

Annex 2 Portfolio review

PORTFOLIO DESK REVIEW REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION PROGRAMME

November 2017

ACRONYMS

AJEM	Association Justice et Miséricorde
CLDH	Lebanese Centre for Human Rights
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
FMR	Forced Migration Review
EU	European Union
FCA	Finn Church Aid
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IRC	International Relief Committee
JCLA	Justice Centre for Legal Aid
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
NGO	Non-Profit Organisation
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
RDPP	Regional Development and Protection Programme
SGBV	Sexual Gender-Based Violence
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations Commission for Refugees
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour
WFP	World Food Programme

PORTFOLIO DESK REVIEW REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION PROGRAMME

The Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) is a three-year programme supporting both refugees from Syria and local communities in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq (in the Kurdistan Region). This portfolio review, conducted as part of an overall evaluation of the RDPP, is divided into two sections. The first provides an overview of the RDPP and assesses the programme in terms of the following criteria: (1) geographic coverage, (2) thematic distribution, (3) partners,¹ (4) selection criteria, (5) project duration, (6) budget, and (7) interlinkages among the four themes. As of 30 June 2017, the RDPP has funded a total of 33 projects in the three countries where the programme is being implemented (see Table 1 below).

Table 1 – Total number of projects funded in each thematic area (as of 30 June 2017)						
Theme	Regional	Lebanon	Jordan	Iraq	Total Partners	Percentage (%)
Research ²	5		1		6	18.2%
Protection	1	8	1		10	30.3%
Advocacy		1			1	3.0%
Livelihoods		6	8	3	16	48.5%
TOTAL	6	15	9	3	33	100%
Percentage (%)	18.2%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%		

Following this assessment, the second part provides a brief analysis based on three aspects: (1) indications of a shift towards “durable solutions”³ in the portfolio; (ii) innovative elements in the projects that were funded; and (3) “jointness” and interlinkages among the different themes. The review focuses on these three elements so as to reflect what the evaluation team has understood to be the core concerns of the evaluation.

This portfolio review is a preliminary assessment that was structured so as to feed into the deeper analysis in the main evaluation report. It is based on a desk review of the 33 project fiches which were made available, as well as other project documents (e.g., RDPP’s programme document, calls for proposals, an example of the scoring exercise, the financial project management tool, and the mid-term review).

I. PORTFOLIO REVIEW

¹ It has been noted that the RDPP reporting uses both “implementing partner” and “partner”, but as the evaluation team has been informed that the term “partner” is preferred we use that in this report.

² Although the second University of Oxford project was classified as an “advocacy” project in the documents received by DANIDA, for consistency, in this portfolio review it is counted as a “research” project.

³ The term “durable solutions” is used here to refer to efforts that reflect the objectives emanating from the protracted nature of the Syrian refugee crisis. This review does not assess the portfolio in relation to working towards results in relation to more specific goals of integration, return or resettlement in a third country.

1. Geographic coverage

As Table 1 above shows, the majority of projects that were funded under the RDPP were in Lebanon (45.5%) followed by Jordan (27.3%) and finally in Iraq (9.1%). In addition, 18.2% of the activities funded were implemented regionally.

2. Thematic distribution

The RDPP adopted a strategy based on four themes that are interconnected and feed into each other.

First, RDPP funded research activities with the purpose of producing independent, reliable and quality information regarding the costs and impacts of displacement on refugees and host countries. The intent was that the outputs of this component would help guide RDPP in its overall objectives. Another ambition was also that the new information would help to inform the European Union (EU), host governments and the broader humanitarian and development community to design and adopt evidenced-based policies and possibly feed innovative ideas and methods into the continued attempts to manage one of the largest current displacement situations. 18.2% of the activities fell under this theme.

Second, and in parallel to the first theme, the RDPP financed activities to improve the protection situation of refugees through (i) legal support and advocacy (4 projects), (ii) community-based protection (3 projects), (iii) conflict mitigation mechanisms (2 projects), and (iv) improving the capacities of local authorities (1 project) to provide protection in a sustainable way. These activities constituted almost a third (30.3%) of the entire programme.

Third, the RDPP planned to make use of the available data on refugees and host communities generated by the programme to facilitate the engagement of EU Delegations, willing Member States, civil society and other relevant interlocutors with governments in a political dialogue and advocacy on optimal ways to face the challenge of displacement, minimizing its negative impacts and maximizing the positive aspects to the extent possible. Objectives have included influence on host government policies and promotion of more evidence-based policies and programming. This theme benefitted from the smallest amount of funding (3.0%) and was implemented by one NGO – ABAAD - only in Lebanon. However, as will be described below, components within other projects have contributed to advocacy.

Finally, the RDPP invested heavily (48.5% of the total funds were allocated to this theme) in livelihoods activities and opportunities to enhance access to employment for refugees as well as vulnerable and poor host communities that were impacted by the influx of refugees. This was done through job creation schemes, vocational training, micro and small business development and job placement services. Of the four themes, only livelihoods activities were implemented in Iraq.

3. Partners

The RDPP's portfolio of partnerships is a diverse one consisting of multilateral organisations (UN and World Bank), national and international NGOs, and academic institutions (see Table 2).

	Academia	INGO	National NGO	Multilateral Organisations	Total
Number of projects	3	14	9	7	33
Percentage	9,1%	42,4%	27,3%	21,1%	100%

The multilateral organisations included the World Bank as well as different UN agencies (e.g. UNHCR, UNDP, ILO and UNICEF). The NGOs constituted a mix of national (27.3%) and international (42.4%) organisations. Finally, one academic institution – the Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University - was selected as a partner for their work with the Forced Migration Review. In addition, national research institutions have been engaged within projects led by other partners.

Though the international organisations (multilateral and NGOs) constitute approximately 64% of the partners, and could be an indication that localisation has been problematic, most of these organisations have generally selected local partners to collaborate within their projects. The range of national or even local institutions includes civil society, municipalities, research institutions, ministries, and law enforcement agencies.

For the first year of implementation, there were some engagements and partners that were pre-identified according to the RDPP Programme Document. This was the case of UN agencies that were pre-selected based on their mandate, expertise and capacity of implementation in partnership with national authorities. For example, UNHCR⁴ was selected to implement refugee protection activities; UNICEF⁵ and ILO child labour projects; and UNDP was funded for implementing livelihoods and employment generation activities.

In the case of NGOs, a call for proposals was launched through which civil society organisations with relevant experience were invited to submit proposals based on a set of clear and transparent criteria, analysed below.

⁴ Discussions were held with UNHCR in Lebanon during project formulation to respond to some of the protection challenges identified. According to the Project Document, UNHCR was pre-selected to “expand its support to the security sector and law enforcement institutions to address the myriad challenges affecting the refugee population and host communities with responses that take into account the specific needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of refugee communities... UNHCR will provide, among other elements, capacity-building of Lebanese law enforcement and security sector actors on specific refugee issues, strengthening of civil society organizations on understanding protection and asylum concepts, etc.”, Annex IA – DCI-MIGR/2013/319-137, Regional Development and Protection Programme, page 19.

⁵ UNICEF has already been contacted in Lebanon and Jordan and discussions are being held to seek ways of cooperation, Annex IA – DCI-MIGR/2013/319-137, Regional Development and Protection Programme, p. 21.

Finally, though there were 33 projects that were selected and funded, the number of partners was 24 since the University of Oxford was funded twice, UNDP received financing for four projects (2 in Jordan, 1 in Lebanon and 1 Regional), DRC was selected to implement three projects (Regional-in a consortium, Lebanon and Iraq), and IRC, Mercy Corps and CLDH were all funded twice, either in different countries or in follow-on projects.

4. Selection criteria

The issue of selection criteria is analysed at two levels: (i) the selection criteria for choosing the partners; and (ii) the selection criteria for selecting beneficiaries, especially of protection and livelihoods projects. The first is to assess the range of partners and the degree to which the RDPP partnered with international versus national organisations. Furthermore, the review examines the calls for proposals and to the extent they included selection criteria related to thematic interlinkages and innovation. The second is to determine whether there were specific criteria for targeting beneficiaries (e.g. refugees versus host communities, women/men).

According to available RDPP documentation, five calls for proposals were made: one on child labour, three on livelihoods and a fifth one which covered the three themes (see Table 3). In the initial calls for proposals which were made between 2014 and 2016, RDPP used five selection criteria which were expanded to seven in the last call for proposal which was launched in 2017 to include two new criteria: innovative and integrated approaches.

Table 3. Evaluation criteria in the different call for proposals		
Call for proposals	Child Labour (Lebanon, December 2014) Livelihoods (Northern Iraq, November 2015) Livelihoods (Jordan, July 2016) Livelihoods (Lebanon, September 2015)	Four themes (Lebanon, May 2017)
Evaluation criteria	Relevance of the action: 20 - 25 Link with RDPP priorities and national strategic documents: 15 Coordination and synergies with national and international actors: 15 Design and logic of the intervention: 25 - 30 Previous experience with similar activities and capacity of implementation: 20	Relevance of the action: 15 Link with RDPP priorities and national strategic and planning documents: 15 Innovative approach: 15 Integrated approach: 10 Coordination and synergies with national and international actors: 15 Design and logic of the intervention: 15 Previous experience with similar activities and capacity of implementation: 15

An analysis of the five calls for proposals reveals that it is only the most recent one – for Lebanon, covering all four themes – that evaluation criteria for integrating the four

themes as well as using innovative approaches were added. By including specific criteria on integrated and innovative approaches and giving them 25 % of the total score, this call for proposal in Lebanon (2017) may have contributed to a greater number of project proposals with linkages among the four different themes.

Of the five partners that were selected to carry out research activities, two (the World Bank and the Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University) were pre-identified during the design phase.⁶ It was expected then that they would have capacities to quickly establish a strong initial evidence base. The other three partners (UNDP, DRC and FAFO) were selected at a later stage. Particularly with the World Bank and the Refugees Studies Centre, research partnerships were seen as being strategically important for moving the discourse towards commitments to modalities that have later come to be referred to as a ‘new way of working’.

For the “protection theme”, discussions with the three UN agencies (UNICEF, ILO and UNHCR) were held during the design phase and agreements were signed with ILO and UNHCR after the programme was initiated. The majority of the protection activities (9 out of 10) were implemented by NGOs who were selected through a call for proposals.⁷

Though the “advocacy” theme had as an impact indicator (i.e. the “number of national policy and development plans and strategies that include refugees as target group in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq”), no specific call for proposals were made for this theme. Only one “advocacy” project was implemented in Lebanon and by one national NGO (ABAAD). Nevertheless, as the section on interlinkages discusses, elements of advocacy (and research to underpin it) exist to various degrees elsewhere in the portfolio, specifically on the rights of refugees, such as in the UNDP SRRF, CLDH, and several of the livelihoods projects.

Finally, under the “livelihoods” theme, three calls for proposals were made which resulted in the RDPP funding 16 livelihoods projects (i.e., 48.5% of the portfolio) in all three counties. The programme supported (i) labour-intensive rapid employment-generation schemes; and (ii) vocational training, job placement and business start-up support. Under the former, the programme supported the creation of short-term employment opportunities (6 to 12 months) targeting both host communities and Syrian refugees, which benefitted local governments by improving their capacities to provide basic social services through enhancing social infrastructure (7 projects). Under the latter, the programme engaged in projects and initiatives which provided vocational training skills, either through formal vocational training centres or informally through existing institutions and organisations (9 projects).

When it comes to the selection criteria for beneficiaries of protection and livelihoods programme, the project fiches provide scant information⁸ as they mainly serve as a

⁶ Annex IA – DCI-MIGR/2013/319-137, Regional Development and Protection Programme, page 16.

⁷ Annex IA – DCI-MIGR/2013/319-137, Regional Development and Protection Programme, page 21.

⁸ Beneficiary selection criteria is elaborated and detailed in the individual Project Documents which were not reviewed as part of this Desk Review.

short reporting format for the donors. An exception is the UNDP’s project in Jordan which clearly outlined the selection process it followed in selecting its beneficiaries (see Box 1). According to the project fiche, Amel, in Lebanon targeted women and youth “based on pre-determined criteria for beneficiary selection”. Beneficiaries were reached (through posters and leaflet distribution) and recruited (based on one-on-one interviews with social workers) to be supported with technical, vocational and life skills. Further information was collected by the evaluation team in the field to complement the information available in the project fiches since the selection of beneficiaries is key for

Box 1. Selection Criteria Used for UNDP’s “Skills Exchange of Vulnerable Hosting Communities and Syrian Refugees for Enhancing Livelihoods and Social Cohesion” Project in Jordan

Eligibility and selection criteria for both Jordanians and Syrian refugees have been developed based on the following weighted parameters/scores that were identified in consultation with the local and relevant governmental and non-governmental agencies:

- Selection of Jordanian Beneficiaries: entrepreneurship, vulnerability, poverty and commitment.
- Selection of Syrian Beneficiaries: proven experience in the pre-identified technical/hands-on skills, poverty, vulnerability, and commitment and familiarity with the culture in the targeted areas.

Source: Project Fiche, updated August 2017

determining the programme’s effectiveness.

5. Duration

Project duration ranged from three months to 36 months, with an average of 15.3 months in duration (see Table 4).

Table 4. Average duration of projects per theme					
	Research	Advocacy	Protection	Livelihoods	All projects
Number of projects	6	1	10	16	33
Duration range	3-18 months	12 months	9-36	12-26 months	3-36 months
Average duration	11.2 months	12 months	17.5 ⁹	15.8 months	15.3

⁹ The higher average duration of the “Protection” projects is a result of the no-cost extension of the UNHCR project to 36 months.

As of June 2017, of the 33 projects that have been funded, 8 projects (24%) were completed and 25 projects (76%) are still ongoing.

The projects implemented by UNDP and UNHCR in Lebanon were both granted a no-cost extension from 18 to 26 months and from 24 to 36 months, respectively.

6. Budget

The total amount of financing of the 33 projects is DKK 216,101,075 of which DKK 72,953,917 has been expended (i.e., 34%).¹⁰ This low expenditure rate is explained by the fact that 15 projects have spent 20% or less of the budget allocated to the project and only 8 projects have spent more than 90% of their allocated budget.

The range is from a minimum of DKK 526,000 funding the University of Oxford’s Forced Migration Review to a maximum of DKK 15,445,263 which financed UNDP’s Livelihoods project in Lebanon, with an average across the portfolio of DKK 6,548,517.

The percentage of the budget allocated per theme was as follows: Advocacy (1%), Research (14%), Protection (17%) and the largest share 68% for Livelihoods (see Table 5). This may reflect the nature of higher expenditure inherent in livelihoods programming compared to the other three components and should not be interpreted as indicating prioritisation in a broader sense. However, the proportion of the budget explicitly allocated for “Advocacy” is insignificant – especially since only one Lebanese NGO received funding to carry out “advocacy” activities in Lebanon.

Table 5. Analysis of Budgets per Theme (in DKK)					
	Research	Advocacy	Protection	Livelihoods	All projects
Range of project funding	526,000 – 9,787,161	1,302,003 – 5,271,183	1,118,861 – 12,830,373	6,266,820 – 15,445,263	526,000 – 15,445,263
Total allocated budget/theme	30,014,011	1,302,003	37,073,716	147,711,345	216,101,075
Number of projects	6	1	10	16	33
Average budget/project	5,002,335	1,302,003	3,707,371	9,231,959	6,548,517
% of total budget	14%	1%	17%	68%	100%

7. Leveraging other partners

¹⁰ This percentage is probably slightly higher. According to the Project Management Tool provided by RDPP, the two closed projects CLDH (Lebanon) and UNDP (Jordan) have 0% expenditure. The reason is that CLDH is delayed with their final reporting and audit report. Therefore no final expenditure has been registered yet. For UNDP the project ended in January 2016. The audit statement is only expected to be received by September 2017. UNDP has reported expenditure for 1,117,222 USD (the allocated budget was 1,000,000 USD).

The theory of change of RDPP, as interpreted by the evaluation team, involves assumptions that programming will contribute to broader nexus processes through replication of innovation, influence from research and advocacy, etc. A few projects were successful in leveraging joint multi-partner initiatives. For example, DRC was able to establish a consortium with the Norwegian Refugee Council and IRC for implementing the regional “Durable Solution Platform for Displaced Syrians” project.

Another example is the “Equitable access to dignifying and safe livelihood opportunities for displacement-affected populations in the Bekaa” implemented by DRC in consortium with OXFAM and the Makhzoumi Foundation.

UNHCR partnered with UNDP, and with the support of the “Centre Professionel de Médiation” (CPM) at Saint Joseph’s University (USJ), developed the training modules for strengthening refugee protection through capacity-building of Lebanese local and national authorities in Lebanon. Other USJ support fed into a broader integration of research and education on migration issues into the work of the university.

ABAAD’s partnership with other NGOs in Lebanon contributed to the successful campaign to end violence against women and girls, which revolved around women survivors of gender based and domestic violence.

In Jordan, IRC – in order to develop its “bundled” services¹¹ – has partnered with several Jordanian NGOs, such as Ruwwad for Development to deliver a training of trainers on IRC’s financial literacy and business management curriculum); with the Micro Fund for Women (MFW) and other Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs) for facilitating access to credit and loans to refugees and host communities; and with Arab Renaissance for Democracy and Development (ARDD) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) for the provision of legal services. In Lebanon, IRC has partnered with Al-Majmoua – a Lebanese NGO specializing in micro-finance – for providing advisory services to SMEs in advanced financial management, planning and marketing.

8. Leveraging additional resources

According to information available in the Project Fiches, only the World Bank and UNDP were successful in leveraging additional financial resources. The World Bank’s “Regional survey on impact of displacement on the socio-economic and living conditions of refugees and host communities” was co-funded by UNHCR. Similarly, UNDP in Jordan succeeded in leveraging its funds for implementing the “Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordanian vulnerable host communities (3x6 approach)” project by mobilizing additional resources from the Japanese Government, OCHA and WFP.

¹¹ The “bundled service model” is a programme which provides employment and financial management training, as well as employment support services and micro-enterprise support.

Additionally, UNDP in Lebanon, following the success of the youth employability activities under the Support to Livelihoods and Local Economic Development Opportunities in Host Communities, which was supported by RDPP, UNDP has been able to replicate the same model through additional funding from other donors. The UNHCR/UNDP Lebanon Municipal Police project attracted additional funds from Canada and the Netherlands to expand coverage.

Finally, the evaluation team's field work is uncovering a significant degree of synergies in actual project implementation. This includes, for example, how USJ (in the support described above) was able to leverage modest contributions from RDPP via UNHCR to initiate a broad range of research and education on migration issues. Support to Mercy Corps enabled them to synthesise and build on earlier learning to adapt programming to emerging opportunities to shift from humanitarian forms of support to deeper community-based conflict management.

II. ANALYTICAL OVERVIEW

1. Indications of a shift towards durable solutions

The portfolio generally shows a commitment to addressing issues related to the protracted nature of the crisis. However, the relatively short duration of the projects (average 15 months) seems not to reflect the emphasis on a shift to multiyear funding that is strongly emphasised in discussions surrounding the 'new way of working'. The portfolio includes a broad mix of humanitarian and development partners and it appears that the content of the projects includes elements that draw on the strengths of both, with some project activities contributing to conflict management and mitigation of xenophobic trends as well.

This shift towards durable solutions to protracted crisis is evident across the themes. For example, in research, whereas the first project funding the edition of the Forced Migration Review (FMR) focused on displacement and protection; the second research project analysed the longer-term impact of protracted displacement. When it comes to the protection theme, different partners have implemented activities that increase the durability and sustainability of their programmes. For example, several NGOs (e.g., AJEM, Mercy Corps and Beyond) have closely collaborated with municipalities raising their awareness and building their capacities at the decentralised level. Similarly, ILO and UNHCR – in addition to working with municipalities – have engaged with several ministries at the central level developing their capacities to promote protection activities. In general, it is difficult to discern the extent to which national governments have been involved in the projects, though this appears to be strongest where UN agencies have been in the lead, and is more explicit in Jordan than in Lebanon and Iraq. Finally, the livelihoods projects have implemented a range of activities that contribute to durable solutions. Whereas a few projects have provided "cash for work" assistance – which is a short-term solution, the majority of projects have offered vocational training, access to micro-finance, and support to SMEs - activities that have a longer-term impact. The clearest example of a "durable" solution under the theme of "livelihoods" is IRC's

bundled service model which consists of provision of employment and financial management training, employment support services and micro-enterprise support. The main report of the evaluation will further explore how RDPP has addressed the challenges of addressing livelihoods in countries where the space for the “durable solution” of integration is severely constrained.

2. Innovative elements

The short-term nature of most projects in the portfolio may be interpreted as being related to the experimental and learning nature of RDPP as it ‘gets to know’ the broad range of partners on the ground. In general, it is difficult to judge the innovativeness of the portfolio from the information available in the fiches, but there are clearly some examples of innovative practices.

For example, the creative nationwide media and advocacy campaign by ABAAD succeeded in reversing the law that allowed rapists to go unpunished in Lebanon. The innovative strategy consisted of three elements: (i) the theme of the campaign "A White Dress Does Not Cover Rape"; (ii) the timing of their advocacy activities which coincided with a broader nationwide campaign; and (iii) their partnering with other women's rights movements and NGOs. One of the direct and immediate results of the campaign was the increase in referrals to ABAAD's shelter facilities and assistance services.

Another example is UNDP in Lebanon which used its project to improve livelihoods of refugees and host communities through cash for work to improve environmental assets, by focusing on forestation and reforestation activities which benefitted 23 communities. As a result, the project -in addition to improving the livelihoods of targeted communities - had an additional positive environmental impact.

Finally, Mercy Corps in Lebanon applied an innovative approach for using “Cash for Work” in its livelihoods project to defuse conflict and improve protection of Syrian refugees.

The success of these innovative initiatives has led RDPP to approve a second project with Mercy Corps (December 2016-May 2018) and ABAAD (July 2017-June 2018).¹² UNDP has been able to replicate the same model through additional funding from other donors.

3. Jointness and interlinkages

The linkages across the four components vary between one theme and another. In the six “research” projects, there seems to be missed opportunities for utilising the results of the research to maximise contributions to wider advocacy campaigns. UNDP and ILO have been proactive in promoting broader learning on the basis of their research undertaken, but sharing of knowledge between RDPP funded projects is weak. Other

¹² The second ABAAD project is not included in this portfolio review since its starts after June 2017.

projects – such as the FMR – published and disseminated the research, however the information in the project fiches does not indicate that advocacy activities were carried out on the basis of that research. Similarly, it is unclear to what extent the “Durable Solutions Platform” set up by DRC has been used by other organisations to reflect on their activities. Others, such as FAFO and FMR II, are still in the start-up phase and it is too early to determine to what extent their activities will be interlinked with other themes.

The “jointness” aspect is strongest in the “protection” projects. With the exception of JCLA which does not seem to have included any elements of advocacy and/or research in its activities, all the other nine “protection” projects have varying degrees of incorporating lessons from research and/or advocacy (albeit often research and advocacy efforts outside of RDPP). One such example is AJEM which interlinked protection with research-based advocacy (see Box 3).

Box 2. Legal Support to Syrian Refugees in Prisons

In Lebanon, AJEM links protection and advocacy for the rights of vulnerable population through documentation of case studies and analysis, which form the basis for a dialogue on legal procedures related to cases for Syrian refugees that are discussed with judges, clerks, security forces. AJEM successfully organized an advocacy workshop after having monitored 96 court hearings, convened with the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, judges, lawyers, legal associations and other relevant actors (including UNHCR), where they exposed the main pitfalls of the system, in general, but more specifically focused on how Syrians are treated (arbitrary detention, unnecessary prolonged detentions due to administrative weaknesses), and what kind of measures can be adopted based on existing Lebanese law. Several key recommendations resulted from this workshop which have fed into a strategy to be adopted by different authorities and actors. Firstly, a new agreement of collaboration between AJEM and the Ministry of Justice was developed which allows AJEM access to legal files of detainees related to reducing arbitrary detention. Secondly, a new referral mechanism was established in coordination with the prisons Directorate in the Ministry of Justice, to improve and address the legal rights of detainees. Thirdly, new administrative recommendations between judges and lawyers were agreed upon which address issues related to the improvement of the administrative legal system. More than 30 municipalities participated in dialogue on the administrative and legal measures and policies taken against Syrian refugees, especially on the curfews, and the need for improved procedures. Further, 104 vulnerable families of detainees were also contacted, of whom 74 vulnerable families were supported by AJEM with in-kind assistance, supplies or referral services to specialized agencies according to their urgent identified needs. Families contacted were especially catered to their socio-economic and psychological state, and were prioritised based on need and vulnerability and for those without registration or assistance.

Source: Project Fiche, updated August 2017.

Another example of successful inter-linkages is ILO’s protection project “Tackling child labour among Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan and Lebanon” which also included advocacy as well as research components. Other innovative linkages between protection and livelihoods include Amel in Lebanon, which targeted women and youth and provided vocational training that combined livelihood skills enhancement with psycho-social interventions.

When it comes to the livelihoods projects, few have apparently incorporated significant levels of research and/or advocacy elements in their activities. According to the project fiches 5 out of 16 projects had planned such activities. A notable exception is DRC

which established a consortium with two other NGOs and created synergies with the EU-funded programme which enabled it to combine research, advocacy, protection and livelihoods (see Box 4).

Box 3. Example of synergies among research, advocacy, protection and livelihoods, DRC in Lebanon

- Project is led by DRC in consortium with Oxfam and Makhzoumi Foundation
- The project created synergies with the Madad-funded LEADERS Consortium.
- Research has been undertaken to assess and analyse barriers to Syrian refugees participation in the labour market. This is complemented with the Skills Gap Analysis of the labour market and Market Analysis research.
- Some job seekers were referred to DRC's protection team to be temporarily employed as skills development trainers providing life skills training to beneficiaries of DRC's psycho social support programme.
- Policy barriers to Syrians' participation in the labour market are addressed with policy makers and civil society.
- As part of DRC's integrated programme between livelihoods and protection, a joint workshop was held to strengthen referral pathways and coordination across sectors.

Source: Project fiche, updated August 2017.

Another example is RI in Iraq which organized roundtables and a national advocacy conference to discuss refugee and IDP labour and economic rights and viable improvement.

There are possibilities for further linkages in the newly signed projects. For example, Oxfam in Jordan is developing an online recruitment platform to attract job and education providers. Once set up, such a platform could be useful for the other "livelihoods" projects which are providing vocation training to their targeted beneficiaries. World Vision International is also planning to carry out a market research to better design its vocational training activities. Lastly, Oxfam and FCA's livelihoods projects are still in the start-up phase however, according to their project fiches, it seems that there are advocacy initiatives planned.

ANNEX 2. PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS BY THEME

Research

	Project title	Partner	Location	Budget (Euros)	Extent to which research is linked to advocacy	Extent to which research focuses on protection	Extent to which research focuses on livelihoods	Additional partners and stakeholders (including localisation aspects)	Notable results and characteristics
1	Regional survey on impact of displacement on the socio-economic and living conditions of refugees and host communities Project fiche updated: August 2017	World Bank	Regional	666,510	None	None	High (Assessment of socio-economic and living conditions of the Syrian refugee and host community population in Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon)	Co-funded with UNHCR	Experienced major delays and was co-funded by UNHCR. Until now the report has yet to be publically shared and the dialogue continues between UNHCR, RDPP and the World Bank about how best to share the findings
2	Forced Migration Review Special Issue on the Syrian Crisis: Displacement and Protection Project fiche updated: August 2017	Oxford University	Regional	70,537	None (although partners of other projects may be utilising the research for advocacy)	High (Publication has several Chapters dealing with protection issues)	High (Publication has several Chapters dealing livelihoods issues)	Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University (only academic partner); contributions from different academic institutions/think tanks	Publication (in English, French, Arabic and Spanish) was promoted through topic-related websites, blogs, and social media, and according to FMR, the issue has been widely used by practitioners, analysts and policymakers who constitute the readership of FMR, with several requests for multiple copies of the full magazine, especially from those working on the Syrian crisis
3	Development of evidence-based policy options and frameworks for the	UNDP	Regional	1,311,969	Several national and cross-regional	n/a	n/a	n/a	As of December 2016, no outputs reported

	accommodation of refugees in countries affected by the Syria crisis Project fiche updated: August 2017				policy dialogues planned				
4	Durable Solution Platform for Displaced Syrians Project fiche updated: August 2017	DRC	Regional	918,570	Provide the basis to be a building block for a future-principled and rights-based durable solutions advocacy	Provide clarity on rights and guiding principles, taking into account international and national law and policy	Provide guidance on programming for solutions	Danish Refugee Council led Consortium with Norwegian Refugee Council and International Rescue Committee	As of December 2016: No major progress to report. Project implementation is delayed. Focus has been on staff recruitment and supplies procurement
5	2017 Research on the education, skills, work experiences and work preferences of Syrians in Jordan Project fiche updated: August 2017	FAFO	Jordan	950,280	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Project just started. No info available. Objective is to provide detailed information on socio-demographic characteristics of the Syrian population in Jordan
6	Contribution to FMR Special Issue of Displacement in the Middle East Project fiche updated: August 2017	Oxford University	Regional	107,308	n/a	n/a	n/a	Refugee Studies Centre at Oxford University (only academic partner); contributions from different academic institutions/think tanks	Start-up phase

Advocacy

	Project title	Partner	Location	Budget (Euros)	Extent to which advocacy is linked to research	Extent to which advocacy focuses on protection	Extent to which advocacy focuses on livelihoods	Additional partners and stakeholders (including localisation aspects)	Notable results and characteristics
1	Voice & Accountability for Syrian Women & Men Project fiche updated: August 2017	ABAAD	Lebanon	174,599	low	High (Project also provided direct services to 200 women - refugee and non-refugee - survivors of SGBV)	none	ABAAD partnered with other national NGOs to conduct advocacy campaign	One of the few projects that was extended with a second phase. Trained 5 psychosocial therapists; provided psychosocial support to app. 200 SGBV survivors; produced information/advocacy material

Protection

	Project title	Partner	Location	Budget (Euros)	Extent to which initiative is linked to and/or learns from research and advocacy	Primary categories of protection issues addressed	Key partners and stakeholders (including localisation aspects)	Notable results and characteristics
1	<p>Legal assistance to vulnerable persons in the context of the war in Syria</p> <p>Project fiche updated: August 2017</p>	CLDH	Lebanon	194,576	High (Report entitled “Legal Challenges faced by Refugees from Syria in Lebanon” has been published and officially launched)	Prisoners, cases of torture and domestic violence	Cases are usually referred by partners such as UNHCR, UNRWA, ICRC and other NGOs.	<p>1,312 beneficiaries (34% refugees) received legal support</p> <p>381 beneficiaries (40% refugees) have had their cases successfully redressed</p> <p>245 inmates (35% refugees) were released from prison</p> <p>72 victims of torture and/or refugees seeking assistance from the centre</p> <p>20 cases of domestic violence</p>
2	<p>Legal Support to Syrian Refugees in Prisons</p> <p>Project fiche updated: August 2017</p>	AJEM	Lebanon	155,308	High (Legal advocacy component with 30 municipalities regarding the curfews imposed on refugees, and with security forces agents (General Security Officers and Internal Security Forces) to implement new procedures for monitoring cases of detention of Syrians).	Syrian refugees and Lebanese prisoners	Municipalities, security forces agencies	<p>Efficient project: with a relatively small budget, the project managed to reach: 1,446 detainees (nearly 70% refugees, majority males) received education awareness on their rights and legal processes, including their right to a fair trial, the right to fair treatment</p> <p>1,046 detainees receive legal assistance and counselling(75% refugees)</p> <p>Following the workshop with judges and clerks with support from Ministry of Justice, three new and</p>

								improved procedures were put in place to be adopted by authorities and relevant actors.
3	Legal assistance to vulnerable persons in the context of the war in Syria – Phase 2 Project fiche updated: August 2017	CLDH	Lebanon	296,252	High (CLDH will target policy makers to actively engage them in dialogue with the relevant Lebanese authorities on the protection and access to rights for both refugees and host communities through the publication of two advocacy papers and the organisation of two public events).	Syrian refugees; vulnerable inmates	Civil society organisations, the National Human Rights Institute, and Bar associations' representatives.	Start-up phase
4	Pathways to Justice: Empowering Syrian Refugees and their Host Communities in Jordan Project fiche updated: August 2017	JCLA	Jordan	200,106	None	Access to justice and legal aid for Syrian refugees and host communities	None	Around 10,000 direct beneficiaries of awareness activities, 1,200 legal consultations, and 675 legal representations
5	Mitigating the Effect of the Syrian Refugees Crisis in Lebanon Project fiche updated: August 2016	Mercy Corps	Lebanon	150,040	Innovative use of Cash for Work (livelihoods) to diffuse conflict and improve protection of Syrian refugees	Syrian refugees (in general)	Municipalities; local leaders	Innovative use of cash for work to reduce conflict
6	Project fiche updated: August 2017	Mercy Corps	Lebanon	897,398	High	Syrian refugees	9 municipalities	MoUs have been signed with 9 targeted municipalities. Project plans to link protection with livelihoods (cash for work). Project also plans to build management capacities of 9 municipalities
7	Strengthening refugee protection through capacity-building of	UNHCR	Lebanon	798,594	Medium (the project had a research component but there is no explicit link to the protection work)	Refugee rights in general	Training modules were developed in partnership with UNHCR and UNDP, and with the support of	Training modules developed; 500 law enforcement officers trained; 2 Week-long university courses on

	Lebanese local and national authorities Project fiche updated: August 2017						the "Centre Professionnel de Médiation" (CPM) at Saint Joseph's University (USJ)	refugee offered; 2 research projects with USJ developed
8	Together Towards a New Beginning for Refugee Children from Syria Project fiche updated: August 2017	Dar Al Amal	Lebanon	600,233	Low (child led campaign for combating worst forms of child labour was launched)	Child labour	None (project is building capacity of 3 Ministries)	
9	Combating Worst Form of Child Labour among Syrian Refugees and the Host Communities Project fiche updated: August 2017	Beyond	Lebanon	255,901	Medium (163 mayors, municipalities and other local authorities sensitized)	Child labour	Ministries, mayors, municipalities, Farers' Unions, and other local authorities sensitized	2,350 children at risk were referred 60 families who have children withdrawn from WFCL has been provided with materials and tools to launch income generating projects to support economically the families and to replace the income generated from the children work
10	Tackling child labour among Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan and Lebanon Project fiche updated: August 2017	ILO	Regional	600,209	Project has advocacy and research components	Child labour	Various ministries, municipalities and private sector	One of the few projects that has linkages among the different themes. Research done in collaboration with the American University of Beirut

	Project title	Partner	Location	Budget (Euros)	Extent to which initiative is linked to research and advocacy	Primary categories of livelihood issues addressed	Additional partners and stakeholders (including localisation aspects)	Notable results and characteristics
1	Support to Livelihood and Local Economic Development Opportunities in host communities Project fiche updated: August 2017	UNDP	Lebanon	2,071,216	None	Vocational training, support to SMEs	Following support from RDPP, UNDP has been able to replicate the same model through additional funding from other donors. Based on the success of the project, UNDP aims to further replicate and scale up the support to additional beneficiaries in the upcoming period	9 cash grants 80 SMEs supported 390 youth received vocational training and internship placement 1,133 households expanded their livelihoods 23 communities supported for forest management Environmental impact
2	Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordanian vulnerable host communities (3x6 approach) Project fiche updated: August 2017	UNDP	Jordan	1,000,000	None	Short-term employment schemes through cash for work	Project was also supported by WFP, OCHA and Japanese government Partner: National Microfinance Bank	200 beneficiaries supported through cash for work 78 microbusinesses supported with seed money
3	Skills Exchange of Vulnerable Hosting Communities and Syrian Refugees for Enhancing Livelihoods and Social Cohesion Project fiche updated: August 2017	UNDP	Jordan	1,035,460	None	Vocational training; support to micro-business	None mentioned	300 Jordanians/Syrians received vocational training; 100 micro-businesses supported

4	<p>Equitable access to dignifying and safe livelihood opportunities for displacement-affected populations in the Bekaa</p> <p>Project fiche updated: August 2017</p>	DRC	Lebanon	1,499,883	Synergies between DRC's protection and research programmes	Vocational training for Syrian refugees and Lebanese	DRC in consortium with OXFAM and Makhzoumi Foundation	One of the few livelihoods projects that combines livelihoods with research, advocacy and protection
5	<p>Empowering Women and Youths in Lebanon Now! (EMPOWERING NOW!)</p> <p>Project fiche updated: August 2017</p>	Amel	Lebanon	1,105,080	n/a	Vocational training, income-generating skills for women and youth	10 enterprises/cooperatives supported by the programme	The project also provided psychosocial counselling. "Based on pre-determined criteria for beneficiary selection, beneficiaries were outreached (through posters and leaflet distribution) and recruited (based on one-on-one interviews with social workers) to be supported with technical, vocational and life skills"
6	<p>Empowering Lebanese host community and Fostering Self-Reliance for Displaced Syrians in South Lebanon</p> <p>Project fiche updated: December 2016</p>	SHIELD	Lebanon	875,938	n/a	Vocational training; support to SMEs/cooperatives	Partnered with 123 municipalities in the 6 targeted districts as well as 6 unions of municipalities to disseminate information	Used municipalities to publicise project
7	<p>Syrian Refugees' Opportunities toward Resilience</p> <p>Project fiche updated: December 2016</p>	Relief International	Iraq	1,361,305	Roundtables and national advocacy conference to discuss refugee and IDP labour and economic right	Female-headed households targeted; Vocational training; development of value chains and small businesses	n/a	

					and viable improvement			
8	Increasing access to immediate and long-term economic opportunities of vulnerable displacement-affected populations in the Northern Iraq Project fiche updated: August 2017	DRC	Iraq	1,053,589	n/a	Cash for work; vocational training	Danish Refugee Council Partnered with the European Technology and Training Centre (ETTC)	Unclear how beneficiaries were selected
9	Support on the Economic and Community-Based Resilience of Vulnerable Refugee and Host Communities in Akkar Region Project fiche updated: August 2017	Save the Children	Lebanon	1,167,966	None	Vocational training and short term employment for Syrian refugees and host communities	None	Start-up phase
10	Regrowth: Supporting durable socio-economic resilience amongst Syrian refugee and host Lebanese communities Project fiche updated: August 2017	IRC	Lebanon	1,502,163	None	Support to refugees and host communities through IRC's bundled service model (provision of employment and financial management training, employment support services and micro-enterprise support)	Al-Majmoua (Lebanese NGO specializing in micro-finance)	
11	Supporting Economic Opportunities and Livelihoods in Jordan	IRC	Jordan	1,269,214	None	Support to refugees and host communities through IRC's bundled service model (provision of employment and	Support to local partners (e.g., Ruwwad for Development through a training of trainers on the IRC's financial literacy and business management	Start-up phase; interesting referral service

	Project fiche updated: August 2017					financial management training, employment support services and micro-enterprise support)	curriculum);refugees and vulnerable Jordanians to Micro fund for Women (MFW) and other Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs) for access to credit and loans through a signed MoU refugees and vulnerable Jordanians referred to Arab Renaissance for Democracy and Development (ARDD) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) for legal services	
12	Strengthening resilience and long term rehabilitation through skills development Project fiche updated: August 2017	LWF	Jordan	841,161	None	Income-generation and skills development for Syrian refugees and host communities	Ministry of Agriculture	Start-up phase
13	Improved access to sustainable livelihood opportunities for vulnerable youth and women refugees and host population members residing in Irbid Project fiche updated: August 2017	Oxfam GB	Jordan	1,497,946	Medium (advocacy activities are planned)	Income-generation and skills development for Syrian refugees and host communities	n/a	Start-up phase; experienced delays in getting permits An online recruitment platform will be developed to attract job and education providers
14	TAREEQI (My Way) Project fiche updated: August 2017	FCA	Jordan	1,034,274	Medium (advocacy activities are planned; project has just started)	Vocational training for Syrian refugees, host communities, focusing on women and persons with disabilities	Ministry of Labour; Vocational Training Corporation (VTC) and the Finland-based Mercuria Business College	Start-up phase

15	Durable Livelihoods Development for Jordanian and Syrian Youth Project fiche updated: August 2017	World Vision International	Jordan	1,197,277	Medium (job market research planned)	Technical and vocational training of young (18-30 years old) Syrian refugees and Jordanians	Vocational institutes	Start-up phase
16	Creating job opportunities for young adults in Kurdistan Project fiche updated: August 2017	ACF	Iraq	1,305,410	None	Vocational training of refugees, IDPs, host communities; support to SMEs	Zakho Vocational Training Centre	Start-up phase