and read in-depth by one person who developed a narrative in response to an evaluative question or develop an analytical summary.

For the three programme components, the following documents were used: the LCRP 15-16, the HRRP tables 14-16, the annual reports 13-15, the available reports to donors and the situation reports 13-16.

For the stabilisation component, these documents were also used: the National Strategy on Water and Sanitation, the 2016 Annual Work Plan with the MoEW and the WASH communal project tables 14-15-16.

For the emergency component, the Draft Lebanon Co WASH strategy 13 and the available NGO reports were used to complete the review.

Analysis of the following documents also provided the evaluation team with quantitative data on the situation in Lebanon regarding WASH access for refugees and host communities: the Vulnerability Assessment for Syrians 13-14-15, the UNICEF Baseline HH Survey 2016, the REACH assessment and the Situation Analysis for Children and Youth in Lebanon 2016. This data was particularly used as guidelines to analyse the information obtained from the FGDs and interviews.

Several documents were not made available to the evaluation team and these are listed in Annex 7.

**b) Focus Group Discussions**

**Application and purpose of the FGDs**

Focus Group Discussions informed the evaluation matrix questions related to the emergency component of the programme.

The aim of the FGDs is to assess the level of ownership and the effective results of the programme on beneficiaries in the IS, as well as identify any shortcomings. FGDs were used to collate information on the beneficiaries’ perception of the implemented activities.

**Site selection**

The scope of the evaluation defined during the inception meeting meant that the sites for FGDs were restricted to the Governorates of Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck-Hermel, Mount Lebanon and South. There is no IS in Mount Lebanon so no FGD was held in this governorate, as agreed in conjunction with the WASH unit.

In order to ensure an accurate data analysis, the sites were selected based on the following criteria:

- Length of time UNICEF interventions have been implemented in the municipality;
- Number of beneficiaries;
- Specific features of the projects, partners, area or interventions;
- Specific requests from UNICEF

The table 13 in Annex 9 indicates the sites where the FGDs took place and any changes with regard to the Inception Report.
FGD approach

Each field visit was prepared in advance with the UNICEF Implementing Partner focal point that provided the evaluators with a schedule for the day and accompanied them on site. The Implementing Partner focal point held a meeting on site with the evaluators to inform them of the activities that were implemented in this specific location. When possible, a meeting with a municipality representative was also held.

For the FGD, the moderator was introduced to the IS population and participants were selected at random from among a group of refugees who had volunteered to take part in the FGD. The following criteria were taken into consideration when selecting the participants: age, gender, social position within the community and the length of time they had been on the site. The implementing partners did not attend the FGDs.

Specific FGD with children/ youth were not deemed relevant as adolescents (15-18 years old) would tend to stay with the men and the women during the FGD. They would contribute, but their interventions were not considered to provide any specific added value to the content and quality of the information gathered during the sessions. However, specific questions related to children and young people - especially adolescent girls - were subsequently put to the male and female FGD participants and particular efforts were taken to understand their role in the community and how this affects WASH related challenges.

Each FGD started with the moderator reviewing the UNICEF WASH Programme activities implemented in the specific IS and introducing the aim of the focus group session. A quick round-table exercise was conducted during which the participants introduced themselves by giving the following information:

- Name;
- Age;
- Marital status;
- Number of children;
- Place of origin;
- Profession.

Finally, the facilitator proceeded with the discussion as per the set of open-ended questions prepared during the inception phase13.

Each FGD lasted for around 60 to 90 minutes, depending on the level of participation.

Following each FGD, the raw data was compiled into a report, detailing the context of the IS, the specific profiles of the participants if any, the discussion and observations on non-verbal behaviour. These reports are available on request.

**c) One-to-one discussions with beneficiaries**

Application and purpose of the discussions

One-to-one discussions with beneficiaries informed the evaluation matrix questions on the stabilisation component of the programme. This data collection method was not requested in the ToRs, but was added to the evaluation methodology following a request from the UNICEF WASH unit.

The aims of these discussions were to evaluate the level of ownership and the effective results of the programme on communities, as well as identify recommendations for addressing concerns. They were used to obtain the beneficiaries' perception of the implemented activities.

13 See Annex 5
Site selection

The scope of the evaluation defined during the inception meeting restricted the possible sites for one-to-one interviews to the Governorates of Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck-Hermel, Mount Lebanon and South.

The sites were selected using the following criteria:
- Specific requests from UNICEF;
- Specific features of the projects, partners, location or interventions.

The table 14 in annex 9 indicates the sites where the discussions were held and any changes with regard to the Inception Report.

Approach to one-to-one discussions with beneficiaries

Each field visit was prepared in advanced with the UNICEF Implementing Partner focal point that provided the evaluators with a schedule for the day and accompanied them on site. The Implementing Partner focal point held a meeting on site with the evaluators to inform them of the activities that were implemented within this specific area. When possible, a meeting with municipality representative was also held.

For security reasons, in the Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen area, the moderator was introduced to the residents who benefited from the stabilisation projects by the local focal points, who accompanied the evaluator in the field. In Majdel Anjar, randomly chosen host community members were asked if they would be interested in discussing the UNICEF WASH Programme activities implemented in the area. When possible, interviews were held with various members of the same family and, in the case of Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen, with members of the WASH committees set up by LRC.

Each interview lasted between 10 and 45 minutes, depending on the involvement of participants.

A complete report was drafted following the interviews and is available on request.

*d) Individual interviews*

Application and purpose of the personal interviews

Individual interviews with key UNICEF partners informed the evaluation matrix questions related to all three components of the programme. This tool was modified from the ToRs. FGDs were requested for two partners and for Ministry staff. However, it was decided in agreement with UNICEF that one-to-one interviews were more appropriate to ensure freedom of expression.

The aims of the individual interviews were to:
- Identify the internal and external environmental factors of success and/or any delays and weaknesses in activities;
- Identify best practices (activities or processes) to be replicated, recommendations for addressing concerns and actions to ensure the sustainability of the programme;
- Provide more detail on the plans and strategies that stakeholders are looking to implement in the near future.

Selection of interviewees

As requested in the ToRs, the Ministry Advisor from the Ministry of Water and Energy was interviewed. The Presidents of the Bekaa, North Lebanon and South Lebanon Water Establishments were interviewed in one-to-one meetings. As agreed with the WASH unit, the focal point for the programme, a member of the BMLWE was interviewed instead of the President of the Beirut-Mount Lebanon Water Establishment.
Municipalities where FGDs and one-to-one discussions were held were met when possible, even though this was not requested in the ToRs. Meetings with municipality representatives helped provide a better understanding of the situation in the field as they took the findings of local institutions’ data collection into consideration. Representatives of the following municipalities were met: Yammouneh, Bar Elias, Mohammara, Tripoli and Majdel Anjar.

The decision was reached with the WASH unit to go beyond the requirements set out in the ToRs and to interview all NGOs currently implementing projects for UNICEF. Representatives of the following NGOs were met: ACF, Concern, CISP, World Vision, Mercy Corps, Solidarités International, LOST and LRC.

**Approach to one-to-one interviews**

The evaluation team gave a description of the activity and its purpose and explained to the interviewees why they were being asked to participate in the study. They were given the Consultant’s contact details in case they had any concerns and were encouraged to share these concerns at any time before, during, and after the study.

The evaluation team explained the data collection procedures to the interviewees and emphasised that their anonymity was assured by the fact that individual responses were not linked with interviewees’ identities. The evaluation team explained who had access to the data collection notes and records and how they are to be stored and protected.

**With implementing NGOs**

On the day of the FGD and site visits, the evaluation team met members of the relevant NGO team in charge of activities/project implementation. The table 15 in annex 9 shows the NGOs met for interviews. The Interviews were held in line with the discussion guide for NGOs (Annex 5) with the aim of obtaining an in-depth understanding of each activity or project, their means/tools of implementation on the ground (i.e. definition of beneficiaries’ needs, methods of coordination with public bodies or institutions, sustainability strategy, etc.), as well as the way the implementing partners interrelated with the UNICEF WASH programme and other stakeholders.

**With municipalities**

In parallel with the field visits, whenever possible an interview was scheduled with the local authorities. These were held without the presence of the implementing partners. The table 16 in annex 9 shows the municipalities met for interviews.

The interviewees were asked a set of questions (Annex 5) tailored to the type of target activity they have received - emergency, solid waste project, stabilisation, etc. These interviews helped to better determine their involvement in the project activities and their assessment of any changes they have witnessed on the ground after implementation, including support to the municipality.

**With Regional Water Establishments and MoEW**

Interviews with the RWEs were scheduled and questions (Annex 5) were developed to provide an understanding of their involvement in the project activities, as well as their involvement on a more global and strategic level. Specific interviews (Annex 5) were also organised with a key representative of the MoEW. The table 17 in annex 9 shows the authorities met for interviews.

**e) Site visits**

**Application and purpose of the site visits**

Site visits were used to inform the evaluation matrix questions related to the stabilisation and emergency components of the programme. This was not requested in the ToRs, but was added to the evaluation methodology following a request from the UNICEF WASH unit.
The aim of the site visits is to assess the effectiveness of the infrastructure to deliver the expected services.

**Site selection**

For the stabilisation component, site visits were held in addition to the one-to-one discussions with households when the works were accessible. For the emergency component, site visits were held in parallel to the FGDs. The table 18 in annex 9 indicates the sites visited and explains the changes made with regard to the Inception Report.

**Approach to site visits**

These site visits consisted of assessing whether the utilities were working properly and were well maintained. The visits were organised with the implementing NGO for the emergency component and with the implementing partner for the stabilisation component. They were held when the works were accessible and their functioning could thus be assessed.

**D.2.1. Analysis method**

Several data collection methods and data sources were used to capture different aspects of the same situation in order to gain a good understanding of the programme. Stakeholders from the design and implementation phases of the projects were met, as well as local, regional and national level stakeholders. The triangulation analysis method was then used to gain a detailed and balanced picture of the situation, and information was crosschecked to produce more accurate results. This allowed for a diversity of perspectives to be considered, thus ensuring data accuracy and overcoming data limits.

For each evaluation question indicator, relevant information was extracted from the data sources listed in the evaluation matrix. This information was then compared and analysed together to obtain a comprehensive and accurate picture of the situation for the indicator. This enabled the evaluation team to answer each indicator in an objective manner. The exercise conducted for each indicator is presented for the Relevance criterion indicators in Annex 4 as an example.

Chapter E, in which the findings are presented, indicates which data sources were combined to answer the evaluation questions.

**D.2.2. Evaluation limitations and constraints**

Several limitations and constraints were encountered during the evaluation. These are listed in the table below, along with the mitigation actions put into place.

**Table 5: Limitations and mitigation measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation/constraint</th>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data limitations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of programme documents</td>
<td>UNICEF did not provide all additional relevant documents to the evaluation team (Annex 7). The missing data is indicated when relevant for each finding in Chapter E. Conclusions and recommendations take this missing data into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent data over time (missing time span of reports and interviewees not aware of the)</td>
<td>The triangulation analysis with interviews was used to complete the missing data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation/constraint</td>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities for the whole timeframe of the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality and freedom of expression from FGD participants: because of the social</td>
<td>The moderator ensured that all participants contributed equally during the discussion, and that nobody was listening outside the tent. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure of groups of refugees and the IS management set-up (role of the Chawish,</td>
<td>triangulation of their testimony with that of the NGOs and municipalities and the site visits helped ensure data reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presence of men around the tent, etc.), it was sometimes difficult for participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to express their opinion freely and spontaneously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional bodies had a political discourse that altered the objectivity of the</td>
<td>The answers were triangulated with the NGO and UNICEF interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting issues of gender, human rights and equity rarely or never mentioned in</td>
<td>Questions on these issues were included in the interviews. However, this only gave limited information as per the number of interviews and FGDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF programme documents and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information bias</td>
<td>All the data collected through one-to-one interviews and FGDs was combined and were cross-referenced with the available documentation. Hydroconseil’s in-depth knowledge of the interaction between institutional sector stakeholders helped the evaluation team to keep an objective distance from sensitive testimonies (personal conflicts, political postures, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in the evidence</td>
<td>The triangulation between the FDGs, site visits, one-to-one interviews, available documentation and the Consultant’s sector knowledge helped to fill the gaps. When this was not possible due to a lack of documentation or information, the gaps are indicated for each finding when relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3. Ethical issues

D.3.1. Ethical obligations for the evaluation team

The evaluation of all projects should be guided by the following principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>The evaluation findings are accompanied by a clear explanation of its aim, outcomes, intended audience, the questions asked, the methods used and their limitations, as well as the rationale and criteria that were used to obtain these findings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>The evaluation team is able to work freely and without interference. It is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provided with full cooperation and access to all relevant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>The participants involved in the evaluation process respect the rights, integrity and safety of all parties concerned. They are mutually prohibited from revealing the names of the people providing the information or opinions collected, except with the express permission of the people concerned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>The people working on the evaluation process have the specific skills required to design and conduct the evaluation and implement the data collection methods and interpret the results. They use recognised methods, particularly those commonly used by the international evaluation community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>The aim of the evaluation is to improve future interventions by building on the lessons learned from the intervention concerned. The findings should be based on objective facts and the recommendations must be clear and realistic for the context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3.2. UNICEF ethical principles and guidelines

The evaluation team followed UNICEF ethical principles and guidelines regarding risks and benefits for research involving human subjects:

1. Respect for subjects: protecting the autonomy of all people and treating them with courtesy and respect and allowing for informed consent. Researchers must be truthful and conduct no deception;

2. Beneficence: the philosophy of "Do no harm" while maximizing benefits for the research project and minimizing risks to the research subjects. Subjects are treated in an ethical manner not only by respecting their decisions and protecting them from harm, but also by making efforts to secure their well-being;

3. Justice: ensuring reasonable, non-exploitative and well-considered procedures are administered fairly — the fair distribution of costs and benefits to potential research participants — and equally to each person an equal share.

D.3.3. Consent of the FGD participants

The moderator requested the FGD participants to sign the UNICEF informed consent form and fill in an attendance sheet\(^\text{14}\). It was made very clear that they could ask questions, talk to other people, and take time before making the decision to participate, and this at any time during the discussion/interview. The moderator explained that the participants had the right to withdraw from the FGD at any time, as well as not to answer certain questions. The facilitator also orally requested the participants’ approval for taking pictures. All participants were also assured that their anonymity was respected as the facilitator did not collect identifying information of individual subjects (e.g. names related to address, email address, phone numbers, discussions, etc.).

D.3.4. Protection of participants’ anonymity

The FGD and interview participants’ anonymity was assured by not collecting identifying information of the individual subjects involved in the FGDs and the one-to-one discussions, and by not linking

\(^{14}\) All documents are available in hard copy.
individual responses with participants’ identities for one-to-one interviews. Only the Consultant collecting and analysing the data was able to identify the individual subjects’ responses. Moreover, the evaluation team has made every effort to prevent anyone outside of the programme from connecting individual subjects to their responses.

For the FGDs and one-to-one discussions with the host community, the following information was not provided to any third party: names of participants, information about participants, opinions of each participant. Moreover, no pictures were taken without the consent of the participants and, when all participants agreed, the moderator taped the FGDs and one-to-one discussions explaining that it was the best way to capture their thoughts, opinions, and ideas. In this case, no names were attached and the tapes were destroyed as soon as they were transcribed. It was also made very clear that participants could refuse to answer questions if they did not feel comfortable.

**D.3.5. Data protection**

To maintain the integrity of the stored data, it was protected from physical damage, tampering, loss, and theft by limiting access. Only one Consultant from the evaluation team was authorised to access and manage the stored data. Data stored on paper was kept in a safe and secure location away from public access. Confidentiality and anonymity was assured by replacing names and other information with encoded identifiers, with the encoding key kept in a different secure location.

The evaluation team members are fully aware of data protection procedures. The following are examples of practices that were implemented to increase the level of confidentiality:

- Limit access to identifiable information;
- Thoroughly dispose, destroy, or delete study data and documents when no longer useful;
- Securely store data documents within locked locations.
E. Evaluation Findings

E.1. Relevance

To evaluate the relevance of the WASH programme, several of the programme’s aspects were examined: its alignment with the MoEW National Strategy and with UNICEF national and WASH strategies, coordination between UNICEF’s and other key actors’ activities to avoid overlap of activities, the relevance of the programme’s coverage, the adequacy of partners to achieve the programme’s objectives and the programme’s alignment to the needs of the beneficiaries. To this end, the following sources were used: interviews with the MoEW, the WEs, the NGOs, UNICEF, the municipalities and the host communities; review of the HRRP tables, UNICEF global intervention strategy, the REACH Assessment report and the MoEW National Strategy, the site visits and the FGDs.

E.1.1. Alignment of the programme and the strategies

a) Programme alignment with National Strategies and national legal framework

UNICEF bases its interventions on the Lebanon Crisis Respond Plan that brings together the Government of Lebanon and national and international partners to deliver integrated and mutually reinforcing humanitarian and stabilization interventions. The 2016 plan proposes a US$2.48 billion appeal plan to provide humanitarian assistance and protection to almost 2.8 million highly vulnerable individuals and invest in services, economies and institutions reaching the most vulnerable communities. WASH sector is targeted in the Strategic priority two which aims to strengthen the capacity of national and local delivery systems to expand access to and quality of basic public services (target 4: “Expand energy, safe water, sanitation and hygiene for the most vulnerable Lebanese and displaced Syrians through emergency gap-filling and by reinforcing existing services”). UNICEF is in the front line on the WASH interventions and bases its activities on the Annual Work Plan (signed with the MoEW since 2016 and before with the Ministry of Public Health in 2015 and through the CDR for the previous years). This plan defines the priorities of UNICEF interventions in line with the National Sectorial Strategy.

The programme is then aligned with the MoEW National Strategy for the water and wastewater objectives, as highlighted in the interview with the MoEW and by the review of its National Strategy and of the HRRP tables. The Programme objectives - especially the capacity-building and the stabilisation component - are focused on enhancing water delivery (water quality and availability monitoring, rehabilitation or development of new supply schemes, and wastewater management). Moreover, the stabilisation projects provide a good opportunity for the MoEW to complete small scale operations that cannot be executed by the CDR because they are too limited in terms of financial and geographical scope. In addition, the studies carried out under the capacity-building component (the 2016 Survey, the Reach assessment, the hydrogeological and aquifers study) are crucial tools for planning sector interventions and achieving the National Strategy, the aim of which is to strengthen water and sanitation service delivery, management and monitoring.

b) Programme Alignment with the UNICEF mission and intervention strategy

The alignment of the Programme with the UNICEF internal strategies in Lebanon is more difficult to assess as the main documents (UNICEF strategy for Lebanon, UNICEF WASH strategy and UNICEF other programmes in Lebanon) were not available. According to UNICEF Beirut Office, the Strategy is...
mostly based on the Lebanon Crisis Respond Plan described above, the Annual Work Plan signed with the Ministry and UNICEF intervention principles and missions.

It is also possible to reach some conclusions based on the fact “that UNICEF promotes the rights and wellbeing of every child and translates that commitment into practical action, focusing special effort on reaching the most vulnerable and excluded children in taking a life-cycle based approach, recognizing the particular importance of early childhood development and adolescence and that UNICEF programmes focus on the most disadvantaged children, including those living in fragile contexts, those with disabilities, those who are affected by rapid urbanization and those affected by environmental degradation”15. Moreover, wherever there is a crisis, UNICEF strives to reach children and families in the hardest hit regions with lifesaving resources.

In this context, the main programme objectives are aligned with the UNICEF global mission (equitable access to a sufficient quantity of safe water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene at temporary and permanent locations; adequate, appropriate and acceptable sanitation conditions, to ensure a safe environment).

From an operational perspective, UNICEF has an intervention strategy based on:

- The human rights-based approach to development, which is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally aimed at promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to analyse inequalities which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress;

- UNICEF’s foundation strategy for a human rights-based approach underpins the equity agenda. The equity-based approach in UNICEF’s programmes and policies seeks to understand and address the root causes of inequity so that all children, particularly those who suffer the worst deprivations in society, have access to education, health care, sanitation, clean water, protection and other services necessary for their survival, growth and development;

- The gender equality that aims to promote equality between girls and boys and women and men. It defines the core standards of performance that are expected, and sets out the organisational mechanisms that will help bring about results over time. The policy addresses UNICEF’s contributions to the development and equal rights of girls and boys through its cooperation both in regular situations and through humanitarian preparedness, response and recovery.

Regarding the human rights, gender and equity aspects that are part of the UNICEF global strategy, the human rights aspect is not mentioned in either the objectives or the design of activities for the three components, as shown by the review of the HRRP tables and the donors’ reports, the interviews with the NGOs, the WEs, the MoEW and UNICEF staff.

The gender aspect is present in the programme objectives, as shown in the HRRP tables: “Outcome: sustainable and gender appropriate access to safe and equitable water is ensured for the target population in sufficient quantities for drinking, cooking, personal and domestic hygiene”.

The equity and gender aspects are present in the design phases of the emergency component, with special latrines for disabled people, a special location or arrangement of latrines for women and children and hygiene promotion sessions aimed at women or children, as shown by the interviews with NGOs, FGDs and the site visits. However, the adaptation of latrines to disabled people is usually a decision made by the NGO, as revealed by the interviews with the NGOs and the site visits; it is encouraged by the programme but not required.

15 https://www.unicef.org/about/who/index_introduction.html
In the stabilisation and capacity-building components, these three aspects are not a focus, as can be seen in the review of the HRRP tables and the donors’ reports, the interviews with the NGOs, the WEs, the MoEW and UNICEF staff. Only one stabilisation project with a social focus designed activities that targeted women and children through WASH committees.

It is thus possible to conclude that the Programme is partly consistent with the UNICEF intervention strategy as it has not been strongly based on its three main principles.

E.1.2. Coordination between UNICEF and other key actors to avoid overlap of activities

For the emergency component, each NGO is assigned a cadastre within which they intervene in order to prevent two NGOs working in the same IS on WASH activities. Moreover, UNICEF intervene in IS of more than four tents while refugees living in abandoned houses are covered by the shelter sector. The national and regional level coordination systems in place between WASH sector stakeholders and with other actors of the emergency response helps avoid overlapping of activities in IS by finding a solutions should two NGOs find themselves working in the same camp and on the same activities.

However, the interviews with the NGOs also highlighted a lack of coordination with other emergency sector stakeholders (shelter, health, etc.). There is no common strategy on how to handle evictions and no sharing of IS-related data. This leads to a duplication of assessments from different NGOs.

For the stabilisation component, as revealed in the interviews with the WEs and the MoEW, there is no overlapping of stabilisation activities with other agencies because the projects are selected in discussion with the authorities. Before 2016, these discussions were held with the WEs and they now take place with the MoEW. In addition, regular coordination meetings are held at the regional and national levels for all WASH stakeholders.

For the capacity-building component, in principle, the activities do not overlap with those of other agencies because they are defined in coordination with the beneficiary authority, as highlighted by the WEs and MoEW interviews. However, it has to be noted that, as studies are not spread among the relevant stakeholders, there may be several stakeholders studying the same data for different beneficiaries. As an example, some WEs are considering carrying out an assessment of groundwater availability within their area, despite a national study already having been conducted through the Programme in collaboration with the MoEW.

E.1.3. Programme coverage

a) Geographical coverage

The Programme has national coverage based on the following criteria:

- The emergency component targets all ISs with more than four tents where no other donors fund activities;
- The stabilisation component covers the 251 most vulnerable locations identified through the REACH assessment;
- The capacity-building component is focused on providing sector support, enhancing the capacities of the sector institutions (MoEW and WES), developing sector monitoring and knowledge and thus has national coverage.

The geographical coverage is thus relevant as it addresses all the areas that need to be supported or provided with WASH facilities and develops sector monitoring at a national scale. The link between this geographical coverage and the coordination mechanism enhances the relevance of the UNICEF approach by avoiding any duplication of activities.
b) Coverage in terms of targeted beneficiaries and needs

As far as the targeted beneficiaries (the most vulnerable population and children) and needs are concerned, the three components have different coverage which gives rise to a number of questions.

According to the REACH Assessment, three priorities for conceptualising vulnerability in Lebanon within the context of the Syrian crisis have been taken into account:

- **human vulnerability**, associated with the ability of people to meet their fundamental survival and protection needs with particular credence awarded to the most vulnerable;

- **geographic vulnerability**, identified as areas with high intersections of people and systems facing endemic poverty and high proportions of displaced individuals, where greater investment must be made in service delivery and other area-based assistance; and

- **systemic vulnerability**, highlighted as institutions and systems crucial to the full realisation of the development response and key factors affecting the country’s long-term stability.

This assessment adopted a broad understanding of vulnerability encompassing these three vulnerability aspects. Building on the existing mapping exercise jointly carried out by the GoL, UNHCR and UNICEF, the report focused on four aspects for conceptualising and understanding community-level vulnerabilities: i) demographic pressure; ii) poverty and deprivation; iii) access to basic services and infrastructure; and iv) social stability.

For the emergency component, the coverage is relevant because the population living is ISs is precarious in terms of WASH access; however, the minimum of four tents could be reviewed, as vulnerable people can also live in smaller settlements. The refugees living in abandoned houses are also vulnerable in terms of WASH access but do not benefit from the activities, as they are covered by the shelter sector since 2015.

The Consultant cannot fully assess the relevance of the stabilisation activities’ coverage to reach the most vulnerable population because, though the programme covers the “most vulnerable areas” as defined in the vulnerability map, UNICEF lacks data to know in which neighbourhoods the most vulnerable people are located in, and thus if the programme actually reaches them. UNICEF is aware of this lack and is currently working on a strategy to improve the selection criteria for the projects’ targeting. In the interviews with UNICEF, the WEs and the MoEW, some partners questioned the relevance of the vulnerability map for targeting the most vulnerable people. The site visits also revealed that, in some of the vulnerable areas, the stabilisation activities have been carried out in wealthy neighbourhoods. This situation can partly be explained by the service providers’ (the WEs) and the MoEW’s need to ensure the financial stability of the services. It is thus more effective and sustainable for them to target areas where the future users have the capacity to pay for the service. The absence of tariff equalization or social pricing policies hinders rather than supports the development of services in the most vulnerable areas.

For the capacity-building component, the activities are not directly aimed at vulnerable people. Instead they seek to strengthen the authorities’ capacities and improve their decision-making to select priority projects and to add specific criteria based on the economic and social background of the target areas (systemic vulnerability), which is a huge step forward in the Lebanese context. However, according to the WE and MoEW interviews, not all partners have benefited from the same amount of support because of “political disagreement with the MoEW”, or from a lack of interest. Plus, also according to the national stakeholder’s interviews, the studies are not shared between the WEs and the MoEW. Lastly, some stakeholders regretted the fact that they had not benefited from specific capacity-building activities, especially the municipalities that are in the front line when it comes to managing local populations complaints when the services are not operating properly or there is unequal coverage. Even if according to the law, customers should complain to the WEs, the local reality is quite different and their first counterparts for any issue relating to any service delivery are the municipalities. It also has to be pointed out that according to Article 47 of the Municipal Law “any intervention of general or public interest implemented in the municipal boundaries are with the competence of the Municipal
Council”. Municipalities should then be more involved in any project of public interest implemented on their territory and could receive support through capacity-building activities to be able to understand the projects and activities implemented. Thus, the capacity-building component coverage is not inclusive enough.

**E.1.4. Adequacy of partners to achieve the programme’s objectives**

*a) For the emergency component*

In accordance with the UNICEF Work Plan first signed in 2016 between the MoEW and UNICEF WASH Programme (and as also mentioned during the interviews with the WEs, the MoEW and NGOs), the MoEW has since been more involved in defining both activities and the strategy, which ensures that implementation is more in line with the National Strategy. However, some implementing partners argued that the changes made since then have been inadequate or difficult to implement (difficulties obtaining the new septic tank materials, etc.).

At the local level, the municipalities are informed of the activities and their agreement is sometimes requested prior to implementation. Most of the NGOs sign Memorandum of understanding before starting any activities. However, despite this coordination process, municipalities are not involved in the activity design and implementation, as revealed in the interviews with NGOs and municipalities. This leads to resentment as municipalities consider that the host communities are now more vulnerable than the refugees in IS, both because of the impact the refugees have on their environment and because of a lack of funding for the host communities.

Finally, it has to be noted that the implementing partners are providing an unequal quality of WASH service delivery in IS, as highlighted by the interviews with NGOs, the FGDs and the site visits. Problems include a lack of latrines, full pits, no greywater treatment, lack of water, etc. It was not possible to gather enough information to identify the exact reasons for this, but according to some interviewed NGOs this situation could be related to:

- the short timeframe given to the projects (six month to one year), which does not allow having enough time to define needs and design related activities accordingly and to launch long term activities and processes;
- the fact that there is a turnover of NGOs in the same area with no specific resources to ensure a qualitative handover between the former NGO and its replacing NGO;
- the high turnover of staff within the NGOs and the lack of handover within their organization;
- the different monitoring levels of the NGOs, with some having more contact with UNICEF than others, or to the way the implementing partners are selected based on the NGO’s historical presence in the area and to the quality of previously implemented activities;
- the NGO’s experience of implementing emergency and stabilisation activities, their knowledge of the specifics of this crisis and the Lebanese context and staff skills can also play a huge part in its capacity to implement the activities.

*b) For the stabilisation component*

The projects were defined, designed and implemented in coordination with the WEs in the first few years of the programme. From 2016 onwards, this activity has been conducted in coordination with the MoEW that started by requesting WE’s to send their project needs to MoEW and had a session with NGO’s / donors where WE’s were asked to present their needs. The second stage was to have needs selected by NGO’s / donors for implementation under an agreement with MoEW (the annual work plan) in the case of UNICEF. WE’s are then supposed to be informed of the selected annual plan projects in their areas of coverage. UNICEF also communicates to WEs the start of the project implementation for them to be involved in the implementation.

However, despite this procedure, the interviews with WEs showed that as there is little coordination between the Ministry and the WEs, this has mostly led to the WEs being informed of the projects only
once they are completed. As the WEs still have to sign off the acceptance of works and are responsible for infrastructure operation and maintenance, this change is making it difficult for them to operate and maintain the infrastructure as they have had no input in supervising this infrastructure’s design and construction, as revealed in the interviews with the MoEW and the WEs. It has to be pointed out that this issue is not specific to the UNICEF programme and that the WEs have the same issue on all water and sanitation programmes implemented in Lebanon through the national institutions (Ministry or CDR) during the handover and infrastructure operating phases.

Moreover, although working in coordination with the MoEW helps improve alignment with its National Strategy as the Ministry chooses the projects to be implemented according to its Master Plan, it is important to note that the MoEW finances infrastructure in villages where people are not WE customers, as highlighted in the interviews with the MoEW and the WEs. This is aligned with the national legal framework allowing the MoEW to intervene in areas that are not covered by the WEs but it also leads to a lack of revenue for the WEs, as customer registration could be introduced as a condition in order to fund the infrastructure. Thus, the WEs are being deprived of the financial resources they need to ensure efficient service delivery and this is also hampering the achievement of the National Strategy’s tariff objectives. However, as highlighted above, this strategy based on vulnerability criteria, does mean that vulnerable people in villages not connected to the WEs are still provided with coverage, whereas the WEs would not make these villages a priority project. This situation highlights a need of balance between the projects being implemented in wealthy areas whose inhabitants are WE customers and projects implemented in vulnerable areas outside of the WE intervention framework.

The interviews with the municipalities and the implementing partners, which were cross-referenced with the site visits, indicated that the municipalities are informed of the activities but not involved in their design and implementation. Apart from the fact that it can be considered as contrary to the municipal Law (article 47), this can lead to them hindering the implementation or operation of the construction work if they disagree with or do not understand the project. This was illustrated on the site visit to the Al-Ghadir wastewater treatment plant, where the municipality of Ghobeiry is refusing to connect a lifting station renovated by UNICEF to the plant.

For the contractors and implementing partners, the WEs and the MoEW interviews cross-referenced with the site visits highlighted that they have constructed infrastructure to high quality standards, which are still working properly a number of years after their completion. However, not enough time has passed to provide a long-term assumption, but it can be concluded that the choice of contractors is relevant and aligned with the programme objectives.

c) For the capacity-building component

For the capacity-building component, activities are completed in coordination with the WEs and the MoEW, depending on the type of activity and their aim, but not with the municipalities. The interview with the MoEW, cross-referenced with those held with the WEs and municipalities, reveals that the activities are useful for the MoEW and WEs but that there is not always strong demand from all partners. However the municipalities do request technical and institutional support.

E.1.5. Alignment of the programme to the needs of the target population

The target population is the refugees for the emergency component, the host community for the stabilisation component and the local (WEs) and national authorities (MoEW) for the capacity-building component.

For the emergency component, the activities are designed based on an assessment conducted by the NGOs every six months. However, the Consultant does not have sufficient information on the method used to conduct these assessments to evaluate their relevance in identifying the refugees’ needs. All
the IS residents benefit from the activities, but the most vulnerable people are targeted with special latrines for disabled people, a special location or arrangement for women and children and hygiene promotion sessions also for women or children, as revealed in the interviews with NGOs, the FGDs and the site visits.

For the infrastructure component of the WASH in emergency activities, implementation is in accordance with the guidelines set out by UNICEF and which are based on national sector standards during emergency operations (1 latrine per 14 people, 35L/person/day, etc.). However, according to the refugees, these ratios are not sufficient and can lead to conflict (especially when it comes to the upkeep of the toilets). It is to be noted that other WASH Emergency agencies in Lebanon have faced the same issues and, following a specific assessment, decided to review the design of the sanitation facilities by installing one latrine per family, which had a huge impact on reducing daily conflicts. According to UNICEF team of the WASH Programme, UNICEF try when possible to adapt as much as possible to better standards, but having in consideration to not jeopardize the response of non-UNICEF partners, this approach is part of UNICEF strategy for 2017.

For the hygiene promotion activities, training on all hygiene topics are delivered regularly by the NGOs, with some recognised as more useful than others by the refugees (breastfeeding for women which is not related to WASH - meaning that other issues are seen as a priority by beneficiaries). Moreover, the refugees know the recommendations but don’t necessarily apply them and there is a lack of information as to whether the training effectively meets their needs or if refugees were already aware of the recommendations beforehand. In all but two FGDs, participants mentioned a lack of understanding of their needs among implementing partners, as well as a lack of follow up and monitoring in terms of maintenance and support through training sessions. Overall, the WASH activities are not designated as a priority by the refugees. This is confirmed by the results of the REACH Assessment carried out in 2014-2015, which shows that WASH access needs are low on the list of priorities for both host communities and refugees, as seen below:

---
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However, this has to be balanced with their current access to water and sanitation services: if their needs have already been met, they are obviously no longer considered a priority. This was highlighted in the interviews with the NGOs and the FGDs.

The interviews with the municipalities, cross-referenced with those with the NGOs and the FGDs, revealed that the activities aimed at supporting the municipalities with waste collection do not always meet their needs; for instance, providing them with bins when they lack the money for solid waste collection. However, when the municipalities were able to sustainably collect the waste in IS, this meets the needs of refugees, who otherwise would have to find other ways to dispose of the waste.

For the stabilisation activities, the choice of projects implemented is based on the WE and MoEW lists of required projects. This list comes from the partners’ master plan or guidelines and usually targets the most populated areas that lack access to water and wastewater services. However, there is a lack of scientific data on which to base the selection of stabilisation projects. UNICEF selects the projects based on their location in the most vulnerable areas (but not necessary in the most vulnerable neighbourhoods of these areas) and on a needs assessment. Cross-referencing the WEs and host communities’ interviews reveals that most of the projects implemented correspond to the WE and host communities’ needs, as they have improved access to water and sanitation. However, because of a lack of information on the project selection criteria used by the partners, on the selection criteria for the most vulnerable areas and on the content of the needs assessments, the Consultant is unable to accurately assess whether or not the programme targets the needs of the most vulnerable people. However, it is important to note that implementing activities in vulnerable areas does not necessary mean that the most vulnerable people are being targeted. Instead, some stabilisation projects have to be viewed as conflict and tension mitigation tools, especially in areas where the percentage of refugees is very high. In this type of environment, targeting the neighbourhoods that are not the most vulnerable can help to reduce the (real or perceived) local stress caused by the influx of refugees.

For the capacity-building component, activities are implemented following direct request from the WEs and MoEW, as highlighted by interviews with these partners.
E.2. Effectiveness

The effectiveness criteria have been assessed through different aspects: UNICEF’s contribution to the WASH sector for institutional aspects; how the partnerships help achieve the programme’s objectives; the achievement of the objectives, the inclusion of the equity, gender and human right aspects in the activities; and the constraints faced and their solutions. To this end, the following sources were used: interviews with the MoEW, the WEs, the NGOs, UNICEF, the municipalities and the host communities, the review of the HRRRP tables, the donors’ reports and situation reports, the site visits and the FGDs.

E.2.1. Institutional contribution of the programme to the WASH sector

As described in E.1.1., the programme has contributed to the implementation of the MoEW National Strategy. The interviews with the WEs and the MoEW showed that there has been no change of priorities in the authorities’ existing strategies; however, as described in paragraph E.1.4, the MoEW has been more involved in monitoring the WASH response to the Syrian crisis.

There is a lack of information to measure the extent to which WASH sector knowledge has improved. However, cross-referencing the WE interviews with the MoEW interview and the documentation review reveals that the programme has facilitated the completion of major studies for sector improvement, namely the hydrogeological and aquifers studies that are supporting the decision making process to determine the sites of wells and the refill of aquifers. If this study is cross-referenced with the REACH Assessment, it will enable Lebanese institutions to prioritise interventions in the most vulnerable areas.

Moreover, the 2016 baseline survey generated data on various aspects (health, WASH, nutrition, education, etc.) related to Lebanon’s population to, identify disparities in various areas, enable evidence-based policy-making and validate data from other sources. This will help the sector to improve the targeting.

However, the information seems only to be partly shared by the MoEW with other authorities (especially the WEs), which limits the effectiveness of these crucial sector initiatives.

E.2.2. The partnerships to help achieve the programme’s objectives

The partnership with the MoEW meets the objectives of strengthening the national systems, and makes it easier to implement activities in line with the National Strategy. However, as described in E.1.4., the MoEW finances infrastructures in villages where people are not subscribers of the WE, which leads to a lack of revenue for them, efficient service delivery and hindering achievement of the National Strategy tariff objectives. This partnership is correlated with MoEW’s stronger involvement in the emergency response to the Syrian crisis, which helps strengthen the national authorities.

The partnership with the WEs meets the objective of strengthening the local authorities. However, since the change of strategy and the poorer coordination that ensued, water and wastewater service provision has been hampered by more difficult operation and maintenance conditions. This is due to the difficulties being experienced by WEs to ensure effective service provision from infrastructure that was designed and constructed without their input. This situation has led to the WEs opting to introduce their services into the wealthy neighbourhoods of the vulnerable areas covered by the stabilisation component in order to ensure recovery of the water bills. However, as seen below, this runs counter to some of the choices made by the MoEW and reflects the lack of a clear strategy that is shared by all stakeholders for selecting the target areas for the stabilisation activities.

The partnership with the municipalities is limited to the emergency component, with the support of solid waste activities. This has partially met the objective of supporting the local authorities and improving the solid waste management, as it consisted of providing bins, trucks and other equipment to the municipalities; however, most of them lack the money required to operate the waste collection
service. Several problems were reported (irregular waste collection, bins stolen from IS, etc.) that show that this partnership was not particularly effective.

For the emergency component, the partnership with NGOs helped achieve the objective of improving water, wastewater and hygiene aspects in IS; however, as seen in E.1.4., not all IS benefit from the same quality of services. Some IS receive better wastewater services with regular desludging, whereas others have to empty the pits themselves; some have to build their own latrine as there are not enough; some receive latrines adapted to disabled people; some IS benefit from greywater treatment, etc. It has also to be noticed that all frontline workers were trained by UNICEF and Balamand University on hygiene promotion and cholera response.

For the stabilisation component, the partnership with an NGO led to the implementation of an inclusive project, from the construction of infrastructure to beneficiary involvement. It helped reduce tension and increase the sense of ownership among beneficiaries.

The partnership with the contractors helped to ensure that the infrastructure was of good technical quality. However, this does not ensure good service delivery, as seen on the site visits, as sand has infiltrated some of the water supply schemes (as seen in Majdel Anjar), and some municipalities have blocked the construction of networks to connect the infrastructure together (as seen with the Ghobairy municipality and Al Ghadir wastewater treatment plant).

**E.2.3. The achievement of the objectives**

*a) Quantitative results*

The table below shows the quantified objectives and the results achieved for the year 2014, 2015 and 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Achieved (Until November 30th, 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>137,952</td>
<td>50,576</td>
<td>137,952</td>
<td>94,834 (temporary location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>101,858</td>
<td>235,619</td>
<td>467,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>592,614</td>
<td>1,510,594</td>
<td>1,100,700</td>
<td>1,683,249 (temporary location)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Achieved (Until November 30th, 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>137,952</td>
<td>50,576</td>
<td>137,952</td>
<td>94,834 (temporary location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>101,858</td>
<td>235,619</td>
<td>467,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>592,614</td>
<td>1,510,594</td>
<td>1,100,700</td>
<td>1,683,249 (temporary location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improved water source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Number of people with access to a waste disposal mechanism</td>
<td>98,878</td>
<td>94,039</td>
<td>244,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Number of people trained in good WASH behaviour</td>
<td>85,564</td>
<td>395,563</td>
<td>773,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Number of people with access to hygiene, dignity or baby kits or vouchers</td>
<td>25,778</td>
<td>132,740</td>
<td>116,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Flood mitigation measures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 6 and its associated figure (figure 7 in annex 10) show that no objective has been successively achieved from 2014 to 2016.

Also, most of the objectives haven’t the same target two years in a row. Except for R1 and R4 objectives in 2015, the objective of the following year is increased or decreased according to the achievement of the objective for the previous year. This shows the adaptation capacity of the programme with ever evolving target numbers.

For all objectives except R1 and R4, the achievement for 2016 is lower than 2015, which can be explained by the fact that the beneficiaries of the unfinished projects in 2016 are reported for 2017. Throughout the three years, the number of beneficiaries reached for R1 and R4 are in constant augmentation, as well as their percentage of the objective met: 37%, 69% and 134% for R1 and 95%, 111% and 199% for R4. This shows the programme’s increase of focus on sanitation and waste management. On the contrary, the number of beneficiaries reached are in constant diminution for R6 and R7 which is coherent with the programme’s will to decrease the distribution of kits to only specific
cases and shows the same decrease of focus for the flood mitigation activities. However, the achievement of 225% of the R7 objective in 2016 shows a need for flood mitigation activities.

The constant evolution of the objectives and achievements’ numbers show the programme’s adaptation depending on its results, on the sector evolution and the activities of other donors and NGOs.

The table 6 and the figure 7 of annex 10 also show the focus of the programme on the R3 objective (access to an improved water source) as it has the highest numbers in terms of objectives and achievements for the three years (except for the achievement in 2016). Also, the high number of beneficiaries (more than 1,6 million in 2015) shows the need for these activities. The R1, R6 and R7 objectives are less of a priority for the programme with low numbers of beneficiaries both for the objectives and the achievements. This may be explained by to the coverage of these activities by other stakeholders.

**b) Qualitative results**

The site visits, FGDs and interviews with NGOs have been used to qualify or supplement the quantitative results with specific qualitative aspects.

The access to improved sanitation objective has not been completely achieved, which is confirmed by the FGDs and site visits: the satisfaction level among the Syrian refugees is very low; the majority agrees that latrines, waste disposal and water tanks have brought a positive change to their daily lives. However, these facilities are scarcely maintained: there are often not enough latrines and some are broken; there are not enough waste disposal facilities and they are sometimes stolen. This can partially be due to a lack of ownership from the refugees, as the NGOs distribute them repairing tools; however these tool kits only allow for small maintenance. UNICEF is aware of this issue and is currently working on the strategy to answer it.

The access to an improved water source objective has broadly been met (except in 2016 for permanent locations); However, certain FGDs revealed that, in ISs, people were buying drinking water from other sources and using the trucked water for domestic use. The FGDs and interviews with NGOs indicated that this could be due to the taste of the added chlorine, and to the beneficiaries not being aware of the quality of the water and not confident it is palatable. This might induce a risk of contamination in case the water bought by refugees is of lower quality than the one distributed by UNICEF.

The level of improvement in water quality under the stabilisation projects cannot be measured as no specific studies have been conducted, as highlighted by the interviews with the MoEW and the WEs. However, the interviews with the host communities and the site visits revealed that the water delivery projects have not resulted in the delivery of palatable water. It has nevertheless to be noticed that the UNICEF programme focuses on maintaining the pre-crisis service level to coop with the increase of population, taking into consideration that the pre-crisis infrastructures had many deficiencies and didn’t meet the national standards. For the ISs, the addition of chlorine and the tests conducted by the NGOs should ensure improvements in water quality; however, tests are not carried out frequently enough at the household level to ensure that the additional water bought by the refugees is palatable. These tests are necessary to inform the refugees in case the water provided through the programme is of better quality, in order for them to change their practices. This could lead to an adjustment of the programme in strengthening the awareness activities on the water quality. It is thus not possible to conclude whether or not the water quality has improved.

The high numbers of people with access to a waste disposal mechanism (largely exceeding the objectives for 2015 and 2016) need to be balanced against the findings of the FGDs and the interviews with the NGOs, which revealed that very few IS had a functioning waste collection system, and highlighted a low satisfaction level with waste management among the refugees.

The number of people trained in good WASH behaviour has exceeded the objective for 2014 and
2016. The site visits, interviews with NGOs and the FGDs highlighted that, although the refugees have become more aware of the hygiene situation in the camp and despite living in a vulnerable environment that may expose them to disease, their hygiene behaviour has still not improved. Women claim that they follow the hygiene advice given during the sessions (handwashing, use of soap, etc.) without stating clearly if they used to employ these practices while in Syria. Men claim that the sessions were not relevant as they were already aware of how to deal with hygiene. However, women say that men would not attend the HP sessions.

The objectives for the number of people with access to hygiene, dignity or baby kits / vouchers, were only met in 2014. This can be explained by the change of strategy in 2015, with the programme restricting the support provided through these kits to newcomers or emergencies (hygiene kits). Although the most economically vulnerable refugees receive assistance with cash, they decide not to spend their money on this kind of item and thus regretted the fact that these products were only distributed on a few occasions.

There are no figures available on waterborne diseases and other hygiene-related diseases in IS but there hasn’t been any major water related disease outbreak during the years of the programme. The refugees mentioned that better hygiene around feeding and the construction of closed latrines far from the tents have reduced the cases of diarrhoea in children, as well as other diseases. Yet, many indicated a high proportion of cases of scabies, skin diseases and fleas. The origin of these diseases are however difficult to trace as the refugees live in precarious conditions and are subject to many factors of risks. Also, there was a high number of reports of very young adolescent girls being married off (the “norm” is 14 years old, but participants also mentioned that some girls were as young as 12). Early marriages make girls more prone to disease, especially STDs, and mean they are liable to take on the chores of fetching water, tank cleaning, toilet cleaning and rubbish collection. With regard to hygiene these same girls are also not aware of how to take care of their children once they are born.

Overall, the FGDs and interviews with the host community showed that the refugees recognise the positive changes resulting from improved sanitation and that the host communities are satisfied with the project’s results, although they consider that more should be done.

The Consultant does not have any information on the exact number of studies conducted for the capacity-building component. However, the major studies carried out are considered useful by the partners who benefited from them, as they used them to determine where new wells can be dug and where aquifers can be refilled.

The qualitative results of the Programme can be summarised as follows:

**Table 7: Qualitative achievement of objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in water quality</td>
<td>Objective met with limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to improved sanitation</td>
<td>Objective met with limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to an improved source of water</td>
<td>Objective met with limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a waste disposal mechanism</td>
<td>Objective not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in good WASH behaviour</td>
<td>Cannot be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to hygiene, dignity or baby kits or vouchers</td>
<td>Cannot be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the percentage of waterborne diseases and other hygiene-related diseases in IS</td>
<td>Objective met with limitations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 Assessment of Groundwater Resources of Lebanon, the National Survey 2016
E.2.4. Human rights, equity and gender aspects

The human rights aspect is not mentioned in the objectives or in the design and implementation of the three components’ activities, as is shown from the review of the HRRP tables and the donors’ reports, the interviews with the NGOs, the WEs, the MoEW and the UNICEF staff.

The gender aspect is present in the programme objectives, as can be seen in the HRRP tables: “Outcome: sustainable and gender appropriate access to safe and equitable water is ensured for the target population in sufficient quantities for drinking, cooking, personal and domestic hygiene”.

The equity and gender aspects are present in the design and implementation phases of the emergency component. The adaptation of latrines to disabled people was encouraged by the programme and has been required since 2016, but the NGOs stated that it usually was a decision taken by them, with no incentive from UNICEF. This could show a lack of communication.

The FGDs also showed that the overall vulnerability of the refugees, especially women and children, may not be reduced. Although the water supply service benefits women and children as they no longer have to walk long distances to fetch water, the men remain the primary users of the water; women and children are in charge of dealing with rubbish, water, and cleaning whereas men are not involved in WASH issues; polygamy exposes women to more work cleaning and fetching water; the high density of many of the IS means higher use of the services, which reduces the availability water and leads to the overuse of latrines, septic tanks or rubbish disposal facilities, which becomes a burden for women; early marriages expose children to health issues; etc.

These three aspects are not a focus of the stabilisation and capacity building-components, as shown by the review of the HRRP tables and the donors’ reports, the interviews with the NGOs, the WEs, the MoEW and the UNICEF staff. Only one stabilisation project with a social focus designed and implemented activities that targeted women and children through WASH committees.

Programme effectiveness for these fundamental aspects of UNICEF intervention is thus partly ensured.

E.2.5. The programme’s adaptation to constraints

As revealed in the interviews with the NGOs, the WEs, the MoEW and UNICEF staff and the review of the donors’ reports, several constraints were encountered: dependency and lack of ownership of the refugees, poor hygiene practice behaviour change, inability to construct permanent WASH infrastructure for IS due to the national policy on refugees, lack of scientific data on which to base the selection of stabilisation projects, lack of infrastructure maintenance, etc.

Solutions were implemented (the dependency of refugees was addressed through the implementation of WASH committees and by halting the distribution of kits, several training methodologies were implemented, studies are conducted to increase the data available, etc.), thus demonstrating the programme’s capacity to adapt. In the emergency component, UNICEF regularly modifies the guidelines and modifications of activities that can be proposed by the NGO during the design phase, as well as during implementation if coordinated with UNICEF.

Furthermore, updates to the programme’s objectives during its implementation, the increase in stabilisation projects and the completion of specific studies show that the programme has been able to successfully adapt to ensure it is aligned with the national policies and meets the MoEW needs and demands. This has also helped to strengthen the MoEW’s involvement in the WASH emergency activities and in the overall monitoring of the Programme.

However, programme implementation could not adapt to factors inherent to the refugees’ social and cultural environment, which proved to be major constraints to achieving successful results. As explained by the women during the FGD – and recognized by the men – women and children are in
charge of dealing with rubbish, water, and cleaning, etc. Men do not get involved in these tasks that continue to be a burden for women and children.

Moreover, many situations were reported where men had married a second or third wife or more. In this specific context, there is not enough water for the whole family, as the family grows quickly and the newly married spouses need more water to clean the house, wash laundry and bathe. The first wife and her children are in charge of fetching water, whereas the new spouse is in charge of cleaning the house and washing the laundry. Many cases very young adolescent girls getting married were also reported (the “norm” is 14 years old but participants also mentioned girls as young as 12). Early marriages make girls prone to more disease, especially STDs, and means they are put in charge of fetching water, tank cleaning, toilet cleaning and rubbish collection. These same girls are also not aware of how to take care of their children once they are born to ensure good hygiene. Also, based on the FGDs and the interviews with some of the NGOs, the refugees have come from various social and cultural backgrounds from different areas of Syria. For example, in Mohammadra, refugees are from semi-urban areas in Syria: they are educated, with some of them having a bachelor’s degree. In Bar Elias, refugees have Bedouin ancestry and thus are less educated. These differences in refugee communities were not taken into consideration during the activity design phase, which limits the efficiency of the proposed activities as they are not deemed relevant by all beneficiaries.

Finally, the role of the “Chawich” is a major issue that needs to be addressed. Based on the various interviews with NGOs, as well as on observations made during site visits, the Chawich is a person who has political power or holds a socially dominant position within the IS population. International NGOs that need a single focus point in the IS usually rely on this Chawich, which gives them even greater power as they make decisions on behalf of and rule the IS. In this situation, the IS depends on the Chawich when it comes to distributing water or kits, as it is they who decide which tent is to benefit from sanitation or water facilities or selects the participants for training sessions. Thus, the most vulnerable people who are not close to the Chawich can become increasingly neglected and vulnerable. In contrast, local NGOs – meaning an NGO that operates within a village/reduced area – recruit their teams locally. There are from the villages that host the refugees, and so the team members are known to all and the refugees can identify them. Therefore, they have direct access to all members of the IS with whom they can freely communicate without the Chawich playing the role of an intermediary. This allows them to accurately identify real needs and to design activities accordingly. The UNICEF Programme team made the same observation and took two main measures to address this issue: focus on local implementing partners to implement activities and start working at the family level instead of at the community level within the IS. However, this response has only recently been implemented and thus could not be evaluated.

E.3. Efficiency

The efficiency criterion has been studied by examining the programme’s human resources strategy, the decision-making rules and procedures and the programme timeframe and cost. Thus, the following sources were used: interviews with the WEs, the MoEW, the NGOs, UNICEF, the municipalities and the host communities, the review of the programme’s budget breakdown, the site visits and the FGDs.

E.3.1. The human resources strategy

a) Proportion of the programme budget allocated to UNICEF HR

As seen through interviews with UNICEF and the budget breakdown of the programme by component, the HR budget is not part of the overall programme budget. From 2014 to 2016, it was constantly around 3% of the total budget, which has continually increased over the years.
Table 8: Programme budget – No. of projects – HR costs in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency (USD)</strong></td>
<td>7,327,161</td>
<td>20,499,617</td>
<td>26,049,668</td>
<td>21,004,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of projects</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stabilisation (USD)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,225,402</td>
<td>14,517,629</td>
<td>29,053,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of projects</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity-building (USD)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,438</td>
<td>79,343</td>
<td>32,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (USD)</strong></td>
<td>7,327,161</td>
<td>22,747,456</td>
<td>40,646,640</td>
<td>50,090,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF HR (USD)</strong></td>
<td>182,743</td>
<td>795,364</td>
<td>1,402,925</td>
<td>1,573,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table can be translated into the figure below that shows the low HR costs compared to the overall annual amount and the number of activities implemented:

**Figure 3: Programme budget trends**

The HR costs are very low compared to other programmes or projects implemented by other agencies\(^\text{18}\) (the average is 7 to 10% of the total amount of the annual activities budget).

---

\(^{18}\) International NGOs and other UN agencies, etc.
This highlights the high level of efficiency with regard to internal HR costs for programme implementation, but it could also reduce the ability of the team to free up time to realize the reporting of the monitoring for the different activities, which could explain the lack of available monitoring tools and documentation (achievement in number for each objective, budget for each activity and per beneficiary, etc.).

Furthermore, this has to be qualified by the fact there is a lack of HR cost-related data used by the NGOs for implementing the Emergency component activities, which could reduce the overall efficiency of this component.

**b) Organisation of human resources for programme management**

In terms of operational organisation, the programme management team is based on the following structure:

*Figure 4: UNICEF WASH staffing structure*

The main element highlighted by this structure is the existence of zone offices in each region in which emergency activities are being implemented, which are staffed with experienced WASH experts. This ensures staff members remain close to the ground and are able to provide stronger support to the implementing partners. However, the job description requirement of a one year experience may be insufficient, although in practice the recruited staff have more than one year of experience. Also, the high number of IS in each area means that zone offices of one or two people may not be enough to cover the whole area and ensure proper implementation of activities. The job description requires the WASH specialists to provide professional technical, operational and administrative assistance throughout the programme, from development planning through to the delivery of results. The role also involves preparing, executing, managing and implementing a variety of technical and administrative programme tasks to facilitate programme development, implementation and programme progress, as well as monitoring, evaluating and reporting results. Although these activities are completed with the support of the Beirut office, given the number of partners and activities involved, fulfilling this role for all the projects under their supervision would appear to be a complicated task, thus showing the lack of staffing for this role.
It is important to note that the WASH specialists from the zone offices are not placed under the supervision of the WASH programme but report to the Field Chief Office. However, the WASH programme has a technical advising role which translates into a strong partnership with the zone offices. This may lead to a lack of coordination at the central level, as highlighted by some NGOs indicating receiving contradictory directives from the Beirut office and the zone offices.

The staffing structure also shows that there is a coordination link but no supervision link between the WASH programme and the coordination sector system - which was the responsibility of UNHCR till the last quarter of 2016. This situation, which is linked to a lack of clear external communication, leads to confusion among the different partners (implementing partners, national and local partners) as to the role of these two major activities.

It also has to be noted that the WASH stabilisation position for the capacity-building component is not linked to the rest of the stabilisation activities. However, as seen in the budget breakdown, the capacity-building budget falls under the stabilisation budget, as it is in line with the stabilization concept of supporting the institutions. Although the decision-making process for capacity-building activities goes through the standard process (TOR preparation, approval, etc.); this can lead to a lack of comprehension around the internal decision-making process for activity implementation.

### E.3.2. Decision-making rules and procedures

For the emergency component, the programme targets all ISs with more than four tents where no other donors fund activities, thus facilitating decision-making for the selection of projects.

As the interviews with the NGOs and the UNICEF staff cross-referenced with the FGDs and site visits showed, the choice of implementing partners is based on criteria of the NGO’s historic project implementation in the area and the quality of their previously implemented activities. However, depending on the NGO and the IS, this can lead to unequal WASH service delivery as described above. It has to be noticed that UNICEF did a partner assessment in 2015 and 2016 to assess the performance of their implementing partners. In case of any specific issue UNICEF changes the implementing partner. But it is done without funding for a proper handover which can also lead to negative consequences on the service delivery quality according to some NGOs.

UNICEF engaged a Third Party Monitor (TPM) to provide routine monitoring reports of the implementation of UNICEF-supported humanitarian assistance: verification of partners on the ground, end-user supply monitoring, and feedback from beneficiaries on programme effectiveness and relevance. The TPM verifies partners’ work on the ground (45 visits per month) using tablets (with Form Hub ODK software) for the data collection and reporting. UNICEF field teams also conduct partner verification using the same form on smart phone/tablet to maximise reach of partner monitoring. However, the interviews with the NGOs indicated differences in the monitoring from one another. Some NGOs receive solid backup from UNICEF, with the possibility to receive feedback and adapt their activities, while others stress a lack of flexibility. The reason for this lack of flexibility can be to avoid the overlap of activities between NGOs, and the lack of communication with the NGOs creates misunderstanding from their part. This difference of support results in activity implementation being better in some ISs than others, with some treating greywater while others propose specific latrines for disabled people, etc. This questions the quality of the services delivered and the answer made following the TPM by the UNICEF team. This could be due to the lack of sufficient human resources in the zone offices, as described in E.3.1. Nothing can however be concluded because of the small number of ISs visited. There is also a problem of communication, with some NGOs stressing that some guidelines have been changed with no explanation). Contradictory directives have also been received from the UNICEF Beirut and the UNICEF zone offices. As seen in E.3.1, this could be due to a lack of supervision and thus shortcomings in coordination between the Beirut and zone offices. It can also be due to confusion between the UNICEF WASH programme and the WASH sector coordination assured by another UNICEF team. As seen in the staffing structure above, this
coordination is assured conjointly by UNICEF and UNHCR but there is no supervisory link between it and the WASH programme.

For the stabilisation component, the project selection decision-making process ensures the host communities are reached but, as explained above, the Consultant has been unable to assess if it targets the needs of the most vulnerable population. Moreover, the process does not involve all relevant partners, which causes problems for project implementation, operation and maintenance.

The selection of contractors to implement the successive project partners’ components (assessment, design and supervision) is conducted through a rapid bidding system between three pre-selected companies, as highlighted in the site visits and the interviews with UNICEF. Then more than forty Class A contractors are invited for bidding with the process of contracting taking an average of three months. The overall timeframe for the implementation of a project remains short and transparent. According to the interviews with the WEs and MoEW, this enables projects to be implemented within the timeframe and at market cost.

For the capacity-building component, the activity selection decision-making process is completed in coordination with the WEs and the MoEW, as described in E.1.4. As they are also the beneficiaries, this helps to respond to their needs. However, it does not necessarily improve overall sector capacity, as the knowledge is not then shared, as explained in E.1.3.

**E.3.3. Timeframe and cost of activities**

The data shown in the following tables and graphics are extracted from different sources: the data for both components comes from the financial breakdown for the whole programme, and Table 12 in E.2.3.; the data for the stabilisation component comes from the breakdown of the budget and beneficiaries by project. Thus, the numbers are sometimes different and/or contradictory. For example, the total number of beneficiaries for the stabilisation projects in 2014 indicated in Table 3 is greater than the number of beneficiaries reached for both components indicated in Table 2 below¹⁹. This might be due a different assignation of projects when they take place over several years, taking the start and end date into account to determine in which year to include them. As such, the numbers must be considered with care, but trends can however be identified.

**a) The cost / activities balance**

As seen in the following table and the figure 8 in annex 10, the programme budget for both the stabilisation and WASH in emergencies components constantly and strongly increased over the years, from US$ 7 million in 2013 to US$50 million in 2016. This however does not result in an increase in the number of projects implemented, as a reduction of almost 10 projects was registered between 2014 and 2015. This may be due to longer or bigger projects being implemented; nevertheless, it reduces the cost efficiency of the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>7 327 161</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20 499 617</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁹ Source: UNICEF WASH programme
The increase in the programme budget is mainly due to the increase in the stabilisation component, from US$ 0 in 2013 to 30 million in 2016. The emergency component budget increased considerably between 2013 and 2014 (from US$ 7 million to more than 20 million), and remained more or less constant over the following years, peaking at 26 million in 2015. The proportion of the budget allocated to the stabilisation component is been constantly increasing over the years, from 0% of the total budget in 2013 to almost 60% in 2016. This is in line with the UNICEF strategy of focusing on stabilisation activities, as seen in the UNICEF staff interviews. However, the interviews also reported a willingness to lower the emergency component budget, which has not yet been translated into action.

The number of projects implemented under the stabilisation component is much higher than under the emergency component, even though there is a lower budget. However, the differences between the type and length of projects make them difficult to compare. It can thus be said that the stabilisation component of the programme implements more projects for the same amount of money, and possibly thus reaches more beneficiaries, making it more efficient. However, this cannot be confirmed as the number of beneficiaries per emergency project is not known.

The capacity-building budget is much lower than the budget for the other components, accounting for less than 0.2% of the total budget at its peak in 2015. This might be due to the low cost of capacity-building activities compared to infrastructure construction or water-trucking. However, this also shows that this component is not considered as important as the other two.

From the perspective of the programme’s beneficiaries, the tables used to extract some of the data were incomplete, with the budget and number of beneficiaries missing for some projects. Nevertheless, some patterns do emerge.

The following table and its associated figure (figure 8 in annex 10) show that the number of beneficiaries remains more or less constant over the years, from 2.2 to 3.4 million people, despite a strong increase in the budget. In 2016, the number of beneficiaries was only a little bit higher than in 2014 and lower than 2015, whereas the budget more than doubled compared to 2014. Thus, the cost per beneficiary reached a peak in 2016, at US$22/beneficiary, and the ratio of the number of beneficiaries/project is the lowest, standing at just over 20,000 beneficiaries per project, making 2016 the least efficient year. This can be explained by the scale of intervention and the new intervention and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency projects</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 225 402</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14 517 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stabilization projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 438</td>
<td>0,1%</td>
<td>79 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in USD</td>
<td>7 327 161</td>
<td>22 747 456</td>
<td>40 646 640</td>
<td>50 090 714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Number of PCA, PD and SSFA. Source: UNICEF WASH programme
reporting guidelines from the WASH sector: in 2014, a chlorinator for about US$8000 would report a village as beneficiaries but in 2016 a complete station for about US$80,000 would be needed to report the village. This was done to prevent multiple donors from working on the same activity in the same village. In terms of number of beneficiaries, 2015 is the most efficient year with more than 43,000 beneficiaries reached per project, whereas 2014 is the most efficient year in terms of cost per beneficiary.

Table 10: Programme budget and number of beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget – US$</strong></td>
<td>7,327,161</td>
<td>22,747,456</td>
<td>40,646,640</td>
<td>50,090,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of projects</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries reached</strong></td>
<td>2,285,370</td>
<td>3,424,225</td>
<td>2,314,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries per project</strong></td>
<td>25,970</td>
<td>43,345</td>
<td>21,629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per beneficiary – US$</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b) Focus on the components**

For the emergency component, interviews with the NGOs showed that the projects were of different lengths (6 months to one year), and have been standardised since 2017. This is a short timeframe which does not allow for the implementation of specific activities, such as waste collection support to the municipalities, or for constant and efficient hygiene promotion training of the refugees.

For the stabilisation component, the projects have been implemented within the same timeframe and at a similar cost than the projects the partners deliver with other donors. The cost per linear meter for sewer systems ranges between US$80 and US$200 for the UNICEF stabilisation projects and between US$80 and US$800 for the CDR projects, depending on the diameter of the pipes. It has to be noticed that the CDR is usually doing important projects with large pipes thus explaining the higher cost per linear meter; for the smaller projects and thus smaller pipes, the same range of prices as UNICEF can be found.

Using the specific data collected by the UNICEF team for this evaluation, it has been possible to obtain a more in-depth view of the efficiency of the stabilisation component. However, this is not the case for the emergency component as there is no clear data on the number of beneficiaries per implemented project. As shown in the previous figures and tables, the programme budget and number of projects for the stabilisation component have increased over the years. As can be seen in Table 11 and its associated figures (9 and 10 in annex 10), for the three years of the programme, there has always been more water projects implemented than wastewater projects (in terms of number, budget and beneficiaries), with no wastewater projects being implemented in 2016. The interviews with the WEs revealed that water projects are their priority, which is consistent with implementation of the component.

Table 11 and its associated figure (figure 10 in annex 10) show that the majority of beneficiaries are Lebanese, with less than a third of all the beneficiaries being Syrian, which is in line with the stabilisation component strategy that primarily targets the host communities. No Palestinians were reported as beneficiaries.

There has been a constant decrease in the number of beneficiaries, from more than 2 million in 2014 to fewer than 700,000 in 2016. A reason could be that the programme has been involved in more complex stabilization projects over the years, starting with the installation of minor equipment like...
chlorination systems and pumps which have a low cost per beneficiaries. Also, the committed budget figures are used here whereas the beneficiaries are reported at the end of the project. In 2016, almost half of the budget was allocated towards the end of the year and thus the beneficiaries were reported in 2017.

Comparing Table 12 below (and it associated figure 11 in annex 10) with Table 6 and similar information on the whole programme reveals that, in 2014, the number of beneficiaries per project was higher for the stabilisation component than for the entire programme; however, this figure then falls to a much lower number in 2016. Similarly, the cost per beneficiary is much lower for the stabilisation component than for the whole programme for 2014 and 2015; however, in 2016, it reaches a peak and is much higher than for the whole programme. Thus, over the programme, 2016 was the least efficient year in terms of number of beneficiaries per project and cost per beneficiary for the stabilisation component, because of the increase of project complexity and the 2016 beneficiaries counted in 2017, as explained above. As the emergency component budget has remained stable over the years, the stabilisation component is more likely to be influencing the efficiency of the programme. This however cannot be concluded with any certainty due to a lack of data for the emergency component.

### Table 11: Number, budget and beneficiaries of stabilisation projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget US$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>6,694,838</td>
<td>10,415,671</td>
<td>27,986,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>3,237,836</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,594,838</td>
<td>13,653,507</td>
<td>27,986,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For water projects</td>
<td>2,763,965</td>
<td>1,420,085</td>
<td>674,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For wastewater projects</td>
<td>56,868</td>
<td>592,142</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,820,833</td>
<td>2,012,227</td>
<td>674,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese beneficiaries</td>
<td>1,980,655</td>
<td>1,621,856</td>
<td>546,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian beneficiaries</td>
<td>840,178</td>
<td>390,371</td>
<td>128,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Beneficiaries per project and cost per beneficiary for the stabilisation component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget – US$</td>
<td>8 594 838</td>
<td>13 653 507</td>
<td>27 986 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries reached</td>
<td>2 615 336²¹</td>
<td>2 012 227</td>
<td>674 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries per project</td>
<td>39 626</td>
<td>32 455</td>
<td>7 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per beneficiary – US$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From figures 5 and 6, below, it can be seen that the budget varies between regions. There are no regions that seem to be more frequently targeted than others, as the budget changes each year. Regions known for their high number of refugees (Bekaa, Akkar, Baalbeck), so with an increased strain on their services, are not specifically targeted. Again, it can be noted that there is more funding for water projects than for wastewater projects, with some regions (Beirut, Bekaa, Nabatieh) having no wastewater projects at all. There was again a steep increase in the budget for 2016, with an overall increase for all the regions (except North).

There is no correlation between the number of beneficiaries and the amount of funding, with Mount Lebanon and North having a high number of beneficiaries in 2016 and 2014 respectively but a low budget. There were also several regions with a low number of beneficiaries in 2016 despite their budget having increased.

As seen above, the project beneficiaries were mainly Lebanese, especially in 2016. Only in the South in 2014, were more Syrian beneficiaries recorded. This is consistent with the aim of the component, which is to reach the host communities.

²¹ The number of beneficiaries reached in 2014 is different between the table 11 and the table 12. It is due to a difference in the number of beneficiaries reported in the tables transmitted by the UNICEF WASH programme.
**Figure 5: Budget per region for the stabilisation component**

![Budget per region graph](image)

**Figure 6: Number of beneficiaries per region for the stabilisation component**

![Number of beneficiaries graph](image)
E.4. Sustainability

The sustainability criterion has been analysed by examining the following different aspects: the relevance of the exit strategy, the sustainability of the programme procedures and mechanisms and the sustainability of the interventions and their capacity to reduce vulnerability for future generations. To this end, the following sources were used: interviews with the WEs, the MoEW, the NGOs, UNICEF and the municipalities, the review of the programme budget breakdown, the site visits and the FGDs.

E.4.1. The exit strategy

The exit strategy is primarily a process of moving from emergency to rehabilitation and development. As showed in the previous developments, the Programme is based on an increasingly large stabilisation component and aims to strengthen the sector institution at national and local level. As such, it is clear that the programme has a strong exit strategy that meets the needs of the refugees and the host communities. However, this statement has to be balanced against the emergency component.

UNICEF has undertaken a number of activities towards developing an exit strategy. As described in E.1.5., the involvement of the municipalities has been encouraged through the waste collection activity; however, there is little sustainable waste collection once the support comes to an end. In addition, the lack of municipalities’ involvement in the design of the activities that target the refugees settled in their areas means they are unable to directly manage some of the activities without the support of external partners.

The programme has attempted to reduce the dependency of refugees by setting up WASH committees to spread good hygiene practices among the refugees and manage routine maintenance. However, as revealed in the FGDs and the interviews with the NGOs, this has not worked effectively, as the refugees did not understand their role and were expecting to be paid for helping the NGOs. As shown in the interviews with the NGOs, the FGDs and the site visits, the numerous evictions, the lack of income for refugees, the inability to build sustainable infrastructure (connecting the IS to the WE water supply networks, for example) in the ISs and the lack of water and sanitation infrastructure, etc. have meant there has been no real effective handover of the equipment provided to the refugees. Furthermore, it must also be noted that many NGOs explained that the refugees’ level of dependency on external funding and interventions (for minor repairs that could be carried out directly by the refugees, for example) is severely hampering their withdrawal and the ability of the NGOs and their donors to shift their focus towards other kinds of activity (economic development and local conflict resolution, for instance). Furthermore, the high frequency of NGOs turnover in the different areas and the short timeframe for the activities implementation (six month to one year) prevent the implementing partners to plan their action over time with a strong exit strategy. Nonetheless, UNICEF is aware of the lack of ownership of the refugees and is implementing activities to reinforce it in 2017. Finally, as described in E.1.4., the MoEW has been more involved in the emergency response strategy, which could lead to a handover of some activities; however, there are likely to be financial limitations to this as the MoEW does not have the finances to sustain the emergency activities and is totally dependent on external funding.

E.4.2. The sustainability of programme procedures and mechanisms

For the emergency component, the interviews with the NGOs and the FGDs showed that the refugees are still very dependent on programme funding and WASH service delivery. Refugees are also not involved in the decision-making for the design and the implementation of activities in ISs, except for the location of latrines. There is low ownership and involvement, and attempts made to increase these have not been effective, as described in E.4.1 with the WASH committees. It can be concluded that
the programme has not developed mechanisms that enable refugees to become more self-reliant in conducting the basic management of the facilities provided, although it is planned for 2017.

Furthermore, the lack of involvement of the municipalities, who are informed of the activities but not involved in their design and implementation, as described in E.1.4, hinders implementation and has an adverse impact on sustainability of the programme. Some municipalities out of the scope of this programme are strongly involved in the response to the refugee crisis and have implemented specific activities to strengthen the link between their residents and the refugees. In these municipalities, there are fewer NGO interventions and NGO support is directly aimed at municipal staff, which helps to improve the sustainability of the interventions. However, it has to be noted that this cannot be developed into an overall strategy of municipal involvement because this is strongly linked to local political will.

The involvement of the MoEW in the emergency strategy is positive in terms of building ownership and sustainability, as described in E.1.4. Nevertheless, the Ministry does not monitor the activities and the programme is still responsible for implementation and follow-up. It must also be noted that there has been no change of priorities in the existing national and local strategies; however, the MoEW is updating its National Strategy to take into account the Syrian crisis, as highlighted by the MoEW interview.

For the stabilisation component, there is ownership of the infrastructure among the WEIs because they are responsible for signing off on the final acceptance of work; however, the lack of cooperation with the WEIs has hindered this process. As shown by the interviews with the MoEW and the WEIs, the WEIs supervise the work of the projects implemented in coordination with them, but there is little to no follow-up on the results of the infrastructure projects, as described in E.2.3. For sanitation, the municipalities have no ownership over the construction work, but they have ownership over the sewer networks within their area when they are involved in the project and are responsible for their operation and maintenance. It is therefore important to include them in the project definition.

For the capacity-building component, there is ownership of the studies but only from the partner who commissioned them. As highlighted by the interviews with the municipalities, MoEW and WEIs, the stakeholders’ capacity have not been greatly improved. There is no strong demand from the MoEW and the WEIs, but the municipalities do request technical and institutional support.

E.4.3. The sustainability of the interventions and their capacity to reduce vulnerability

For the emergency component, as described in D.4.1. and D.4.2., the activities are not sustainable without the programme’s support: the refugees cannot provide themselves with WASH services nor maintain the infrastructure – by lack of ownership but also because the tool kits distributed only allow for small maintenance, and the local and national authorities are not managing the IS activities. According to the interviews with the NGOs and the FGDs, there has been no strong behaviour change among the refugees with regard to hygiene practices. However, as described in E.1.5., there is a lack of information on the reasons for this poor behaviour change: the refugees are aware of the recommendations but do not necessarily apply them, and they may already be familiar with them before the training.

The interviews with the NGOs and the FDGs showed that the WASH vulnerability of the refugees in ISs is reduced when there is proper WASH service delivery. However, the lack of hygiene practice behaviour change hinders the sustainability of the reduction in vulnerability.

For the stabilisation component, the lack of WE resources means the infrastructure is not well-maintained infrastructures, which adversely affects sustainability. The interviews with the WEIs and the site visits revealed that there is a shortage of human and financial resources for proper infrastructure operation and maintenance. However, the communication strategies developed for the WEIs (with the
aims of making WEs transparent and efficient in their communications with community/stakeholders, building the customer relations and communications (CRC) capacity with WEs, as a new service unit, developing CRC structure and job descriptions, developing capacity building for CRC staff, developing materials and enhancing image and reputation of WEs, improving branding and environment branding, producing materials to facilitate communications with customers, mobilizing resources for better communications with customers, improving customer care services, improving communication to increase service enrolment and tariff payment, assisting WEs in improving complaints and issues management and call centre and creating new connection service kit) will allow them to obtain more water and sanitation service customers, which will make service delivery more financially sustainable. Nevertheless, the WEs will need specific support with this as the lack of registered customers is only partly due to communication. Commercial strategies have to be defined and implemented, and the municipalities have to be involved in this process because some of them are still managing wells and springs and operating the water supply and sanitation services as they have a lack of trust in the WEs – which is sometimes political posturing. Moreover, the absence of a social tariff policy targeting the most vulnerable population is hampering efforts to reduce inequality and vulnerability.

The capacity-building component and the different studies carried out should enable the national authorities to define strategies to target the most vulnerable population (REACH assessment cross-referenced with the 2016 Survey and the study on groundwater resources); however, this has not yet resulted in a noticeable change.
F. Conclusion and Lessons Learned

F.1. Conclusion

F.1.1. Coordination

For both the stabilisation and emergency components of the programme, no or few activity overlaps have been identified. For the emergency component, the fact that each NGO has their own area of intervention has reduced the risk of overlaps. Where an overlap has occurred, the coordination systems in place at the regional and national levels have helped resolve the situation.

For the stabilisation component, coordination procedures have been set by UNICEF. Coordination with the WEs before 2016 and the MoEW after 2016 for project selection has helped prevent the overlap of activities with other stakeholders, as it has ensured that no other partners were funding the same projects. However, the lack of coordination between the MoEW and the WEs can be considered a risk as it could lead to an overlap of activities because the WEs have the right to implement projects above 200M LBP / USD133,000 without informing the MoEW beforehand. Even if any project above 200M LBP / USD133,000 directly implemented by the WEs has to be approved by the minister, the WEs can also rely on other implementing partners (NGOs, or foreign institutional partners) to launch projects or works above this limit without directly inform the MoEW.

The stabilisation projects are not implemented in coordination with all the relevant stakeholders. The lack of coordination with the MoEW (before 2016) made it more difficult to implement the MoEW National Strategy, which is the strategy followed by UNICEF for the stabilisation and capacity-building components. The lack of coordination with the WEs (since 2016) is hindering effective handover and causing operation and maintenance difficulties, thus compromising the sustainability of the infrastructure. The lack of coordination with the municipalities can adversely affect activity implementation or operations, especially for the networks, and can also cause resentment as refugees are perceived as receiving more help than the host communities. Plus, there is a risk of activities overlapping if different stakeholders decide to implement a project without informing the others.

The MoEW and the WEs have no clear methodology for selecting the projects required. The projects are said to be selected according to Master Plans or internal guidelines, and target the most populated areas or those with the poorest service coverage. However, no systematic data is accessible explaining each sub-criterion for the selection of the covered areas. As far as UNICEF is concerned, it was not possible to assess the relevance of targeting the most vulnerable areas, because of a lack of information on how they were defined and on coordination between the national and local stakeholders. However, it has to be noted that this question is a crucial matter for UNICEF and the WASH Programme team is currently setting tools with national stakeholders and other donors to ensure for the coming years objectivity, impartiality and rationality in the choice of the covered areas.

F.1.2. Capacity-building

The activities seek to strengthen the authorities’ capacities and improve their decision-making to select priority projects. The MoEW and the WEs are supported through communication strategies, provision of staff and studies. The studies that have been conducted through this programme, especially the 2016 Survey and the assessment of groundwater resources, are fully aligned with the National Water Strategy and are a big step forward for the sector.

However, it must be noted that the capacity-building component does not include the municipalities, despite there being strong demand from these municipalities for technical and institutional support as they are on the frontline when it comes to waste management and also need specific support to
promote and support good hygiene behaviour (for both host communities and refugees according to some of the results of the REACH assessment).

Lastly, there might be a risk of studies overlapping with other donors’ funding because they are carried out in coordination with one stakeholder only, who might not be in discussion with all the donors and may not share the results with other stakeholders. This is especially the case for the groundwater assessment, which has also been requested by some WEs whereas only a national study has been carried out.

F.1.3. Emergency activities

Depending on the NGO and IS, not all refugees have access to the same quality of WASH services, with some having access to greywater treatment or regular desludging for example. We were unable to collect enough information to explain this difference; however, it could be due to the different monitoring levels of the NGOs, with some having more contact with UNICEF than others, or to the way the implementing partners are selected. The NGO’s experience of implementing emergency and stabilisation activities, their knowledge of the specifics of this crisis and the Lebanese context and their staff skills can also play a part in their capacity to implement the activities. The short timeframe to implement the activities is a crucial point raised by NGOs and presented like major obstacle hampering the WASH services quality.

F.1.4. Vulnerability

Three priorities were used to conceptualise vulnerability in Lebanon within the context of the Syrian crisis22 (human vulnerability, geographic vulnerability, systemic vulnerability), and these have been cross-referenced with four aspects to conceptualise and understand community-level vulnerabilities (demographic pressure, poverty and deprivation, access to basic services and infrastructure and social stability).

For the stabilisation component, the most vulnerable people are targeted through the most vulnerable areas of Lebanon, in which UNICEF selects the projects to be implemented. However, this does not necessarily result in the most vulnerable people inside the area being reached, as they are not directly targeted in the project design and implementation. Not enough data is available to assess the relevance of the process in reaching the most vulnerable people; however partners have been questioning this approach. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the implementation of activities in vulnerable areas that do not directly target the most vulnerable population can have a positive effect on this population by reducing social tension between communities. This is particularly the case for the stabilisation projects. Vulnerability thus has to be understood in a broader sense in the Lebanese context.

For the emergency component, women and children are targeted through specific HP sessions and with special arrangements of latrines. Some NGOs target disabled people by offering specially adapted latrines, as the programme imposes it as a requirement since 2016. The remainder of the activities are designed and implemented for all the refugees in ISs. Moreover, although the water delivery service benefits women and children as they no longer have to walk long distances to get water, the men remain the primary users of the water. In addition, women and children are in charge of dealing with the rubbish, water and cleaning, whereas men are not involved in WASH activities. The high density of many of the IS means higher use of the services, reducing the availability of water and leading to the overuse of latrines, septic tanks or rubbish disposal facilities, thus increasing the burden on women. There is thus a gap between the intended and final results. It has to be noted that the response to the needs of the Syrian refugees and to the needs of the most vulnerable groups of this

22 REACH Assessment
population (women, girls and children) does not always produce the expected results. In targeting women, girls and children, emergency response stakeholders may in fact be increasing their vulnerability by exposing them to unexpected – but culturally explainable - reactions from the men (increase in early marriages as girls are seen as a way to earn money through the empowerment activities, increase in domestic violence because of lack of employment among the men that generates frustration and social blame, etc.). This might not be considered as a core aspect of WASH issues (even if some signs were identified during the site visits and FGDs with regard to water availability) but it nonetheless needs to be highlighted as a crucial issue for the inclusion of vulnerability in the Emergency activities.

F.1.5. Refugee behaviour change

There has been no strong improvement in hygiene practices among the refugees following the implementation of hygiene promotion sessions. There is a lack of information as to the reasons for this, although possible explanations could be that the topics do not meet the refugees’ needs, the refugees do not understand the recommendations, or simply do not want to implement them.

However, based on the interviews with NGOs and municipalities, as well as the FGD and the REACH Assessment, it seems that the designed activities were not tailored to the social and cultural situation in the IS. Thus, activities failed to take into account the fact that women and children exclusively carry the burden of dealing with WASH issues, that the refugee communities in the IS do not all come from the same social and economic backgrounds, and that the internal organization of each community revolves around the Chawich, whose power and interests often run counter to the interests of individuals within the community.

The lack of accurate knowledge of the way each community functions makes it difficult to design specifically targeted activities that factor in local constraints, which explains why the intended behaviour change objectives and related results have not been achieved.

F.1.6. Lack monitoring tools, indicators and data management

In order to ensure effective project implementation, proper monitoring of the activities and the implementing partners is required. For the emergency component, the programme delegates activity implementation to partners, with various results on the level of service delivery provided. The third party monitoring system and the implementing partner assessment make it possible to verify the implementation quality of a partner and take corrective measures if necessary. These tools seem to work properly considering the adaptations that have been made over the years (change of partner when it is necessary, review of objectives and targets, etc.).

But within the framework of this evaluation, the consultant didn’t have access to a clear and complete data storage tool describing the fund tracking, the annual HR budget breakdown per component, the number of beneficiaries per implementing partner (or per project), the number of targeted beneficiaries and the number of final beneficiaries per activity, etc. These data do exist because it has been possible to collect progressively some of them but not in a comprehensive table resuming all existing data on the programme. It makes it then difficult for any external actor to get clear and complete information on the programme.

F.2. Lessons Learned

F.2.1. Flexibility

Throughout the four years of the programme, the programme has demonstrated its ability to enable activity management and implementation to adapt and evolve. For the emergency component, the
zone offices mean staff members remain closer to the ground and are thus able to adapt more quickly to changing situations. A number of activities have been removed or added along the years (distribution of kits, WASH committees, etc.) and the programme has also shifted towards providing increasing support to stabilisation activities to take into account the host communities’ needs. To achieve this, the programme has improved coordination with the MoEW, starting in 2016. For the capacity-building component, the programme has worked towards increasing sector knowledge, even if this meant deviating from UNICEF’s initial aim.

The flexibility of this programme is one of the main added-values of UNICEF’s intervention in Lebanon. It has helped adapt the activities to the changing context, and especially to the political situation that is highly volatile in Lebanon. It has helped to enhance the trust of the MoEW in UNICEF’s ability to respond to institutional needs and provided an opportunity for the national authorities to benefit from structuring studies for sector development.

The example of the UNICEF WASH programme shows that flexibility is a significant part in the achievement of the objectives of a programme. The ever changing and new situations, the evolution of political and social contexts, and the changing needs of the target population make it necessary for the activities and objectives to evolve and adapt, whatever are the context and outputs of a programme.

**F.2.2. Coordination**

The different programme components showed the importance of setting up an efficient coordination process, which involves all relevant stakeholders. In the programme, problems have been seen with municipalities not allowing NGOs to access the IS because of a lack of previous coordination with them. In addition, the lack of coordination with the WEs has led to difficulties with infrastructure handover and their operation and maintenance. However, there are efficient mechanisms in place that have prevented the overlapping of activities.

Although there is room for improvement, the coordination mechanisms put in place through this programme are a step forward in Lebanon, where there has previously always been a lack of communication between stakeholders.

The experience of the UNICEF WASH programme highlights the importance of coordination between all relevant stakeholders in the implementation of a programme. It can facilitate the implementation of activities and ensure ownership of the activities, both from partners and beneficiaries.

**F.2.3. Designing multi-faceted projects**

The activities implemented in Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen showed a very high level of ownership, which in turn is a basis for sustainability. Involving all categories of the population, including children, in a proactive process through adapted multifaceted activities that combine WASH and social aspects and which have an immediately tangible impact (the areas are clean, conflict is reduced, etc.), has helped the Programme to initiate a long-term process.

This process of implementing multifaceted activities can be applied to other programmes to ensure the sustainability of the activities implemented.
G. Recommendations

The following recommendations are aiming at the UNICEF WASH programme Beirut Office.

The recommendations were developed by the evaluation team, according to the findings of the evaluation. The evaluation team focused on the weaknesses of the programme and its possibilities for improvement, to help achieve its objective of improving WASH conditions for the most vulnerable population.

The recommendations were then discussed and clarified during a meeting with the UNICEF team, before their validation by the WASH team.

G.1. Consolidate coordination mechanisms

G.1.1. Coordinate with the WEs for the stabilisation projects

According to Law 221/2000, the WEs are the service providers and are thus the main stakeholders of any infrastructure project implemented in their area. The strong coordination developed with the MoEW should be maintained, as it reinforces MoEW leadership and aligns the programme with the National Strategy. However, the lack of coordination between the MoEW and the WEs has to be taken into account and the programme should mitigate this issue by involving the WEs in the design and implementation of the projects selected (as set out in the National Water Strategy). This would enable them to monitor the projects and would facilitate the operation and maintenance that the WEs will subsequently have to carry out after handover.

The lack of communication between MoEW and WEs is an internal issue, mostly due to personality issues and political postures, but as other foreign technical and financial partners do, it is possible to create communication spaces as periodical meetings in each WEs headquarter and in presence of MoEW representatives, specific meetings in Beirut held at the invitation of the Ministry of Energy and Water among sectorial stakeholders and other technical and financial partners. It can also be done at UNICEF offices or in neutral locations (for example workshops on specific issues held in hotels in Beirut).

This means for UNICEF to set up for the coming years mechanisms with the MoEW in order to strengthen the involvement of WEs and to design roadmap and tools for the consultation processes in the activities planning.

G.1.2. Coordinate with the municipalities

The programme could involve the municipalities in the design and implementation phases of the projects for the stabilisation and emergency components (mostly to define soft component of the projects)

For the stabilisation component, they are relevant stakeholders for municipal (sewer) network construction and maintenance. They also are closer to the beneficiaries and so are aware of their needs and can help select and design projects that satisfy beneficiary requirements. In the event of opposition on the part of the local population, they can also intervene to help resolve conflict. For water project, they could be part of the dissemination of the WEs information and communication plan and could also be mobilized as partners for the transmission of information to the local population covered by the stabilisation projects.

However, their involvement cannot be seen as an overall strategy because it is intrinsically linked to the political context, the mayors’ personality and their political will to work in collaboration with the
WEs or any institution considered as a representative of the central government. It has then to be defined on a case-by-case basis.

For the emergency component, the municipalities could be closely involved in the activities in order to increase their sustainability. They can provide relevant information and data on the local situation and needs. They are by the law the main stakeholders of local solid waste management and some of them (depending on the mayors’ personality and political will) are strongly involved in the respond to the Syrian crisis (organisation of social activities with refugees and host communities, provision of basic services, etc.). -But here again, it has to be done from case to case depending on the local context.

Municipalities could also be a beneficiary of the capacity-building component, as there is a demand of institutional and technical support. Moreover, this would help them become more effectively involved in the other two components.

In that framework, UNICEF could design a specific strategy, which could be linked with the recommendation in G.5 (Carry out a specific study on the role of municipalities in the Response to the Syrian Crisis). The results of this study will allow defining specific strategy and tools to improve municipalities’ involvement in the Programme implementation.

G.2. Support host communities along with refugees through stabilisation projects and capacity-building activities

The presence of refugees has a considerable impact on the host community’s immediate environment (natural resources, public services, environment, etc.), which - when added to the international help for refugees - results in tension between the two communities. The municipalities’ lack of involvement in the emergency activities aggravates this situation and creates a feeling of resentment and unfairness. To counter this issue, the programme could implement stabilisation activities in municipalities where it is supporting refugees in ISs.

Working on both service delivery improvement in ISs and local development in host communities at the same time would enable Syrian refugees and host communities to all benefit from the programme and would foster a sense of inclusion among the host community. The programme would have to work closely with the municipalities to define their needs in a precise and equitable way, providing them with technical input and institutional support, and thus reinforce their on water, sanitation and solid waste collection capacities.

Most of the municipalities which host Syrian refugees are not part of the 251 list of vulnerable localities. It could be then relevant to define a specific strategy for these municipalities in the stabilisation projects selection process as it appears to be an overall matter.

This means for UNICEF to assess the needs of the host communities and their municipalities in their main intervention areas of the emergency component. This will lead to carry out specific context and need assessment studies in order to define stabilisation interventions – or capacity building activities – for these communities.
G.3. Improve the stabilisation projects selection process

The stabilisation project selection process consists of two parts: a list of required projects is provided by the partners then the projects to be funded from this list are selected by identifying the most vulnerable areas as defined by UNICEF.

The list transmitted by the partners is usually based on guidelines or Master Plans and targets the most populated areas or those with the least service coverage. However, there is no clear methodology underpinning the MoEW and WE project selection process. The programme should thus ask for detailed information on each project on the list and for precise data on its expected results and why it is a priority.

Moreover, the most vulnerable areas criterion used by the programme does not guarantee that the most vulnerable people inside the area are reached. Thus, after selecting the projects from the partners’ list using the relevant criteria for achievement of the National Strategy, assessments should be conducted to determine the project’s ability to reach the most vulnerable people.

In addition, aspects other than vulnerability could be included in the selection criteria (as outlined in the REACH Assessment): tension between refugees and host communities, number of refugees in the area (which would enable the equity aspect to be taken into account as it increases the pressure on services).

Lastly, it is crucial to add social support to the project’s implementation (communication on good behaviour, on the need to pay for the service delivered, etc.). For the last four years, the main sector partners have been adding this type of activity to their project in order to improve communication and coordination between national and local stakeholders (including future users) to ensure the sustainability of their project. This activity can be implemented by local stakeholders who are strong facilitators (NGOs mostly) to prevent blockages during the construction phase, who can support the WEs with the handover and raise the users’ awareness of various aspects of the service (respect of the facilities, water bill payments, etc.).

It has to be noticed that UNICEF is currently improving this process for the coming years.

G.4. Reinforce collaboration with local implementing partners

The WASH service delivery provided to the refugees is unequal and should be improved to ensure good quality service delivery for all IS. The programme should more closely and equally accompany all the NGOs implementing the activities by giving them clear instructions, especially after changes are made to the guidelines and by giving them more time and stability to implement the activities (increase the contracts duration, ensure conditions for a strong handover in case of change of implementing partner). This would sustainably strengthen the NGOs and enable all NGOs to provide and implement equally good service and activities.

Moreover, for cultural reasons, local NGOs are more comfortable dealing with IS. It is recommended that the programme develops a pool of local NGOs to act as its direct implementing partners. These partners would also be the most effective at implementing projects that target both refugees and host communities as they can be an effective link between them. But this has to be balanced by the lack of local NGOs specialised on WASH interventions and then the risk of overloading the ones that could be able to work on this programme.
For the emergency component, this recommendation could be progressively implemented in promoting in the first step, from case to case, partnerships between international and local NGOs, which could allow on the one hand skill transferring to local NGOs and on the other hand improving the adaptation of some activities to local contexts. And in a second phase, based on a geographical coherence, these NGOs could become direct implementing partners.

For the stabilisation component, it could be relevant to identify per area some NGOs able to work on soft activities (communication, public awareness, social activities, etc.) as it has been done in Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen.

**G.5. Carry out a specific study on the role of municipalities in the Response to the Syrian Crisis**

The role of municipalities in WASH sector and in the crisis response is not clear and is subject to debate. Some of them are strongly involved in the service delivery for Syrian refugees while others don’t want to deal with the situation. But all the municipalities interviewed within this assignment asked for more information, involvement and support.

In this context, it could be relevant that UNICEF carry out a specific study on this topic in order to have a capitalisation on municipalities’ involvement in the crisis response (on WASH and solid waste issues) and to identify how they could be more mobilized and supported through the Programme. This could allow defining a clear strategy to fund the collect ant treatment of solid waste generated by IS and reviewing the scope of some activities (soft activities of the stabilisation component, specific topics for the capacity-building component, etc.).

The results of this study could be disseminate to other stakeholders of the crisis response in order to capitalise on good and bad practices and to adapt other programmes and project to the specific context of Lebanese municipalities and union of municipalities.

**G.6. Improve the monitoring tools, indicators and data management**

Just collecting data per component appears to be insufficient. To have confidence in its quality, consistency, and accessibility over time means developing clear procedures for its measurement, recording, and storage and security as well as descriptions about how these things change. To ensure it will be accessible for future users, it must also be stored and described in suitable ways.

Information about the data is also crucial - such as what, how, where, when, how often and by whom data is collected, as well as how it is recorded, stored and analysed. This information allows determining whether or not data sets collected at different times are truly compatible and so able to be combined to build accurate time series. It preserves a clear understanding of the data over the years despite staff turnover. It can set out criteria for significance when interpreting the data, as well as make clear any limitations in the measuring techniques applied or samples taken.

In order to improve the programme data management, it could be relevant to define specific framework and tools. The HRRP tables used by the team should provide clear information on expected outcomes and achieved outcomes per activity but it seems that they are not updated. These tables could also include the track funding per donors and some specific comments on key events. They could be updated on a monthly or quarterly basis with the support of implementing partners.
Each WASH specialist of the Zone Offices could collect the data and transmit them to the Beirut Office which will evaluate and compile them in an overall table.

However, this has to be balanced with the low level of HR costs, which could also mean a risk of understaffing, especially in the zone Offices. As the data management can be a time-consuming activity, this could require strengthening the team by recruiting additional staff.

**G.7. Tailor HP sessions to the local context and with gender considerations**

There has been no strong improvement in hygiene practices among the refugees following the implementation of hygiene promotion sessions. The lack of accurate knowledge of the way each community functions makes it difficult to design specifically targeted activities that factor in local constraints, which explains why the intended behaviour change objectives and related results have not been achieved. The designed activities were not tailored to the social and cultural situation in the IS.

Thus, activities failed to take into account the fact that women and children exclusively carry the burden of dealing with WASH issues, that the refugee communities in the IS do not all come from the same social and economic backgrounds, and that the internal organization of each community revolves around the Chawich, whose power and interests often run counter to the interests of individuals within the community.

For the emergency component, women and children are targeted through specific HP sessions. However, in targeting women, girls and children, emergency response stakeholders may in fact be increasing their vulnerability by exposing them to unexpected – but culturally explainable - reactions from the men (increase in early marriages as girls are seen as a way to earn money through the empowerment activities, increase in domestic violence because of lack of employment among the men that generates frustration and social blame, etc.).

The hygiene promotion sessions should thus take into account the context of the IS in its design and its targeting, working towards reducing the burden on women, and answering the specific needs of each IS. Assessments of the social context and local constraints for each IS should be led by each implementing partners to design the hygiene promotion sessions and target the right people. This would allow lowering the strong gender inequalities in IS. This should be done in an inception phase allowing the activities implementation after UNICEF validation of the context assessment.
H. Annexes

H.1. Annex 1: Terms of references

Evaluation of UNICEF WASH Programme

Background:
The influx of Syrian refugees has exacerbated Lebanon’s already stretched water, wastewater and solid waste management systems and services, which were underfunded and underperforming even before the crisis.

According to the #Lebanon Environmental Assessment of the Syrian Conflict & Priority Interventions, September 2014# report, refugees contribute to an increase in wastewater generation between 8 and 14 per cent, and it is estimated that demand for water has increased by 8 to 12 per cent by the end of 2014. The incremental annual waste generated by refugees is significant and is equivalent to 15.7 per cent of the solid waste generated by Lebanese citizens prior to the crisis; solid waste management is decentralized to the municipality level with limited regulation.

Pre-crisis, wastewater networks reach 60% of the population and up to 92 per cent of Lebanon’s sewage is discharged untreated into watercourses, groundwater and the sea, and the remainder only primary treated, with little improvement since due a focus on providing basic water needs by most donors. Water supply networks reach 80% of the population; however there are significant water losses in aging supply networks (up to 48%) and high levels of illegal access due to poorly unregulated service providers, resulting in continuity of supply as low as 3 hours per day in many areas.

Lebanon is already using two thirds of its available water resources, high by global standards (averaging 10-30% for other regions), and there is significant groundwater mining. Significant groundwater declines of up to 20m in some areas (period 2013-2014) have been observed, and are expected to increase due to climate change. There is a serious risk, that Lebanon will not be able to achieve SGD 6 by 2020. Due to the increasing poor condition of supply infrastructure, lack of reliable services and the fact that Lebanon’s water sources are receiving increasing loads of human and agricultural contaminants making water unsafe, thereby destabilizes previous achievements. Of particular concern in Lebanon is the quality of drinking water and inequity of supply. Up to 90% of natural sources are affected by bacterial contamination in populated/urban areas, with 70% nationally contaminated. Ali host and refugee populations, rural and urban, are affected to some degree by the lack of WASH services depending on their wealth status and geographic location.

The responsible government authorities, including multiple Ministries, Water Establishments (WES) and Municipalities are under resourced both financially and in human capital, and need a significant capital investment with capacity building to sustain the implementation of strategies based on recent sector reforms and to develop sustainable and realistic plans that ensure reduced impact on the environment and effective, sustainable service provision.

Syrian refugees living in temporary settlements (by the end of 2015, more than 175,000 right holders living in around 1,900 Informal Settlements with more than 4 tents) make up a disparate category of vulnerable people whose needs are not considered in government planning and must therefore be prioritized, especially regarding access to appropriate and clean water and sanitation facilities.

UNICEF reactivated its WASH programme in 2013, and significantly scaled up its WASH activities targeting the most vulnerable areas and children. Over 1.5 million people, 56% Lebanese living in both urban and rural areas, benefited from improved access to safe water, and over 100,000 Syrian
Refugees living in 1,500 Informal Settlements benefited from the full range of humanitarian WASH services.

In order to contribute to the overall outcome, three separate although interlinked components were designed to respond to the major gaps identified for water, sanitation and hygiene provision in Lebanon. These include:

1. Strengthen the capacities and information systems of authorities in Lebanon

This component of WASH UNICEF programme focuses on (i) Assessing WASH vulnerability of disadvantaged groups through studies and assessments that might directly affect child health and (ii) Providing capacity building to relevant water regulating authorities to implement approved water and wastewater strategies and (infrastructure) Masterplans. (Key Partners: Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW) and Water Establishment’s (WEs)).

2. WASH in Emergencies

UNICEF and WASH partners implemented a holistic package of non-permanent WASH interventions to meet basic needs in informal (refugee) settlements by providing sufficient quantities of safe water, arrangement of basic sanitation, and promoting appropriate hygiene behavior to support Syrian refugees in the humanitarian situation (Key partners: MoEW, Ministry of Public Health (MoPH)).

3. WASH urban/stabilisation interventions

WASH related stabilisation projects focused on support to neighborhoods populated by the host and refugee populations and were undertaken separately to the humanitarian response.

The stabilisation approach seeks to implement the strategic planning of the Government of Lebanon, however was prepared pre-Syrian crisis and does not consider humanitarian support or support based on vulnerability. UNICEF’s response targets the most vulnerable children through implementing the agreed legislative approach.

Two other components of UNICEF programming fall into the stabilisation interventions. UNICEF WASH Section started implementing a WASH in school programming, focusing on the software component while the Education Section implements the hardware component. UNICEF has also been providing equipment and training on Solid Waste Management to municipalities, shifting to encouraging recycling.

Objectives, Purpose & Expected results:

Purpose: UNICEF is commissioning a WASH evaluation to generate substantial knowledge and learning on the results of WASH Programme to strengthen UNICEF and National strategies in order to improve national systems capacity, water quality, water supply, sanitation services, and public health behavior in Lebanon. UNICEF will be the primary user of the evaluation report. Ministries, local authorities and implement Ong partners will be the secondary users.

Objectives: The evaluation will explore how WASH Programme has contributed towards improving access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene to host communities and refugee populations in Lebanon.

More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation are to:

(i) Learn from previous implementation (2013-2015) of humanitarian WASH Programme on the targeted children, women and vulnerable population.

(ii) Learn from UNICEF’s partnership with Ministries and local authorities addressing WASH vulnerability.

(iii) Provide specific recommendations on the basis of lessons learned in order to improve planning and implementation for better delivery of results for the most vulnerable. These recommendations will be utilized by UNICEF to feed into future strategies for the Syrian crisis response.
Purpose and description of assignment and Scope of work:

The scope of the evaluation will focus on the UNICEF Lebanon Country Office WASH Programme component, encompassing the 3 components listed above. The period 2013 to 2015 will be considered as the time frame for the evaluation in all governorates of Lebanon including Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck/Hermel, Beirut, Mount Lebanon, South and Nabatieh.

a. Coverage and level of results

The evaluation will focus on three components of the UNICEF WASH Programme in Lebanon. They represent the totality of WASH UNICEF#s support of vulnerable population.

Strengthen the capacity of water authorities in Lebanon to address WASH vulnerability: The specific evaluation focus under this outcome is:

1- National and regional capacities are strengthened to implement National Water Sector Strategy (2010) that seeks to stabilize systems for the most disadvantaged groups.

2- Data sources are improved to develop national WASH vulnerability and which is used to inform stabilisation projects.

3- Awareness and response to water scarcity are enhanced to improve sustainable interventions.

WASH in Emergencies:

The specific evaluation focus under this outcome is:

1- Sustainable and gender appropriate access to safe and equitable water is ensured for the target population in sufficient quantities for drinking, cooking, personal and domestic hygiene.

2- Access to improved, sustainable, culturally and gender appropriate sanitation services for target population is increased.

3- Target populations are aware of key public health risks and are capacitated to adopt good hygiene practices and measures to prevent the deterioration in hygienic conditions and to use and maintain the facilities available.

WASH urban/stabilisation interventions:

The specific evaluation focus under this outcome is:

1- Sustainable and gender appropriate access to safe and equitable water is ensured for the target population in sufficient quantities for drinking, cooking, personal and domestic hygiene (Water Supply).

2- Access to improved, sustainable, culturally and gender appropriate sanitation services for target population is increased (Waste water and Solid Waste).

These 3 components represent the focus of UNICEF and Ministries# work plans over the last 3 years.

The evaluation will focus on specific outputs under these main outcomes with further details to assess the coverage, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability.

b. Time period covered by the evaluation

The period 2013-2015 will be considered as the time frame for the evaluation.

c. Timing of the evaluation

As highlighted in the objectives of the evaluation, a key strategic utility is for it to feed into future UNICEF and National strategies for the Syrian crisis response.

Evaluation questions:
The following are key questions of the evaluation in line with OECD-DAC criteria (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Assistance Committee):

1. How effective and efficient was the partnership between UNICEF and National local authorities in delivering results for the most vulnerable children in Lebanon?
   a. To what extent have UNICEF contributed to the implementation of national strategies and influenced the ministries to consider the most disadvantaged children as priority interventions?
   b. To what degree does the programme provide evidence to inform decision making on WASH related national policies and plans?
   c. To what extent do national and local authorities have sufficient capacity to take on tasks without UNICEF support?
   d. What are the constraints that were identified? What are the actions raised? What are the recommendations that follow?

How effective, efficient and appropriate were UNICEF WASH emergency and urban/stabilisation interventions?

   e. Does the program reach the most vulnerable population in Lebanon?
   f. To what degree the interventions meet the needs of the communities and users particularly women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations?
   g. To what extent has the planned and implemented response reduced WASH related vulnerability?
   h. To what extent the program has contributed to create sustained local ownership and involved local communities in the decision making process?
   i. To what extent are the interventions sustainable and reduce vulnerability for future generations?
   j. To what extent UNICEF established partnerships or coordination with other key actors (e.g. implementing partners, local authorities, other line ministries and other UN agencies conducting complementary interventions) to enhance processes and results, to avoid duplication of intervention, and set a clear description of roles and responsibilities within joint initiatives?
   k. To what extend has the WASH interventions converged with other programmes lead by UNICEF and contributed to UNICEF global strategy in Lebanon?
   l. To what extent the WASH programme design and implementation are aligned with UNICEF's renewed focus on equity?

   m. What are the constraints and gaps that were identified? What are the actions raised? What are the recommendations that follow?

Evaluation Stakeholders:

A preliminary mapping of relevant stakeholders of the Wash programme by the committee of the evaluation has identified the below list of stakeholders. In addition these stakeholder are divided into four sub-categories depending on their relative level of interest and relative influence. This is intended to be a preliminary guide to assist in mapping out the key stakeholders who the team will engage with and tailor the products accordingly:

High INFLUENCE and High INTEREST

- MEW
- Water Establishment
- Donors
- UNICEF
- UNHCR

Low INFLUENCE and Low INTEREST
- Local Communities
- WASH Committees
- Women
- Children (girls and boys)

Low INFLUENCE and High INTEREST
- International/national NGOS
- Municipalities (Mayors)
- WASH (coordination) sector

Ethical considerations:
In line with the Standards for UN Evaluation in the UN System (developed by the UN Evaluation Group), all those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities will aspire to conduct high quality and ethical work guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles. The proposal must identify actual or potential ethical issues, as well as measures and methods adopted to mitigate against these issues. All interviewees will be informed with the purpose of the evaluation and their role and what information is required specifically from them. Confidentiality of their views is ensured. If interviewees will include minors, a written consent should be taken from the persons in charge of their care. All the documents, including data and fieldwork instruments, developed in the course of this consultancy are the intellectual property of UNICEF.

Management of the evaluation:
The evaluation will be managed by a reference group represented by the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist with support from the WASH sector focal points. The reference group will oversee the timely implementation of the evaluation work plan and provide overall guidance in the management of the evaluation process and will be the main contact point for the evaluation team within UNICEF.

The reference group will also be responsible for approving the inception report and the final report as well as for finalizing the evaluation management response in consultation with the representative.

In addition, UNICEF team will support the coordination of the evaluation, by facilitating the evaluation team and providing necessary assistance, information to effectively support the WASH Programme Evaluation. The Regional Office (RO) will raise be invited to comment on the draft deliverables. SPPME together with the Representative and in consultation with Chief of WASH will give final approval for all the deliverable, including inception report, the final evaluation report prior to final payment.

UNICEF team will be responsible in the evaluation of bids and act as the selection panel following the rules and regulations of UNICEF, which will be the contacting party.

Deliverables:
Phase 1 (10 days)
Review background documentation, including reports on WASH programme interventions, policies, guidelines, other WASH evaluations in Lebanon and other countries that have similar context as Lebanon.

Phase 2 (20 days)
Develop an inception report including evaluation design and detailed methodology/tools, work plan for data collection, and data analysis outline/framework.

Deliverables: Inception Report submitted to UNICEF Lebanon country office

Phase 3 (20 days) Data collection:
Meet/interview/group discussion with relevant key stakeholders and beneficiaries Deliverables: Interviews and group discussion with key stakeholders conducted in due time.

Phase 4
- Perform analysis and produce draft preliminary findings and Produce draft evaluation report

Deliverables: Preliminary findings and draft report available and shared with UNICEF Lebanon country office, regional office and other key stakeholders. (25 days)
- Produce final evaluation report

Deliverable: Final report shared with UNICEF Lebanon Country Office, regional office and other key stakeholders. (15 days).

Methodology:
The methodology for this evaluation will mainly be qualitative in gaining insights from range of stakeholders and analyzing available quantitative data and other relevant documents. The overall methodology should be participatory and should ensure that the various social groups including the most marginalized will be reached and their voices elicited. It is expected that the evaluation will use the following methods at a minimum.

- Desk Review of key Programme documents: analysis of data from reports, studies, national
- HH surveys and administrative data from MoEW, Water Establishment, MoPH, MoE and others.
- Key informant interviews with beneficiaries (women, children and adolescents) in Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck Hermel, Beirut, Mount Lebanon, South and Nabathieh.
- Focus group discussions with communities (women, children, adolescents), in Akkar, North, Bekaa, Baalbeck Hermel, Beirut, Mount Lebanon, South and Nabathieh. 2 to 3 focus group discussions per area with communities and 2 focus group discussion with 2 partners selected by UNICEF and 1 focus group discussion with staff from the ministry (if possible).
- Personal interviews with:

One focal point from the water establishment and one from Ministry of Energy and Water in Beirut and the North, South, Bekaa and Beirut/Mount Lebanon.

One project manager from 2 biggest partners (NGOs/INGOs) in the North, South, Bekaa and Beirut/Mount Lebanon.

The team can further elaborate these requirements in the inception report as appropriate and needed.

Existing information sources:
The following are some of the key information sources for the evaluation:
- UNICEF and MEW work plan
- HHRP 2015
- LCRP strategy and progress reports
- REACH Assessment
- Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr)
- Community Assessment: OCHA/UNICEF/REACH
- Household Survey
- Assessment of Groundwater Resources of Lebanon (2014) # MoE & UNDP
- State and Trends of the Lebanese Environment (2010) # MoE & UNDP

Responsibilities:
The consultancy firm is responsible to produce the following by the stated deadline:
- Desk review and preparation of the inception report: 30 days
- Data collection: 20 days
- Final report draft submission: 25 days Final report: 15 days

Reporting requirements:
The team will report to the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist who will coordinate with the WASH focal person for the evaluation.
The report will be electronically submitted to the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Qualification Requirements:
The staff from the company should have the following qualifications:
- Team Leader (International)

Work Experience and academic qualification:
Advanced University degree with preferably at least 8 years of work experience (both international and national) in WASH in both humanitarian and long term solutions;
A minimum of preferably 8 years of practical experience in implementing evaluations; Qualitative and quantitative methods expertise;
Excellent report writing and analytical skills in English; Knowledge of Arabic language will be an asset;
Familiarity with UNICEF’s programming strategies and organizational culture;
Previous experience in undertaking evaluations for WASH programmes or similar work experience in the Region specifically in Lebanon will be an asset;
Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills;
Familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;
- Overall team requirements

University degree in one of the disciplines relevant to the following areas: Public Health, Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Geology, Hydrology, Sanitation Engineering, or a field relevant to international WASH related development assistance;
Good understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies especially in qualitative method and qualitative data collection;
Previous experience in undertaking evaluations especially for WASH programme is considered an advantage; Familiarity with UNICEF's programming strategies and organizational culture;

Familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software;

Fluent in both English and Arabic languages.

Timing/Duration of Contract: 3 months

Duty Station: Beirut

Administrative issues: Overall, management oversight will be provided by UNICEF. The evaluation team is to be based in Lebanon for the entire period of the consultancy.

Project management: the project will be managed by the SPPME unit of UNICEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How relevant is the programme to the priority of the country and to the direct beneficiaries: Syrian refugees and Lebanese host communities? To what extent does the programme meet social/economic/development needs?</td>
<td>Q1.1.1. The programme objectives and activities are consistent/aligned with the MoEW national strategies regarding the sectorial monitoring, the service delivery and the management of the refugees crisis;</td>
<td>- National Water Sector Strategy (2010) and National Wastewater Sector Strategy (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1.1.2. The programme objectives, activities (strategic studies implemented, emergency and stabilisation activities) and the target beneficiaries are aligned with UNICEF’s strategy in Lebanon (especially on equity, gender and human rights aspects) and with other UNICEF programmes (education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc.);</td>
<td>- Lebanon WASH sector strategy (LCRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1.1.3. The activities implemented helped achieve the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon.</td>
<td>- HRRP tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interview with MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews with UNICEF Lebanon staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF WASH strategies in Lebanon (UNICEF Lebanon CO WASH Strategy, National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- HRRP tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning documents of other UNICEF programmes (education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc.) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews with UNICEF Lebanon staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF strategy in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q1.2. To what extent has UNICEF been able to adapt its activities and approaches in order to complement the intervention of other key actors at global level and how relevant is the coverage of the programme? | Q1.2.1. The intervention areas of other key actors do not overlap with UNICEF activities; | - NGO reports  
- UNICEF strategy in Lebanon  
- Interviews with UNICEF Lebanon staff  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
|                                             | Q1.2.2. The capacity buildings activities are complementary with other national sectorial strengthening activities; | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports |
|                                             | Q1.2.3. The coverage of the WASH in emergencies component reached the vulnerable population and has been coordinated with national | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1.2.4. The coverage of the stabilisation component reached vulnerable population and areas that are not directly covered by other national infrastructures projects implemented by the Ministry or the CDR | and international stakeholders; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- FGDs with beneficiaries  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| Q1.3. How adequate is the rationale behind the choice of partners at national or local levels and at implementation level? | Q1.3.1. The partnerships have helped achieve the programme objectives; | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1.3.2. MoEW, RWE and municipalities facilitated definition and implementation of the stabilisation activities; | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |                                                                            |
| Q1.3.3. MoEW, RWE, municipalities and NGOs facilitated definition and implementation of the WASH in emergencies activities; | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW |                                                                            |
| Q1.3.4. The implementing partners were sufficiently skilled and set-up to carry out the requested activities (NGOs for the WASH in emergencies component, RWEs for the stabilisation component, staff of the Ministry and RWE for the sectorial monitoring improvement activities); | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs |                                                                            |
| Q1.3.5. A clear description of roles and responsibilities with partners and stakeholders has been set. | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW |                                                                            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1.4. To what extent have the intended activities corresponded to the needs of the target beneficiaries? | Q1.4.1. Strategic tools are designed/used to identify the intervention sites and target population (for WASH in emergencies and stabilisation components); | - One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  |
|  | Q1.4.2. Activities are designed according to identified needs for each component; | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- Targeting and needs assessment studies (LCRP strategy and progress reports of NGOs, REACH Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr))  
- UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016  
|  | Q1.4.3. The level of WASH services for children and the most vulnerable population is improved; | - HRRP tables  
- Needs assessment studies (LCRP strategy and progress reports of NGOs, REACH Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr))  
- UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One to one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  |
|  |  | - FGDs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  |
### Evaluative questions for each expected output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Q1.4.4.** The satisfaction level of the direct beneficiaries (RWEs for stabilisation component, Refugees and host communities for the WASH in emergencies component, the MoEW and RWEs staff and representatives for the capacity building component); | - One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- Annual activity reports  
- NGO reports  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Site visits |
| **Q1.4.5.** Women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations’ needs have been specifically taken into account in the activities’ design. | - FGDs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW |

### Effectiveness

**Did the programme accomplish its intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaulative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q2.1. Overall, what have been the outcomes of UNICEF’s institutional contribution to the WASH sector in Lebanon during the evaluation period? | Q2.1.1. UNICEF contributed to the implementation of national strategies; | - National Water Sector Strategy (2010) and National Wastewater Sector Strategy (2012)  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| | Q2.1.2. National policies and strategies have evolved using UNICEF recommendations and tools; | - Topic and main findings/added value of the studies undertaken by UNICEF  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| | Q2.1.3. Recent changes to the MoEW and RWE vision of sector priorities; | - Topic and main findings/added value of the studies undertaken by UNICEF  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q2.1.4. Overall sector knowledge and monitoring has been improved; | - Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) | - Topic and main findings/added value of the studies undertaken by UNICEF  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| Q2.1.5. Level of MoEW involvement in conducting and approving the strategic studies; | - One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members | |
| Q2.1.6. The capacities of the authorities regulating the sector have been enhanced; | - One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Annual activity reports | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1.7. The most disadvantaged children are considered as priority interventions by the ministry;</td>
<td>- Topic and main findings/added value of the studies undertaken by UNICEF</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1.8. The programme has helped inform decision making on WASH related national policies and plans</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2. To what extent has the partnership/coordination with major stakeholders enhanced the capability of the programme to achieve the targeted objectives?</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2.2. No major stakeholder has been left out of activity planning and implementation;</td>
<td>One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual activity reports</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO reports</td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Q2.2.3. Activities have been successfully managed by the responsible authorities. | One-to-one interviews with the MoEW | - One-to-one interviews with the MoEW |
| | One-to-one interviews with NGOs | - One-to-one interviews with NGOs |
| | One-to-one interviews with RWEs | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs |
| | One-to-one interviews with Municipalities | - One-to-one interviews with Municipalities |
| | One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members |
| | Annual activity reports | - Annual activity reports |
| | Reports to UNICEF donors | - Reports to UNICEF donors |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q2.3. To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? | Q2.3.1. Improvement level of the water quality; | - NGO reports  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| Q2.3.2. Number of people having access to improved sanitation; | | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Site visits |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q2.3.3. Number of people having access to an improved source of water; | - One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Site visits | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Site visits |
| Q2.3.4. Number of people having access to a waste disposal mechanism; | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Site visits |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3.5. Number of people trained in good WASH behaviour;</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one discussions with host communities</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Site visits</td>
<td>- Site visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources:
- Annual activity reports
- Reports to UNICEF donors
- NGO reports
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3.6. Number of people with access to hygiene, dignity or baby kits or vouchers;</td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3.7. Changes in the percentage of waterborne diseases and other hygiene-related diseases in ITS;</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q2.3.8. Nature and cause of any external and internal factors influencing the activities' implementation; | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries | - Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Site visits |
| Q2.3.9. Satisfaction level of direct beneficiaries interviewed; | - FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities | |
| Q2.3.10. Number of studies done for the capacity-building component; | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Annual activity reports | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3.11. Children and most vulnerable people have been the primary beneficiaries of the programme.</td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors&lt;br&gt;- Studies undertaken by UNICEF&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)&lt;br&gt;- Annual activity reports&lt;br&gt;- Reports to UNICEF donors&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with NGOs&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with RWEs&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members&lt;br&gt;- FDGs with beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one discussions with host communities&lt;br&gt;- Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4. Has UNICEF targeted its resources to reach areas where equity levels were lower / worrying? Were gender appropriate and human rights focused activities implemented?</td>
<td>Q2.4.1. Adequacy and effectiveness of the tools implemented to target the areas of interventions;</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports&lt;br&gt;- Reports to UNICEF donors&lt;br&gt;- NGO reports&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2.4.2. Main programme implementation areas;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Targeting and needs assessment studies (LCRP strategy and progress reports, REACH Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2.4.3. Average socio-economic profile of the target population;</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q2.4.4. The most vulnerable were primary targeted; | - One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Targeting and needs assessment studies (LCRP strategy and progress reports, REACH Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr))  
- UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 | |
| Q2.4.5. Activities are adapted to the specific needs of women and girls; | - Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- Targeting and needs assessment studies (LCRP strategy and progress reports, REACH Assessment, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian (VaSyr))  
- UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5. To what extent did the programme address any constraints met during the design and implementation phases?</td>
<td>Q2.5.1. Type and cause of any identified constraints;</td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one discussions with host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2.4.6. The services are used by everybody.</td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one discussions with host communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources:
- Annual activity reports
- Reports to UNICEF donors
- NGO reports
- One-to-one interviews with the MoEW
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members
- FDGs with beneficiaries
- One-to-one discussions with host communities
### Evaluative questions for each expected output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5.2. Type of action taken to address these constraints.</td>
<td>- NGO reports&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with NGOs&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with NGOs&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Efficiency

**How well did the programme teams use their human and financial resources to achieve the intended results? What could be done to ensure a more efficient use of resources and information?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1. Did the UNICEF human resources strategy enable proper implementation of the programme?</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1.1. Proportion of the programme budget allocated to UNICEF HR;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members&lt;br&gt;- Programme budget (HRRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1.2. Analysis of management processes;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with MoEW&lt;br&gt;- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1.3. Staff members’ profiles and skills (Beirut office and zone offices).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2. Did the rules and procedures for decision-making prove to be efficient?</td>
<td>Q3.2.1. Examples of rules and procedures established for activity planning and implementation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.2.2. Pattern of major decision-making at all levels (design, work plans, etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.2.3. Flaws/gaps observed in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3. To what extent were the activities implemented within reasonable timeframes and allocated resources and were there other ways to more efficiently implement the activities?</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q3.3.1. Average duration of main activity implementation; | | - NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF main subcontractors (WET and BTD)  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
| Q3.3.2. Average cost-range of the main activities (especially works) compared to the number of beneficiaries and to the average cost-range of other similar activities implemented by other agencies and other average prices from the market | | - Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)  
- Programme budget (HRRP)  
- BOQ used for the stabilisation activities  
- Price of the contracts for the stabilisation component  
- NGO reports  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF main subcontractors (WET and BTD) |
### Evaluative questions for each expected output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.3.3. Average quality of construction material.</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF main subcontractors (WET and BTD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability

*Are the benefits of the programme sustainable? Are there measures put in place to ensure sustainability?*

<p>| Q4.1. Was an exit strategy defined during the programme design phase? Is it relevant and realistic? |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Q4.1.1. Type of strategy and planned implementation processes; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW |
| | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members |
| Q4.1.2. Level of ownership of the strategy by the responsible authorities; | - One-to-one interviews with NGOs |
| | - One-to-one interviews with Municipalities |
| | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW |
| | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs |
| | - One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members |
| Q4.1.3. External factors cannot negatively influence the exit strategy. | - One-to-one interviews with NGOs |
| | - One-to-one interviews with Municipalities |
| | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW |
| | - One-to-one interviews with RWEs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2. To what extent are the procedures and mechanisms put in place by the programme likely to continue to function after the programme ends?</td>
<td>Q4.2.1. National and local authorities have sufficient capacity to take on tasks without UNICEF support;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4.2.2. The programme has helped create sustained local ownership and involved local communities in the decision-making process;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF WASH Unit staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one discussions with host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4.2.3. The relevant stakeholders have been adequately trained and their capacities strengthened to ensure effective service provision;</td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with MoEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with RWEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q4.2.4. A monitoring system is effectively used by the public authorities and (random and regular) visits are planned for post-completion monitoring; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members | |
| Q4.2.5. Programme outputs and procedures have been incorporated into national rules and procedures; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors | |
| Q4.2.6. Financial mechanisms put in place to sustain institutions and services; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors | |
| Data sources | Annual activity reports  
Reports to UNICEF donors  
NGO reports  
Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative questions for each expected output</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2.7. Communities are involved in WASH infrastructure management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.3. To what extent are the interventions sustainable and reduce vulnerability for future generations?</td>
<td>Q4.3.1. The infrastructure constructed is correctly maintained;</td>
<td>- FDGs with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one discussions with host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- One-to-one interviews with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports to UNICEF donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative questions for each expected output</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q4.3.2. Projects have led to behavioural change at national and local level; | - One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- FDGs with beneficiaries  
- One-to-one discussions with host communities  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors  
- NGO reports  
- Annual activity information reports (HRRP tables with achievements column) | |
| Q4.3.3. Updated national and local strategies and plans target vulnerable populations. | - Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW  
- Lebanon WASH strategy (LCRP)  
- One-to-one interviews with MoEW  
- One-to-one interviews with RWEs  
- One-to-one interviews with Municipalities  
- One-to-one interviews with UNICEF staff members  
- One-to-one interviews with NGOs  
- Annual activity reports  
- Reports to UNICEF donors | |
H.3. Annex 3: Changes in evaluative questions

In order to cover the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability criteria, the evaluation team modified some of the evaluation questions listed in the ToRs and converted others into indicators of broader questions, in order to make a more comprehensive evaluation matrix. For this reason and to cover other important aspects of the programme, the evaluation team also added extra questions and indicators. The evaluation questions are not separated by components to allow for an evaluation of the programme as a whole.

1. How effective and efficient was the partnership between UNICEF and National local authorities in delivering results for the most vulnerable children in Lebanon?

2. How effective, efficient and appropriate were UNICEF WASH emergency and urban/stabilisation interventions?

The main two questions are transversal and regroup several criteria. They are spread through the whole evaluation matrix and are answered through the questions developed by the evaluation team.

1. Question 1.1. of the ToRs

1.1. To what extend have UNICEF contributed to the implementation of national strategies and influenced the ministries to consider the most disadvantaged children as priority interventions?

This question has been included in a broader one, under the effectiveness criterion:

Q2.1. Overall, what have been the results of UNICEF’s institutional contribution to the WASH sector in Lebanon during the evaluation period?

The question is then divided into two indicators:

Q2.1.1. UNICEF contributed to the implementation of national strategies
Q2.1.7. The most disadvantaged children are considered as priority interventions by the ministry

2. Question 1.2. of the ToRs

1.2. To what degree does the programme provide evidence to inform decision making on WASH related national policies and plans?

This question has been divided into two questions into the effectiveness criterion:

Q2.1 Overall, what have been the results of UNICEF’s institutional contribution to the WASH sector in Lebanon during the evaluation period?

Q2.3 To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

It is then divided into the following indicators:

Q2.1.8. The programme has helped inform decision making on WASH related national policies and plans
Q2.3.10. Number of studies done for the capacity-building component

3. Question 1.3. of the ToRs

1.3. To what extent do national and local authorities have sufficient capacity to take on tasks without UNICEF support?

This question have been converted into an indicator (Q4.2.1: national and local authorities have sufficient capacity to take on tasks without UNICEF support), included in a broader question, under the criterion sustainability:

Q4.2. To what extent are the procedures and mechanisms put in place by the programme likely to continue to function after the programme ends?
4. **Question 1.4. of the ToRs**

1.4. What are the constraints that were identified? What are the actions raised? What are the recommendations that follow?

The first two questions are joined into one evaluation question, under the criteria effectiveness, and then separated into two distinctive indicators:

Q2.5. To what extent did the programme address any constraints met during the design and implementation phases?

Q2.5.1. Type and cause of any identified constraints;

Q2.5.2. Type of action taken to address these constraints.

The third question is not an evaluation question and will form a chapter of the final report.

5. **Question 2.1. of the ToRs**

2.1. Does the program reach the most vulnerable population in Lebanon?

This question is broad and was divided into several indicators in different questions, into the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability criteria.

Q1.2. To what extent has UNICEF been able to adapt its activities and approaches in order to complement the intervention of other partners at global level and how relevant is the coverage of the programme?

Q1.2.3. The coverage of the WASH in emergencies component reached the vulnerable population and has been coordinated with national and international stakeholders;

Q1.2.4. The coverage of the stabilisation component reached vulnerable population and areas that are not directly covered by other national infrastructures projects implemented by the Ministry or the CDR.

Q1.4. To what extent have the intended activities corresponded to the needs of the target beneficiaries?

Q1.4.3. The level of WASH services for children and the most vulnerable population is improved.

Q2.3. To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Q2.3.11. Children and most vulnerable people have been the primary beneficiaries of the programme

Q2.4. Has UNICEF targeted its resources to reach areas where equity levels were lower / worrying? Were gender appropriate and human rights focused activities implemented?

Q2.4.4. The most vulnerable were primary targeted

Q4.3. To what extent are the interventions sustainable and reduce vulnerability for future generations?

Q4.3.3. Updated national and local strategies and plans target vulnerable populations.

6. **Question 2.2. of the ToRs**

2.2. To what degree the interventions meet the needs of the communities and users particularly women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations?

This question is included into several indicators, grouped into a question under the criterion relevance.

Q1.4. To what extent have the intended activities corresponded to the needs of the target beneficiaries?

Q1.4.2. Activities are designed according to identified needs for each component;

Q1.4.4. The satisfaction level of the direct beneficiaries

Q1.4.5. Women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations’ needs have been specifically taken into account in the activities’ design.

7. **Question 2.3. of the ToRs**
2.3. To what extent has the planned and implemented response reduced WASH related vulnerability?

This question is included into several indicators, grouped into a question under the criterion effectiveness.

Q2.3. To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Q2.3.1. Improvement level of the water quality;
Q2.3.2. Number of people having access to improved sanitation;
Q2.3.3. Number of people having access to an improved source of water;
Q2.3.4. Number of people having access to a waste disposal mechanism;
Q2.3.5. Number of people trained in good WASH behaviour;
Q2.3.6. Number of people with access to hygiene, dignity or baby kits or vouchers;
Q2.3.7. Changes in the percentage of waterborne diseases and other hygiene-related diseases in ITS;

8. Question 2.4. of the ToRs

2.4. To what extent the program has contributed to create sustained local ownership and involved local communities in the decision making process?

This question have been converted into an indicator (Q4.2.2: The programme has helped create sustained local ownership and involved local communities in the decision-making process), included in a broader question, under the criterion sustainability:

Q4.2. To what extent are the procedures and mechanisms put in place by the programme likely to continue to function after the programme ends?

9. Question 2.5. of the ToRs

2.5. To what extent are the interventions sustainable and reduce vulnerability for future generations?

The question has been kept this way (Q4.3.).

10. Question 2.6. of the ToRs

2.6. To what extent UNICEF established partnerships or coordination with other key actors (e.g. implementing partners, local authorities, other line ministries and other UN agencies conducting complementary interventions) to enhance processes and results, to avoid duplication of intervention, and set a clear description of roles and responsibilities within joint initiatives?

This question regroups several ones so it has been divided into three questions and their related indicators, under the relevance and effectiveness criteria.

Q1.2. To what extent has UNICEF been able to adapt its activities and approaches in order to complement the intervention of other key actors at global level and how relevant is the coverage of the programme?

Q1.2.1. The intervention areas of other key actors do not overlap with UNICEF activities;
Q1.3. How adequate is the rationale behind the choice of partners at national or local levels and at implementation level?

Q1.3.1. The partnerships have helped achieve the programme objectives;
Q1.3.2. MoEW, RWE and municipalities facilitated definition and implementation of the stabilisation activities;
Q1.3.3. MoEW, RWE, municipalities and NGOs facilitated definition and implementation of the WASH in emergencies activities;
Q1.3.5. A clear description of roles and responsibilities with partners and stakeholders has been set.
Q2.2. To what extent has the partnership/coordination with major stakeholders enhanced the capability of the programme to achieve the targeted objectives?

Q2.2.2. No major stakeholder has been left out of activity planning and implementation;

11. Question 2.7. of the ToRs

2.7. To what extend has the WASH interventions converged with other programmes lead by UNICEF and contributed to UNICEF global strategy in Lebanon?

This question has been included into a broader one, under the criterion relevance.

Q1.1. To what extent are the programme’s objectives, activities and approaches in line with national and global strategies?

Q1.1.2. The programme objectives, activities (strategic studies implemented, emergency and stabilisation activities) and the target beneficiaries are aligned with UNICEF’s strategy (especially on equity, gender and human rights aspects) and with other UNICEF programmes (education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc.);

Q1.1.3. The activities implemented helped achieve the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon

12. Question 2.8. of the ToRs

2.8. To what extent the WASH programme design and implementation are aligned with UNICEF’s renewed focus on equity?

This question has been divided into two questions, under the criteria relevance and effectiveness.

Q1.1. To what extent are the programme’s objectives, activities and approaches in line with national and global strategies?

Q1.1.2. The programme objectives, activities (strategic studies implemented, emergency and stabilisation activities) and the target beneficiaries are aligned with UNICEF’s strategy (especially on equity, gender and human rights aspects) and with other UNICEF programmes (education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc.)

Q2.4. Has UNICEF targeted its resources to reach areas where equity levels were lower / worrying? Were gender appropriate and human rights focused activities implemented?

Q2.4.1. Adequacy and effectiveness of the tools implemented to target the areas of interventions;

Q2.4.2. Main programme implementation areas;

Q2.4.3. Average socio-economic profile of the target population.

13. Question 2.9. of the ToRs

2.9. What are the constraints and gaps that were identified? What are the actions raised? What are the recommendations that follow?

The first two questions are joined into one evaluation question, under the criteria effectiveness, and then separated into two distinctive indicators:

Q2.5. To what extent did the programme address any constraints met during the design and implementation phases?

Q2.5.1. Type and cause of any identified constraints;

Q2.5.2. Type of action taken to address these constraints.

The third question is not an evaluation question and will form a chapter of the final report.
H.4. Annex 4: Analysis per indicator

For each indicator of the evaluation questions, a triangulation analysis will be done with the data sources indicated in the evaluation matrix. The information extracted from these sources will be compared to one another to obtain the most objective information. This will allow the evaluation team to answer each indicator in an objective manner.

The exercise that will be done for each indicator is presented below as an example, for the indicators of the criterion Relevance.

1) Indicator Q1.1.1.

**Definition**: The programme objectives and activities are consistent/aligned with the MoEW national strategies regarding the sectorial monitoring, the service delivery and the management of the refugees’ crisis.

**Interpretation and triangulation**: The National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategies, the Lebanon WASH sector strategy and the information obtained through one-to-one interviews with the MoEW will be compared to the programme objectives and activities described in the HRRP tables and the information obtained through interviews with UNICEF Lebanon staff. The National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategies and the Lebanon WASH sector strategy will give information on the objectives of the MoEW national strategies. The one-to-one interviews with the MoEW will allow to precise the objectives of the MoEW and take into account any change and adaptation in them. It will also allow having the feedback of the MoEW on UNICEF WASH programme objectives and activities regarding its consistency with national strategies. The HRRP tables will give information on the objectives and planned activities of the programme through the evaluation period.

2) Indicator Q1.1.2.

**Definition**: The programme objectives, activities (strategic studies implemented, emergency and stabilisation activities) and the target beneficiaries are aligned with UNICEF’s strategy in Lebanon (especially on equity, gender and human rights aspects) and with other UNICEF programmes (education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc.) in Lebanon.

**Interpretation and triangulation**: The HRRP tables and the UNICEF WASH strategies in Lebanon will be compared to the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon, to planning documents of education, child protection, health, nutrition, advocacy, etc. UNICEF programmes and to the information obtained through interviews with UNICEF Lebanon staff. The annual activity reports, the NGOs reports, the annual activity information reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will be compared to the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon and to the information gathered through the interviews with UNICEF staff. The annual activity reports, the NGOs reports, the annual activity information reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will allow knowing the activities that have been implemented and the objectives achieved through the evaluation period. The information obtained will be compared with the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon.

3) Indicator Q1.1.3.

**Definition**: The activities implemented helped achieve the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon.

**Interpretation and triangulation**: The annual activity reports, the NGOs reports, the annual activity information reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will be compared to the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon and to the information gathered through the interviews with UNICEF staff. The annual activity reports, the NGOs reports, the annual activity information reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will allow knowing the activities that have been implemented and the objectives achieved through the evaluation period. The information obtained will be compared with the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon.
The interviews will allow getting additional information on the activities implemented, as well as precise the UNICEF strategy in Lebanon.

4) Indicator Q1.2.1.

Definition: The intervention areas of other key actors do not overlap with UNICEF activities.

Interpretation and triangulation: The information obtained through the interviews of the RWEs, the MoEW, municipalities and NGOs will be compared to the information obtained through the interviews of UNICEF staff and with the description of activities made in the annual activity reports, the NGOs reports and the reports to UNICEF donors. The interviews of the RWEs, the MoEW, municipalities and NGOs will bring information on other activities implemented by these institutions as well as their other partners’ activities. The annual activity reports, the NGOs reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will allow for a description of the activities made by UNICEF and their area of intervention, and the interviews of UNICEF staff will give a more precise description of them.

5) Indicator Q1.2.2.

Definition: The capacity buildings activities are complementary with other national sectorial strengthening activities.

Interpretation and triangulation: The information obtained through the interviews of the RWEs, the MoEW and municipalities will be compared to the information obtained through the interview of UNICEF staff and with the capacity-building activities reported in the annual activity reports and the reports to UNICEF donors. The interviews of the RWEs, the MoEW and municipalities will bring information on other national sectorial strengthening activities. The annual activity reports and the reports to UNICEF donors will give a description of the capacity-building activities made by UNICEF, with the interview of UNICEF staff giving a more precise description of them.

6) Indicator Q1.2.3.

Definition: The coverage of the WASH in emergencies component reached the vulnerable population and has been coordinated with national and international stakeholders.

Interpretation and triangulation: The information obtained through the one-to-one interviews with the RWEs, the MoEW, the municipalities and the NGOs will be compared to the annual activity information reports and UNICEF WASH strategy documents for Lebanon’s information. The annual activity information reports and the UNICEF WASH strategy documents for Lebanon will give information on the targeting of the programme on the most vulnerable people, as well as the achievement of this objective. The interviews with UNICEF staff will give more qualitative information on the selection of the most vulnerable people, as well as the achievement of the objective.

7) Indicator Q1.2.4.

Definition: The coverage of the stabilisation component reached vulnerable population and areas that are not directly covered by other national infrastructures projects implemented by the Ministry or the CDR.

Interpretation and triangulation: The information obtained through the one-to-one interviews with RWEs and the MoEW will be compared to the annual activity information reports, UNICEF WASH strategy documents for Lebanon and the Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW’s information. The interviews with the RWEs and the MoEW will tell if the stabilisation component was done in coordination with them. It will also
allow getting their insight on the reaching of the most vulnerable people. The discussions with the host communities and interviews with the municipalities will allow verifying on site if the most vulnerable people have been reached. The annual activity information reports, the UNICEF WASH strategy documents for Lebanon and the Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW will give information on the targeting of the component for the most vulnerable people, as well as the achieved objectives on vulnerable people. The interviews with UNICEF staff will give more qualitative information on the selection of the most vulnerable people, as well as the achievement of the objective.

8) Indicator Q1.3.1.

Definition: The partnerships have helped achieve the programme objectives.

Interpretation and triangulation: The interviews with the MoEW, the RWEs, the NGOs and the UNICEF staff will be compared with the annual activity information reports. The interviews with the MoEW, the RWEs and the NGOs will give the feedback of the different partners of UNICEF on how the objectives were achieved. The interviews with the UNICEF staff will allow to have the feedback of UNICEF staff on the partnerships and how well they have helped achieve the objectives. All this information will be compared to the annual activity information reports, giving the objectives and their achievements for the evaluation period.

9) Indicator Q1.3.2.

Definition: MoEW, RWE and municipalities facilitated definition and implementation of the stabilisation activities.

Interpretation and triangulation: The Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW will be compared to an interview with the MoEW, as well as interviews with the RWEs, the municipalities and the UNICEF staff will be compared together. The interviews with the RWEs, the MoEW and the municipalities will allow having feedback from these stakeholders on their role in the definition and implementation of the activities. The interviews with the UNICEF staff will allow having their feedback on the role of these institutions for the definition and implementation of activities. The Annual Work Plan 2016 with the MoEW will help evaluate the MoEW involvement in the definition of activities.

10) Indicator Q1.3.3.

Definition: MoEW, RWE, municipalities and NGOs facilitated definition and implementation of the WASH in emergencies activities.

Interpretation and triangulation: Interviews with the MoEW, the RWEs, the municipalities, the NGOs and the UNICEF staff will be compared together. The interviews with the RWEs, the MoEW, the NGOs and the municipalities will allow having their feedback on their role in the definition and implementation of the emergency activities. The interviews with the UNICEF staff will allow having their feedback on the role of these institutions for the definition and implementation of activities.

11) Indicator Q1.3.4.

Definition: The implementing partners were sufficiently skilled and set-up to carry out the requested activities (NGOs for the WASH in emergencies component, RWEs for the stabilisation component, staff of the Ministry and RWE for the sectorial monitoring improvement activities).

Interpretation and triangulation: Interviews with the MoEW, the RWEs, the municipalities, the NGOs and the UNICEF staff will be compared together. The interviews with the RWEs, the MoEW, the NGOs and the municipalities will allow having their feedback on how they implemented the activities. The interviews with the UNICEF staff will allow having their feedback on how they perceived the work of the partners and if they had all the necessary skills.

12) Indicator Q1.3.5.

Definition: A clear description of roles and responsibilities with partners and stakeholders has been set.
Interpretation and triangulation: Interviews with the MoEW, the RWEs, the municipalities, the NGOs and the UNICEF staff will be compared together. The information collected will allow knowing if their roles and responsibilities were clear to each of them, as well as the other actors’ roles.

13) Indicator Q1.4.1.
Definition: Strategic tools are designed/used to identify the intervention sites and target population (for WASH in emergencies and stabilisation components);

Interpretation and triangulation: The UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016, the targeting and needs assessment studies and the National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategies will be compared to the information collected in the UNICEF staff interviews and from the annual activity information reports, the annual activity reports, the reports to UNICEF donors and the NGO reports. These last documents will give information on the intervention sites and target population, and the UNICEF staff interviews will precise that information. The UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016, the targeting and needs assessment studies and the National Water and Wastewater Sector Strategies are the strategic tools against which the obtained information will be compared.

14) Indicator Q1.4.2.
Definition: Activities are designed according to identified needs for each component.

Interpretation and triangulation: The HRRP tables, the UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 and the needs assessment studies will be compared together, as well as interviews with MoEW, RWEs, municipalities, NGOs and UNICEF staff. The HRRP tables will give information on the activities designed. The UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 and the needs assessment studies will give information on identified needs. The interviews will give feedback of the stakeholders on the correspondence of the activities to the needs.

15) Indicator Q1.4.3.
Definition: The level of WASH services for children and the most vulnerable population is improved.

Interpretation and triangulation: The FGDs, the one-to-one discussions with the host communities and the interviews with NGOs will be crossed with the annual activity information reports, the annual activity reports, NGO reports and site visits. The FGDs will give feedback from the beneficiaries in IS on their access to WASH services. The discussions with the host communities will give their feedback on their access to WASH service. The site visits will verify and complement the information obtained through the interviews. The annual activity information reports and annual activity reports will give us information on the level of achievement of the objectives. The NGO interviews and their reports will give their feedback on the level of WASH services.

16) Indicator Q1.4.4.
Definition: The satisfaction level of the direct beneficiaries (RWEs for stabilisation component, Refugees and host communities for the WASH in emergencies component, the MoEW and RWEs staff and representatives for the capacity building component).

Interpretation and triangulation: Interviews with the RWEs, the MoEW, the host communities and FGDs with beneficiaries from IS will allow to get their satisfaction level of the activities implemented by the programme.

17) Indicator Q1.4.5.
Definition: Women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations’ needs have been specifically taken into account in the activities’ design.

Interpretation and triangulation: HRRP tables, the UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 and the needs assessment studies will be compared together, as well as interviews with MoEW, RWEs, municipalities, NGOs and UNICEF staff. The HRRP tables will give information on the activities
designed for women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations. The UNICEF Baseline Survey 2016 and the needs assessment studies will give information on their specific needs. The interviews will give the feedback of the stakeholders the correspondence of the activities to the needs of women, children, disabled, vulnerable and deprived populations.

H.5. Annex 5: Questionnaires

H.5.1. Focus Group Discussions guide

Emergency Component

Participants: Syrian Refugees

a) Introduction by Facilitator
   - Consent form is signed for adolescents
   - Context and purpose of the FGD

b) Introduction of participants, clarification of WASH interventions and explanation of the process

c) Discussion

1. Can you describe your needs in terms of water accessibility/rubbish/sanitation/access to hygiene related information and kits?

2. In what way did UNICEF WASH interventions in your IS answer these needs?

3. If any, can you describe the changes they brought to your daily life habits?

4. What groups (women/girls/boys/men/children) in the IS do the UNICEF WASH interventions serve/who are the users of the facilities/tools?

5. What prevent them (women/girls/boys/men/children) of using these facilities/tools?

6. Is there anything you would like to add concerning (main issues raised during the FGD)?

**********

H.5.2. One-to-one discussions guide

Stabilisation Component

Participants: Host communities member

a) Explanation of the purpose of the interview and clarification of WASH intervention (or of the project implemented)

b) Questions / Discussion

1. Do you know what WASH interventions were implemented by UNICEF in your area?

2. Are you satisfied with the UNICEF WASH interventions in your area?
   a. Were these activities adapted to your needs?
b. According to you, what was their result on hygiene?
c. According to you, what was their result on health?
d. What changes did they bring in your daily life habits?

3. How were you involved in UNICEF WASH activities?
   b. On an individual level or community level?

4. How useful are the water related projects implemented by UNICEF?
   a. Is water more available?
   b. Is water palatable?
   c. Did they bring any change to your personal and/or family daily habits? How? And on the community level?

5. How useful are the wastewater related projects implemented by UNICEF?
   a. Could you describe tangible changes (smell, open air untreated wastewater, less diseases, etc.)?

6. Are these projects still in good use today?
   a. Do you know who maintains and manages them?

7. Do you consider UNICEF interventions served all the community?
   a. Are they equitable?
   b. Are they usable by all members of the community?
   c. Do you consider they take into consideration human rights?

8. Do you consider UNICEF interventions helped improve your overall living conditions and how?

9. How did UNICEF interventions influence the community?
   d. Conflict resolution or exacerbation
   e. Increase of autonomy or dependence?
   f. More involvement of men, women and/or adolescents in WASH issues?

10. Is there anything you would like to add?

*********

H.5.3. Implementing Partners interviews guide

Emergency and stabilisation component

Participants: One-to-one interviews with NGOs (Solidarités, CISP, Lost, Concern, ACF, World Vision, LRC)
a) **Explanation of the purpose of the meeting**

b) **Questions**

1. What are the WASH activities implemented by your NGO?

2. How were WASH needs assessed in your projects and what role did UNICEF play in this phase?

3. How did you take the most vulnerable populations needs into consideration in design and implementation of WASH activities and what was UNICEF input at this level?
   
   a. How did you design the intervention so it equally answers the needs of all members of the community?
   
   b. How did you design the intervention so it is equitable?
   
   c. How does it take into consideration basic human rights?

4. What was the role of local beneficiaries and local authorities in decision-making and implementation in the interventions your NGO implemented in the framework of the UNICEF WASH program?

   a. Did you involve communities and how?
   
   b. Did you involve national authorities and how?
   
   c. Did you involve local authorities and how?

5. Explain the results of the WASH activities you implemented in the framework of the UNICEF WASH program.

   a. Define the positive and negative results of the WASH activities implemented by your NGO.

      i. Health
      
      ii. Hygiene
      
      iii. Water quality and availability
      
      iv. Wastewater and solid waste services
      
      v. Overall living conditions

   b. For LRC and CISP: What is the result of stabilisation activities?

      i. Are the stabilisation projects still in use?
      
      ii. Who is in charge of their maintenance and management?

6. How were organised the decision-making and follow-up processes between UNICEF and your NGO?

7. What is going to happen when UNICEF’s involvement and funding comes to an end?

   a. Water quality and accessibility
   
   b. Living conditions (Hygiene/health)
   
   c. Improvement of water, wastewater and solid waste services
8. How did the interventions implemented in the framework of the UNICEF WASH program influence the community?
   a. Conflict resolution or exacerbation
   b. Increase of autonomy or dependence?
   c. More involvement of men, women and/or adolescents in WASH issues?

9. Is there anything you would like to add?

*********

H.5.4. Municipalities interviews guide

Emergency, stabilisation and capacity building components

Participants: One-to-one interviews with Mayors and/or other person from the municipality who have followed up on the activities or have been the implementing partners’ focal point

   a) Explanation of the purpose of the meeting and clarification of WASH intervention/component

   b) Questions

1. Can you tell us what interventions have been implemented in your area thanks to the UNICEF WASH programme?

2. How did UNICEF or the implementing partner involve you in the decision-making and/or implementation?

3. Do you consider the UNICEF activities/projects to:
   a. Be adapted to real needs?
   b. Be gender-adapted?
   c. Be equitable?
   d. Take into consideration human rights?

4. Do you think the UNICEF activities have targeted the most vulnerable populations?
   a. Especially women
   b. Especially adolescents/children

5. Define the positive and negative results of the UNICEF activities implemented in your area:
   a. Water quality and accessibility
   b. Living conditions (Hygiene/health)
   c. Improvement of water, wastewater and solid waste services

6. How did the UNICEF interventions influence the communities in your area?
a. Conflict resolution or exacerbation?

b. Increase of autonomy or dependence?

c. More involvement of men, women and/or adolescents in WASH issues?

7. How did UNICEF WASH activities influence the municipal decision-making?

   a. Awareness of WASH related needs to be addressed.
   
   b. Considering WASH as priority issue.
   
   c. Taking into consideration most vulnerable population in projects.
   
   d. Taking into consideration human rights, gender and equity in projects.
   
   e. Redefining the municipal role and empowering the municipality in knowledge and decision-making.

8. Are the UNICEF WASH project costs and timeframes consistent with those of similar projects implemented in your area? How could implementation be more cost and time-efficient?

9. What is going to happen when UNICEF’s involvement and funding comes to an end?

   a. Are the infrastructures still in good use today?
   
   b. Who is in charge of their maintenance and management?

10. Is there anything you would like to add?

*********

H.5.5. Regional Water Establishments interviews guide

Emergency, stabilisation and capacity building components

Participants: one-to-one interviews with the chairperson of each of the three RWEs’ (North, South, Bekaa) board of directors

a) Explanation of the purpose of the meeting

b) Questions

1. Do you know what activities were funded by the UNICEF programme?

2. To what extent did the RWE collaborate with the UNICEF team:

   a. During the needs assessment phase;
   
   b. During the design phase;
   
   c. During the implementation phase;
   
   d. For the handover and OM phase

3. What were your selection criteria for supporting the projects implemented in the framework of the UNICEF programme? (vulnerability / specific area / availability of land / complementary works in process, etc.)
4. What is the target population of the projects implemented in the framework of the UNICEF programme?
   a. Refugee/host communities;
   b. Women/Men/Boys/Girls.

5. Do you think the activities implemented in the framework of the UNICEF programme address their needs?

6. How would you assess the programme’s results on improving living conditions:
   a. Health and Hygiene
   b. Water Quality/Quantity
   c. Improvement of water, wastewater and solid waste services
   d. How did you measure the change before/after?

7. Is there a coordination mechanism used by all stakeholders involved in WASH in your area? Is UNICEF part of it and is it efficient?

8. How are you involved in the decision-making process concerning projects identification and implementation in the framework of the UNICEF programme? How would you improve the decision-making process?

9. Are the infrastructure projects implemented in the framework of the UNICEF programme working effectively?

10. Does the WE have sufficient resources to technically manage project implemented thanks to UNICEF?

11. Are the UNICEF WASH project costs and timeframes consistent with those of similar projects implemented in your area? How could implementation be more cost and time-efficient?

12. Did the programme have an result on:
   a. The data you already have;
   b. RWE staff skills;
   c. Decision-making processes;
   d. The priorities set.

13. Do you know of any negative or positive social/environmental/economic results of the UNICEF WASH programme?

14. What happens when the projects implemented by UNICEF are completed, how are you ensuring sustainability and operation and maintenance of these projects?
   a. Who is in charge of the infrastructure?
   b. How are you going to financially sustain actions/ projects already launched?
   c. Is there an exit strategy from UNICEF and to what extent did you contribute to defining it?
d. What would you need in order to sustain these projects, etc.?

12. Is there anything you would like to add?

*********

H.5.6. Ministry of Energy and Water interviews guide

Emergency, stabilisation and capacity building components

Participants: One-to-one interviews with the Minister’s advisor and the Water Director

a) Explanation of the purpose of the meeting

b) Questions

1. Are the UNICEF programme activities and objectives consistent with the national strategies?

2. Is there coordination between sector stakeholders to avoid overlapping activities?

3. Which population is the main target of your national strategy? Is there a special vulnerable population target?

4. How was identified the targeted population? According to which data and which priorities?

5. Did the UNICEF programme have an result on:
   1.1. The data you already have;
   1.2. MoEW staff skills;
   1.3. Decision-making processes;
   1.4. Monitoring system;
   1.5. The priorities set.

6. How are you involved in the decision-making process concerning projects identification and implementation in the framework of the UNICEF programme? How would you improve the decision-making process?

7. Is there a work plan between you and UNICEF?

8. Do you have a monitoring system of the activities in place? How would you improve it?

9. Are the facilities constructed by UNICEF currently working?

10. Is UNICEF in the usual cost-range and timeframe for implementing similar activities? How could implementation be more cost and time-efficient?

11. What kind of challenges did you face during the UNICEF WASH programme implementation? How was the situation resolved?

12. How have the current sector priorities been transformed from 4 years to now?

13. How would you assess the UNICEF WASH programme’s results on improving living conditions:
   a. Health and Hygiene
   b. Water Quality/ Quantity
c. Improvement of water, wastewater and solid waste services

d. How did you measure the change before/after

14. Do you know of any negative or positive social/environmental/economic results of the UNICEF/WASH programme?

15. What is going to happen when UNICEF’s involvement and project come to an end?
   a. Who is in charge of the infrastructures (O&M and financially)?
   b. How are you going to financially sustain actions/projects already launched?
   c. Is there an exit strategy and to what extent did you contribute to defining it?
   d. What would you need in order to sustain these projects, etc.?

13. Is there anything you would like to add?
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UNICEF, Situation Analysis of Children and Youth in Lebanon, 2016
UNICEF, Syria Crisis Humanitarian Highlights & Results, 2015-2016
UNICEF, Syria Crisis Humanitarian Results, 2016
A.1.3. NGO Reports

a) ACF


Programme Progress - Humanitarian WASH Response to the Conflict Affected Population in the Bekaa Valley, Lebanon - From 10/09/2015 to 10/03/2016

UNICEF report format for IASC Global WASH Cluster projects - Humanitarian WASH Response to the Syrian Refugees in Eastern Lebanon, Bekaa Valley – From 01/10/12 to 31/01/13

Quarterly Report - Humanitarian WASH and NUTRITION Response to the conflict affected population in Bekaa Valley, LEBANON - 1st December to 28th of February 2015

Final Report – Humanitarian WASH response to the Conflict affected population in Bekaa Valley, Lebanon – addendum to current PCA – 01/09/13 to 30/04/14

Quarterly Report - Humanitarian WASH and NUTRITION Response to the conflict affected population in Bekaa Valley, LEBANON - 1st of April to 30th of June 2015

c) CISP

Final Report - Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North Lebanon - 20th of November 2012 to 30th of June 2013

Programmatic Reporting - 24/04/2014 to 30/9/2015

Programmatic Reporting - Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North and South Lebanon - 8 July 2013 to 31 August 2014

Detailed Activity Budget – 01/05/16 to 30/11/16

Integrated Workplan and Logframe – Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North Lebanon – 01/05/16 to 30/11/16

Programmatic Reporting – Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North and South Lebanon – 21/04/14 to 15/12/15

Programmatic Reporting - Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North and South Lebanon – 23/09/14 to 15/09/16

Programmatic Reporting - Improving WASH Conditions for Syrian Refugees and Affected Populations in North and South Lebanon – 8 July 2013 to 31 July 2014

d) Concern

Standard Progress Report – PCA/LEBA/2014/18 – 08/10/14 to 08/01/15

e) LRC

Financial Reporting – WASH in Emergency

Programme Progress Report – WASH in Emergency – 09/15 to 02/16

f) Mercy Corps

Financial Audit - March 2016

Programme Progress Report - Emergency Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Response for Syrian Refugees in Lebanon – 01/06/16 to 01/11/16
**g) Solidarités International**

Final Report – WASH Assistance for Vulnerable Families Affected by the Syrian Crisis in North Lebanon – 17/03/16 to 12/16


Final Report – 17/03/15 to 17/03/16

**h) World Vision**

Programme Progress Report – Provision of WASH services to Vulnerable Syrian and Lebanese children in the Bekaa, Phase 3 – 09/15 to 05/16

Programme Progress Report – Provision of WASH services to Vulnerable Syrian and Lebanese children in the Bekaa, Phase 3 – 09/15 to 05/16

**H.7. Annex 7: Missing documents**

LCRP 2013 and 2014


UNICEF strategy in Lebanon

HRRP tables 2013

Activity info (HRRP tables with achievements) 2013-2014-2015-2016

Annual report 2016


Timely continue and complete reports of NGOs

WASH communal projects tables 2013-2015 - 2016 maybe incomplete

Vulnerability assessment for Syrian 2016

Studies undertaken by UNICEF for the capacity-building component
H.8. Annex 8: Map of Registered Syrian Refugees in Lebanon
H.9. Annex 9: Sites visited and stakeholders met during the data collection phase

Table 13: Selected sites for FGDs and selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Baalbeck-Hermel</td>
<td>The location initially chosen was Kfar Dabach. However, LOST explained that they had already conducted the assessment of Kfar Babach IS but that activities were implemented by Mercy Corps. Yammoune village was chosen because it is the only IS where Lost was working during the evaluation timeframe. Also, LOST worked closely with the municipality of Yammoune.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Yammouneh</td>
<td>17/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>The locations were selected in discussion with World Vision based on the fact that a wide range of activities were implemented in Bar Elias, a solid coordination/discussion mechanism was put in place with the municipality and the IS is one of the largest involved in World Vision projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Bar Elias</td>
<td>21/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: World Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: South</td>
<td>Large variety of WASH activities implemented (including follow up survey and creation of WASH committees in the IS) Urbanised area Small scale IS but high density When the evaluation team arrived on site at Ras El Ain to conduct the FGD, it appeared that only a few men were present. Women were out working. Therefore, one FGD was organised with men in Ras el Ain and the evaluators went to meet with women in Ezziye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Ras el Ain and Ezziye – Tyre District</td>
<td>23/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: CISP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Akkar</td>
<td>The field visit location was proposed by the Concern team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Mohammara</td>
<td>24/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: North</td>
<td>The field visit location was proposed by the Solidarités International team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Hissa</td>
<td>24/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Solidarités International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Interventions started in 2013 Large number of beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Kamed el Laouz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FGD | Selection Criteria
--- | ---
Implementing partner: ACF | High number of IS
27/03/17 | Highest number of ACF interventions, including WASH and solid waste activities

Table 14: Selected sites, selection criteria for host community interviews and modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host community interviews</th>
<th>Comment/modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: North Locality: Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen (Tripoli) Implementing partner: LRC 25/03/17</td>
<td>Requested by UNICEF Pilot project with social/peace building dimension Urbanized area Challenging environment on political and social levels Large number of beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa Locality: Majdel Anjar Implementing partner: WET 27/03/17</td>
<td>Requested by UNICEF Remote area Challenging environment on political and social levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Mount Lebanon Locality: Ghadir Wastewater Treatment Plant Implementing partner: UN-Habitat 28/03/17</td>
<td>Urbanized area Large number of beneficiaries Technically interesting project (pumping station) Example of project implemented by another UN agency (UN Habitat) Initially Bourj Hammoud locality was selected. Based on the discussions with UN-Habitat, it appeared that Ghadir locality could be more interesting in terms of impact on the WASH sector and coordination with RWE In both localities, the works took place in remoted areas and population could not measure the immediate impact of the projects on their daily lives. Based on the above, and during the field visit, the evaluator made the decision not to hold one to one interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: NGOs met during personal interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Persons met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Baalbeck-Hermel Locality: Yammouneh</td>
<td>Zoubaida Haidar (field officer), Ghina Chreif (Hygiene promotion supervisor), Hawran Shaheen (HP supervisor), Zeinah Shreif,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner</td>
<td>Supervisor education program in Yamouneh, Osman Solh (driver), Ferass Shemaly (WASH officer in Baalbeck), Jenan Chreif (assistant education program in Yamouneh), Hussein Chreif (HP officer in Baalbeck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Simon Tawk (WASH officer), Ali Divani (WASH Officer), Roudy Saidy (WASH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Bar Elias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: World Vision</td>
<td>21/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: South</td>
<td>Michele Citton, CISP coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Ras el Ain and Ezziye – Tyre District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: CISP</td>
<td>23/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Akkar</td>
<td>Monica Rahal (IS community support team leader), Aleen Karam (IS Rehabilitation &amp; maintenance Team Leader), Rebecca Bellrose (ITS programme manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Mohammara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Concern</td>
<td>24/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: North</td>
<td>Kevin Bonel (WASH coordinator), Rayan Mostafa (Community Hygiene Promotion Activity Manager), Jamil Marouk (Construction Supervisor), Karine Lacroix (Program Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Hissa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Solidarités International</td>
<td>24/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: North</td>
<td>Rayan El Fawal (Project Coordinator), Khaled Al Sabbagh (Field Officer), Samah Ghamrawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen (Tripoli)</td>
<td>25/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: LRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Olfat Mohammad (HP supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Kamed el Laouz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: ACF</td>
<td>27/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Maya Chall (WASH/UNICEF Project Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Zahle</td>
<td>10/04/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 16: Municipalities met for personal interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Person met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Baalbeck-Hermel</td>
<td>Hussein Shreif, Vice mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Yammouneh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Mawas Araji, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Bar Elias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: World Vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Akkar</td>
<td>Abdel Moneem Othman, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Mohammara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: Concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: North</td>
<td>Khaled al Wali, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen (Tripoli)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: LRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/03/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td>Sami el Ajame, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Majdel Anjar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner: WET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Institutional partners met for personal interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional partner</th>
<th>Person met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bekaa Water Establishment</td>
<td>Maroun Moussalem, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: Bekaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Zahle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lebanon Water Establishment</td>
<td>Ahmad Nizam, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate: South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Saida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td>Criteria for selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Government: Baalbeck-Hermel                      | The location initially chosen was Kfar Dabach. However, LOST explained that they had completed the assessment of Kfar Babach IS but that activities were implemented by Mercy Corps.  
Yammoune village was chosen because it is the only IS where Lost has been working during the evaluation timeframe. Also, LOST has worked closely with the municipality of Yammoune. |
| Location: Yammoune                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Implementing partner: Lost                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 17/03/17                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Government: Bekaa                                 | The locations were selected following discussions with World Vision as a wide range of activities were implemented in Bar Elias, a solid coordination/discussion mechanism was put in place with the municipality and the IS is one of the largest involved in World Vision projects. |
| Location: Bar Elias                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Implementing partner: World Vision               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 21/03/17                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Government: South                                | Large variety of implemented WASH activities (including follow up survey and creation of WASH committees in the IS)  
Urbanised area  
Small scale IS but high density  
When the evaluation team arrived on site at Ras El Ain to conduct the FGD, it appeared that only a few men were present. Women were out working. Therefore, one FGD was held with men in Ras el Ain and the evaluators went to meet with women in Ezziye. |
| Location: Ras el Ain and Ezziye – Tyre District  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Implementing partner: CISP                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 23/03/17                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
### Site visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site visits</th>
<th>Criteria for selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governorate: Akkar  
Location: Mohammara  
Implementing partner: Concern  
24/03/17 | The field visit location was proposed by the Concern team. |
| Governorate: North  
Location: Hissa  
Implementing partner: Solidarités International  
24/03/17 | The field visit location was proposed by the Solidarités International team. |
| Governorate: North  
Location: Kobbé/Jabal Mohsen (Tripoli)  
Implementing partner: LRC  
25/03/17 | Requested by UNICEF  
Pilot project with social/peace-building dimension  
Urbanised area  
Challenging environment on a political and social level  
Large number of beneficiaries  
Contrary to what was planned in the Inception Report, it was not possible to conduct a site visit because the work (networks) has been finished. |
| Governorate: Bekaa  
Location: Kamed el Laouz  
Implementing partner: ACF  
27/03/17 | Interventions started in 2013  
Large number of beneficiaries  
High number of IS  
Highest number of ACF interventions, including WASH and solid waste activities |
| Governorate: Bekaa  
Location: Majdel Anjar  
Implementing partner: WET  
27/03/17 | Requested by UNICEF  
Remote area  
Challenging environment on a political and social level |
| Governorate: Mount Lebanon  
Location: Ghadir Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Implementing partner: UN-Habitat  
28/03/17 | Urbanised area  
Large number of beneficiaries  
Technically interesting project (pumping station)  
Example of a project implemented by another UN agency (UN Habitat)  
Initially, Bourj Hammoud was selected. Following discussions with UN-Habitat, it appeared that Ghadir could prove more interesting in terms of impact on the WASH sector and coordination with RWE  
In both locations, the work took place in remote areas and the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site visits</th>
<th>Criteria for selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population could not measure the immediate impact of the projects on their daily lives. Based on the above, and during the field visit, the evaluator made the decision not to hold one-to-one interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H.10. Annex 10: Figures illustrating tables from the evaluation findings

**Figure 7: Achievement of the Programme’s objectives**

![Bar chart showing objectives achievement over years](chart1.png)

**Figure 8: Programme budget and number of beneficiaries**

![Line chart showing budget and beneficiaries](chart2.png)
Figure 9: Stabilisation projects’ budget

Figure 10: Number of beneficiaries for stabilisation projects
Figure 11: Evolution of budget and beneficiaries