

EVALUATION OF OXFAM GB'S CASH-FOR-RENT PROJECT IN LEBANON



March 2014

By Marilise Turnbull, Independent Consultant



Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Background	4
3. Methodology	6
4. Findings	7
4.1 Effectiveness and impact	7
4.2 Adherence to global humanitarian standards	13
4.3 Accountability to beneficiaries	17
4.4 Partnerships	19
4.5 Application and generation of learning	20
5. Conclusions	23
6. Recommendations	24
7. Annexes	26

Cover photo by Sam Tarling

List of Abbreviations

CaLP	Cash Learning Partnership
CTP	Cash Transfer Programming
CTWG	Cash Transfer Working Group
DEC	Disasters Emergency Committee
DECAF	Disasters Emergency Committee Accountability Framework
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DFID	Department for International Development of the UK Government
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership
HIT	Humanitarian Indicator Tool
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
IRNA	Integrated Needs Assessment
JAK	Jadawel Al Kheir
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PDM	Post Distribution Monitoring
PMEAL	Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
SAR	Syrian Aid and Rescue
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WU	Western Union
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinians in the Near East

1. Executive Summary

In March 2013 the DEC launched an appeal to respond to the humanitarian crisis caused by the deepening civil war in Syria. Oxfam GB was allocated a total of £1,189,797 of the £12 million raised, of which it apportioned £237,951 to assisting Syrian refugees in Lebanon.

Within a context of cautious donor engagement, these much-needed funds enabled Oxfam GB to begin a cash-for-rent project. Oxfam and its new local partner, Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK), provided cash transfers of \$US150 for two consecutive months to 780 vulnerable refugee families residing in El Khoura, Qalamoun and Tripoli in Northern Lebanon. Oxfam GB also used the funds to set up monitoring, evaluation and accountability systems for its planned programme.

This evaluation found that Oxfam delivered a highly relevant project that achieved its primary objective in terms of significantly contributing to meeting the cash-for-rent needs of vulnerable Syrian refugee households for two months. It also confirmed that Oxfam was able to reach almost double the initial target number of beneficiary households (420) by focusing DEC-funding solely on cash-for rent and using funding from additional sources for other types of assistance.

The project drew on institutional learning from previous cash transfer projects, mainly as a result of the deployment of experienced staff from Oxfam GB's global pool. It demonstrated adherence to Sphere core standards and technical standards for cash transfer programming, although it is likely that most of the accommodation paid for with the cash did not meet Sphere standards for shelter. This contextual challenge offers Oxfam and other organisations potential learning for future cash transfer programming and shelter interventions.

Oxfam GB provided strong and continuous support to its new partner, Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK), to establish adequate logistics and financial management procedures for the project. It also worked closely with Western Union to ensure the cash transfer process was cost-effective and user-friendly.

This evaluation identified some weaknesses in the project's monitoring system. Although post-distribution monitoring (PDM) surveys enabled Oxfam GB to monitor the effectiveness of the cash transfer process and usage of the cash, they did not track the quality of the accommodation nor enable Oxfam GB to understand the impact of its support on beneficiaries' longer-term shelter prospects and income-security. Furthermore, the survey content and interpretation did not provide any insights into the gendered impacts of the project.

This evaluation also found areas for improvement in the accountability arrangements for the project. Although Oxfam GB effectively involved potential beneficiaries in the project design process and provided timely and appropriate information about procedures for cash distributions, it did not establish a robust, verifiable system to address their concerns and complaints during the project's implementation.

Oxfam GB has already taken action to implement the majority of the recommendations that resulted from this evaluation. It is also continuing to scale up its programme, which has (to date) provided humanitarian assistance and protection to over 80,000 Syrian refugees in Northern Lebanon.

2. Background

Three years of civil war in Syria have caused over 2.5 million Syrians to flee across the country's borders. To date, over 900,000¹ refugees, the majority of whom are women and children, have been registered by UNHCR in Lebanon² where they have had little option but to rent cramped and inadequate accommodation such as garages and unfinished/abandoned buildings in urban areas, erect tents on previously unoccupied land, or join long-term Palestinian refugees in their camps and gatherings³. With dismal work prospects, most have depleted any savings or assets they brought with them and have rapidly become food insecure and vulnerable to a variety of threats, including eviction and sexual and gender-based violence.

UNHCR, UNRWA⁴ and some INGOs⁵ began to respond to the emerging crisis from the first half of 2012. In July 2012 Oxfam GB supported a former partner organisation to distribute food and non-food items to refugees in its programme areas. Its affiliates, Oxfam Italia and Oxfam Novib, also approved funding for partners working in host communities in which refugees⁶ were seeking protection and assistance.

However, as fighting intensified in Western Syria at the end of 2012, the number of refugees in Lebanon increased significantly, creating the need for an urgent and large-scale response. Oxfam GB deployed a humanitarian team to conduct a needs assessment in northern Lebanon and start up a major programme, but the funding situation was not at all favourable. Oxfam GB's traditional humanitarian donors, ECHO and DfID, had already disbursed funds in 2012 to the first INGOs to respond to the crisis and were not yet able to consider new proposals. Relatively few other international funding options were available as Western governments adopted a 'wait and see' approach.

With clear programming needs identified, Oxfam GB decided to launch an appeal to the British public. Within days the DEC agencies reached the same conclusion and launched a joint DEC appeal on 21st of March, 2013. The DEC appeal raised over £12 million, of which £1,189,797 was allocated to Oxfam GB's overall Syria response including £237,951 for the Lebanon programme. With these much-needed funds Oxfam GB began a cash-for-rent project in the Northern Governorate of Lebanon in April 2013 and set up monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) systems for its planned programme.

Gradually, with short projects funded by a number of different donors, Oxfam's programme expanded and consolidated. To date, Oxfam GB has reached over 80,000 beneficiaries in Lebanon through a programme that has included: cash transfers for rent payments; distributions of blankets, mattresses and pillows; distributions of

¹ <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=122>

² Syria Regional Response Plan 5, https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/CAP/2013_Syria_RRP.pdf

³ An estimated 50,000 Palestinian Refugees from Syria have entered Lebanon as a consequence of the war in Syria.

⁴ UNWRA, not UNHCR, has responsibility for Palestinian Refugees from Syria in Lebanon

⁵ Most of INGOs that responded in early 2012 had long-term programmes and a presence in the areas where refugees began to congregate, such as Save the Children and World Vision. Some INGOs with a mandate to protect refugees, such as Norwegian Refugee Council, were also among the first to respond.

⁶ Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Italia supported partners working in existing Palestinian camps in which Palestinians and Syrians fleeing Syria were seeking refuge.

hygiene kits; distributions of vouchers for food, clothing and hygiene items; hygiene promotion; installation and repair of WASH facilities in camps and host communities; information dissemination, advice and referrals on protection issues; and advocacy on humanitarian assistance and protection, adequate donor funding and a political solution to the crisis.

At the time of this evaluation, the programme is on-going and expanding, as the Syrian refugee crisis enters into its fourth year.

Figure 1. Locations of Oxfam GB’s programme in Lebanon and areas of implementation of the DEC-funded cash-for-rent project.

DEC funds were used for a cash-for-rent project in the Northern Governorate:

- Tripoli
- Qalamoun
- El Khoura



3. Methodology

This evaluation report is the result of an extensive literature review (of internal documentation and external reports), a field visit to project sites in Northern Lebanon, and interviews with key Oxfam GB staff and former staff. A full bibliography and a list of interviewees are provided in Annex 2 of this report.

A large part of the data required for this evaluation was collected in November and December 2013, during which time Oxfam conducted an internal evaluation⁷. Given the growing sense of frustration among refugees in Lebanon about the continuous cycle of assessments and evaluations by aid agencies while many needs remain unmet, Oxfam GB and the DEC agreed that an additional visit was not necessary for this project-specific evaluation.

The terms of reference for this evaluation required data to be analysed with respect to commitments and expectations of: effectiveness and impact; adherence to global humanitarian standards; involvement of and accountability to beneficiaries; quality of partnerships, and learning. The full terms of reference are presented in Annex 1 of this report.

In addition to the explicit foci of the evaluation, relevant DECAF benchmarks were integrated into the methodology. These are listed in Annex 3.



This evaluation would not have been possible without the support of Chele Degruccio (Humanitarian Programme Manager, Lebanon) and Maria Ghazzaoui (MEAL Officer, Lebanon), who hosted the evaluator's visit to Lebanon and ensured that relevant documentation was made available. The guidance offered by Vivien Walden (Global Humanitarian PMEAL Advisor, Oxfam) also contributed greatly to the planning and analytical processes.

Sincere thanks are also given to the beneficiaries in Qalamoun who participated in focus groups and house-to-house visits, and to Oxfam's partner, Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK), for hosting the evaluator's visit to parts of the project site.

Oxfam and the evaluator are very grateful to all staff and ex-staff who dedicated time to providing information about the DEC-funded project.



As is common the early stages of an organisation's response to a humanitarian crisis, Oxfam GB experienced considerable staff turnover during and since the DEC-funded project. As a result, some primary sources of information on planning and implementation of the project were not available for this evaluation. All efforts have been made to compensate for this, and it is the opinion of the evaluator and Oxfam that any such gaps do not affected the accuracy of the conclusions of this evaluation report.

⁷ This evaluation used Oxfam's Humanitarian Indicator Tool, which measures 12 aspects of programme quality. Such evaluations (internally called 'HITS') are conducted for all major emergency responses.

4. Findings

In this section of the report, the findings of the evaluation are presented in relation to the key questions that Oxfam GB and the DEC sought to answer, and under the following headings:

- Effectiveness and impact
- Adherence to global humanitarian standards
- Involvement of, and accountability to, beneficiaries
- Quality of partnerships
- Learning

4.1 Effectiveness and impact

Key questions: To what extent have the proposed specific objectives and outcomes been achieved? What changes, if any, have been made to people's lives?

Following its Integrated Rapid Needs Assessment of the Tripoli and El Khoura districts in the North Governorate of Lebanon⁸ in February 2013, Oxfam GB concluded that the overarching need and concern for the majority of refugees was rent for shelter, with food and hygiene as additional concerns. The IRNA indicated that few international NGOs had provided aid in these areas, and that UNHCR was experiencing long delays in registration⁹. It also revealed that refugees were resorting to borrowing, selling their possessions (such as jewellery), reducing their food intake and, in some cases, allowing their children to work in order to pay rent.

Consequently, Oxfam GB's proposal to the DEC was for a project to distribute cash-for-rent and food in Tripoli and El Khoura/Qalamoun, and to establish a MEAL system that integrated protection issues as a basis for quality MEAL processes in this and future projects. Specifically, Oxfam GB planned to generate the following outcomes:

- (1) Targeted households (420) are supported to meet rent and food needs*
- (2) Monitoring, evaluation and accountability¹⁰ mechanisms have been enhanced and cross-cutting issues are integrated into the programme plan.*

⁸ Loreto Palmera, Lou Lasap and Bibi Lamond, Integrated Rapid Needs Assessment – Tripoli and El Khoura Districts, North Governorate, 15th February 2013

⁹ In March 2013, UNHCR reported that 103,769 refugees were registered and 21,333 were awaiting registration in the Northern Governorate.

¹⁰ Efforts and achievements with respect to accountability are evaluated in Section 4.2 of this report.

With regard to **outcome (1)**, following further contextual analysis and the approval of funding specifically for food from other donors, Oxfam GB decided to focus solely on meeting beneficiaries' rent needs with the DEC funding.¹¹

Oxfam GB identified a local non-governmental organization, Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK), as a feasible partner for implementation in Qalamoun and El Khoura. Although JAK lacked humanitarian experience, a capacity assessment indicated that it was an established, trusted social actor in the areas to be targeted by this project and had collaborated with UNHCR in a recent beneficiary targeting process. Its role in the new partnership with Oxfam was to select and register beneficiaries, for which it had a distinct advantage over Oxfam as a 'new arrival' in the context.

For implementation in Tripoli Oxfam GB decided to select and register beneficiaries directly with the support of a small local organisation, SAR, which provided a venue for registration and distribution, and advice on targeting.

Based on a rapid analysis of the available options for cash transfer programming, Oxfam GB selected Western Union (WU) as the most accessible service for the refugees. Its services were relatively quick (the cash was available within 4 days of the deposit) and cost-effective (a reduced charge of \$3 was made by WU for each transfer of \$150). In a later project, however, Oxfam GB chose an alternative service provider¹² on the grounds that it was more convenient and secure for both Oxfam GB and the beneficiaries¹³.

Oxfam GB chose to provide blanket coverage for all Syrian refugee families in specific neighbourhoods identified during the IRNA as hosting large numbers of highly vulnerable families with very limited financial resources. House-to-house visits were made to verify the actual conditions of each household, and preliminary beneficiary lists were cross-checked with those of UNHCR and DRC (the only other INGO implementing cash transfer programming in the Northern Governorate) to ensure that Oxfam GB's support was only provided to families that were not already receiving support from UNHCR.

Beneficiaries were informed of the date and location of the distribution by telephone or text message¹⁴ one day in advance. They were all invited to a briefing session on how to collect the cash from WU, although some chose not to attend.

From May to August Oxfam GB distributed cash to a total of 780 households as beneficiaries of the project: 230 households in Tripoli and 550 in Qalamoun/El Khoura. This greatly exceeded the planned number of 420 beneficiary households of 420 households due to the decision to focus solely on cash-for-rent. An additional 1020 households were benefited using funds provided around the same time by other donors, thus expanding overall coverage with economies of scale in terms of project management costs. In Figure 3, the relative

¹¹ This decision was reported to the DEC in Report 1, although it was erroneously reported that the food vouchers were distributed to the same beneficiaries. In fact, Oxfam decided to target different population groups based on different criteria: cash for rent for households that had been in Lebanon for over 3 months and were considered vulnerable to eviction as they had already sold their main assets and could not sustain rental payments; food vouchers for new arrivals awaiting registration with UNHCR.

¹² LibanPost

¹³ In post distribution monitoring surveys, beneficiaries reported expenses for transport to Western Union outlets.

¹⁴ Oxfam PDM Data Analysis, June 2013

contribution of each donor and their location of work are shown. All beneficiary households of the DEC-funded project received cash transfers for two consecutive months (May/June/July and June/July/August).¹⁵

Figure 3. Beneficiaries of the cash-for-rent project, by donor and area

Area/Donor	DEC	COFRA	SOJ	OXFAM APPEAL	Total by area
Tripoli	230 hh		14 hh	270 hh	514 hh
Qalamoun/El Khoura	550 hh	325 hh	56 hh	355 hh	1286 hh
Total number of beneficiary households	780 hh	325 hh	70 hh	625 hh	1800 hh

Two post-distribution monitoring surveys carried out by Oxfam GB in June and October 2013 strongly indicate that the DEC-funded project achieved its objective of contributing to refugees’ rent needs¹⁶. A high proportion of respondents (85% in June and 92% in October) reported spending the cash solely on rent, with the remainder reporting also spending the money on food, medicine, transport and other purposes. The surveys also indicate that for the majority of respondents (80% in June and 61% in October), rental costs exceeded the amount provided by the project with respondents citing monthly rents of between 250 and 400 USD.

Qualitative data collected via key informant interviews in targeted neighbourhoods before and after the distributions corroborate the findings of the PDMs, as shown in Figures 4 and 5.

Although Oxfam GB was aware that the value of the transfer was insufficient to fully meet most households’ rental costs, it chose to respect the agreement between members of the Cash Transfer Working Group to maintain the same value on the basis that most refugee families were generating a small but irregular income to complement the voucher, and to mitigate possible rent inflation in the areas targeted.

It is not possible to judge the impact of Oxfam GB’s cash-for-rent project on other aspects of beneficiaries’ well-being, as the organisation did not collect any relevant data. However, it is reasonable to suggest that the project may have reduced the likelihood of negative coping strategies (as cited in the IRNA) being used during the two months in which beneficiaries received cash for rent.

In terms of beyond-immediate impact, the situation is also unclear. The rationale behind providing cash for two consecutive months was to ‘bridge the gap’ until families were registered and receiving assistance from UNHCR, but Oxfam GB did not track the UNHCR registration process of its beneficiaries and therefore cannot provide direct evidence of this. However, as UNHCR in the Northern Governorate cleared the backlog for registration of refugees by September 2013, it may be reasonably assumed that many of the beneficiaries of the DEC-funded cash-for-rent project are likely to have received follow-on financial support for rent from UNHCR. A minority

¹⁵ Full records of transfers detailing beneficiary households and donors were not available for this evaluation. Staff interviews indicate that the vast majority households targeted in the DEC project received two transfers as planned.

¹⁶ Although no receipts were requested or checked, and no checks were made with landlords

who were not willing to register (for fear of reprisals, or other reasons) are likely to have remained very vulnerable.

Figure 4. Interview with Mohammed Alarja, Qalamoun)



We have been here for four months. Before coming to Lebanon we moved to other cities and villages around Syria. We'd stay in one place until the fighting got so bad we had to move on to the next, and then the next, and the next until it was so bad we decided to come here to Lebanon. I used to have a very nice house with a garden. The last I knew, half of it was burnt and destroyed.

I've not been able to find any work here. I used to be a car mechanic in Syria.

We are paying \$400 a month for these rooms where I am living with my wife, my two small sons, my brother and his wife and their baby. I collected the money (\$150) yesterday from Western Union. It's a relief - we were all saying so when we were waiting to collect our letters at the distribution. It's the kind of support most needed. If I hadn't received this support I'd have to borrow money from everyone I know. I will have to pay the rent on 10th May. We are still trying to get the rest of the money together.

(Source: J Beesley, 4th May 2013. Photo by Sam Tarling)

Figure 5. Interview with Khadija, Qalamoun



Part 1: *I came to Lebanon two months ago with my nephew and his wife and their children. Before we came we were moving from one place to another in Syria. When the fighting and shelling got too heavy we would move to another village until the fighting and shelling got too heavy there as well. Eventually we had no choice but to go and live in a place underground. There was no electricity. It was dark all the time and very frightening but if we hadn't hidden there I think we'd all be dead by now because of the fighting. Then the Syrian Air Force started bombing in that area. That's when we finally decided to leave Syria and we fled to Lebanon.*

Now the landlord is asking us to leave because we can't afford to pay the rent (around \$70 for each of the two rooms). I'm really worried about what I'm going to do and I beg 'Please be patient, I don't have the money at the moment'. I think I might end up sleeping in the street.

I registered with UNHCR a week ago. I gave them a telephone number but I found out later that the phone has been blocked because I hadn't paid any credit. Now I'm very worried that they won't be able to get in touch with me and I won't receive any help.

Part 2, following the first distribution of \$150 from Oxfam: *The cash has stopped me from worrying about what I'm going to do. It is a great help at this time. I am very touched by your actions and your open heart.*

(Source: J Beesley, 4th May 2013. Photo by Sam Tarling)

With regard to **outcome (2)**, Oxfam GB's achievements are as follows:

When the DEC-funded project began in April 2013, Oxfam GB had recently deployed a dedicated monitoring and evaluation specialist to set up and support MEAL processes in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. A monitoring plan was rapidly established for Oxfam GB's planned programme and, for the DEC-funded project, a post-distribution monitoring (PDM) tool was developed as the principal data collection instrument.

Post-distribution monitoring surveys (PDMs) were carried out in June and October 2013, i.e. within 2-6 weeks of people receiving the cash transfers. Randomising software was used to select a sample group of 110 beneficiaries each time, who were contacted by telephone by a temporary monitoring assistant hired for this purpose. Oxfam GB trained the monitoring assistant and some of JAK's staff on the use of the PDM tool, which enabled the exercise to run smoothly.

The PDM tool included questions about family demographics, the organisation of the distribution process, treatment of beneficiaries by staff, and about the usage of the cash. However, as previously noted, the PDM was not designed to collect data on impact, and at this stage in the response Oxfam GB did not have a range of tools to collect data on housing quality, impact, or wider protection issues.

The integration of cross-cutting issues into the MEAL system was limited. For example, questions about security at the distribution sites were included in the PDM, but security issues in relation to the rental accommodation, interpersonal relations and the host community environment were not systematically monitored using this tool or any other. Gender was considered in the PDM design in as much as the respondents were categorized by sex, but a gendered analysis was not produced with the results. Disability was not considered at all. The complementary key informant interviews allowed deeper insights into gender and protection, but it is not clear to what extent their results were shared with and analysed by programme staff.

In October and November 2013, after end of DEC-funded project, Oxfam GB undertook three complementary actions to review and improve its MEAL and safe-programming/protection mechanisms. These were: an internal evaluation of the Lebanon humanitarian response to date, a training visit from Oxfam GB's MEAL Advisor, and a Protection Review and strategic planning process by Oxfam GB's Global Protection Advisor. They made recommendations focused on the following areas:

- To develop a wider variety of MEAL tools, to include more rapid tools to capture real-time data (such as daily observations, transect walks and spot checks of installations) and more participatory processes to collect qualitative data (such as focus group discussions and key informant interviews).
- To use the results of monitoring exercises to plan future actions by ensuring that they are analysed by MEAL and programme staff, and that key learning (including on unintended impacts) is identified and the project design is adapted accordingly.
- To regularly undertake gendered and generational analysis of monitoring data, and use it as described above to improve programming.
- To develop a system to track identification and referral of refugees requiring greater protection.
- To provide training and support to partners to ensure they understand MEAL requirements and processes and have the skills to implement them.

Since then, Oxfam GB has made notable progress in MEAL. A new MEAL toolkit that includes tools for collecting qualitative and quantitative data has been developed and is in use; a Gender Advisor has been successfully recruited and is establishing a gender strategy for the programme; and the protection referral system has been consolidated and is regularly monitored. Oxfam GB is now confident that it has enhanced MEAL systems in place that will enable it to measure the effectiveness and impact of its programmes and respond to the evolving needs of different sectors of the refugee population.

4.2 Adherence to global humanitarian standards

Key Question: To what extent were Sphere and other international standards integrated into the project?

An analysis of the extent of application and integration of all relevant Sphere standards and indicators is presented in Figure 6. In summary:

- The assessment and planning methodology used by Oxfam GB for the DEC-funded project was, for the most part, in line with Sphere core standards for coordination and collaboration, assessment, design and response technical standards for analysis, consultation, coordination and planning in shelter and cash transfer programming.
- Good practice is particularly evident in the area of coordination and collaboration, as Oxfam GB used a 'capacity gap analysis' methodology for its assessment and consulted a broad range of actors, including refugees (through household interviews and focus groups), local NGOs, the Lebanese Red Crescent, municipal authorities, the UN and INGOs already operating in the area. Oxfam GB also coordinated implementation with other actors providing cash for rent (UNHCR and DRC) and regularly participated in the inter-agency Cash Working Group meetings.
- Good practice is also evident in the design and implementation of cash transfers, particularly with respect to monitoring satisfaction, security and protection issues.
- The project appears to have lacked systematic monitoring of the quality of the shelter solutions facilitated by the cash distributions. Sphere standards not used and monitoring visits to observe conditions in the accommodation paid for with the cash were not routinely undertaken.
- Another weakness identified is the apparent lack of responsiveness to monitoring results indicating that the cash amount was insufficient. This is likely due to a combination of factors, including the fact that the cash value was set in agreement with other agencies in the CWG and was unlikely to be reconsidered and changed within the short implementation period of the DEC-funded project, regardless of monitoring results. While understandable, Oxfam GB could have used these results to advocate for increasing the rental amount or providing increased complementary assistance.

Figure 6. Application of Sphere standards

Sphere standard	Evidence of use
<p><u>Core Standard 2: Coordination and collaboration</u> Humanitarian response is planned and implemented in coordination with the relevant authorities, humanitarian agencies and civil society organisations engaged in impartial humanitarian action working together for maximum efficiency, coverage and effectiveness.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>The humanitarian activities of other agencies in the same geographical or sectoral area are not duplicated.</p> <p>The agency's response takes account of the capacity and strategies of other humanitarian agencies, civil society organisations and relevant authorities.</p> <p>Assessment reports and information about programme plans and progress are regularly submitted to the relevant coordination groups.</p>	<p>✓ Oxfam GB's assessment report states that the assessment methodology included: <i>Meetings with representatives from Syria Aid and Relief (SAR) organisation, Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK) organisation, Qatar Red Crescent Society, Municipal Public Health Department and the North Lebanon Water Company; Household and focus group discussions with refugees against set questionnaire (see Annex I); Observations; Visit to the water treatment plant at North Lebanon Water Company; Meetings with Premiere Urgence, CISP, DRC & NRC.</i></p> <p>✓ Oxfam GB's assessment methodology built on assessments by other actors and used a 'capacity gap analysis' to identify gaps in coverage in WASH and Shelter.</p> <p>✓ The purpose of providing cash for rent for two consecutive months to new arrivals or people waiting to register with UNHCR was to 'bridge' the gap until refugees were able to qualify for assistance from UNHCR (and other UN agencies).</p> <p>✓ Oxfam GB cross-checked potential beneficiary lists with UNHCR and DRC in order to avoid duplication. Information about implementation was also provided regularly through the Cash Working Group meetings.</p>
<p><u>Core Standard 3: Assessment</u> The priority needs of the disaster-affected population are identified through a systematic assessment of the context, risks to life with dignity and the capacity of the affected people and relevant authorities to respond.</p> <p>Indicators</p> <p>Assessed needs have been explicitly linked to the capacity of the affected people and state to respond.</p> <p>Rapid and in-depth assessment reports contain views that are representative of all affected people, including members of vulnerable groups and those of the surrounding population.</p> <p>Assessment reports contain data disaggregated by sex and age.</p> <p>Rapid assessments have been followed by in-depth assessments of the populations selected for intervention.</p>	<p>✓ The methodology of the IRNA took into account the limited income-generating capacities of refugees and the service provision (in WASH) by local authorities.</p> <p>(✓) The IRNA included focus groups with men and women separately, but not with members of vulnerable groups or host communities.</p> <p>(✓) The IRNA report contains information about the situation of men, women and children in relation to shelter, WASH, livelihoods, gender and protection. The situation of older people is not mentioned.</p> <p>☐ No evidence has been found for further in-depth assessments.</p>

Core Standard: Design and Response

The humanitarian response meets the assessed needs of the disaster-affected population in relation to context, the risks faced and the capacity of the affected people and state to cope and recover.

Indicators

Programme design is based on an analysis of the specific needs and risks faced by different groups of people.

Programme design addresses the gap between people's needs and their own or the state's capacity to meet them.

Programme designs are revised to reflect changes in the context, risks and people's needs and capacities.

✓ *Oxfam GB's assessment stated: 'Although some households said that they can cope by engaging in daily labour (2-3 days in a week), the priority is to then to pay for rent. If rent is being covered, respondents said they would be able to find means to cover the food gaps...Local markets and shops are fully functioning and accessible to the refugees...Recommended response: cash assistance to cover shelter and basic needs....'*

(✓) *Other projects (not funded by the DEC) were planned and implemented to meet some of the needs of other groups (such as refugees living in informal settlements with WASH needs)*

✓ *See above for details of 'capacity gap analysis' methodology of the assessment.*

☐ *Changes to the DEC-funded project were not made once implementation had begun.*

Cash and vouchers transfers standard 1: Access to available goods and services.

Cash and vouchers are considered as ways to address basic needs and to protect and re-establish livelihoods.

Indicators

All targeted populations meet some or all of their basic food needs and other livelihood needs through purchase from the local markets.

Cash and/or vouchers are the preferred form of transfer for all targeted populations, particularly for women and other vulnerable people.

The transfer does not result in anti-social expenditure.

The transfer does not generate insecurity.

✓ *Oxfam GB's assessment indicated that the vast majority of refugees were paying rent to landlords of local buildings and were thereby engaged in local markets.*

(✓) *This was not tested during Oxfam GB's assessment, but questions regarding satisfaction with the cash for rent distribution process were included in the PDM. The results indicated satisfaction with the form of transfer and process.*

✓ *The PDM tool included questions about expenditure. The results indicated that 90-99% of respondents spent the full amount on rent. No additional evidence was found of anti-social expenditure.*

✓ *The PDM tool included a question on safety during and after the distribution. The results indicated that the vast majority of beneficiaries felt safe at the distribution.*

Shelter and settlement standard 1: Strategic Planning

Shelter and settlement strategies contribute to the security, safety, health and well-being of both displaced and non-displaced affected populations and promote recover and reconstruction where possible.

Indicators

Shelter and settlement solutions to meet the essential needs of all the disaster-affected population are agreed with the population themselves and relevant authorities in coordination with all responding agencies.

All temporary shelter and settlement solution are safe and adequate and will remain so until more durable solutions are achieved.

(✓) Oxfam GB's assessment stated: *"Most interviews were carried out with families who were living in some form of constructed building/house. The structure of these shelters varied from comfortable and well constructed to semi constructed shops and garages. There were a few dwellings that could be classified as "informal collective shelters" whereby families shared semi-derelect buildings that had previously been used as offices or school buildings."*

(✓) The decision to pay for rented accommodation was taken by the refugees before any offer of assistance with rental costs was made by any organisation, including Oxfam GB. After receiving the cash, refugees were able to change accommodation if they wished. The amount of the cash transfer (\$150) was coordinated across the Cash Working Group agencies, including all of those responding in the shelter sector.

(✓) See above. It is likely that some accommodation was not safe or adequate but refugees were not able to afford other options, even with the cash distribution.

Shelter and settlement standard 3: Covered living space

People have sufficient covered living space providing thermal comfort, fresh air and protection from the climate ensuring their privacy, safety and health and enabling essential household and livelihood activities to be undertaken.

Indicators

All affected individuals have an initial minimum covered floor area of 3.5m per person.

All shelter solutions and materials meet agreed technical and performance standards and are culturally acceptable.

□ Oxfam GB did not monitor the quality of the rental accommodation facilitated by its cash distributions.

□ Some key informant interviews were conducted in situ and revealed over-crowding, or lack of furniture to occupy the rented space.

✓ Many refugees stated that the accommodation was far inferior to where they had been living in Syria, but no specific cultural issues were noted.

4.3 Accountability to beneficiaries

Key Questions: To what extent did Oxfam GB involve beneficiaries? To what extent was it accountable to them?

As stated in its proposals and reports to the DEC, Oxfam GB is committed to the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) principles of accountability. An analysis of the extent to which it was able to promote and follow principles 3, 4 and 6¹⁷ is presented as follows:

HAP Principle 3: Participation in programmes

Members involve beneficiaries in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes and report to them on progress, subject only to serious operational constraints.

As mentioned in Section 4.2, Oxfam GB's assessment methodology involved the affected population and potential beneficiaries through focus groups discussions with refugees (men and women), household interviews and community mapping activities. The findings clearly indicated that refugees' priorities were shelter and food, with some limited WASH needs. In accordance with these results, Oxfam GB designed the DEC-funded project and others to meet these needs.

Beneficiary participation in the organisation and implementation of the cash-for-rent project was intentionally low, due the individual nature of registration and cash collection. Similarly, beneficiaries were not involved in conducting post-distribution monitoring surveys due to the need for confidentiality in data collection, but over one quarter of households benefited had the opportunity to provide feedback to Oxfam through this process.

An internal evaluation conducted by Oxfam GB in November 2013 included focus group discussions with beneficiaries of different projects, including beneficiaries the DEC-funded shelter project renting accommodation in a disused shopping mall in Qalamoun. This was also used as an opportunity to respond to queries from refugees about future support.

Principle 4: Communication

Members inform, and consult with beneficiaries about the programmes to be undertaken and mechanisms available for addressing concerns.

In Qalamoun, EL Khoura and some areas of Tripoli Oxfam's partner, JAK, was responsible for informing potential beneficiaries of the cash for rent project and the procedures for registration. JAK used community mobilisers and word of mouth to disseminate this information in the targeted neighbourhoods, in order to avoid creating tensions in other neighbourhoods or security problems at registration or cash distribution points. These efforts

¹⁷ These principles were selected as those most relevant to programme design and implementation. Principle 7 is dealt with in section 4.4 of this report.

appear to have been very effective, although as is often the case, it appears that beneficiaries attributed the aid only to the organization they knew – JAK.

In other areas of Tripoli Oxfam GB worked with a local organization, Syrian Aid and Rescue (SAR), to disseminate information in the targeted neighbourhoods. No documentation of these activities was made available for this evaluation, but the PDM indicates that the activities were effective.

Prior to distributions, Oxfam GB and/or JAK informed selected beneficiaries by phone or text message of their inclusion in the project, the site where they would receive the letter to take to Western Union, the amount they would receive, and the purpose of the cash transfer. They also invited beneficiaries to a briefing on how to claim their cash from Western Union, at which concerns about these aspects could be raised and addressed.

JAK relied on informal mechanisms to address other concerns, principally through its network of community mobilisers who answered questions and tried to resolve problems on the spot. Unfortunately Oxfam does not have a documented record of these interactions, the problems presented or ways in which they were addressed, either in Qalamoun/El Khoura or Tripoli.

The post distribution monitoring survey served to collect feedback and concerns from beneficiaries. For example, in the first survey one person interviewed queried why some households had benefited twice from a distribution due to registration of two of their members as heads of the household. To address this, the partner and Oxfam GB jointly discussed the issue with the beneficiaries and mutually discussed the importance of ensuring clarity in terms of family members ahead of the second round distribution. The refugees were then correctly registered and correctly received second round payment accordingly.

The main concern expressed by beneficiaries was that the rents were much higher than the cash transfer. As explained previously, Oxfam GB did not consider changing the amount due to inter-agency agreements.

Principle 6: Addressing complaints

Members enable beneficiaries to report complaints and seek redress safely.

Oxfam GB did not set up a complaints mechanism in time for the first round of distributions. Around the time of the second one (and to serve other concurrent and future projects) Oxfam GB set up a 'hotline' for complaints and distributed leaflets in its programme areas to make beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries aware of the mechanism. At the time of this evaluation, only two complaints have been received via the hotline, neither of which related to the cash-for-rent project. Oxfam GB staff suggested this might be due to the fact that the line is not toll-free, or because the refugees are afraid about reprisals if they make a formal complaint. Oxfam has recently submitted a request to the Ministry for Transportation for a toll-free number, but is still awaiting a response.

The post distribution monitoring surveys suggest that beneficiaries had concerns about partner staff conduct. In October, nine people surveyed stated that they were not happy with the behaviour of partner staff. These

issues should have been documented as complaints and investigated accordingly, but due to staff turnover and general gaps in documentation it is not clear if these procedures were followed.

In summary, Oxfam GB's efforts to promote participation by beneficiaries were effective and the information that it provided was regarded as timely and useful by the majority of beneficiaries. However, the lack of a formal complaints mechanism and the absence of records of how complaints were handled considerably weakened Oxfam GB's accountability to beneficiaries in this project.

4.4 Partnerships

Key question: To what extent were the partners supported in terms of capacity building and to what extent were they involved in the project implementation process?

Oxfam GB worked with two organisations (Jadawel Al Kheir and Syrian Aid and Rescue) for the DEC-funded cash-for-work project, but a formal partnership existed only with Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK). Syrian Aid and Rescue (SAR) collaborated with Oxfam GB for beneficiary targeting in Tripoli but as it was a relatively new organisation, Oxfam GB chose to implement the project directly. For this reason this section of the evaluation focuses solely on JAK.

Prior to the refugee crisis, Oxfam GB had no previous experience of working with JAK, so it carried out an organisational capacity assessment on 22nd March 2013 which indicated that JAK could meet Oxfam GB's basic organisational, logistics and financial management requirements. The assessment process also highlighted that JAK had very little humanitarian experience and low awareness of gender issues (as reflected in the composition of JAK's governing body, which was comprised only of men), but it was concluded that Oxfam GB could build its capacity in these areas. Oxfam GB duly established a partnership with JAK which, to date, has included four separate projects funded by different donors: Food and hygiene kit distribution; cash for rent; WASH and winterization materials.

JAK's role in implementation of the DEC-funded cash-for-work project was in beneficiary selection and community liaison which, according to both JAK and Oxfam GB, it carried out well. According to JAK and Oxfam GB staff involved in the project, JAK satisfactorily drew up beneficiary lists, presented them to Oxfam GB for cross-checking with UNHCR, entered the final beneficiaries' names into a database and distributed 'entitlement' letters. It also contributed to the design of the PDM. JAK struggled, however, to maintain financial records to the standards required by Oxfam GB and most international donors, and Oxfam GB found that it had to invest much more heavily than anticipated in close accompaniment and monitoring for the duration of the DEC-funded project and the others that followed.

In addition to ongoing capacity-building, Oxfam GB also held specific training sessions for JAK on technical and humanitarian issues relevant to the project, such as project cycle management, monitoring, and cash transfer programming. During the DEC-funded project Oxfam GB did not find time to organize the training on gender or humanitarian principles that it had planned when deciding to partner JAK, although since the project ended

Oxfam GB's Programme Manager engaged in discussion around these issues with JAK's management and a further PCM/MEAL training has been held.

During Oxfam GB's internal evaluation carried out in November 2013, a meeting was held with JAK to obtain its staff's opinions on several aspects of the programme. During this meeting JAK staff spoke with satisfaction about supporting Oxfam GB by facilitating contact with refugees in the area, and about being able to respond the urgent needs in the communities where it works. By contrast, they showed dissatisfaction about their lack of involvement in programme design and future strategy. From Oxfam GB's perspective, a huge investment was made into building the general capacity of JAK to operate adequately in this humanitarian crisis, but that as Oxfam GB is planning to move towards a more directly-implemented programme in the area, the focus of its capacity building with JAK should be focused on current, operational issues.

4.5 Application and generation of learning

Key question: To evaluate to what extent past lessons or recommendations have been fulfilled and to capture new learning from this current project.

In its proposal to the DEC, Oxfam GB stated its intention to apply learning from cash transfer programming (CTP) in the Tsunami response to its programme in Lebanon. In fact, as a result of the deployment of a large number of permanent, expert humanitarian staff¹⁸ to its Lebanon response, Oxfam GB also injected significant institutional learning from other contexts into the design of its programme. The following areas have been identified as the areas in which learning has been applied:

The importance of coordination for cash transfer programming: As highlighted in a recent study about the future of cash programming¹⁹, harmonising transfer values amongst different actors is critical to the success of widescale CTP. In Lebanon Oxfam GB participated actively in the Cash Transfer Working Group, through which it coordinated its cash-for-rent project with other actors using cash in the shelter sector. It reduced the amount that it had initially planned for cash-for-rent to \$150 in order to align itself with other agencies, including UNHCR, and avoid inflating the rental market. While the appropriateness of this value may be questioned (as it was by beneficiaries participating in PDMs), Oxfam GB demonstrated awareness of the need for inter-agency coordination by respecting the collective decision.

Investment in targeting: The CaLP urban toolkit, which has become a standard tool for Oxfam GB food security and emergency livelihoods staff, was used to design the cash for rent project in Lebanon. As recommended in the kit, a significant amount of time was spent in to targeting and selecting beneficiaries, to avoid duplication with other actors and to reduce the risk of social conflict. All potential registrants were interviewed by Oxfam and its partner, JAK; following this, a preliminary list of beneficiaries was created and submitted to UNHCR to ensure that the same names did not appear on their cash distribution lists. This investment was considered worthwhile by Oxfam GB as the process was relatively conflict-free.

¹⁸ From its pool of Humanitarian Support Personnel (HSPs)

¹⁹ Bailey, S., Is Emergency CTP 'Fit for the Future?'

Investment in beneficiary sensitisation: A Humanitarian Practice Network/ODI publication on CTP in emergencies²⁰ emphasises the importance of explaining to beneficiaries the process for collecting the cash. In Lebanon, Oxfam GB made a phone call or sent a text message to all beneficiaries to inform them of their selection for the project, the time and date of the distribution (of letters to be presented at Western Union), and to invite them to a briefing to explain how to claim their entitlement at Western Union.

Monitoring effectiveness and impact: The above-mentioned Humanitarian Practice Network/ODI publication also provides guidance on how to monitor CTP, which includes a recommended set of key questions on effectiveness. These questions were all integrated (without exception) into Oxfam GB's post-distribution monitoring questionnaire and were used in both surveys to gauge the intervention's effectiveness.

Naturally, the learning process is imperfect, and some lessons from previous responses appear to have been overlooked, such as:

Focusing on the objective of the cash transfer: Many recent publications on CTP have included a reminder that cash is just a tool to achieve the objective of the intervention, not the objective itself. As explained in section 4.2, Oxfam GB neglected to monitor the quality of the shelter facilitated by the cash transfers, and it did not continue monitoring the intervention for long enough to understand whether the cash had in effect helped to 'bridge the gap' between exhausting a household's financial resources and qualifying to receive assistance from UNHCR.

Gender and cash transfers: According a study conducted by Oxfam GB and Concern²¹, there should be an organisational commitment to gender from the start of any cash transfer programme and its planning must take account of gender relations and realities. It emphasizes that organisations should be clear when to target women and men, why and what is to be achieved, and that the delivery of cash needs to take women's specific needs into account. In Lebanon this was not the case. The gender analysis conducted during the assessment was only partial and appears not to have influenced the cash programming design in any way. Monitoring was partially blind to gender, only recording whether the PDM questionnaire was answered by a man or a women, but no further analysis was made of the impact of the cash on gender relations or gender equity.

The DEC-funded project has also offered Oxfam GB opportunities to capture new learning. Although a formal learning review has not yet taken place, the following lessons have been identified and are in the process of being documented within Oxfam GB:

Using Western Union Global Pay System for CTP: The Lebanon response was the first time Oxfam GB had used Western Union's Global Pay system for CTP. As explained in Section 4.1, Western Union was selected for having a wide network of terminals in the project location, offering reduced handling fees for NGOs, and because its

²⁰ Paul Harvey and Sarah Bailey, HPN, ODI

²¹At the following link:

http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cashlearning.org%2Fdownloads%2Fresources%2Fpresentations%2F06-oxfam-gb-concern-cash-and-gender.pdf&ei=09wYU_38FdLzoAS9r4HgAQ&usg=AFQjCNGz_JjDpWYyj5Xh2fNjfJuh_TRzUw&bvm=bv.62578216,d.cGU

Global Pay system enabled Oxfam GB to reduce risks by removing the need to handle large amounts of cash in its Beirut office or with its new partner. While the decision is still considered to have been appropriate, the process was unexpectedly time-consuming for staff in Oxfam GB's Oxford Finance Department. Not only did all beneficiaries' names and details have to be manual keyed into the Western Union system, but Western Union was also legally required to check if any beneficiaries had sanctions against them; sometimes further details had to be sought to disprove this, which caused significant delays.

Since this project was implemented Western Union has made its data uploading processes more efficient, but, in Oxfam GB's experience, its reporting tools still need to be better adapted to aid agencies' needs. Oxfam GB would consider using WU again in specific contexts, but with better preparation to cope with some of the inconveniences.

Options for EFSL work in prolonged refugee crisis: The Lebanon crisis has shown that exit strategies from cash are not readily available in contexts such as this, and that donors or agencies that expect to 'progress' from cash to another form of assistance may find it unfeasible in situations of prolonged displacement in already poor host communities.

5. Conclusions

The results of this evaluation indicate that:

- Oxfam GB delivered a **highly-relevant project that achieved its primary objective** in terms of significantly contributing to meeting the cash-for-rent needs of 780 vulnerable Syrian refugee households for two months.
- The **method** chosen (Western Union) **to distribute the cash** was considered relatively **cost-effective** and user-friendly by beneficiaries and Oxfam GB. As a pilot experience, it has generated useful learning that Oxfam GB is considering to apply elsewhere.
- The project demonstrated very good practices in terms of **adherence to Sphere core standards and technical standards for cash transfer programming**. However, **Oxfam GB did not consider using Sphere standards to assess and monitor the quality of the accommodation (shelter)** facilitated by its cash-for-rent distributions. It is likely that most of the accommodation paid for by this project did not meet Sphere standards, but if Oxfam GB and other agencies had considered applying the standards within the constraints of this particular context they would probably have been able to identify ways and means to better protect beneficiaries' well-being and dignity.
- The **monitoring processes** put in place during the project were **sufficient to measure the effectiveness** of the cash-for-rent distributions **but did not enable Oxfam GB to measure or understand the full impact** of the DEC-funded project. They **fell short of adequately integrating cross-cutting issues**.
- **Oxfam GB involved beneficiaries** through focus groups and house-to-house visits at the assessment stage, thereby enabling it to design a relevant project. At the implementation stage Oxfam GB **provided timely and appropriate information** to them but **did not establish a robust system to address their concerns or complaints**. Therefore, Oxfam GB **did not fully meet its commitments to accountability**.
- **Oxfam GB provided strong support to its partner, JAK**, throughout the DEC-funded project and others since then. Its focus, however, was mainly on ensuring adequate logistics and financial management procedures rather than on building general capacity to implement a project in accordance with humanitarian principles and international standards.
- **Oxfam GB applied a wealth of institutional learning and good practices** from other cash transfer projects, mainly as a result of the deployment of experienced staff. **The project also offers Oxfam GB very important learning** in terms of ensuring cross-cutting issues are integrated and that cash is regarded as a tool to reach other objectives, not as an end in itself.

6. Recommendations

Although the DEC-funded project ended in September 2013, the following recommendations are still considered valid for Oxfam GB's on-going programme in Lebanon and institutional learning:

For Lebanon:

- Immediately review performance in the area of accountability; ensure that a basic system is in place and that all staff and partner staff understand that accountability is not optional.
- Verify that previous MEAL recommendations (resulting from advisory visits and evaluations) have been considered and, where considered relevant, are being implemented.
- Verify that the current MEAL framework and plan are being used as programming tools, not just for donor reporting. Managers, technical teams, MEAL staff and partner staff should be regularly analysing progress against the MEAL framework and adjusting activities and plans accordingly.
- Check that the current MEAL framework and plan include the means to measure impact.
- Hold a humanitarian learning day with JAK and other new partners to reflect on the application of humanitarian principles in current and planned projects. Even if Oxfam GB scales down its partnership with JAK, it is important to recognise that JAK will continue to work with refugees in host communities and would benefit from a deeper understanding of the principles that underpin humanitarian action. In the case of new partners, this would provide a timely opportunity to ensure that Oxfam GB and partner staff have a shared understanding of issues such as impartiality and accountability.

General:

- Encourage staff in all programmes to put in place various complementary accountability mechanisms, to avoid reliance on one channel for communications and complaints.
- Ensure that cash transfer programmes have access to technical expertise relevant to their objectives (such as for shelter, in the case of the Lebanon response), and that they fully consider all relevant technical standards.
- Use experience gained in Lebanon to discuss appropriate alternative indicators for meeting shelter standards (Sphere) in poor urban environments.
- Ensure that mechanisms are agreed in the earliest stages of a project for partners to meet expected accountability standards, particularly with respect to documenting and responding to concerns and complaints. This may require the development and application of a simple tool, the results of which are

systematically discussed in meetings with Oxfam GB staff, and are included as a requirement in partners' monitoring reports.

- Document the experience of cash transfers via Western Union for internal learning purposes and to share with other actors in the humanitarian sector.

7. Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR OXFAM GB Lebanon Response to the Syria Crisis

Emergency food security and shelter response for vulnerable households affected by the Syria crisis in Lebanon.

Project supported by the DISASTER EMERGENCY COMMITTEE

Introduction:

As of April 2013²², the total number of Syrian refugees seeking refuge in neighboring countries is estimated at 1.3 million. There were over 420,000 registered and unregistered Syrian refugees (Syrian Syrian – SS) in Lebanon, and it was anticipated that by end of this year the number of refugees will reach 1.2 million (30% of the total Lebanese population). The ongoing Syrian Crisis had also accelerated the exit of over 40,000 Palestinian refugees from Syria (PRS) to Lebanon, more than 33,000 Iraqi refugees had returned to Iraq, and over 22,000 Lebanese had returned to Lebanon. However, the Government estimated that including those not registering with UNHCR, more than 1 million Syrians were in Lebanon as of April 2013.

In Palestinian refugee camps, which were established for the Palestinians back in late 40s, where Palestinian Syrian (PRS) and Syrian Syrian (SS) refugees displaced from Syria were seeking refuge; there has been limited access to aid. The camps were becoming overcrowded, with accommodation reaching saturation point. Due to the limited accommodation available, families resorted to living in garages, unfinished buildings and empty shops or several families had been sharing accommodation meant for just 1 family.

I. Short description of the project:

1.1. Global objective of the project:

Oxfam GB has responded with the aim to:

- i. To contribute towards the basic needs for rent and food of 420 Syrian refugee households (approximately 2100 people) living in host communities in Tripoli and El Khoura.

²² The section introduction refers to the situation of the refugees in April 2013, when the project was designed.

1.2. Geographical area: Lebanon (Tripoli and El Koura)

1.3. Target beneficiaries: 420 households (approximately 2,100 people)

1.4. Global budget: 237,951 GPB (approximately 388,637 USD)

1.5. Duration of the project: April 2013 until September 2013

1.6. Sectors of intervention: Cash for rent, and food security

1.7. Partner organizations: the project is implemented through the partner organization Jadawel El Kheir (JAK) in North Lebanon.

II. Global objective of the evaluation:

To assess the impact and effectiveness of the DEC-funded food security and shelter response for vulnerable households affected by the Syria crisis in Lebanon.

III. Specific objectives:

The objectives of the evaluation are structure around the DEC Accountability framework:

- 3.1. To evaluate to what extent the proposed specific objectives and outcomes have been achieved and whether it is possible to show what changes have been made to people's lives (cost-effectiveness of the intervention should also be considered);
- 3.2. To evaluate to what extent were Sphere and other international standards integrated into the project;
- 3.3. To evaluate the level of involvement of and accountability to beneficiaries;
- 3.4. To evaluate to what extent past lessons or recommendations had been fulfilled and to capture new learning from this current project;
- 3.5. To evaluate to what extent the partners have been supported in terms of capacity building and to what extent they were involved in the project implementation process.

IV. Methodology of the evaluation:

4.1. Review of the literature: • Project proposal: narrative and financial. • Project reports: narrative and financial. • Other relevant literature

4.2. Interviews with the main stakeholders

- Meetings and interviews at Oxfam in Lebanon

- ❖ Humanitarian Program Manager: verify to what extent the DEC support has contributed to the achievement of the Lebanon Response's humanitarian strategy.
- ❖ Oxfam staff from the Emergency Food Security and Livelihoods (EFSL) team

- Meetings and interviews in the field
- ❖ Project staff at JAK, Oxfam's partner: verify their level of involvement in the implementation of the project, the support they received in terms of capacity building and their impressions of the working relationship. Interview the project manager, the finance manager, PHE, PHP, etc.
- ❖ Other agencies working in the area (if applicable and relevant)
- ❖ The beneficiaries: direct and host families: their involvement in defining the basic needs, the activities. What changes took place and did the project cover their needs? What difference did the intervention make in their lives?

V. Expected outputs of the evaluation:

A comprehensive final report that includes:

- The findings in terms of concrete results and outcomes;
- The level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries and of the implementing partners;
- The relevance of the project's objectives and activities to the emergency situation;
- How cost effective was the program;
- Lessons learned of the project.

A debrief session could be held with Oxfam's staff to present the findings and the lessons learned.

VI. Duration of the mission:

VII. Dates: The evaluation field mission will take place in January 2014. Exact dates are to be decided in consultation with Oxfam.

Annex 2: Sources of data

Internal Reports

1. Situation reports 1-47
2. Syria discussion paper on what is going on in the country, December 2012, Kitka Goyol
3. Perspectives on scaling up humanitarian work on the Syria crisis from the Syria scoping workshop and field visit, Beirut, 3-8 December 2012, M. El Sanousi, G. Dodkhudoeva, N. Timmins
4. Lebanon – Jordan Trip report, Nigel Timmins, March 2013
5. Teleconference call minutes December 2012-April 2013
6. Funding Grids September and October 2013
7. Handover Report, Humanitarian Advisor, Francesco Rigamonti, 22nd July 2012

Assessments

8. Tyre Area Notes 14th Sep 2012 (no author)
9. Jordan & Lebanon Rapid Assessment Overview, Francis Lacasse et al., September 2012
10. Assessment of Beqaa locations, Bibi Lamond, 14 Feb 2013
11. Tented settlement rapid assessment report in Kafarkahel and Barsa (Tripoli), OXFAM Lebanon office, April 2013
12. Rapid WASH Assessment Report in Saida, OXFAM, Lebanon Programme, 5 June 2013
13. Emergency Food Security Assessments and Livelihoods Assessment, February 2013, Loreto Palmaera et al.
14. Assessment On Syrian Palestinian Refugees Residing In Central Bekaa In Lebanon: Wavel Camp, Gatherings Of Taalabaya And Bar Elias Oxfam Italia, September 2012
15. Oxfam Assessment – Palestinian Camps and Gatherings, February 2013, Loreto Palmaera et al.
16. Palestinian Refugees from Syria Assessment Report and Concept Note, 26th January 2013, Loreto Palmaera et al.
17. Oxfam Rapid WASH Assessments: Tented Settlements May 2013
18. Integrated Rapid Needs Assessment – Tripoli and El Khoura Districts, North Governorate, Loreto Palmaera et al., 15 February 2013

Programme Strategy and Design

19. Joint Oxfam Response Strategy Syria Emergency: First Draft, 1st October 2012, Kitka Goyol
20. Notes from discussion of OGB's engagement in Syria, 13 December 2012
21. Joint Oxfam Response Strategy Syria Emergency, Updated 13 February 2013
22. WASH Strategy for Lebanon OGB Syria Crisis Response, Oxfam, March 2013
23. Joint Oxfam Response Strategy Syria Emergency: CATEGORY 1, 15th April 2013
24. Protection Mainstreaming Strategy, Jordan and Lebanon, Oxfam, March 2013

Monitoring, Accountability, Evaluation and Learning

25. Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Minimum Standards in Oxfam Humanitarian Programs, January 2012
26. Real Time Evaluation of Oxfam's Response to the Syria Refugee Crisis, February 2013
27. Lebanon Action Plan, Oxfam Lebanon, March 2013

28. Oxfam MEAL Framework for WASH Programme in Lebanon, March 2013
29. Complaints/Feedback collection form for during distribution (undated)
30. Oxfam EFSVL Indicator Framework (undated)
31. Post Distribution Monitoring Report Food and Hygiene Voucher, August 2013
32. Post Distribution Monitoring: Data Analysis for DEC-funded Cash for Rent Project in Tripoli and Qalamoun, Oxfam Lebanon's MEAL Team, October 2013
33. Post Distribution Monitoring Report, Cash for Rent, Tripoli and Qalamoun, 12 June 2013
34. Post Distribution Monitoring Report for Winterisation Kit, Oxfam's MEAL Team with support from AMEL, NAVTSS and PAWL, 10 April 2013
35. Logical Framework, Lebanon Jasmine Response – Cash Transfer Project

Partnership

36. PARD Emergency Proposal, October 2012
37. PARD Emergency Capacity Assessment, Vivien Korsten, October 2012
38. Project Proposal Najdeh, December 2012
39. Memo approval emergency Najdeh, Vivien Korsten, November 2012
40. Memo approval emergency PARD, Vivien Korsten, November 2012
41. Funding approval Najdeh, Vivien Korsten, December 2012
42. Partners Assessment Humanitarian Relief for Development (n.d.)
43. Organisation assessment report SAWA, May 2013
44. Partner financial assessment report SAWA, June 2013
45. Organisation Assessment report SAR and JAK, Tripoli, March 2013
46. Oxfam Partner Security Assessment, SAWA, Lebanon, June 2013
Organisation Assessment Report Utopia, Tripoli, August 2013
47. Funding agreement between Oxfam GB and Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK) LEBA51
48. Funding agreement between Oxfam GB and Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK) LEBA 56
49. Funding agreement between Oxfam GB and Jadawel Al Kheir (JAK R04941
50. Partnership agreement with Muslim Scouts, Oct 2013
51. Partnership agreement with NAVTSS, May 2013
52. Partnership with SAWA, October 2013
53. Funding agreement between Oxfam GB and SAWA Group, October 2013

Protection

54. Beyond information dissemination and referrals: Organising refugees into committees for self-protection, Lou Lasap, September 2013
55. Survey of refugees' information needs, access about services and entitlements and attitude about self-referrals, Oxfam, October 2013
56. Referral Monitoring System, Oxfam, October 2013
57. Palestinian Camps and Gatherings Assessment, Protection < Lou lasap Feb 3013
58. Protection and Gender in Emergencies: An orientation workshop, Lou Lasap, July 2013
59. Protection Sitreps February 25 to May 20, 2013
60. Protection questions for September 2013 Assessment
61. Standard Operational Procedures for Oxfam information dissemination and referrals, July 2013, Beirut
62. Safe And Conflict-Sensitivity Programming Approaches For Wash And Livelihoods, Lou Lasap (no date)
63. Professional standards for Protection Work carried out by humanitarian and human rights actors in armed conflict and other situations of violence, ICRC, 2013 edition

Advocacy

64. Oxfam Syria Crisis External Updates 5 March 22 May
65. Mid-Term Review of the Oxfam Syria RIC Campaign, Kirsten Hagon, October 2013
66. http://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases?keys=Syria+crisis&date_filter%5Bmin%5D%5Bdate%5D=&date_filter%5Bmax%5D%5Bdate%5D=
67. Oxfam International: <http://blogs.oxfam.org/en/category/tags/syria>
68. Oxfam GB: <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/blogs/tag/syria-crisis>
69. Oxfam America: <http://www.oxfamamerica.org/emergencies/syrian-conflict-and-refugee-crisis/#press>
70. <http://metro.co.uk/2013/01/28/oxfam-launches-12m-syria-appeal-as-refugees-contend-with-brutal-winter-3368722/>
71. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/ffce97bc-6647-11e2-919b-00144feab49a.html>
72. <http://news.sky.com/story/1043813/oxfam-launches-12m-syria-refugee-appeal>
73. <http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/home-news/oxfam-in-syrian-refugees-appeal.20022170>
74. <http://www.scotsman.com/news/uk/oxfam-launches-12m-syria-appeal-1-2762272>
75. <http://www.morningstaronline.co.uk/news/content/view/full/128760>
76. <http://www.itv.com/news/update/2013-01-28/the-worst-time-of-the-year-to-be-a-syrian-refugee/>
77. <http://www.itv.com/news/update/2013-01-28/oxfam-launches-12m-syria-appeal/>
<http://www.itv.com/news/update/2013-01-28/oxfam-appeal-video-highlights- plight-of-syrian-refugees/>
<http://edition.cnn.com/2013/01/28/world/asia/jordan-syrians-escape/http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/9830279/Bashar-al-Assads-chances-of-holdong-on-shrinking-by-the-day-says-Russia.html>
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/middle-east-live/2013/mar/06/syria-refugees-one-million-live>
78. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-21676542>
79. <http://en-maktoob.news.yahoo.com/video/oxfam-urges-donors-more-syrian-194500338.html>
80. <http://uk.news.yahoo.com/syria--spiralling-towards-disaster---video-shows-life-in-refugee-camps-as-one-million-are-displaced-142106459.html>
81. Global Syria Campaign Strategy Nov 2013 – March 2015, Draft, October 2013

Donor Proposals, Reports and Media Coverage

82. DEC Form 7, Oxfam, 2013
83. DEC Form 6, Oxfam, 2013
84. DEC Form 6a Narrative Plan, Oxfam, 2013
85. DEC Forms 11a and 11b Phase 2 Narrative plan, Oxfam, 2013
86. DEC form 12 Financial Plan, Oxfam, 2013
87. Oxfam WASH and Protection Proposal for DFID (Bekaa), August 2013
88. Oxfam Proposal to Unicef WASH Response for Refugee Influx due to Syria Crisis in Bekka and Baalbeck Valley Areas, plus annexes, June 2013
89. Oxfam Proposal to ECHO plus annexes, Humanitarian Response and Assistance for People Affected by the Security Crisis, July 2013
90. Oxfam DfID Logframe August 2013
91. ERF Final Report: Emergency food security and protection response for vulnerable refugees from Syria crisis, July 2013
92. Application to French Government, Oxfam September 2013
93. Oxfam Interim Financial Report FACE, October 2013

94. Annex 4 – Programmatic Reporting to UNICEF: WASH Response for Refugee Influx due to Syria Crisis in Baalbeck, Bekka Valley, Lebanon, 05 July – 04 October 2013
95. SIDA Final Report, Oxfam, August 2013
96. Project Description UNHCR Annex 8, September 2013
97. Oxfam Workplan: UNHCR September 2013
98. UNICEF PCA Amendment September 2013
99. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/50m-uk-support-to-lebanon-as-refugee-numbers-soar>
100. DEC Form 6a
101. DEC Form 6b
102. DEC Form 7
103. DEC Form 8a
104. DEC Form 8b
105. DEC Form 13a Narrative
106. DEC Form 13b
107. DEC Final Financial Report October 2013
108. Oxfam Expenditure Report on DEC Grant to July 2013
109. DECAF Assessments 2013-14: Guidance

Reports from External Sources

110. ACF WASH Assessment Humanitarian Response to the Syrian Refugees. Bekaa Valley Eastern Lebanon, December 2012
111. Regional Response Plans 1-6
112. World Vision Needs Assessment Report Syrian Refugees, Bekaa Area, Lebanon November 2012
113. UN Inter-agency Updates on Syria Situation Response in Lebanon, October 2011-February 2013, at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi>
114. Coordination and Cash Transfer Programming: Is Emergency Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) ‘fit for the future’? CaLP with Humanitarian Futures Programme, S Bailey, 2013.
115. Gender issues in Cash transfer programmes, Oxfam and Concern Worldwide, powerpoint presentation (n.d.)
116. One Year of Humanitarian Action with Syrian Refugees, April 2012 to April 2013, AMEL Emergency Response
117. Cash Transfer Programming in Emergencies, Paul Harvey and Sarah Bailey, Good Practice Review, Humanitarian Practice Network, 2011
118. DEC Syria Crisis Appeal 2013, Response Review: Final Report, James Darcy, October 2013
119. DFID, Humanitarian Guidance Note: Cash Transfer Programming 11/2013
120. Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon, 2013 Report, World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and UNICEF

Human Resources

121. Lebanon Organogram, Alicia Oughton, August 2013
122. Capacity Planner, Alicia Oughton, October 2013
123. Recruitment Planner, Alicia Oughton, October 2013
124. Headcount Lebanon, Alicia Oughton, October 2013
125. Job Profiles (12 examples)
126. List of HSPs deployed to Lebanon from 2012 onwards
127. Introduction to Performance Management, Alicia Oughton, July 2013

- 128. Syria Crisis Sub-Region Org Chart, January 2014
- 129. Oxfam Non-staff Code of Conduct

Other

- 130. Revised WASH Contingency Budget September 2013
- 131. Syrian Crisis Lunchtime Talk Presentation, Jane Beesley, May 2013
- 132. Shifting Sands: Changing Gender Roles among Refugees in Lebanon, OI Joint Research Report, October 2013
- 133. Words and Pictures (for photos by Sam Tarling)
- 134. Khadija's Story, Jane Beesley, May 2013
- 135. Mohammed Alarja's Story, Jane Beesley, May 2013

Interviews and Correspondence

- 136. Lou Lasap, HSP Protection and Gender, Oxfam GB
- 137. Loreto Palmaera, HSP Food Security, Emergency and Vulnerable Liveilhoods, Oxfam GB
- 138. Justin Okwir, HSP Food Security, Emergency and Vulnerable Liveilhoods, Oxfam GB
- 139. Maria Ghazzaoui, MEAL Officer, Lebanon, Oxfam GB
- 140. Chele Degruccio, Humanitarian Programme Manager, Lebanon, Oxfam GB
- 141. Melinda Young Syria Crisis Response Manager, Oxfam GB
- 142. Colette Fearon, Former Humanitarian Programme Coordinator for Syria Response, Oxfam GB
- 143. Rick Bauer, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator, MECIS, Oxfam GB
- 144. Alicia Oughton, HR Manager, Lebanon, Oxfam GB
- 145. Gaziul Hassan Mahmood, HSP - Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning, Oxfam GB
- 146. Vivien Walden, Global MEAL Advisor, Oxfam GB
- 147. Kitka Goyol, former Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for MECIS, Oxfam GB
- 148. Nigel Timmins, Deputy Humanitarian Director, Strategic Lead for Syria Crisis Response, Oxfam GB
- 149. Philippa Young, Emergency Food Security and Livelihoods Advisor, Oxfam GB
- 150. Matthew Rothero, Humanitarian Funding Coordinator, Syria Crisis, Oxfam GB
- 151. Netsanet Taye, Finance Officer, Lebanon, Oxfam GB
- 152. Aleksander Bursac, Finance Manager, Lebanon, Oxfam GB
- 153. Tim Childs, Tax and Treasury Manager, Oxfam GB
- 154. Pradip Bishwakarma, Team Leader, Payments Team, Oxfam GB
- 155. Anne-Marie Baan, MEAL Advisor, Syria Response, Oxfam GB

Annex 3: DECAF Framework (with highlights showing areas of focus of this evaluation)

1. We use our resources efficiently and effectively	2. We achieve intended programme objectives in accordance with agreed humanitarian standards, principles and behaviours	3. We are accountable to disaster affected populations	4. We learn from our experience – taking learning from one emergency to the next
1.1 Documented processes are in place at the appropriate level governing the use and management of funds	2.1 The agency has defined and documented processes for programme management which are underpinned by a clear statement of standards	3.1 A defined and documented Accountability Framework is in place governing accountability to disaster affected populations	4.1 A documented process is in place at the appropriate level to ensure that learning is systematically captured, shared and utilised
1.2 Approach to the management and care of staff reflects People in Aid code of good practice	2.2 Programmes respond to clearly defined needs and are adjusted as needs change	3.2 Information on agency background, programme timelines, beneficiary entitlements and selection criteria is communicated to disaster affected populations	4.2 Key learning is effectively communicated to staff, partners and other stakeholders
1.3 Programme design and procurement processes maximise value for money - balancing quality, cost and timeliness at each phase of the response	2.3 Staff and partners understand and integrate agreed standards in to their programmes	3.3 Disaster affected populations participate in programme assessment, design, implementation and evaluation	4.3 Key learning (including from evaluations) is incorporated into processes and programmes in a systematic and timely manner
1.4 Incidences of actual/suspected fraud or loss are investigated and actioned	2.4 Agencies participate in established coordination mechanisms and support their partners to do the same	3.4 In consultation with disaster affected populations appropriately designed and described complaints handling procedures are implemented	4.4 Agencies contribute to peer and sector learning in humanitarian response
1.5 Partners are consulted and their capacity is assessed, utilised and developed where appropriate	2.5 Unintended programme impacts and outcomes are identified and acted upon in a timely manner	3.5 Agencies shall work with partners to strengthen their capacity to be accountable to disaster affected populations	
1.6 Local structures (including governments, civil society organisations and markets) are consulted and strengthened	2.6 Programmes contribute to disaster risk reduction and build the resilience of communities, partners and governments		

