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I am pleased to share with you the 2017 Annual Report of the Lebanon Humanitarian Fund (LHF). This report presents an overview of the Fund’s operations in 2017, showing how it has supported vulnerable communities across Lebanon through a wide range of emergency projects.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to the Fund’s donors, whose constant commitment to burden-sharing has helped ease the suffering of thousands of vulnerable people in Lebanon.

In 2017, donors contributed US$12.6 million to the Fund. The limited contributions in early 2017 led us to launch a large-scale fundraising campaign encouraging donors to boost their funding to preserve the Fund. Donors generously responded at the end of the year, bringing in around $9 million in the last quarter. On this note, I am very pleased to welcome back Denmark, Germany and France as contributors to the Fund, joining Belgium, Iceland, Ireland, and Sweden.

Given the pattern of contributions, the LHF conducted three Allocations (two Reserve and one Standard allocation), for a total amount of $6 million. 26 projects were funded, covering activities in a wide range of sectors, from WASH to health, emergency shelter, protection, education and early recovery.

Of special note, the Fund was instrumental in supporting four local municipalities affected by the Riyyak evictions in Baalbeck el Hermel (Sarrin, Hawsh al rifka, Tamnin and Qsarnaba), supporting provision to the most vulnerable among the elderly and Persons with Specific Needs (specially children with disabilities). In addition, the Fund supported specialized services, school rehabilitation and the provision of psycho-social support services to children and youth affected by the Ein El Helwe clashes of May 2017.

These achievements illustrate the strategic reorientation undertaken in 2017: the Fund refocused on its comparative advantage and added-value in the context of the crisis in Lebanon, responding to emerging crises, reaching the most vulnerable populations with specific needs who not targeted by mainstream projects; and filling crucial funding gaps that threatened to discontinue protection services to hundreds of women and children across Lebanon.

Perhaps one of the Fund’s most exciting accomplishment in 2017 was to deliver on its commitment to increase its support to national partners: 50 per cent of funds were allocated to Lebanese NGOs. Lebanon, with its vibrant civil society, is a fertile soil to help turn the Grand Bargain’s localisation objective into an achievement, and we intend to maintain this support to local NGOs in 2018.

As a matter of fact, I want to commend the remarkable efforts and engagement of all our partners: national and international Non-Governmental Organizations, United Nations agencies and the Red Cross/Red Crescent. In fact, the LHF is one of the few Funds worldwide that has partnered with all four of these entities at once. They have all done an incredible job in bringing assistance in a timely and efficient manner to the people who need it the most.

I also want to thank the sector coordinators of the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan as well as the Inter-Sector team for their instrumental role in setting the priorities for the allocations, and for providing valuable technical support before and throughout the implementation.

As we launch into 2018, we look forward to continuing to work closely with all our partners – from local NGOs to global donors – to support the most vulnerable communities in Lebanon.

PHILIPPE LAZZARINI
Humanitarian Coordinator for Lebanon
LEBANON HUMANITARIAN FUND AT A GLANCE

12.6M CONTRIBUTIONS

- Germany: $3.55M
- Denmark: $2.21M
- Belgium: $1.77M
- Sweden: $1.72M
- Ireland: $1.60M
- France: $0.59M
- Iceland: $0.20M

5.7M ALLOCATIONS

- $2.56M to INTERNATIONAL NGOs
- $2.83M to NATIONAL NGOs
- $0.1M to UNITED NATIONS
- $0.26M to RED CROSS/RED CRESCENT

18,978 PEOPLE REACHED

- 9,106 women
- 1,501 girls
- 6,886 men
- 1,485 boys

23 PARTNERS

26 PROJECTS

ALLOCATIONS BY SECTOR

- Protection: $2.62M
- Shelter/NFIs: $1.21M
- Health: $1.13M
- Education: $0.34M
- Early Recovery: $0.24M
- WASH: $0.21M

Projects per Governorate - Sum of projects exceeds total number of projects funded due to projects covering several Governorates.
Humanitarian situation in 2017

Lebanon remains at the forefront of one of the worst humanitarian crises of our time. The situation in the country continues to be precarious, with extensive humanitarian and development needs. Lebanon hosts the highest per capita population of refugees in the world. As of January 2018, the Government of Lebanon estimates that the country hosts 1.5 million Syrians who have fled the conflict in Syria (including 995,512 registered as refugees with UNHCR), along with 34,000 Palestinian Refugees from Syria (PRS). 35,000 Lebanese Returnees, and a pre-existing population of more than 277,985 Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon (PRL). The vulnerabilities of each of these groups have different root causes, requiring the overall crisis response to include a multifaceted range of interventions from emergency aid to development assistance.

High poverty levels

Eight years into the crisis, poverty levels are high and the long-term resilience of Lebanon’s vulnerable communities is eroding as they run out of savings and struggle to access income. At present, 1.5 million Lebanese live below the poverty line, of whom 470,000 are children. More than 76 per cent of Syrian refugees are living below the poverty line, along with 65 per cent of PRL and 89 per cent of PRS, who are one of the most vulnerable groups in the region. In response to protracted poverty, which is leading to rising food insecurity, 96 per cent of Syrian refugees are adopting negative coping strategies such as selling household goods, productive assets and housing or land, or withdrawing children from school. Households are sinking deeper into debt. In addition, constraints related to labour and residency policies have compelled refugees to resort to illegal and exploitative labour.

Increasing socio-economic disparities

Lebanon has witnessed an increased demand on its infrastructure and services, which lack the capacity to meet increased demand. The distribution of refugees in areas with a high concentration of Lebanese living below the poverty level, in conjunction with unemployment and a deteriorating economic situation, is exacerbating poverty and social tensions between communities while deepening socio-economic disparities. Between 2014 and 2017, the percentage of Lebanese who did not report any inter-community tensions dropped to around 10 per cent and 25 per cent of the Syrian refugees, are in particular need of more support. Mortality and morbidity are expected to increase due to inadequate access to healthcare.

Food Security

The food security situation remains very critical despite provision of direct food assistance, with an increase of food insecure households compared to 2015: 91 per cent of Syrian refugees live in some degree of food insecurity in 2017, compared to 89 per cent in 2015.

Gender-Based Violence

Socio-economic vulnerabilities, exacerbated by a protracted crisis, have translated into an increase in the levels of violence against children and women. There is an increased reliance on harmful practices such as child marriage and child labour, and an amplified risk of traffickers preying on the heightened vulnerability of populations.

Disability

One of the main objectives of the LCRP is to ensure a tailored provision of protection and other services for persons with specific needs such as persons with disabilities, older persons as well as women and children. However, data on persons with disabilities who are at high risk of violence, discrimination and exclusion is a persisting gap. Persons with disabilities have specific needs that entail additional costs on the family and require continuous assistance to improve their integration in society and access to services. Therefore, special attention should be given to this specific group through a holistic multi-sectoral response.

Education

The protracted nature of the Syria crisis has overstretched the capacity of Lebanon’s education system to address critical needs. Despite the efforts of the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) and partners, there are still unmet needs and challenges to be tackled. It is estimated that half of Syrian refugee children – more than 250,000 – remain out of school.

Healthcare

Despite the institutional support provided, health facilities at the level of primary healthcare and hospitalization across Lebanon are heavily strained with an increased demand on services due to the crisis. For instance, Akkar and Bekaa, which are traditionally underserved areas and hosting respectively around 10 per cent and 25 per cent of the Syrian refugees, are in particular need of more support. Mortality and morbidity are expected to increase due to inadequate access to healthcare.

WASH

64 per cent of the population in Lebanon do not have access to safe drinking water services. The presence of a large number of refugees has led to a stress on resources, but also to an increase of 15 per cent of solid waste, 14 per cent of waste water, and 12 per cent in water demand.

---

1 All numbers and figures are sourced from the LCRP
## TIMELINE OF EVENTS

### JANUARY 2017
**UN and Government jointly launch the LCRP for 2017, as part of the 2017-2020 response plan.**

### FEBRUARY 2017
**The first-ever census of the Palestinian population in Lebanon is launched, covering 12 Palestinian refugee camps and 121 “gatherings.”**

### MARCH 2017
**General Security announces that it is waiving the prohibitive residency fee for refugees registered with UNHCR.**

### APRIL 2017
**Hezbollah declares that it has “cleared” Lebanon’s eastern border with Syria of jihadist elements, and begins dismantling its military positions and handing them over to the Lebanese Armed Forces.**

### MAY 2017
**More than 12,500 Syrian refugees are evicted from their informal settlements in the Riyak area, and 2,400 refugees are evicted in Zahle (both in the Bekaa region).**

### JUNE 2017
**Thousands of Syrians return to their villages in West Qalamoun (Syria) following Hezbollah-brokered deals with the Jabhat Fath el Sham (Nusra Front) militant group.**

### JULY 2017
**President Aoun addresses the UN General Assembly, and calls for the return of Syrian refugees.**

### AUGUST 2017
**Hundreds of Lebanese and Syrians return to the eastern Baalbek town of Tfail (near the Syrian border), more than three years after abandoning their homes due to insecurity.**

### SEPTEMBER 2017
**The Parliament passes the first official government budget since 2005. President Aoun restates his call for refugees to return to “stable and low-tension areas” in Syria.**

### OCTOBER 2017
**The first-ever census of the Palestinian population in Lebanon is launched, covering 12 Palestinian refugee camps and 121 “gatherings.”**

### NOVEMBER 2017
**General Security announces that it is waiving the prohibitive residency fee for refugees registered with UNHCR.**

### DECEMBER 2017
**The Parliament passes the first official government budget since 2005. President Aoun restates his call for refugees to return to “stable and low-tension areas” in Syria.**
2017 IN REVIEW
ABOUT THE LEBANON HUMANITARIAN FUND

LHF basics
The LHF is one of OCHA’s Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPF), established in 2014 following the decentralization of the Regional Syria Fund to support the timely allocation and disbursement of donor resources to address the most urgent humanitarian needs and assist the most vulnerable people in Lebanon.

Aligned with the LCRP, the fund is a predictable and complementary source of humanitarian financing, making timely and flexible funding available for life-saving humanitarian and critical stabilization activities.

The LHF is distinguished by its focus on assisting most vulnerable groups of population, its flexibility, and empowering humanitarian leadership in Lebanon.

The Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) for Lebanon oversees the Fund and decides on its funding allocations. The HC is supported by OCHA that manages the Fund on a day-to-day basis, the LHF Advisory Board and the Lebanon Inter-Sector coordination structure.

What does the LHF fund?
The LHF funds activities that have been prioritized as the most urgent and strategic to address critical humanitarian needs in the country in close alignment with the LCRP.

Who can receive LHF funding?
The Fund channels funding to eligible national and international NGOs, UN agencies, and Red Cross/Red Crescent movement organizations.

LHF funds are channelled through partners that are best-placed to deliver prioritized activities in accordance with the agreed strategy and humanitarian principles in a timely and effective manner. To be eligible to receive LHF funding, NGOs undergo a rigorous capacity assessment to ensure they have in place the necessary structures and capacity to meet the Fund’s robust accountability standards and efficiently implement humanitarian activities in Lebanon.

Who sets the Fund’s priorities?
The HC, in consultation with OCHA Lebanon, the LHF Advisory Board and upon consultations with the Inter-Sector, decides on the most critical needs to be funded. Sector coordinators work with their members to define the sector-specific priorities in prioritized geographical areas or population groups, which are reflected in individual allocation strategies.

How are projects selected for funding?
The LHF has two allocation modalities:

Standard Allocation: LHF funds are allocated early in the year based on the LCRP and an analysis that identifies the highest priority needs underpinned by vulnerability data, the Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon (VASyR), the ARK perception survey and other assessments. The strategy is developed by OCHA, in consultation with the Sectors, approved by the HC and endorsed by the LHF Advisory Board. It forms the basis for individual project submissions. Project proposals are prioritized and vetted within sectors through Technical Review Committees and then recommended to the LHF Advisory Board for endorsement and final approval by the HC.

Reserve Allocation: Reserve funds are primarily intended for rapid and flexible allocations of funds in the event of unforeseen emergencies or to address identified gaps. These funds can be allocated through individual reserve allocations or broader allocation rounds and are usually slightly faster and more geographically focused. They must be cleared (through strategic and technical review) by sector coordinators before endorsement and approval by the HC.

Who provides the funding?
The LHF is funded with contributions from UN Member States, but can also receive contributions from individuals and other private or public sources. Since its inception in 2014, the Fund has received more than $51 million in contributions.
HOW DOES THE LEBANON HUMANITARIAN FUND WORK?

DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS
Donors contribute to the humanitarian funds before urgent needs arise.

IDENTIFYING HUMANITARIAN NEEDS
Aid workers on the ground identify the most urgent types of humanitarian assistance that affected people need.

MANAGING FUNDS
Contributions are pooled into single funds.

ALLOCATING FUNDS
Based on expert advice from aid workers and on needs, the Humanitarian Coordinator allocates CBPF funding.

REQUESTING FUNDS
Humanitarian partners work together to prioritize life-saving relief activities. They request CBPF funding through the Humanitarian Coordinator.

HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
Relief organizations use the money for urgent aid operations. They always track spending and impact, and report back to the Humanitarian Coordinator.
How is the efficient and accountable use of the LHF funds ensured?

Through pooling and mitigating the multi-layered risks of humanitarian operations in Lebanon, the LHF has maintained its comparative advantage as an attractive tool that enables donors to channel funds regardless of the nature, location or mode of delivery of response.

The LHF risk management approach is outlined in its Accountability Framework, which aims to increase accountability and mitigate risks. It comprises four elements:

- Partner Capacity Assessment
- Operational Modalities
- Performance Management
- Financial controls and audits

The dynamic nature of the Framework ensures that it is continuously updated with the most recent partner performance information, which complements other components to reflect the overall capacity and risks associated with individual LHF partners.

Operationally, the Framework follows and complements the LHF allocation process from the prioritization areas and sectors, the selection of projects and partners, to the implementation of the project at the field level, including its subsequent reporting, audit and monitoring.

The practical assurance modalities applicable for each individual project are thus determined through the minimum Operational Modalities — parameters that define the amount and the frequency of financial tranches received by the implementing partner, monitoring frequency and modality, and financial controls that need to be applied.

A fifth element of the Accountability Framework, the Common Performance Framework, will be formally introduced in 2018 (a first tentative report is included in the Fund Performance section p.19 and in the annexes).

Who manages the LHF?

The HC is responsible for the overall management of the LHF and is accountable for the use of funds. The LHF Advisory Board, chaired by the HC and comprising two UN agencies, four NGOs (two international NGOs, two national NGOs), and donor representatives advises on the use of funds and the governance of the LHF (for 2017 composition see Annex B).

The LHF is managed by OCHA Lebanon Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU), which manages the Fund on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the HC. OCHA contracts and disburses LHF funds to all implementing partners.

What rules govern the LHF?

The LHF is guided by the global CBPF Guidelines, which include the CBPF Policy Instruction and the global Operational Handbook. This guidance is reflected in the localized LHF Operational Manual.

The Policy Instruction sets out the principles, objectives, governance and management arrangements for CBPFs, while the Operational Handbook provides technical guidance, tools and templates used in the management of CBPFs. The funds contracted to partners are further subject to the UN Financial Regulations and Rules (FRR).

The LHF Operational Manual and its annexes provide technical guidance as well as tools and templates used in the management of the Fund. The latest version of the LHF Operational Manual was issued in March 2018. The manual and its annexes are available for download on https://www.unocha.org/node/947619.
Donors demonstrated a renewed trust and support for the LHF, depositing $12.64 million between January and December 2017, on top of $1.43 million carried over from 2016. The generous funding allowed the LHF to support humanitarian partners implementing urgent humanitarian activities in Lebanon.

2017 was a pivotal year for the Fund. While the LHF remained pivotal in addressing critical humanitarian needs in Lebanon, the overall contributions to the Fund declined since 2015 – from $19.2 million in 2015 to $12.6 million in 2016 and less than $3 million by mid-2017. This sharp decrease led the HC to engage with the Advisory Board and donors to discuss the future of the Fund. At the same time, the Fund’s strategy was refocused on specific priorities (see First Standard Allocation).

On 24 October 2017, the HC invited previous and potential LHF donors to the first 2017 Donor Meeting. It was attended by 18 countries and representatives from national and international NGOs.

The purpose of the meeting was to brief the donors on LHF’s role in the response to the humanitarian crisis in Lebanon and to discuss its achievements since its creation, its current funding challenges and the way forward.

Participants expressed their full support for the Fund’s direction and proposed developing a resource mobilization strategy.

The HC highlighted that the LHF strategic focus for 2018 would strongly depend on the level of funding. He emphasized that upcoming allocations will focus on supporting mental health, people with special needs and social stability, which would be further identified with the sector coordinators and the Inter-Sector coordination unit.

During the last Quarter of 2017, close to $8 million were contributed to the LHF, which was perceived as a vote of confidence in the LHF’s refocus and its management through a renewed dialogue.

These end-of-year contributions will allow the LHF to launch a Standard Allocation in early 2018 to support the needs identified in the updated LCRP.
SUCCESS STORIES

Zeinab’s story:

Home visits and medical support for a family in a desperate situation.

Living in a one-room apartment with no windows, in a building that is falling apart, on Bouchrieh street in Mten district (Mount Lebanon), Zeinab, a 74-year-old Syrian woman, suffers from poor health.

Like many people in a desperate situation, Zeinab especially appreciates home visits. She suffers from high blood pressure that is continually rising, as well as other complications that come with old age. Thanks to assistance from the Helping Hands project funded by LHF and implemented by the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) Lebanon, Zeinab can now buy her much-needed medication and engage once again in family life.

Her family faces its share of challenges: Zeinab lives in an apartment in poor condition with her daughter, four grandchildren, and great-granddaughter, for which they pay US$400 per month. Without any financial support, the breadwinning and security has been left up to the teenage grandson.

In addition to all these challenges, the family’s neighbourhood has been shaken by significant insecurity and religious unrest.

Zeinab’s daughter expresses a desire to take her family abroad and seek asylum outside of the Middle East, adding that their hometown in Aleppo has been completely destroyed. Between financial strains, health complications, and safety concerns, this family cherishes the help received through the Helping Hands project, which is essential for their survival.

About the Helping Hands project

Assessments have found that a significant number of elderly persons above the age of 60 are vulnerable to exclusion, abuse, neglect, and increased hardships. Many are in difficult economic situations and are unable to afford the specific care they require. The Helping Hands project supports elderly people living independently in their community while protecting their dignity, wellness, and resilience. At-home care is provided according to individual needs by community volunteers through scheduled weekly home visits. The intervention is also aimed at supporting care givers so that they can maintain the capacity to care for the elderly in their community. The activities are targeted at 200 Syrian refugee and host community families living in the areas of Dekweneh, Fanar, and Bouchrieh in the Metn district, which have been identified as vulnerable localities.
SUCCESS STORIES

Ahmad’s Story

Rebuilding lives after a fire

The last few weeks were far from easy for Ahmad and his family, and the 29 other families living in a refugee settlement in Ghazze, in the Bekaa Valley. On 7 December 2017, a fire tore through 30 tents in the village, killing eight children and destroying many families’ entire homes and possessions.

Syrian refugees and Lebanese living in the village joined forces that night and did their best to save as many lives as they could, with emergency assistance from the Lebanese Red Cross, but the damage was still extensive. Ahmad says that “on that night, the cries of children got mixed with the shrieks of women while the flames burned deep red and amber.” He added: “I only have God to thank for the safety of my family, since they were in the market at that time. Everything that is lost can be recovered somehow, but not my family!”

The disaster affected many families in Ghazze camp and deprived them of all their belongings, leaving them without a roof over their head. Families had to find a place to stay until they could rebuild the tents. Some of them were hosted by other Syrian refugees living outside Ghazze camp or by Lebanese families, as the settlement was under reconstruction for more than two weeks after the fire.

Following the disaster, LHF partnered with Medair to respond to the critical situation and provide assistance to the families in an efficient and effective way. Medair distributed new equipment and tents for the families and started site improvement work in order to prepare the land for tent construction. In early January, the Medair team went back to Ghazze to check on the families and distributed eight fire extinguishers, along with guidelines and instructions about how to properly use them.

Ahmad, who has been living in the Ghazze settlement for five years, thanked Medair and the LHF for the help provided to his family and to the other families who suffered from the fire. “Now I will be more cautious with anything that can cause a fire,” he added. “I care a lot about my family’s safety and I want to thank you for your constant help and support—without it, we wouldn’t have a place to live.”

About Medair

Medair is a humanitarian organization inspired by Christian faith to relieve human suffering in some of the world’s most remote and devastated places. It works to bring relief and recovery to people in crisis, regardless of race, creed or nationality, providing a range of emergency relief and recovery services in Lebanon.
Life-saving, coordinated and effective response
In 2017, the LHF continued to be a crucial tool for timely, coordinated and effective humanitarian response, addressing the most urgent needs of GBV survivors, People with Specific Needs, displaced populations and other vulnerable people in Lebanon under the leadership of the HC. Combining flexibility and strategic focus as its comparative advantage, the Fund ensured the timely allocation of scarce resources, facilitated humanitarian interventions and strengthened humanitarian coordination.

In 2017, the LHF funds were allocated through both Standard and Reserve allocation modalities, with strategic prioritization adjusted to meet the emerging needs and availability of funding.

Alignment with the LCRP
The LCRP provided a baseline for allocating LHF resources throughout 2017. Specifically, the Fund supported two LCRP strategic objectives:

Strategic Objective 1: Ensure protection of vulnerable populations: Recognizing that the imperative of protecting people lies at the heart of humanitarian action, this response objective aims to strengthen protection services and interventions for displaced persons from Syria and vulnerable populations, empower individuals and mainstream protection across all sectoral interventions. It promotes protection of, and access to, affected people in accordance with relevant instruments of international refugee and human rights law ratified by Lebanon.

Strategic Objective 2: Provide immediate assistance to vulnerable populations: This response objective addresses the immediate needs of the vulnerable populations (displaced Syrians, vulnerable Lebanese, Palestine Refugees from Syria and Palestine Refugees in Lebanon), prioritizing the most vulnerable through temporary solutions, with the aim to mitigate the rapid deterioration of social and economic conditions.

Empowering coordination
The LHF continued to be among the most inclusive and transparent funding mechanisms in the Lebanon humanitarian landscape. It promoted collective response and partnership diversification through the engagement of multiple stakeholders in its decision-making processes.

Diverse set of partners
LHF allocations strengthened partnerships within the humanitarian response by allocating funds to both local and international humanitarian organizations.

The Fund leveraged the distinct comparative advantages of its partners, promoting diversity, reach and collective ownership of the response to provide timely and improved access to basic services for affected people.

More than $5.4 million or almost 94 per cent of programmable funds were channelled through non-governmental implementing partners. $2.8 million or almost 50 per cent of those funds were channelled to national NGOs, and $2.6 million or 45 per cent to international NGOs. This demonstrates the distinct strategic focus of the Fund to enable multiple partners to provide direct delivery of services on the ground. The Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement received $0.3 million (4 per cent) and the UN agencies, funds and programmes received $0.1 million or 1 per cent of funds programmed by the LHF.

Starting 2017 with a Reserve Allocation
The first 2017 Reserve allocation focused on humanitarian interventions and the provision of immediate assistance to highly vulnerable individuals with urgent unmet needs. It also aimed to support short-term, critical and time-sensitive activities, for example, bridging funding gaps to ensure the continuity of vital humanitarian services.

The HFU received 43 project proposals submitted on the Grant Management System (GMS) by 34 humanitarian actors, requesting a total of $10.87 million. During the strategic review, 23 proposals were recommended for funding, amounting to $5.4 million as per the below breakdown:

- Projects submitted by international NGOs: 12 projects; $3.15 million;
- Projects submitted by national NGOs: 10 projects; $1.9 million;
- Projects submitted by UN agencies: one project; $0.25 million.

The recommended projects were reviewed by a committee, which was composed of the Inter-Sector coordinators (UNDP, UNHCR), an OCHA representative, NGO representatives (Dorcas and Save the Children) and the HFU.

The committee identified eight applications amounting to $1.5 million, submitted by five international NGOs, three national NGOs and one UN agency, which met the allocation criteria and responded to the allocation priorities.
Strategic focus of the First Standard Allocation

Based on the 2017 mid-year review of the LCRP, and in close coordination with the sector coordinators and the LHF Advisory Board at their meeting on 30 May 2017, a Standard Allocation was launched on 1 June at the request of the HC. The allocation focused on; supporting People with Specific Needs (PwSNs) including people living with disabilities, the elderly and individuals with mental health issues, in addition to marginalized groups or at-risk groups.

In addition to adhering to the above specifications, all proposals had to comply with at least one or several of the required general priorities below as well as to the identified sector-specific priorities/gaps.

- Bridging of critical humanitarian funding gaps, threatening the continuity of existing programmes;
- Activities that address critical gaps for vulnerable communities with little or no access to essential services;
- Activities to prevent and respond to evictions of the most vulnerable refugees, not covered by ongoing assistance including support to local municipalities.

A total of 74 project proposals were submitted by 65 humanitarian organizations to the LHF, requesting a total budget of $23.7 million.

The technical review was conducted by eight Sector Review Committees (SRCs) including sector coordinators, UN and NGO representatives. The SRCs scored the project proposals as per the LHF scorecard and was based on the allocation paper, and focused on:

- Strategic relevance,
- Programmatic relevance,
- Cost effectiveness,
- Management and monitoring,
- Engagement with Sector coordination forums at national and regional levels.

The SRCs recommended 29 projects (39 per cent of submissions) amounting to $9.2 million.

The HFU and the LCRP Inter-Sector coordination undertook a further review of the projects, taking into consideration:

- The recommended projects by the sector and sub-sector;
- The strategy of the LHF for 2017 and the focus of the allocation paper;
- The total allocation envelope as per the allocation paper ($4 million).

As a result of this review process, the HFU and the LCRP Inter-Sector coordination recommended 15 projects submitted by five international NGOs, eight national NGOs and one organization from the Red Cross/Red crescent movement.

Shortfall of funding

Following alerts by UNICEF and partners on a funding shortfall affecting the Child Protection and GBV sectors, the 2017 Second Reserve Allocation was launched on 15 November by the HC. The allocation focused on bridging critical humanitarian funding gaps which threatened the continuity of ongoing programmes. Critical gaps were identified through the Child Protection and GBV sector coordinators.

A total of five funding requests were submitted to the LHF by two international NGOs and one national NGO. Three were approved for funding, for a total of $305,963.
ALLOCATIONS BY RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION

1 UN Secretariat Programme Support Costs (Jan-May 2016 3% of NGO allocations, 2% since June 2016); Management (OCHA Lebanon HFU); Accountability costs (capacity assessments and external monitoring); Audits (as budgeted).

See Annex D for acronyms
With the introduction of the Common Performance Framework (CPF), OCHA has added a new tool to the set of management, reporting and accountability instruments for CBPFs.

The CPF was developed jointly by OCHA and CBPF donors to assess and improve individual fund performance and understand how the CBPF mechanism performs as a whole.

Together with insight from other monitoring and reporting tools, the objective evidence-based analysis provided by the CPF will help stakeholders to ensure that CBPFs are efficient and responsive to the changing needs. It will also help demonstrate how donors’ investments through CBPFs contribute to improved humanitarian outcomes.

With the introduction of the CPFs for CBPFs in 2017, managers and stakeholders involved in the governance of the Funds are responsible for the proper CPF use and implementation.

The CPF stems from the theory of change and overall policy and operational parameters included in the CBPF guidelines and is summarized below:

- To generate operational impact (“the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity”), CBPF operations are embedded in the humanitarian coordination architecture at the country level.
- Therefore, the CBPFs aim at delivering three strategic objectives or outcomes:
  a. Improve the effectiveness of the humanitarian response by directing funding towards priority humanitarian needs;
  b. Strengthen leadership and leverage the coordination role of the HC;
  c. Mobilize resources and support coordination in support of the LCR.

CBPFs embody the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and function according to Inclusiveness, Flexibility, Timeliness, Efficiency, and Accountability and Risk Management.

**Principle 1: Inclusiveness**
A broad range of humanitarian partner organizations (UN agencies, INGOs, NNGOs, RC/RC) participate in LHF processes and receive funding to implement projects addressing identified priority needs.

As per the LHF Operational Manual, the different stakeholders were represented in Governance bodies (Advisory Board, Strategic Review Committees), and considered based on their comparative advantages for allocation of resources.

In 2017, the LHF sought to fulfill the Grand Bargain commitment on Localization and channeled close to 50% of the funds to NNGOs.

**Principle 2: Flexibility**
The programmatic focus and funding priorities of CBPFs are set at the country level and may shift rapidly, especially in volatile humanitarian contexts. The CBPFs are expected to adapt rapidly to changing priorities and allow humanitarian partners to identify appropriate solutions to address humanitarian needs in the most effective way.

In this regard, the LHF as performed very well and demonstrated flexibility in the allocation process, using both modalities in accordance with the situation (both of the levels of funding available, and the evolving context). The HFU also demonstrated a high level of flexibility to process No Cost Extension or reprogramming requests at the right time to address operational and contextual changes, and in a timely manner (the processes were often completed in a significantly shorter time than stipulated in the Operational Manual).
Principle 3: Timeliness

The CBPFs allocate funds and save lives as humanitarian needs emerge or escalate. It is therefore expected of CBPFs such as the LHF to ensure timely allocation processes vis-à-vis the objectives of the allocation.

Timely Allocations: while its timelines for Standard and Reserve Allocations are longer than most other Funds, the LHF’s processes are adapted to the crisis, coordination structures and timeframes for Lebanon. In 2017, the LHF achieved to conduct the First Standard Allocation in 47 working days (against a target set at 45 working days).

Timely Disbursements: disbursements were released in a timely fashion, with an average of 13.8 days (or 10 working days) from IP Signature of GA and Disbursement of 1st Tranche for Standard Allocations, and 8.5 days (or 7 working days) for Reserve Allocations.

Timely Contributions: as explained in the Contribution chapter, funds received in 2017 followed an unusual pattern, with more than 63% of contributions received in the last quarter:

- Q1: $2.7M (22%; Sweden, Ireland)
- Q2: $0.2M (2%; Iceland)
- Q3: $1.7M (14%; Belgium)
- Q4: $7.9M (63%; Sweden, Germany, Denmark, France)

Principle 4: Efficiency

Management of all processes related to CBPFs enables timely and strategic responses to identified humanitarian needs. The CBPFs employ effective disbursement mechanisms, minimizing transaction costs, whilst operating in a transparent and accountable manner.

Efficient scale: at the global level, the target for CBPF’s percentage of Humanitarian Response Plans’ funding requirements channeled is 15%. Lebanon’s LCRP is a strategic document that addresses both humanitarian and transition challenges, for at total budget of $2.75 billion in 2017, and therefore the target of 15% was not deemed relevant. The LHF target for 2017 was set at $15 to 20 million. Thanks to the end-of-year contributions, the total received amounts to $12.6 million, or 84%.

Efficient prioritization: While the LCRP doesn’t propose a formal prioritization, the Inter-Sector and Sector Coordinators have been instrumental in compiling needs assessments, synthesizing and identifying priority needs in their sectors for the LHF Allocations.

Efficient coverage: The information presented in this report is misleading as it suggests underperforming while the reality is potentially the opposite: for the purpose of this report, narrative reports submitted by partners were used to compile the number of beneficiaries reached as of 10 March 2018.

However, a considerable number of projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report.

As a comparison, all projects funded in 2015 are completed, with a coverage rate of 140% (188,370 beneficiaries reported against a target of 133,836); and 41/55 (74%) projects of 2016 have ended, with a coverage rate of 88% (535,745 beneficiaries reported against a target of 608,428).

Based on past data, 2017 projects are on track to achieve 100% coverage of more.

Efficient management: in 2017, HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) amounted to $280,000 (out of $508,000 initially required), or 2.2% of overall contributions to the Fund in 2017 (12.6 MUSD). The low execution of the HFU cost plan (the target was set at 5%) is due to Human Resources gap in 2017, which were addressed by the end of the year.

Efficient management: The LHF updated it Operational Manual and other tools as per CBPF guidelines in 2017.
Principle 5: Accountability and Risk Management

The CBPFs manage risk and effectively monitor partner capacity and performance. The CBPFs utilize a full range of accountability tools and measures, both at the Fund level, and at the Grant level.

The fund-level risk management framework consolidates all activities and functions that mitigate key risks under one umbrella. The analysis will be conducted on a yearly basis.

In line with the Operational Handbook for CBPFs, there are 4 components to risk-based grant management:

- The capacity assessment of NGO partners, including reference to registration and due diligence; this determines the risk level of a partner, which in turn determines the operational modalities
- The operational modalities (parameters based on the partners’ risk level that define the amount and the frequency of financial tranches received by the implementing partner, monitoring frequency and modality, and financial controls that need to be applied.
- The performance management;
- The compliance mechanisms.

Accountability and risk management for projects: the LHF funding is appropriately monitored through field visits and financial spot checks. The levels of compliance with the Operational Modalities, while not perfect, are satisfactory: all high-risk partners’ projects were monitored (details available in annex B: Accountability and Risk Management). Of note, all the audits conducted on 2016 projects concluded that funds had been used as per the Financial rules and Regulations, only identifying relatively minor observations, such as VAT coverage. As most 2017 were still ongoing at the date of this report, only 3 audits was due to be launched.

Accountability and risk management of implementing partners: LHF funding is allocated to partners with demonstrated capacity. All partners undergo a Due Diligence and Capacity assessment to become eligible to receive LHF funding.

23 partners received funds in 2017. Out of 5.74 MUSD allocated in 2017:

- 0.27 MUSD were allocated to High Risk partners (1 project, 5% of funds)
- 3.51 MUSD were allocated to Medium Risk Partners (17 projects, 61% of funds)
- 1.95 MUSD were allocated to Low Risk Partners (8 projects, 34% of funds)

NB: The level of risk doesn’t play a role in the selection of a partner to implement a project that is deemed strategically and technically sound. However, assurance mechanisms are determined based on partner risk level, value and duration of the project.

Accountability and risk management of funding: oversight and assurances of funding channeled through the LHF, as articulated through the Operational Modalities in the LHF Operational Manual, validated by the Advisory Board, allowed the HFU to detect potential under-performance in 2017, provide treatment and correct the problem at hand. All potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF’s Annex 22b.: SOP on suspected Fraud and Misuse of Funds.

Accountability to affected people: All proposals submitted to the LHF are required to indicate the plan on the accountability to affected population (AAP). Accordingly, all monitoring activities include the consultation with beneficiaries component.
This section of the Annual Report provides a brief overview of the LHF allocations and results reported in 2017 by sectors. Reports at sector level section highlights key indicator achievements based on partners narrative reports submitted within the reporting period, 1 January to 31 December 2017. Achievements against targets include only information from projects funded through one of the three 2017 Allocations. A considerable number of projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.
ACHIEVEMENTS BY SECTOR

BASIC ASSISTANCE

SECTOR OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: The ability of the socio-economically vulnerable population, including female headed households, to meet their basic survival needs is increased.

Objective 2: Populations affected by seasonal hazards and emergencies are able to secure additional basic survival needs.

Objective 3: The National Poverty Targeting Programme (NPTP) is supported and capacitated.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

UNHCR, Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA) and Lebanon Cash Consortium

ALLOCATIONS

$591,780

REACHED BENEFICIARIES

1,556

WOMEN 327  MEN 375

GIRLS 444  BOYS 410

PROJECTS 2  PARTNERS 2

ACHIEVEMENTS

In 2017, the LHF supported the implementation of two basic assistance projects by providing improved access to essential goods and services for highly vulnerable populations in hard-to-reach areas in Arsal as well as in Beirut and Mount Lebanon with multipurpose cash assistance.

The LHF funded projects aimed at continuing to mitigate the existing constraints surrounding access to food and non-food items/services, and the subsequent negative mechanisms utilised by individuals and families to manage these access constraints. One of the two projects was able to maintain the provision of direct, multipurpose cash transfers allowing people to satisfy their basic needs in Arsal, a hard-to-reach area where no other cash method can effectively reach the underprivileged population.

Cash support serves as a boost to the purchasing power of people in need, facilitating their access to goods available in the markets; those which are not directly accessible for the target populations through the existing cash transfer modalities. These projects also served as a boost to the local market economies, particularly local vendors that benefited from direct cash injection in their businesses.

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of vulnerable households receiving seasonal cash assistance</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of socio-economically vulnerable households assisted</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of USD amount distributed</td>
<td>403,500</td>
<td>403,500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHIEVEMENTS BY CLUSTER

EDUCATION

SECTOR OBJECTIVES
Objective 1: Enhanced access to and demand from, children youth, and their caregivers, for equitable formal or regulated non-formal education.
Objective 2: Enhanced quality of education services and learning environment to ensure grade-appropriate learning outcomes for children and youth.
Objective 3: Enhanced governance and managerial capacities of RACE 2 implementing institutions to plan, budget, deliver, monitor and evaluate education services.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS
UNICEF and MEHE

ACHIEVEMENTS
In 2017, the LHF supported the implementation of two education projects implemented by two partners amounting to $0.34 million.

The Fund supported continued access to education providing access to learning opportunities for children and youth with disability. In addition, the Fund supported the provision of Technical and Vocational Education Training sessions which contributed to increasing the number of children and youth accessing non-formal education in Beb el Tebbene, a poor neighbourhood in the northern city of Tripoli.

By the end of the reporting period, it is expected that the Fund supported at least 941 children and youth in the Bekaa and north of Lebanon.

LHF funding promoted an integrated approach by ensuring that the activities were implemented in complementarity with interventions from other sectors in the targeted areas as well as in close coordination with other education partners to ensure maximum efficiency, sustainable impact and avoid duplication efforts.

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

| No. of children and youth enrolled in regulated non-formal education programs whose education-related costs are partially or fully subsidized | 250 | 213 | 85 |
| No. of children with special needs receiving additional support in formal schools | 693 | 266 | 38 |
| No. of public school buildings fully furnished in line with MEHE specifications | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| No. of teachers, education personnel and educators trained | 360 | | |

ALLOCATIONS
$340,000

REACHED BENEFICIARIES
479

WOMEN | MEN
0 | 0

GIRLS | BOYS
201 | 278

PROJECTS | PARTNERS
2 | 2
ACHIEVEMENTS BY CLUSTER

HEALTH

CLUSTER OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: Population in need receives hospital and diagnostic services.
Objective 2: Sufficient chronic disease medication available.
Objective 3: Sufficient acute disease medication, medical supplies and reproductive health commodities available.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

WHO and UNHCR

ACHIEVEMENTS

The LHF supported the provision of essential and lifesaving medical services in settings where health services are generally insufficient and overstretched. Some $1.1 million was allocated to six health projects implemented by six partners across the country.

With the support of LHF funds, the Health Sector partners managed to address and cover gaps in the provision of emergency aid to: improve mental health; cover funding gaps to dialysis treatment for Syrian and Palestinian refugees; and improve the health of children “with congenital malformation” and ensure their access to diagnostic and hospital services. In addition, the Fund filled funding gaps in the provision of chronic medication to 500 primary health care centers across Lebanon.

Through 2017 funding, the LHF targeted 6,058 beneficiaries across the eight governorates.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients who received chronic disease medication</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of persons receiving hospital services</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subsidized mental health consultations out of total</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>4,908</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.
ACHIEVEMENTS BY CLUSTER
PROTECTION

CLUSTER OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: Persons displaced from Syria have their basic rights respected and fulfilled, and enjoy access to justice and have a valid legal residency.

Objective 2: Community-based interventions are strengthened to contribute more effectively to referral pathways, access to services, and the identification of vulnerabilities and protection concerns.

Objective 3: Access to protection and services is ensured to the most vulnerable women, girls, boys and men identified and resettlement/other form of humanitarian pathways is realized.

Objective 4: SGBV risks are reduced and access to quality services is improved.

Objective 5: Boys and girls at risk and survivors of violence, exploitation and abuse have access to an improved and equitable prevention and response.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS
UNICEF, UNHCR, UNFPA, and MoSA

ACHIEVEMENTS

The LHF supported the provision of essential and lifesaving protection needs with a specific focus on vulnerable groups as PwSNs, GBV survivors, elderly and children with disabilities that continue to face challenges to access their basic rights and services.

Some $2.6 million were allocated to 12 protection projects implemented by 11 partners to support more than 70,000 beneficiaries across the country.

With the support of LHF funds, the protection sector partners managed to provide services to PwSNs, including older persons, individuals suffering from trauma, and persons with disabilities, including Palestine Refugees having mental and physical disabilities through the provision of specialised services such as focused psycho-social support and legal support. This group had been identified as the most vulnerable population group among both displaced and host communities.

Women and girls in Lebanon affected by sexual and gender-based violence were also targeted through the provision of a holistic approach including Cash assistance, legal and medical assistance (especially for cases related to penal suit, divorce, alimony and custody), basic needs assistance, skills training and recreational activities.

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of boys and girls assisted through Child Protection case management services</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children (and adolescents) benefiting from psycho-social support services and outreach initiatives</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of patients who received chronic disease medication</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of women, girls, men and boys at risk and survivors accessing SGBV prevention and response services in safe spaces</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women and girls accessing safe spaces reporting feeling empowered</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of individuals reached through awareness sessions on legal topics</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of institutions supported</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of individuals participating in community and social development centers</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of individuals receiving information on services</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of individuals trained (public officials, civil society, service providers and front-liners etc.)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of referred individuals provided with services</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHIEVEMENTS BY CLUSTER
SHELTER

CLUSTER OBJECTIVES
Objective 1: Vulnerable population groups have access to affordable shelter conditions at minimum standards.
Objective 2: The shelter sector response is strengthened through an enhanced level of coordination, collaboration, and contribution of national institutions, local authorities and Lebanese NGOs.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS
UNHABITAT, UNHCR, and MoSA

ALLOCATIONS
$624,230

REACHED BENEFICIARIES
479

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th>BOYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECTS | PARTNERS | 4 | 4 |

ACHIEVEMENTS
The LHF supported the provision of essential shelter services for the most vulnerable Syrian refugees with an integrated approach, focusing on the PwSNs. Some $0.6 million were allocated to four shelter projects implemented by four partners in the Bekaa (with a specific focus on Arsal) and Mount Lebanon.

With the support of LHF funds, the shelter sector partners managed to address and cover gaps in the rehabilitation of sub-standard housing units for Syrian refugees in Arsal. In response to evictions and emergencies, actors addressed the acute shelter needs of displaced Syrian living in informal settlements in the Bekaa with the aim to ensure that temporary shelters meet basic minimum standards. Rehabilitation of sub-standard shelters took into consideration protection risks for vulnerable groups, particularly women and children, as well as PwSNs and elderly through the addition of doors, locks and barriers on balconies and stairs.

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of vulnerable displaced people in temporary shelters maintained at liveable conditions</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of vulnerable people with access to affordable shelters at minimum standards</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHIEVEMENTS BY SECTOR

SOCIAL STABILITY

SECTOR OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: Social stability is promoted by strengthening the ability of municipalities, communities, systems, and institutions to mitigate tensions and prevent conflict as well as ensure early warning within the response.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

UNDP, UNHCR, MoSA, Ministry of Interior and Municipalities (MoIM)

ACHIEVEMENTS

The LHF funded the provision of support to municipalities affected by evictions in the Riyaq area in the Bekaa by enhancing social stability through youth empowerment and dialogue.

The programme supported the municipalities of Sarain, Hawsh al-Rifka, Tamnin & Qsarnaba in North Bekaa by building the capacity of youth and local communities to engage in conflict-preventing dialogue and increase community development. This intervention reinforced the sectors’ objective in defusing tensions and preventing secondary evictions especially in high-concentrated areas.

In addition, the project targeted PwSNs and their integration in the community.

Through 2017 funding, LHF is expected to support 40,000 Lebanese and 30,000 Syrian refugees located in the four above mentioned municipalities.

ALLOCATIONS

$236,667

REACHED BENEFICIARIES

0

WOMEN | MEN
0 | 0

GIRLS | BOYS
0 | 0

PROJECTS | PARTNERS
1 | 1

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of youth volunteers involved in initiatives at programme closure (target 50 per cent young women)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of municipalities benefiting from comprehensive support to promote social stability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHIEVEMENTS BY CLUSTER

WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE

CLUSTER OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: To ensure that by 2020, more vulnerable people in Lebanon are accessing sufficient, safe water for drinking and domestic use with reduced health and environmental impacts from unsafe wastewater management.

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

UNICEF and Ministry of Energy and Water (MoEW)

ACHIEVEMENTS

The LHF supported the provision of essential and lifesaving needs in settings where safe water for drinking and domestic use is not available. The LHF funded two projects implemented by two implementing partners in the Bekaa and north of Lebanon for a total of $0.2 million.

Through the LHF, critical humanitarian needs of more than 7,000 targeted beneficiaries were addressed by focusing on meeting the basic and most urgent WASH needs of the most vulnerable Syrian refugees, with a specific focus on PwSNs. Through the funded projects, the sector facilitated access to safe water in informal settlements and substandard shelters by: providing safe water for potable and domestic use in sufficient quantity; providing more than 400 water storage tanks, in addition to water quality testing and latrine de-sludging and decommissioning.

ALLOCATIONS

$210,836

REACHED BENEFICIARIES

17,087

WOMEN 5,129  MEN 4,482

GIRLS 4,037  BOYS 4,159

PROJECTS 2  PARTNERS 2

NB: projects funded in 2017 are still under implementation or their final reporting was not yet due at the time of this report. The associated results and achievements will be reported subsequently.

OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of individuals who experienced a WASH behaviour change session/activity</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of affected people assisted with temporary access to adequate quantity of safe water for drinking and water for domestic use</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of affected people with access to improved safe sanitation in temporary locations</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of people living in vulnerable areas who were provided with drinking water that met drinking water with quality standards delivered at targeted vulnerable areas</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# INDICATOR | RESULT | ANALYSIS | FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS
---|---|---|---
1 INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE – SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD. | 12 members: 2 INGOs, 2 NNGOs, 2 UN agencies, all contributing Donors, HC, OCHA HoO. | The composition of the advisory board represents a high level of engagement of the different stakeholders and was highly appreciated by the HC. The results are aligned with the target set for 2017. | Define a selection and rotation mechanism of the Advisory Board members for 2018, and align with the new CBPF Guidelines. |
2 INCLUSIVE PROGRAMMING – SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF STRATEGIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEES | Strategic Review Committee: 2 NNGO (22%), 2 INGO (22%), 2 UN Agencies (22%), 1 Sector Coordinator (11%), 1 Gender Advisor (11%), 1 OCHA (11%) Technical Review Committee: 1 Sector Coordinator (33%), 1 Technical Expert (33%), 1 OCHA (33%) | The review committees include an equitable representation of the different stakeholders. | Review composition of the committees to reduce the number of members. It was suggested that the participation of the Gender Advisor would be more valuable in the TRC than the SRC. |
3 INCLUSIVE IMPLEMENTATION – CBPF FUNDING IS ALLOCATED TO THE BEST-POSITIONED ACTORS | 23 projects / 26 partners: 12 projects for NNGOs (2.8 MUSD, 49.1%), 11 projects for INGOs (2.6 MUSD, 44.6%), 2 projects for RC/RC (0.3 MUSD, 4.5%), 1 project for UN (0.1 MUSD, 1.7%) | The results are aligned with the 2017 LHF Strategy and Grand Bargain Commitments | No follow up required. |
4 INCLUSIVE ENGAGEMENT – OUTREACH AND INVESTMENT IN LOCAL CAPACITY | Six training sessions for partners focused on building their capacity to design, manage and implement LHF projects. Combined 160 HFU staff hours. Individual partner sessions (on-demand, 25 partners/allocation). Combined 200 HFU staff hours. | All planned activities took place (100%), with positive partner feedback. | Include satisfaction surveys in training sessions. Conduct outreach and investment needs survey to better target HFU efforts. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FLEXIBLE ASSISTANCE – CBPF FUNDING FOR IN-KIND AND IN-CASH ASSISTANCE IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td>2 projects Multi-Purpose Cash top-up (new phases of projects funded in 2016). 3 projects with cash components.</td>
<td>Cash as a response modality was considered, where appropriate, as per CBPF cash guidance note.</td>
<td>In Lebanon, ECHO and DFID support the single provider model, with USD 90 million combined contribution. Given the financial volume, it is not the LHF’s comparative advantage to support cash-based assistance, but it is considered whenever is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FLEXIBLE OPERATION – CBPF FUNDING SUPPORTS AN ENABLING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>No funding allocated for Common Services</td>
<td>Not applicable in Lebanon – no financial estimation of common services costs in the LCRP, logistics are not considered a big challenge as the vast majority of the country is easily accessible by road. Coordination and needs assessment costs are integrated in programming.</td>
<td>No follow up required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FLEXIBLE ALLOCATION PROCESS – CBPF FUNDING SUPPORTS STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESPONSE TO SUDDEN ONSET EMERGENCIES</td>
<td>Total Allocated: 5.74 MUSD 1 Standard Allocation: 3.91 MUSD (68%) 2 Reserve Allocations: 1.83 MUSD (32%)</td>
<td>No target set in 2017, but allocation aligned with the LHF 2017 strategy.</td>
<td>Suggestion to set a target for 2018 at 70% of funds allocated through Standard Allocations and 30% through Reserve Allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FLEXIBLE IMPLEMENTATION – CBPF FUNDING IS SUCCESSFULLY REPROGRAMMED AT THE RIGHT TIME TO ADDRESS OPERATIONAL AND CONTEXTUAL CHANGES</td>
<td>7 project revisions requested by IPs, average of 10 days to process project revision (only 2.1 days between submission by IP and approval by HFU)</td>
<td>Target achieved</td>
<td>No follow up required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIMELY ALLOCATIONS – ALLOCATION PROCESSES HAVE AN APPROPRIATE DURATION VIS-À-VIS THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Allocation:</td>
<td>Average of 66 days (or 47 working days) from Project Proposal (PP) Submission until IP Signature of GA</td>
<td>Country targets for Lebanon are 45 working days for SA and 16 working days for RA. The timeliness is satisfactory for SA. In 2017, the 1st RA followed the same timeline as a SA, which explains the longer timeframe. The 2nd RA followed the RA timeframe and it took on average 9 days (5 working days) between PP and Signature.</td>
<td>Review the Timeline in the 2018 Operational Manual and use the 2 allocation modalities in line with the objectives of the Allocation round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Allocation:</td>
<td>Average of 59 days (or 44 working days) from Project Proposal (PP) Submission until IP Signature of GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIMELY DISBURSEMENTS – PAYMENTS ARE PROCESSED WITHOUT DELAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Allocation:</td>
<td>Average of 13.8 days (or 10 working days) from IP Signature of GA and Disbursement of 1st Tranche</td>
<td>Set globally at 10 calendar days for SA and RA. The timeliness is satisfactory for RA, and slightly too slow for SA.</td>
<td>Discuss with FCS Finance and Administration to improve delays identified in SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Allocation:</td>
<td>Average of 8.5 days (or 7 working days) from IP Signature of GA and Disbursement of 1st Tranche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIMELY CONTRIBUTIONS – PLEDGING AND PAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO CBPFS ARE TIMELY AND PREDICTABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received:</td>
<td>Q1: 2.7 MUSD (22%; Sweden, Ireland)</td>
<td>The first LHF Donor meeting took place on 24 October 2017, and results are visible in Q4. While the limited funding Q1-Q3 made it more difficult to plan SA, the late-year contributions will allow the LHF to initiate a SA early 2018.</td>
<td>Develop Resource Mobilisation Strategy for 2018, and continue ongoing efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2: 0.2 MUSD (2%; Iceland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3: 1.7 MUSD (14%; Belgium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4: 7.9 MUSD (63%; Sweden, Germany, Denmark, France)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EFFICIENT SCALE – CBPFs have an appropriate to support the delivery of the HRPs</td>
<td>12.6 MUSD received out of a Lebanon-specific target of 15-20 MUSD.</td>
<td>The LCRP is not a humanitarian response plan, and therefore the LHF can’t use the global target of 15% of HRP. The 15-20 MUSD target was set by HC as the necessary amount to implement the LHF strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EFFICIENT PRIORITIZATION – CBPF funding is prioritized in alignment with the HRP</td>
<td>All funded projects address LCRP objectives.</td>
<td>No strategic prioritisation on the LCRP. LHF funding is prioritised based on a Secondary Data Review to identify thematic priorities across sectors and on an analysis of urgent intra-sector gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EFFICIENT COVERAGE – CBPF funding reaches people in need</td>
<td>2017 projects are still being implemented. Only 7/26 progress or final narrative report were submitted as of 15 March (aligned with Operational Modalities). These reports indicate the following: Total reported beneficiaries: 21,141/98,178 (21%)</td>
<td>Information is not complete and should not be considered as of 15 March 2018. As a comparison, all projects funded in 2015 are completed, with a coverage rate of 140% (188,370 beneficiaries reported against a target of 133,836); and 41/55 (74%) projects of 2016 have ended, with a coverage rate of 88% (535,745 beneficiaries reported against a target of 608,428). Based on past data, 2017 projects are on track to achieve 100% coverage of more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT – CBPF management is cost-efficient and context-appropriate</td>
<td>HUF operations costs (execution of cost-plan) amount to 280,000 USD (out of 508,000 USD initially required), or 2.2% of overall contributions to the Fund in 2017 (12.6 MUSD)</td>
<td>Country target set at 5%. The low execution of the HUF cost plan is due to Human Resources gap in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT – CBPF management is compliant with Guidelines</td>
<td>LHF Operational Manual reviewed during Q1. Annual report and allocation papers compliant with global guidance documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FUND PERFORMANCE: ACCOUNTABILITY & RISK MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED PEOPLE – CBPF ALLOCATIONS ARE ACCOUNTABLE</strong></td>
<td>All proposals are required to indicate the plan on the accountability to affected population (AAP). All monitoring instances include the consultation with beneficiaries component.</td>
<td>Accountability is satisfactory.</td>
<td>Explore opportunities to extend AAP to initial consultations and/or satisfaction surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18 | **ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT FOR PROJECTS – CBPF FUNDING IS APPROPRIATELY MONITORED** | As of 15 March:  
16 Interim Financial reports were due, 100% submitted on time and approved.  
8 Final Financial reports were due, 87% were submitted on time.  
19 Progress Narrative reports were due, 100% were submitted on time  
8 Final Narrative reports were due, 100% were submitted  
3 Audits must be initiated | Similar comment as for Indicator #14: projects are still ongoing. Good level of compliance. The lack of Long Term Agreement with an Audit firm is identified as a risk. | Follow up on Global LTA with Audit Firms.                                                                                                 |
| 19 | **ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT OF IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS – CBPF FUNDING IS ALLOCATED TO PARTNERS WITH DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY** | 23 partners received funds in 2017.  
Out of $5.74M allocated in 2017:  
$0.27M were allocated to High Risk partners (1 project, 5% of funds)  
$3.51M were allocated to Medium Risk Partners (17 projects, 61% of funds)  
$1.95M were allocated to Low Risk Partners (8 projects, 34% of funds)  
The Operational Modalities and the Performance Index are adequately tuned. On average, the risk levels were improved by 1.5 points (out of 100) through satisfactory performance observed during the implementation of the project. | No follow up required.                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                             |
| 20 | **ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT OF FUNDING – APPROPRIATE OVERSIGHT AND ASSURANCES OF FUNDING CHANNELED THROUGH CBPF** | No potential diversion or fraud case to report in 2017.  
All potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs on fraud management. |                                                                                                                                            | Continue Field Monitoring visits and Financial Spot Checks as per Operational Modalities.                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT CODE</th>
<th>ALLOCATION TYPE</th>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/P/NGO/5563</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>ABAAD</td>
<td>$158,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/BA/INGO/5521</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Basic Assistance</td>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>$341,779.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/BA/INGO/5439</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Basic Assistance</td>
<td>SIF</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/H/NGO/5547</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>$104,432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/P/UN/5444</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>$99,799.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/P/NGO/5492</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>KAFA</td>
<td>$271,983.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/H/INGO/5485</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>QRCS</td>
<td>$145,622.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/2017 RA_LEB/H/INGO/5594</td>
<td>2017 Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>SAMS</td>
<td>$159,087.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P/NGO/6310</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>ADJI</td>
<td>$279,182.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/H/INGO/6301</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>URDA</td>
<td>$352,407.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/H/INGO/6342</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>$252,219.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P/NGO/6385</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>AMEL</td>
<td>$235,042.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P/NGO/6346</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>CARITAS</td>
<td>$355,680.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/H/INGO/6317</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>FPSC</td>
<td>$110,686.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P-S/INGO/6333</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection (75%), Shelter (25%)</td>
<td>GVC</td>
<td>$324,196.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P-S/INGO/6363</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection (60%), Shelter (40%)</td>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
<td>$397,976.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/P/INGO/6319</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$250,857.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/W/INGO/6348</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>$125,692.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/S-W/INGO/6359</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Shelter (76%), WASH (24%)</td>
<td>MEDAIR</td>
<td>$354,761.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/SS/NGO/6371</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Social Stability</td>
<td>NABAD</td>
<td>$236,666.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/E/INGO/6332</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>RMF</td>
<td>$154,395.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/20171stSA/S/INGO/6354</td>
<td>2017 First Standard Allocation</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>QRCS</td>
<td>$114,371.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/LBN-17-2ND-RES/P/NGO/7386</td>
<td>2017 2nd Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Association HIMAYA</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/LBN-17-2ND-RES/P/INGO/7623</td>
<td>2017 2nd Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>TdH It</td>
<td>$152,104.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LEB-17/DDA-3604/LBN-17-2ND-RES/P/INGO/7648</td>
<td>2017 2nd Reserve Allocation</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
<td>$33,859.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LHF ADVISORY BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>Relief International (RI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>Save the Children (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>ABAAD - Resource Center For Gender Equality (ABAAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>Caritas Liban Centre Des Migrants (CARITAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHF/OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD</td>
<td>ABAAD Resource Center For Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Action Contre la Faim Liban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJI</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION DES JEUNES ISLAMIQUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEL</td>
<td>Lebanese Association for Popular Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARITAS</td>
<td>CARITAS LIBAN CENTRE DES MIGRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF</td>
<td>Country-Based Pooled Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>OCHA Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>Funding Coordination Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFR</td>
<td>Financial Regulations and Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSC</td>
<td>Fundacion Promocion Social de la Cultura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Grant Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVC</td>
<td>GVC- Gruppo di volontariato civile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFU</td>
<td>OCHA Lebanon Humanitarian Financing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAFA</td>
<td>KAFA enough Violence &amp; Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHF</td>
<td>Lebanon Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Association LRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDAIR</td>
<td>MEDAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTF</td>
<td>Multi-Partner Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABAD</td>
<td>Association Nabad for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>Non-food items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>National Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRCS</td>
<td>Qatar Red Crescent Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Reserve Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMF</td>
<td>Rene Mouawad Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMS</td>
<td>Syrian American Medical Society Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIF</td>
<td>Secours Islamique France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDH IT</td>
<td>Fondazione Terdes Hommes Italia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>United Nations Operation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRDA</td>
<td>Union of Relief and Development Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Welfare Association - Lebanon Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEB PLATFORMS
unocha.org/lebanon
http://www.unocha.org/lebanon/about-lhf
gms.unocha.org
fts.unocha.org

SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS
@LHF_Lebanon | @unocha
facebook.com/UNOCHA