



EVALUATION OF UNDP STRENGTHENING LMAC PHASE IV (2016-2019)

FINAL REPORT

Final Evaluation of European Union Delegation Agreement
ENI/2016/373-187
November 2019

Charles Downs
charles.downs@gmail.com

**UNDP-LMAC Project: Strengthening LMAC – Phase IV
Final Report**

Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	iii
Executive Summary	1
Background to the Evaluation.....	6
National Context	8
Landmine and Cluster Munition Problem and Mine Action Programme before 2011	8
Lebanon mine action programme (LMAP) – Actors.....	9
Lebanon mine action strategy (2011-2020).....	10
The Project: EU support for UNDP Strengthening LMAC – Phase IV	12
Purpose and Strategy of support	12
Logical framework and UNDP support.....	13
Results during Phase IV	15
Findings	18
Relevance	18
Effectiveness	20
Efficiency	22
Sustainability.....	23
Conclusions and Recommendations	25
Conclusions regarding the EU-financed UNDP project to Strengthen LMAC (2016-2019)	25
Recommendations regarding future LMAC requirements and potential UNDP support.....	26
Tables	29
Table 01: Total Landmine and CM casualties to 23 September 2019	30
Table 02: Casualties by type of munitions (14 August 2006 to 23 September 2019).....	31
Table 03: Annual Landmine and CM Casualties (14 August 2006 to 23 September 2019)	32
Table 04: Timeline of Lebanon Mine Action Programme	33
Table 05: Landmine contamination and demining results	34
Table 06: Cluster Munition contamination and clearance results.....	35
Table 07: Explosive hazard contamination at beginning of NMAP 2011-2020.....	36
Annexes.....	37
Annex 01: Evaluation TOR.....	38
Annex 02: Documents Consulted.....	41
Annex 03: Key Evaluation Questions and Specific Interview Questions.....	42
Annex 04: Key Informant Interviewees	44

Annex 05: Stakeholder Questionnaire	45
Annex 06: Stakeholder Questionnaire Respondents	46
Annex 07: Summary of stakeholder feedback on results of UNDP support to LMAC	47
Annex 08: Role of LMAC (according to the National Mine Action Policy - 2007)	48
Annex 09: Lebanon Mine Action Strategy – Results Framework – with 2020 targets	50
Annex 10: UNDP support to LMAC in relation to LMAS Results Framework.....	52
Annex 11: Past LIS and LMAC Prioritization Scoring Grids for Communities and Tasks	53

Abbreviations and Acronyms

APMBC	Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention – Ottawa Convention
ARCP	Arab Regional Cooperation Programme
BAC	Battle Area Clearance (approach to clearance of cluster munitions)
CCM	Convention on Cluster Munitions
CHA	Confirmed Hazardous Area
CM	Cluster Munition
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DA	Dangerous Area
DCA	DanChurchAid
EORE	Explosive Ordnance Risk Education
EU	European Union
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
HI	Humanity and Inclusion
IDF	Israel Defense Forces
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
KEQ	Key Evaluation Questions
KII	Key Informant Interview
LAF	Lebanese Armed Forces
LAMINDA	Lebanese Association for Mine and Natural Disaster Action
LIS	Landmine Impact Survey
LMAC	Lebanon Mine Action Centre
LMAP	Lebanon Mine Action Programme
LMAS	Lebanon Mine Action Strategy
MACC-SL	Mine Action Coordination Cell – South Lebanon
MAF	Mine Action Forum
MAG	Mines Advisory Group
MRE	Mine Risk Education
MVA	Mine Victim Assistance
NMAS	National Mine Action Standards
NPA	Norwegian Peoples Aid
NTS	Non-Technical Survey
OES	Operation Emirates Solidarity
POD	Peace Generation Organization for Demining
RHDSL	Regional Humanitarian Demining School in Lebanon
RMAC	Regional Mine Action Centre (Nabatiyeh)
SHA	Suspect Hazardous Areas
SIQ	Specific Interview Questions
TWG	Technical Working Group
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
VVAF	Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation

Executive Summary

1. This is an evaluation of the EU-funded UNDP project “Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Centre (LMAC) Phase IV (2016-2019)” (EU Delegation Agreement ENI/2016/373-187 and UNDP project 00098899), with particular attention to its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The evaluation applied a mixed methods approach including: (a) document review, (b) compilation of core data on contamination, clearance, victims and finances, (c) stakeholder questionnaire, (d) Key Informant Interviews and (e) field visits. Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ) and Specific Interview Questions (SIQ) as well as a list of organizations and individuals interviewed are in the Annexes. In addition, the evaluation identified LMAC requirements for eventual further support. The evaluation was possible due to the open and frank comments by all those met, consistently provided with interest to improve the national mine action programme. The evaluator was continually impressed by commitment and quality of work of all those met, particularly within the UNDP project team, LMAC, and demining operators.
2. UNDP, LMAC and the donor community for many years have maintained a general partnership in support of mine action in Lebanon. This partnership has included strategic management support, advocacy on mine action issues, financial support for operations, and provision of certain civilian personnel to operate within LMAC. UNDP has funded the civilian positions since the establishment of the RMAC in 2009, based on the transfer from UNMAS of the Mine Action Coordination Cell – South Lebanon (MACC-SL) which previously included those civilian positions. While the composition has changed slightly over time, and some roles have been transferred to LAF personnel, the rationale for there being civilian positions was related to: (a) specialist expertise for data base management; (b) LMAC staff turnover due to normal military rotations; (c) greater flexibility of travel for civilians not requiring military authorization; and (d) greater ease of villager interaction with civilians. The validity and exit implications of these assumptions are central issues for this evaluation.
3. The UNDP project has been evaluated in terms of its support to LMAC in its role to centrally manage the Lebanon Mine Action Programme (LMAP) in line with the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy (LMAS 2011-2020). Summaries of their objectives, progress and results are included in the evaluation, taken from LMAC Mine Action Strategy (2011-2020), LMAC Annual Reports (2011 through 2018) and relevant evaluations conducted by others – and were validated during the evaluation. The LMAC, the LMAP and the LMAS are not the subjects of this evaluation; rather they provide the context within which UNDP provided support and where the results of UNDP support might be found.
4. The Strengthening LMAC Phase IV project results framework comprised four results:
 - Result #1: National capacity reinforced to document and prioritize clearance operations and the respective socio-economic impact
 - Result #2: Impacted communities empowered and equipped to deal with the residual risk of mines
 - Result #3: Victims enabled to socially and economically reintegrate into their communities

- Result #4: LMAC’s institutional capacity strengthened to enable the LMAC to meet its national, regional, and international obligations as well as transfer its expertise to support stability, security, and territorial cohesion
5. UNDP support to LMAC – institutional, capacity development and management advice – has been evaluated in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The project has been generally effective in supporting significant progress by LMAC in multiple areas. The core of the institutional support was provided by project staff who worked as part of LMAC. They carried out roles that would be appropriately done by civilian staff, in the absence of civilian LMAC positions. Only the minor project staff support provided in the areas of MRE and MVA was of limited effect. Several of the positions are no longer necessary, but a few remain important into the future, as detailed in the next paragraph. UNDP support to capacity development also involved facilitation of short-term technical inputs, such as for updating the National Mine Action Standards, response to IEDs, consideration of gender and diversity in mine action, and regional response for Explosive Ordnance Risk Education to mitigate risks likely to be faced by Syrian refugees returning to Syria. General partnership management support included strategic advice to LMAC, identification of regional needs to which LMAC could respond, as well as coordination with donors, UN family, politicians, and the private sector.
6. In summary, the overall partnership between UNDP and LMAC, supported by the EU, provided management and strategic advice that was relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable, which helped strengthen LMAC management, identified potential new areas of work, facilitated dialogue which LMAC could not undertake alone with donors, parliamentarians, private sector and UN entities, and identified best practice experience from other countries that could be useful for Lebanon. However, the assessment of specific components of institutional support was more varied:
- Result #1 – Strengthened LMAC ability to task, monitor and track progress on demining and its socio-economic impact
 - Support to the IMSMA database management was relevant, effective and efficient, however its sustainability was limited by the rotation of relevant LMAC staff; this support will continue to be necessary until rotation is made more stable or appropriate civilian posts are established within LMAC
 - Support to LMAC interaction with communities was relevant, effective and efficient, however the sustainability of the function is limited by rotation of relevant LMAC staff and the need for civilian staff to carry out the function; continued support is necessary
 - Support to LMAC management of demining operations through QA and other positions in Operations was relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable; this function has been fully transferred to LMAC and while LMAC rotation will necessitate new training, no problem is expected
 - Result #2 - Support to the national MRE effort was relevant but too limited to be effective; it can be discontinued without loss. The solution identified since 2011 – inclusion of MRE in the national school curriculum – was not addressed effectively and should continue to be advocated. Specific support was provided to develop the EORE for Syrian refugees as part of

the UN regional response to the specific risks that will be faced by this population when they return to Syria; this support has been relevant and effective upto this point.

- Result #3 - Support to enable mine victims to socially and economically reintegrate into their communities was relevant but much too limited to be effective; it can be discontinued without loss. The solution identified since 2000 - full implementation of the Law 220/2000 on the Rights of the Disabled – was not addressed effectively and should continue to be advocated.
- Result #4 – Support to enable LMAC to fulfill its international legal obligations as well as to solidify its national, regional and international role was relevant, effective, efficient and largely sustainable. This support was provided through the overall partnership between LMAC and UNDP and included support to the LMAC coordination role in the Mine Action Forum, support with transparency and annual reporting, and support to develop the programme of the Regional School for Humanitarian Demining in Lebanon (RSHDL).
- Two important Result #4 outputs were not developed as of the date of the evaluation, both of which should be supported:
 - Exit strategy for international cooperation to LMAC not developed
 - Residual response mechanism not developed

7. In addition to maintaining the general partnership between LMAC, UNDP and the international community, there are several specific LMAC requirements that should be consider for support. These requirements are presented to LMAC, UNDP and interested donors for discussion to determine which are priority for LMAC and of interest to donors for support in the coming phase.

Operations – Improved evidence of contamination enables LMAC to prioritize and task demining operators to efficiently address socio-economic impact of landmines and cluster munitions

8. **Recommendation:** UNDP should continue to provide specific support to efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the national demining programme based on engagement between LMAC and operators, including in context of LMAC rotation. Specific studies that would be valuable to conduct include: (a) review of past prioritization methodologies (LIS 2004 and LMAC 2011) and the extent to which prioritized communities and tasks have been resolved; (b) revision of current prioritization methodology to reflect changes on the ground and socio-economic impact of hazards on communities; (c) assessment of the efficiency improvements from NMAS revision; and (d) review of post-clearance impact monitoring and reporting.

9. **Recommendation:** The IMSMA database will remain essential for long-term; support is important until qualified LMAC civilian staff take over. Currently the database provides essential support to strategic planning, priority setting, tasking and handover of completed tasks. It is the basis for recording progress made and projection of remaining contamination and would benefit from regular non-technical survey (NTS). Overtime, errors accumulate in any database; thorough review and cleanup should be conducted periodically to remove duplicates, overlapping records and other anomalies. The review should start from the results of cleaning done as part of the IMSMA conversion

and also consider operator databases to identify any anomalies for reconciliation. In the future the database will be essential for the residual risk phase, providing the record of past contamination and clearance. This will be important for support to development actors – public and private – to understand presence or absence of risk on land to be used for infrastructure or other public or private development. UNDP should work with the government and the international community to ensure any support necessary to maintain the improved database to be useful for future development investments.

10. **Recommendation:** UNDP should support LMAC to develop a residual response mechanism pilot based on current CLO rapid response experience. Rapid response is triggered by learning of new incident/victim or reported finding of ERW, with immediate response by CLOs. Issues to be considered include whether this should be done by current CLOs or by personnel provided through NGO partners and whether in the future the function should be transitioned to military or police vs continue with civilian personnel in LMAC posts.

MRE – Impacted communities are empowered to deal with the residual risk of mines

11. **Recommendation:** UNDP should work with UN family and international community to advocate with the Ministry of Education and Higher Education to incorporate MRE into the national curriculum. The MRE Steering Committee should arrange for an evaluation of the MRE efforts in Lebanon, perhaps beginning with the two-week “health topic,” with input from the MRE operators and potentially GICHD or other specialised international support. UNDP should support attention to the differing needs and circumstances of women and men, children and adults, refugees and others. UNDP should work with the UN agencies and international community to support the EORE training under development to reduce the risk to displaced Syrians in Lebanon and when they return home.

MVA – Victims are enabled to socially and economically integrate into their communities

12. **Recommendation:** UNDP should continue its lobbying efforts with Parliament and ministries for implementation of law 220/2000 to ensure a general improvement for all persons with disabilities including mine victims. UNDP should ensure attention to different situations of women and men, girls and boys. UNDP should follow-up with employers who may have persons with disabilities in their work force in order to seek their involvement as champions for implementation of the law 220/2000. Specific studies that would be valuable to conduct at this time include: (a) type and extent of employment of mine victims in Lebanon; and (b) survey of mine victims regarding their needs and services received considering Law 220/2000.

LMAC meets national, regional and international obligations and opportunities

13. **Recommendation:** LMAC will continue to require support to engage with donors, UN agencies, Parliamentarians, and the private sector. UNDP should maintain its strategic partnership with LMAC, which provides important benefits for engagement with the national and international community. As part of the partnership, UNDP should assist LMAC to strengthen communication with stakeholders:
 - LMAC-donors (twice annual meeting of ISG; alternate quarters with MAF)
 - LMAC-donors and operators (twice annual Mine Action Forum)

- LMAC-operators (two to four meetings annually of TWG)
- Clear Transparency and Annual Reports

14. **Recommendation:** UNDP should support LMAC in development and negotiation of an exit strategy for international assistance. The exit strategy should present the target capabilities for LMAC to operate without further institutional support. It should recognize that LMAC will continue to require outside civilians to support the non-traditional roles required for a national mine action center until it is able to recruit its own civilian staff for these positions. It should identify support to LMAC and the national mine action programme that may be necessary even after other requirements have been met. The exit strategy should be agreed with the principal donors supporting mine action in Lebanon.
15. **Recommendation:** Resource mobilization for operational partners depends on the image and enabling environment provided by the quality of the LMAP and of LMAC management, together with specific proposals put forward by the INGOs. The single most important statement the government could make to mobilize more resources would be to accede to the APMBC. UNDP should support LMAC to ensure the enabling environment for operator resource mobilization through:
- Clear realistic national mine action strategy
 - Transparent priority setting, including consideration of community socio-economic impact
 - Transparent reporting and treaty compliance
 - Recognition of operator role in LMAC reports
 - Advocacy for accession to the APMBC
16. **Recommendation:** Resource mobilization for UNDP continuation – for which LMAC expressed strong interest – has not been a major issue in recent years, thanks to the on-going EU commitment. Going forward, LMAC request to continue its partnership with UNDP would benefit from high level government expression of support for continued UNDP work with LMAC.

Background to the Evaluation

Purpose

17. This is the final evaluation of the EU-financed UNDP project to “Strengthen the Lebanon Mine Action Centre (LMAC) – Phase IV” – 2016-2019 – EU Delegation Agreement ENI/2016/373-187 and UNDP project 00098899. The evaluation further seeks to identify LMAC requirements for further support, which UNDP and other stakeholders could consider for future projects. Prior phases of UNDP support covered 2009-2010, 2011-2013 and 2014-2016. EU has been the principal funder for all phases, with related funding provided through UNDP by the UK, Netherlands, Norway and Denmark together with substantial funding to NGO demining operators by UK and Norway. Additional donors to the National Mine Action Programme have included France, Japan, and the USA, as well as BLOM Bank Lebanon.

Consultant selection and evaluation timeframe

18. The evaluator was selected based on competitive process conducted by UNDP in June-July (see Annex 01 for TOR). The evaluation began in late July with review of extensive documentation made available through UNDP and online (Annex 02: Documents reviewed). The Inception Report was accepted on 15 August and the field mission was conducted from 30 September to 7 October.

Methodology

19. The evaluation utilized five primary methods: (a) document review for initial assessment during the Inception Phase; (b) updating of historic contamination, clearance, victim and finance data with UNDP and LMAC staff; (c) survey of mine action stakeholders regarding with LMAC services supported by UNDP, including whether such support continues to be necessary and how it can be improved; (d) Key Informant Interviews with LMAC, UNDP Resident Representative, UNDP project staff, donors, and operators; and (e) field visit to the RMAC in Nabatiyeh.

20. The evaluation sought to respond to Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) identified in the ToR regarding the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the UNDP project results:

OECD/DAC Category	Key Evaluation Questions
Relevance	To what extent was the UNDP support project relevant to the identified LMAC needs, especially related to reducing the level of risks and socio-economic development potentials? To what extent does the project intervention meet the needs of local mine affected communities and does the intervention align with national priorities? How has the project been able to assess and address the institutional needs and priorities, including the context of emerging development priorities and changing requirements? To what extent are the objectives still valid and support still necessary?
Effectiveness	To what extent were objectives achieved at outcome level? To what extent has the project been successful in establishing partnerships with key stakeholders (including private sector), especially through coordination mechanisms? What were the major

	factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? Were there any unintended results of the programme?
Efficiency	Has the project been a cost-efficient way to support mine action? Were outputs provided and objectives achieved on time? Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Sustainability	Are the benefits brought about by UNDP support likely to continue after finalization of the project? Why and why not? Have the capacity building efforts (organizational development and development of individuals) in the LMAC proven to be useful and sustainable? Why and why not? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

21. Specific Interview Questions for each Key Evaluation Question are presented in Annex 03. Annex 04 identifies the Key Informant interviewees.

22. The Stakeholder Questionnaire (Annex 05) was sent to 25 people, including LMAC, UNDP, UNDP project staff, donors and operational partners, with responses received from 24 (Annex 06). The stakeholder questionnaire responses provided the starting point for the Key Informant Interviews.¹ Annex 07 provides a summary of stakeholder response regarding usefulness of UNDP support to LMAC. The questionnaire was not intended for statistical analysis, but it was strikingly clear that those most directly involved with the assistance – LMAC and UNDP project staff – share the view that the support was very useful and that it should continue. Those respondents who work with LMAC but had little contact with the UNDP project staff, recognized that the support may have been useful but are not convinced there is a good reason for it to continue. These issues are central to the dual purpose of the evaluation: final evaluation of the EU-funded Phase IV and identification of potential further LMAC support requirements.

Limitations

23. There were a few limitations worth noting, although none are believed to have imposed significant limitations on the validity of the conclusions of the evaluation. First, time planned for field work (one week) was relatively limited, although feasible given the focus of attention on results of UNDP strengthening of LMAC, rather than on the Lebanon Mine Action Programme. Second, useful background quantitative information on the progress of the national programme against the mine problem was not readily available. Since the evaluation was not focused on the evolution of the national programme, this loss of expected contextual information did not limit the assessment of results. Third, although originally planned, meetings were not held with national MRE or MVA implementing partners; however these areas had not received much emphasis from the UNDP project. Finally, certain key individuals with whom the evaluator was to meet during the field mission were recently rotated to other positions in the LAF. This did remove the best-informed interviewee to discuss information management and the IMSMA database, limiting somewhat assessment of the current strength of this function.

¹ Exemplifying one of the issues that complicates LMAC capacity development, two LMAC department chiefs who had been identified as important Key Informants with whom the evaluator was scheduled to meet were rotated out of LMAC in the two weeks between their completion of the Stakeholder Questionnaire and evaluation interviews.

National Context

Landmine and Cluster Munition Problem and Mine Action Programme before 2011

24. Landmine problem. The landmine problem faced by the people of Lebanon began with the 15 year civil war which ended in 1990. Landmines were used throughout the country by all warring factions, particularly along the lines of demarcation between areas of control. Dense military minefields were laid along the entire southern border during the Israeli occupation which ended in May 2000. An estimated 4 million cluster munitions were used by Israel during the five-week conflict in July-August 2006. Unexploded CM were widely spread throughout South Lebanon, including in many areas which had been cleared of landmines. Finally, a significant area in Northeast Lebanon is contaminated with IEDs and nuisance minefields following the 2017 LAF expulsion of Syrian terrorist groups. The various components of contamination have resulted in a cumulative total of 3,808 victims (920 killed and 2,888 injured) up to the time of the evaluation mission in September 2019. 78% of victims were from before 2000, with the majority of victims since 2006 due to CM. 2017 had a new peak in victims, due in large measure to the IEDs and nuisance mines in the northeast of the country; 97% of fatalities since 2006 were men, while the proportion of women killed or injured since 2016 is 5% (there have been no fatalities of women since 2012). (Tables 01-03: Victims)
25. The national Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) conducted in 2002/2003 estimated that 306 communities with 1,087,249 inhabitants (one-third of the national population) were impacted by a total of 980 Suspect Hazardous Areas (SHAs). The LIS substantially overstated the size of the contaminated areas, due to the methodology applied and the lack of mine action experience of LIS survey teams.
26. Landmine programme. The Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) began clearing the minefields along the lines of demarcation in 1990. In 1998, during the period of signature before entry-into-force of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC – Ottawa Treaty), the Government of Lebanon created (a) the Lebanon Mine Action Authority (LMAA) as an Inter-Ministerial Committee chaired by the Ministry of Defence and (b) the National Demining Office (NDO) within the LAF and located in a military compound to manage the military engineer clearance programme.² In 2007, the NDO was renamed as the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) with responsibility for the national mine action programme. (Table 04: Timeline.)
27. When the IDF withdrew in May 2000 from the area it had occupied in southern Lebanon, the existing military clearance programme began to be transformed into a broader national mine action programme. This was jump started with a \$50 million contribution from the United Arab Emirates for clearance of the area south of the Litani River, which was concluded during the period 2003-2005. The funds were channeled through the United Nations and the operation was managed by a tripartite Mine Action Coordination Cell – South Lebanon (MACC-SL) comprised of staff from the LAF, UAE and UNMAS. In 2001, GoL signed the first UNDP support project, although it took until 2003 for agreement on inclusion of UNDP project personnel within the LMAC. A process of systematic non-technical

² Lebanon has not ratified the APMBC. For roughly 20 years, the Government has indicated that it is prepared to ratify when Israel does so; and affirms that in the meantime it acts within the spirit of the APMBC. In 2019, the LAF and the Ministry of Defense indicated that they have no objection to ratification of the Ottawa Convention.

survey (NTS) from 2005 to 2011 to improve size estimates resulted in a general reduction in estimated suspect area of about 75% in relation to the LIS.

28. At the beginning of 2006, with the area south of the Litani River cleared under Operation Emirates Solidarity, it was projected by some parties that the remaining landmine contamination affecting high and medium impact communities (other than along the BlueLine) could be eliminated by 2010. The widespread use of cluster munitions by Israel during the July-August 2006 war resulted in a massive increase in explosive contamination, particularly in the recently cleared area south of the Litani River. This brought the second stage to a close. (Tables 05-06: clearance progress and contamination.)
29. The extensive unexploded cluster munitions were a new hazard and resulted in a dramatic increase in number of victims – having fallen consistently from an annual figure of over 100 in 2000 to 22 in 2005, it increased to over 200 during the second half of 2006 alone (by 2011 the annual total had fallen to 6). There was an immediate increase in international funding to mine action operators, provided by donors directly to international NGOs already present. Most resources focused on battle area clearance under the coordination of the LMAC, although often under the more direct tasking of the MACC-SL. In 2007, the National Mine Action Policy was adopted, clearly stating the role of the LMAC for overall coordination throughout the country (see Annex 08). It was agreed that the MACC-SL would be transferred in 2008 (postponed to 2009) to the LMAC as its Regional Mine Action Centre (RMAC). 2006-2011 was the third phase of the Lebanon National Mine Action Programme.
30. A new phase began in 2011, with entry into effect of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), first arrival of refugees from the civil war in Syria, and approval of the National Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020. Lebanon was a leading advocate for the CCM. Syrian refugees often settled on higher risk land and were unfamiliar with the risks and individual actions necessary for mine and CM safety. In 2017, new risks due to IEDs and nuisance mines resulted with the LAF victory over terrorist groups displaced from Syria and the number of victims increased. The problem was large enough to justify donor interest to establish a second RMAC for the affected region.

Lebanon mine action programme (LMAP) – Actors

31. LMAC provides overall management for the LMAP. It has a very positive international reputation, recently ranked #3 among national mine action programmes addressing cluster munitions.³ Among partners in Lebanon it is also highly regarded, with particular credit given to the Director and key managers since 2016. One NGO manager with experience in several countries commented that LMAC is the best national mine action centre with which he has worked. Evaluation of LMAC was not part of this assignment, but the consultant shares the very positive impression heard from donors and operators.
32. Survey and clearance operators. The LAF is the core long-term operator and is focused on both mines and CMs. Several international mine action NGOs have operated in Lebanon, including MAG, NPA,

³ “Performance Scoring of States-Parties to the CCM,” Clearing Cluster Muniton Remnants, 2019, figure 2, page 9. www.mineactionreview.org

HI, DCA and Intersos. Most INGOs work in CM clearance, but some also conduct mine clearance of Blue Line minefields since 2017. Two Lebanese NGOs are active in CM clearance, Laminda and POD.

33. MRE and MVA operators working with LMAC are all national NGOs. Each of them is based in a particular religious community and works on both MRE and MVA issues.
34. Funding. The Government of Lebanon has been a reliable long term contributor to the National Mine Action Programme. Its primary contribution has been through the budget of the LAF Engineers Regiment and the LMAC, which are fully financed by the national budget. Estimated in early 2000s at about \$4,000,000 annually, this increased in 2007 to \$5,500,000, then to \$6,500,000 in 2009 and \$9,000,000 in 2012, where it has remained since. International donors currently include: the EU, Norway, USA/WRA, UK, Netherlands, Sweden, Japan and France. According to the Landmine Monitor, during the period 2002-2005, total external contributions averaged between \$5 and \$10 million annually; this increased to almost \$69 million in 2006 and remained over \$20 million annually between 2007 and 2010. Funding fell to an average of \$12 million annually between 2012 and 2015, and has increased again to an average of about \$18 million annually since 2016. In an interesting private sector involvement, two national banks have agreed to allocate fees received from credit cards to fund mine action. Principal funding for UNDP support to strengthen LMAC has been provided by the EU Delegation in Lebanon, with a Phase IV budget of EUR 2,010,000.

Lebanon mine action strategy (2011-2020)

35. The National Mine Action Strategy (LMAS 2011-2020) provides an overall goal for the LMAP together with relevant specific outputs, indicators and milestones (Annex 09: LMAS Results Framework with Results and 2020 Targets and Annex 10: UNDP support to LMAC in relation to LMAS results).

Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020 – Results Framework and UNDP Support

Results	Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020	UNDP Support
Output #1	Affected communities enabled to better manage risks posed by mines	IMSMA, CLO (MRE)
Output #2	The full realization of the rights of mine victims guaranteed	Advocacy (MVA)
Output #3	Mine Action contributes to socio economic use through land release	IMSMA, CLO, QA
Output #4	Compliance to and promotion of the universalization of the CCM and other relevant international instruments	Advocacy, convening, support to reporting
Output #5	A sustainable capacity to manage residual risks is established	Management advice

36. The first three outputs are the result of actions by multiple LMAP operators in the areas of demining (survey and clearance), MRE and MVA, including LAF, international and national NGOs, Ministries of Health and Education, and NGOs supporting persons with disabilities. The role of LMAC for these first three outputs is to ensure the best use of resources through prioritization and tasking, provide QA/QC on field operations, maintain up-to-date the database on contamination and clearance to inform

priority setting and reporting, convene operator input to review lessons from demining practice, and when appropriate to revise the National Mine Action Standards to enable increased operational efficiency with safety and high quality of results. LMAC also ensure cooperation among partners for MRE and MVA, and advocacy for full government institutional support.

37. Since even before the adoption of the 2011-2020 Lebanon Mine Action Strategy, UNDP has provided support to enable LMAC to fulfill key responsibilities for implementation of the LMAS, including for:

- Strategic planning
- Database and information management
- Demining priority setting and tasking
- QA/QC of demining operations
- MRE and MVA coordination, advocacy for full public sector institutional response
- Reporting and Treaty compliance
- Resource mobilization for mine action programme partners
- Development of national residual response capability

38. The fourth output is primarily the result of LMAC actions (reporting and coordination with other external stakeholders), although it relies on the database and operator reporting of actual progress, together with the result of resource mobilization which is to a significant degree conducted directly by the operators with their respective donors. LMAC support for such resource mobilization is essential, but the respective contacts are often home-country based.

39. The fifth output is largely under the responsibility of the LAF. Establishment of a sustainable residual capacity is a question of government policy to recognize that the LAF is meant to hold this responsibility and be equipped to carry it out – both management and operational capacity is required. LMAC has a role to advocate for formal recognition of this LAF responsibility, to operate the residual response mechanism if so charged, and to ensure coordination with local police and medical services who might be prepared to provide support, as well as for the communication mechanism from communities when residual problems are identified.

40. Based on the two milestone reviews (2011-2013 and 2014-2016), as well as LMAC Annual Reports, there has been progress toward each of the Strategic Outputs, but the 2020 targets will not be achieved. Specifically:

- Output #1: MRE reaches a significant minority of at-risk population. There was good coordination, and multiple MRE information events, although their effectiveness has not been assessed. Training has been provided to include MRE in the nationwide two-week health module for schools. However, the Government has not completed the review of curricula materials and thus not incorporated MRE into general education, as a result MRE still does not have the planned broad coverage through the educational system.
- Output #2: MVA reaches only a small share of survivors. There were useful coordination meetings, continuing survey of mine survivors, and several small scale income generation projects and employment training which benefited a limited number of people. Mine victims

are recognized as persons with disabilities entitled to the same support guaranteed by the law. Nonetheless, Law 220/2000 on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which is the basis for a comprehensive public sector response to the needs of mine victims, has yet to be fully implemented.

- Output #3: Land release is contributing directly to socio-economic development. Post-clearance survey reports suggest that roughly 97% of released land is in productive use soon after handover, although the type of usage is often not clearly enough identified. Nonetheless, targets to be free of impact from landmines and cluster munitions are years from being met. At the time the strategy was developed, the LMAC IMSMA database indicated that 70% of areas contaminated by landmines (other than Blue Line minefields) and 67% of areas contaminated by cluster munitions had been resolved, with approximately 22 sqkm of landmines and 18 sqkm of cluster munitions remaining to be demined (see Table 07). When initially adopted, the Mine Action Strategy projected elimination of 100% of the landmine and cluster munition threat by 2020 (in line with Lebanon's CCM 10 year clearance obligation), and included appropriate benchmark targets to confirm progress. Targets were set to comply with the timeframes of the CCM and the APMBBC, although they would have required levels of funding far above historical levels. While the LMAC Annual Reports accurately state that slower than planned clearance is due to shortfall in international funding, it appears that projected annual funding was never realistic. The first (2013) and second (2016) interim reviews confirmed progress but found that it was slower than projected, due largely to insufficient international resources. Rather than adjusting targets on the basis of the actual resource flow, the interim reviews optimistically increased the projected annual resource requirements to meet the 2020 completion targets. As a result the mine action strategy became less and less useful. Lebanon will need to request an extension of its CCM clearance deadline, but is in compliance with its transparency reporting Treaty obligations (CCM) and voluntary commitments (APBCM).
- Output #4: Lebanon compliance with relevant international treaty obligations is assured through UNDP support to LMAC transparency reporting as well as for its annual reporting.
- Output #5: Regarding the residual response capacity, the LAF have established LMAC as the management structure for residual response, but have not clarified operational procedures, coordination with local police and medical services, nor the mechanism for citizen reporting of potential new hazards.

41. The above assessment of the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy is based on existing sources and is not the focus of this evaluation since they were never intended as the results of UNDP support. Rather UNDP support was designed to strengthen the operational and strategic management of LMAC.

The Project: EU support for UNDP Strengthening LMAC – Phase IV

Purpose and Strategy of support

42. The Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020 provided the framework for the UNDP support during the project period (2016-2019). The project was approved in 2016 to further strengthen LMAC with

the expectation to transition away from further direct international institutional support. The expected outcome of the EU-funded project was that LMAC capacity would be strengthened to effectively manage the Lebanon Mine Action Programme and achieve the objectives of the LMAS 2011-2020, and international support to LMAC would transition away from on-going institutional support and capacity development.

“Phase IV of the project is the continuation of a longstanding support that specifically aims at empowering and enabling the LMAC to sustainably manage and address the humanitarian and development impact posed by mines, and accordingly to plan for an exit of international support, especially in terms of supporting the LMAC’s institutional development as well as supporting Lebanon to complete clearance of cluster munitions.” (Phase IV Prodoc pg 11)

Logical framework and UNDP support

43. Below is the high-level UNDP-LMAC project results framework with reference to the respective LMAS Strategic Outputs (SOs), and indicating the project support provided by UNDP. As described in the following section, UNDP project support focused primarily on Results #1 and #4.

UNDP project to Strengthen LMAC – Results Framework Summary		
Result	Project Results Framework	UNDP Support
Overall objective	The impact of mines on the security and livelihood of the population in Lebanon and the region reduced through the promotion of sustainable government structures	
Specific Objective	The LMAC empowered and enabled to sustainably manage and address the humanitarian and development impact posed by mines, specifically in Lebanon and generally in the region, in line with its strategy 2011-2020	
Result #1	National capacity reinforced to document and prioritize clearance operations and the resulting socio-economic impact (SO1 and SO3)	IMSMA, CLO
Result #2	Impacted communities empowered and equipped to deal with the residual risk of mines (SO1)	Advocacy, (MRE)
Result #3	Victims enabled to socially and economically reintegrate into their communities (SO2)	Advocacy, (MVA)
Result #4	LMAC’s institutional capacity strengthened to enable the LMAC to meet its national, regional, and international obligations as well as transfer its expertise to support stability, security, and territorial cohesion (SO4 and SO5)	Advocacy, reporting, management support, Advisory role

44. Throughout Phase IV, UNDP provided the following inputs to support the identified results.

- Mine Action Advisor to support strategic planning, donor relations, coordination with LMAC and other external mine action partners, and to manage the project
- LMAC institutional support to ensure the organizational continuity of LMAC
 - IMSMA staff to ensure up-to-date database and maps for strategic planning and prioritization; enable reporting for programme management, donor and Treaty compliance; provide core elements of task dossiers; inform planning for MRE and tracking of MVA requirements
 - Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) to enable rapid response; civilian identification of new requirements; handover of completed demining projects; MRE and accident investigation
 - Quality Assurance Officers to support in conducting QA/QC of operators and tasks
 - Secretariat assistance to support stakeholder coordination through the MRE Steering Committee, the MVA Steering Committee, Mine Action Forum and Technical Working Group
- Technical Studies and Workshops including LMAC training needs assessment, IT assessment, assessment of the cost/benefit results of mine action in Lebanon, and workshops on IEDs, NTS, NMAS, Gender and Diversity
- Resource mobilization in support of LMAP/operators and specific MVA and MRE pilot projects

45. UNDP project support was to strengthen LMAC via provision of appropriate strategic and management advice, staff and other inputs. The bulk of UNDP project budget was dedicated to fill key LMAC staffing requirements, particularly IMSMA and CLO positions (other positions also supported: QA assistant, radio clerk, MRE coordination assistant, MVA coordination assistant, operations clerk). These all had been civilian positions under the MACC-SL and were taken over by UNDP in 2009 to ensure smooth transition to LMAC responsibility, and to be handed over from UNDP to LMAC by the end of 2019. As foreseen in the budget, the relevant inputs – in addition to general UNDP Country Office partnership – were 12 project staff, since reduced by five:

- Strategic advice to LMAC and management of project:
 - 1 Mine Action Advisor / Project Manager (unchanged)
 - 1 Junior Project Officer (unchanged)
- Database: 2 IMSMA/GIS assistants (reduced to 1)
- Demining Operations:
 - 1 Quality Assurance and Completion assistant Coordinator (unchanged)
 - 1 Operations clerk (reduced to 0)
 - 1 Quality Assurance clerk (reduced to 0)
 - 1 Radio operator (reduced to 0)
- Community Liaison: 3 CLOs (unchanged)
- MVA and MVA: 1 MRE/MVA assistant (reduced to 0)
- Operational resources: office expenditures, training, studies, travel, Regional School, etc.

46. Nearly all UNDP LMAC project staff have extensive experience in mine action in Lebanon. Most of them worked for several years for the MACC-SL and were taken over by UNDP in the 2009 transition in recognition that the specific functions were not traditional army tasks and were better carried out by civilians. UNDP project staff provide the institutional memory of LMAC with regard to the national explosive hazard history and response, including interaction with operators. UNDP project staff

presence provide continuity to mitigate risks of rotation. LMAC staff who rotate out and return a few years later rely on UNDP project staff to brief them on programme developments. LMAC would function without the experience that UNDP project staff bring, but it would not operate as well.

47. UNDP strategic support included: (a) support to transparency in reporting, with writing designed for clear communication in terms understood by donors and other stakeholders; (b) collaborative approach to LMAC engagement with programme partners and incorporation of their insights in efforts to improve operations; (c) access to donors; (d) access to the UN family of agencies; (e) access to politicians and the private sector; and (f) civilian perspective focused on the strategic and humanitarian impacts of mine action. With its attention to mine action and development, UNDP has sought to assist LMAC to leverage support and use of mine action results and information for broader purposes including in terms of SDGs, Crisis Response Plan, and UN agency approaches.
48. The principal financial support for UNDP Strengthening LMAC 2016-2019 was the contribution of EUR 2,010,000 provided by the European Union (EU). During the project other donors added funds for specific purposes, including Norway (400,000 NOK) to upgrade database servers and United Kingdom (94,810 UKP) to open a regional LMAC office in the Northeast (Arsal). Parallel funding was provided by US/WRA, GICHD and France for focused training purposes and general support to the Arab Regional Cooperation Programme and the RHDSL.

Results during Phase IV

49. The following sets out relevant project activities and LMAC outputs according to four project results.
50. **Result #1:** National capacity reinforced to document and prioritize clearance operations and the resulting socio-economic impact (LMAS SO1 and SO3).
- **Clearance and survey.** National Mine Action Standards were revised in a way that should significantly improve efficiency by reducing the depth of clearance by one-third (from 22 to 15 cm) and reducing the fadeout area for clearance beyond the respective area by one-third (from 50 to 35 mts).
 - Non-technical survey has been further developed and continues to identify smaller hazardous areas from larger suspect areas as well as in pre-clearance preparation. The smaller confirmed areas should enable much better targeting of resources and require less time for clearance.
 - **Database management.** IMSMA system and its use continue to be supported. Database contains technical errors, including overlapping and duplicate records. Baseline contamination data for both landmines and cluster munitions is reported by LMAC and operators to be out of date.
 - **Socio-economic aspects.** The study conducted on the socio-economic impact of mine action concluded that each \$1 invested in mine action produced \$4.15 over time. The study does not fill the gap identified in the LMAS and elsewhere for socio-economic data for prioritization. (a) LIS (2004) which identifies communities by degree of impact, with attention to victims and socio-economic blockages and (b) LMAC (2011) which identifies individual task priorities considering land use, victim and other data. (See Annex 11 for LIS and task priority scoring grids.) Each methodology generated clear priorities, but the cumulative results of demining have not been assessed against them.

51. Result #2: Impacted communities empowered and equipped to deal with residual risk of mines (SO1)
- MRE. MRE Steering Committee met several times.
 - MRE has not been incorporated into the national education curriculum.
 - MRE has been included as a component of the nationwide two-week health module.
 - Over the years, many MRE initiatives have been undertaken as referred in the LMAC Annual Reports. Nonetheless, it is not clear what approaches may have been successful for which populations.
 - UNDP has engaged LMAC in piloting regional EORE training for Syrian refugees, in a proposed multi-year project.
52. Result #3: Victims enable to socially and economically reintegrate into their communities (SO #2)
- MVA. MVA Steering Committee met multiple times
 - The mine victim survey was updated, but data has not yet been collected.
 - Law 220/2000 on Rights of Persons with Disabilities has not been implemented.
 - Small scale income generation projects reached 39 survivors in 2017. Employment training was being conducted for 11 mine survivors at the time of the evaluation mission. Men and women were included in both efforts. These efforts are not to scale; they should be treated as pilot projects with results to be monitored and evaluated for potential broader application.
 - While it is hoped that pilots will be beneficial for the participants, UNDP involvement is only warranted if they are managed to enlist private sector champions for rights of the disabled.
53. Result #4: LMAC enabled to meet its national, regional, and international obligations, as well as transfer its expertise to support stability, security and territorial cohesion (SO#4 and SO#5)
- Treaty compliance. Treaty compliance centers around reporting and universalization. Lebanon has complied with its transparency reporting obligations and voluntarily complies with the spirit of the APMBC. It will need to request extension of its CCM deadline, and that extension should be supported by a new Lebanon Mine Action Strategy.
 - Regional Outreach. In 2017 Lebanon took on new roles in outreach within the Arab Region, including: it took over the GICHD Arabic Outreach Programme and the Government of France supported Regional School for Humanitarian Demining in Lebanon opened with additional support from the EU. These are important platforms to expand LMACs support to other programmes and ensure that relevant support is provided to LMAC and other mine action actors from the region. Regional workshops were conducted on: EORE for refugees from Syria, International IED experience, and Gender and Diversity.
 - Coordination. During Phase IV there have been important steps to improve dialogue with operators and efficiency based on accumulated experience. The Mine Action Forum (MAF) established in 2016 for LMAC, donors and operators to discuss operational, technical and financial issues, and the demining Technical Working Group (TWG), have been particularly important. The MVA/MRE Steering Committee has met regularly and coordinated public outreach activities throughout the country. The National Mine Action Standards were thoroughly reviewed through joint efforts of LMAC and demining operators, supported by a UNDP expert, taking into consideration both national and international experience. The revision resulted in significant efficiency gains through incorporation of non-technical survey (NTS) and reduction to standard

clearance depth and fadeout. As part of the UN-family response to the Syrian crisis, LMAC and UNDP have coordinated programme development meetings with UN-family agencies and GICHD to develop a regional approach to Explosive Ordnance Risk Education and pilot response in Lebanon.

- Residual response. LMAC has been accepted as the future base for residual response, although specifics as to how this will be carried out and coordination with local police and medical services have not been developed.
- Exit strategy. Exit strategy for international assistance to LMAC was to be developed as a joint strategy for LMAC, donors and UNDP. As of the date of the evaluation, this had not moved forward, although there is a proposal to develop this strategy in the coming months.

54. Result #4 – resource mobilization: LMAC staff are fully funded by the national budget and cannot receive outside resources. Some running cost are covered by UNDP. LMAC and UNDP resource mobilization is primarily for the operators. For donors, positive response depends on the quality of the national mine action programme and of LMAC management, both of which are highly regarded. After over 20 years of LMAC activity, a key to success is having a believable strategy to resolve the cluster munition and landmine problems, including clear indicators and milestones, based on the existing level of resources. In general this is best done through transparent LMAC reporting on strategy, planning, progress and use of funds, and highlighting efforts of various partners in LMAC own reports. The 2011-2020 strategy was well thought through and presented, but was unrealistic because it was based on the level of resources required to resolve the problem within the defined time frame, rather than opening the time frame to depend on the resources actually available. Resource mobilization to continue UNDP project support– for which LMAC expressed strong interest – has not been a major issue until today, thanks to the on-going EU commitment.

55. UNDP arranged for studies and specialist advice required to advance the programme. UNDP facilitated national and regional workshops on NMAS, NTS, IED clearance, MRE, and Gender and Diversity which drew on and reinforced LMAC and operator expertise. UNDP contracted a study of the Socio-Economic Impact of Mine Action in Lebanon, which produced interesting conclusions on the long-term economic benefit of mine action and how that varies across different types of land use. Practical lessons have yet to be drawn from the study to better guide priority setting and tasking as well as post clearance impact review.

56. UNDP provides general support to LMAC management, primarily through the Project Manager/Mine Action Advisor and the UNDP Country Office (Resident Representative and head of CPR). This support includes active engagement with donors by identifying shared interests; engagement with Lebanese politicians and private sector in support of national mine action; advocacy of international treaty obligations and support for transparency reporting. It includes practical support as channel for external funding (which LMAC would not be able to receive directly) and administrative support to contract with international specialists to support LMAC. All of this is recognized by LMAC leadership as very valuable.

57. As part of the Armed Forces, LMAC is very limited in its ability to interact with Parliament, donors, private sector and even UN agencies. Any such contacts require prior assurance that they cannot be

misunderstood as the military becoming involved in politics (thus the military cannot lobby for the APMBC, but it can state that it has no objection to the ban from a military perspective, as it has done in 2019) nor appear to be officers requesting financial support. As one LMAC officer put it, “UNDP knows the world of politicians, donors, embassies, citizens, and is better able to communicate with them than is LMAC as part of the Armed Forces. LMAC staff could learn to deal with donors, but LMAC will lose that knowledge when they rotate. LMAC would not be allowed to deal with politicians and private sector as UNDP does. Other partners could provide specific technical support, but not neutral political communication with stakeholders. LMAC will continue with or without UNDP, but it would be better to do so with UNDP.”

Findings

Relevance

Relevance: The extent to which the project is consistent with LMAC requirements and the local context and problems. Under this criterion the evaluation should consider, inter alia:

- Are the project's methodologies, outputs and results relevant within the framework of the LMAC Mine Action Strategy and its overarching objective of an impact-free country?
- To what extent does the project intervention meet the needs of local mine affected communities and does the intervention align with national priorities?
- Has the project been able to assess and address the institutional needs and priorities, including the context of emerging development priorities and changing requirements?
- To what extent were the project implementation modalities suitable to strengthen the institution and enhance its capacity, including the extent of support provided?
- Was the project timeframe (for each result) reasonable to achieve the outputs and outcomes?
- Did the project promote the principles of gender equality, human rights-based approach, and conflict sensitivity?

58. Overall, the project support was relevant to LMAC requirements as manager of the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy. The project document was carefully designed to support LMAC in relation to the LMAS. The project inputs and results were sensible and implementation was closely aligned with the design.

- Each UNDP project position filled an important gap in LMAC functions, particularly those which were best done by civilians. The support provided LMAC institutional memory and (a) greater stability of personnel considering the frequency of rotation in the LAF (all positions), (b) greater ease of dialogue with community members (Community Liaison Officers), (c) continuing technical support in non-traditional area of database management (IMSMA), and (d) active participatory coordination with operational partners and other stakeholders (technical input and management advise). These functions will only be fully assured when LMAC has appropriate civilian staff in its own structure.
- The UNDP Project Manager/Mine Action Advisor (as well as the UNDP RR and Country Office) provided an essential contribution to LMAC overall image and success through facilitation of communication between LMAC and donors. The language and mentality of the parties are different, as are the ways they look at the contamination problem and its impact on the

people of the country. While they can each understand the other, it is very helpful to have an intermediary supporting that communication, whether in informal contacts or regular reporting.

- UNDP served as an effective channel for donor financial support to LMAC. Humanitarian and development funding from most countries cannot be provided directly to a military institution. Similarly, LMAC is not allowed under Lebanese law to receive donor funding; LMAC management expressed their discomfort at even requesting funds from donors. UNDP is an accountable financial intermediary to the benefit of all parties.
- UNDP supported LMAC in broadening stakeholder engagement, since departments of the LAF normally do not have authority to deal directly with donors, private sector, UN agencies, etc.
- UNDP provided technical support on specific issues identified with LMAC, such as review of the National Mine Action Standards, which lead to significant improvements in efficiency of field operations.
- UNDP worked with LMAC and donors to respond to the specific vulnerabilities of Syrian refugee population in Lebanon and in their future return to Syria, with development of pilot EORE project.
- UNDP supported the strengthened international role of LMAC, both the RSHDL and ARCP.

59. Result #1 UNDP project staff included three Community Liaison Officers (CLOs). All three have worked in mine action for over 15 years and provide institutional memory regarding hazards and demining efforts. The CLOs provide LMAC with civilian representatives to meet with community members and leaders. LMAC has found that local people typically have more open discussion with civilian CLOs than with a uniformed member of the military. CLOs are able to move more freely, without the travel authorizations required by the military. The CLOs provide input to tasking, progress monitoring, completion and handover. They respond to civilian reports of suspected hazardous objects as well as to all accidents and victims. While all of their work benefits from the civilian nature of the CLOs, perhaps the key role for which the civilian status is most important is for dealing with community members when there is a mine accident or explosive hazards have been identified. If there is a civilian available to respond to these situations, they can also provide other CLO support. This is one of the roles for which LMAC access to civilian posts is very important.

60. Actions for Result #2 (MRE) and Result #3 (MVA) were not at the scale required to have significant effect. In both cases, the project support was primarily through an assistant who carried out secretariat functions for the MVA/MRE Steering Committee and respective LMAC departments. UNDP partnership support included public engagement on the respective national days (mine action and persons with disabilities), but did not appear to carry out a more systematic approach to advocacy with ministries, parliamentarians, and other stakeholders. These results were treated as relatively secondary aspects of the project.

61. Under Result #4 there are two important outputs for which as of the date of the evaluation no significant advance had occurred.

- Exit strategy. There was no advance with development of an LMAC exit strategy for international cooperation, although there is a plan to prepare this in coming months. The exit strategy was an important part of the project. Perhaps it was misunderstood as a workplan

to close the project and thus not yet necessary. However, the purpose of this output is to develop agreement among donors, LMAC and UNDP as to the goals of cooperation, intended LMAC capacity that would represent the end state for successful capacity development, and what cooperation may remain necessary (eg, support to INGO operations).

- Residual response mechanism. Development of the concept and design for the residual response mechanism. This mechanism will be required for decades, involving roles of the LAF (LMAC and perhaps others), local police, first responders and hospital system. This could be designed based on current experience with the CLOs in response to civilian accidents (about one per month) and to civilian identification of suspicious devices.

62. UNDP project activities and outputs are not directly addressed to mine affected communities. The relevance of UNDP support is in its relationship to LMAC requirements in managing implementation of the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy. The LMAS, LMAP and LMAC respond to the needs of local mine affected communities, and in that sense the UNDP project does as well.

63. The project facilitated four workshops on Gender and Diversity during Phase IV. The Workshops were reportedly well received by participants from Lebanon and other mine action actors in the region. LMAC has female staff, none with management responsibilities, and has identified a gender focal point (male); INGO operators have female staff including as deminers. Gender in mine action was not identified in the project document as a focus, and it has received limited attention during Phase IV.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness: The extent to which planned UNDP project results have been achieved, including analysis of principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives. Under this criterion the evaluation should consider, inter alia:

- To what extent are the objectives and results likely to be achieved by end of December 2019?
- What have been the main challenges faced by the project and how has LMAC sought to overcome them?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement (or non-achievement) of the LMAC project objectives?
- Has the LMAC systematically included knowledge management (evaluations, reviews, etc.) for relevant projects during project implementation?
- To what extent has the project been successful in establishing partnerships with key stakeholders (including private sector), especially through coordination mechanisms?
- Has the project managed risks effectively? Refer to the risk analysis matrix as part of the project document and how it was put into action.
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and outputs levels benefitted women and men equitably and to what extent have marginalised groups benefited?

64. The project has produced most of the planned outputs under all four results and has been particularly effective under Result #1 and Result #4. The majority of project staff supported Result #1 and enabled LMAC to ensure more effective operations. Result #4 included support to strengthen the regional projection of LMAC. The regional role of LMAC is significantly stronger at the end of Phase IV, due in part to the management advice and operational support provided by the UNDP project:

- Regional School for Humanitarian Demining in Lebanon was established with the support of the EU and France. It is operating well and with a busy schedule of courses, most of which are conducted for regional participation. It provides the best facilities in the region for such activities and will facilitate bringing relevant external expertise more frequently to Lebanon.
- Arab Regional Cooperation Programme ensures LMAC involvement with development of standards and technical advances through the GICHD, and that those documents and ideas are disseminated and discussed with greater facility in Arabic speaking national programmes. The ARCP coordinates closely with the RSHDL for regional meetings.
- Regional support to safe return of Syrian refugees. The family of UN agencies are coordinating to provide support to Syrian refugees wherever they may be in the region and to support their eventual return. With political cover from UNDP, LMAC is coordinating development of Explosive Ordnance Risk Education materials for Syrian refugees in Lebanon to reduce the risks they face in Lebanon and eventually in their return to Syria. Materials being developed for Lebanon will serve as models for use in other countries of the region.

65. Many planned outputs under Result #2 and Result #3 were produced, but they were actual activities (primarily meetings) and they did not significantly contribute to desired global changes in safety of mine affected communities or socio-economic integration of mine victims. MRE and MVA are two areas in which targeting of programme activities by gender and age could be particularly important, but notwithstanding four Workshops on gender and diversity, this was not an area of focus for the project (or LMAC) and there is no significant change to report. Gender and age are included in victim reporting and planned to be incorporated into the EORE pilot for Syrian refugees.

66. While project support for MRE and MVA was relevant in both cases, it was generally not effective:

- Result #2 - MRE. The solution to ensure nationwide mine risk education recognized in the Lebanon MAS 2011-2020 is to incorporate MRE into the national school curriculum. While the overall review of the national curriculum is politically fraught and unlikely to occur in the near future, UNDP advocacy with the Ministry of Education to take the leading role in MRE outreach is important, but is part of overall partnership, independent of the specific position. Based on training and materials provided through the MRE Steering Committee, MRE has been incorporated into the two-week “health topic” which is provided by special instructors who travel to all schools. Furthermore, while there have been many MRE efforts, there is still a need to determine “what works” and “what does not work” – the need for which was identified in previous evaluations in the Milestone reviews and other evaluations. UNDP project staff have assisted the meetings and reporting of the MRE Steering Committee but have not played a technical role in MRE. While such a secretariat support role is useful for the Steering Committee, it does not warrant further UNDP input. UNDP support to LMAC in development of pilot EORE project for Syrian refugees is a useful development in the context of changing regional circumstances and needs, although it does not address the essential role of the Ministry of Education in response to the national MRE requirements.
- Result #3 - MVA. The solution recognized in the Lebanon MAS 2011-2020 to ensure improved services and conditions for mine victims is implementation of Law 220/2000 for Rights of Persons with Disabilities – to improve situation of all persons with disabilities. Mine victims

account for approximately 5% of all persons with disabilities in Lebanon. Mine victims have ID cards from Ministries of Social Affairs and Health which recognize their status as persons with special needs who are entitled to government support. The issue is full availability of that support and UNDP has an appropriate role at the political level to promote implementation of the law. Both the LMAS and the UN Mine Action Strategy prioritize addressing the needs of mine victims through improvement in services to all persons with disabilities including broader socio-economic inclusion. Income generation and employment training projects are interesting efforts and good for immediate beneficiaries, but not significant for UNDP involvement. LMAC has specific responsibilities for mine victims and the training should be evaluated in terms of its results (income/employment) for beneficiaries. UNDP and the international community understand that effective support to mine victims is through recognition of mine victims as a specific set of persons with disabilities, with a shift from attention to individual mine victims alone to focus on the rights of all persons with disabilities. The significance of UNDP involvement in current MVA activities rests on whether these efforts result in new advocates/champions from private sector for implementation of Law 220/2000. UNDP project staff have assisted the organization and reporting of the MVA Steering Committee, but have not played a technical role in MVA. Such a secretariat support role may be useful for the Steering Committee, but it does not warrant further UNDP input. While MVA activities do not have to be contracted by LMAC or UNDP it certainly is the role of LMAC with the support of UNDP to advocate and encourage inclusion.

67. Result #4 included two areas identified previously as not receiving appropriate attention thus far. The lack of inputs applied to develop (a) exit strategy and (b) residual response mechanism not surprisingly means that these outputs were not produced and the project was not effective in these regards.

Efficiency

Efficiency: The extent to which resources or inputs were converted to results economically? Under this criterion the evaluation should consider, inter alia:

- Were project activities cost efficient?
- To what extent has the project been effective in avoiding duplication of funding? How has coordination with different actors contributed to this?
- Were project annual outputs achieved on time?

68. The project has made reasonably efficient use of resources and generally delivered results on time. Project staff have been recruited based on UNDP Lebanon salary scale. While those costs are higher than for civilian staff on government contracts, LMAC does not have any civilian positions or ability to hire civilians for these roles. Although an operational partner might be able to provide staff, UNDP has an image of integrity and neutrality which has enabled LMAC to accept UNDP staff within LMAC offices; staff from an INGO would have to overcome the perception of self-interest of the respective organization, and obtain clearance from the army to share office space.

69. There were no other external funding channels to LMAC outside of UNDP, so there was no risk of duplication of resources.

Sustainability

Sustainability: The extent to which the project benefits will continue even after the project is concluded and the principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project sustainability. Under this criterion the evaluation should consider, inter alia:

- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from UNDP interventions continue after the project completion?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievements or non-achievements of the interventions sustainability?
- How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?

70. LMAC is part of the LAF and as such is sustainable. The relevant questions are first whether the LMAC functions that were strengthened during Phase IV are sustainable at the quality reached and second whether continuing improvement will occur autonomously.

- LMAC officers are subject to unpredictable but frequent rotation, usually to positions outside LMAC. Rotation to new positions is essential for the military as an institution as it is for the career development of each officer. In some countries where the military runs the NMAC, rotation is typically on a two-year basis – it may be inconvenient from the perspective of the mine action programme, but it can be planned for and transitions assured. In Lebanon rotation is significantly more frequent and less predictable. This makes it more difficult for officers to gain experience with the required non-traditional roles, such as that of a mine action centre interacting primarily with INGO and civil society actors.
- LMAC does not have civilian posts for many core positions of a national mine action centre. This makes it more complicated to efficiently carry out some internal functions, such as management of the IMSMAS database and support to MRE and MVA Steering Committees. It also makes it more complicated to carry out some external functions such as meeting with mine-affected communities and citizens who may identify potential explosive hazards.
- UNDP has assisted LMAC to identify interesting experiences and best practices from other mine action programmes. Once identified, UNMAS has demonstrated openness to learn and apply such practices when appropriate – this is part of sustainable development.

71. When dealing with institutional support in a capacity development project, donors and UNDP itself are legitimately concerned if it appears that project staff substitute rather than train government officials. In the case of LMAC, the project staff carried out functions that are not otherwise in the LMAC organization structure or that suffer due to frequent rotation of army personnel. In this situation of capacity “reinforcement” or “supplementation,” capacity development is unlikely to be fully effective. LMAC has taken onboard the results of specific technical support (eg., revision of NMAS) and the resulting improvements will continue even without further UNDP support. However, while individuals have been trained in IMSMA data entry and information management, this non-traditional area requires regular training of new staff and further data quality assurance that will only be secure with appropriate civilian staffing. Similarly, while military staff have been trained in work of Community Liaison Officers, this role can only be effectively fulfilled by civilians. LMAC would continue to operate without UNDP support, but it would not carry out these functions well.

72. The initial Phase IV project strategy was to twin UNDP civilian staff with LMAC military staff for transfer of skills and hand over all positions to LMAC military staff by the end of the project. While 5 out of the 12 UNDP positions in 2016 have been phased out, responsibilities have generally been added to the existing workload of one or more LMAC staff rather than becoming the main responsibility of specific individuals who could focus on improvement. LMAC reported that it does not have extra staff to whom the responsibilities could be assigned, nor does it have any civilian staff, and government recruitment has been frozen through at least 2021.

73. The rationale for the civilian posts varied slightly. The evaluation examined each of the rationales:

- IMSMA positions. These positions are best filled by specialised IT personnel, unlikely to be assigned to these roles by the military. Rotation requires training new staff each time.
- CLO positions. These positions required prompt daily mobility, without delay waiting for formal order of movement. Furthermore, the role is primarily for liaison with community members, who more easily establish rapport with another civilian.
- QA positions. These positions are best filled by experienced mine action field personnel. Rotation requires training new staff each time. However, QA/QC procedures and practice are well established and with clear SOPs this should not be a significant problem. Past support in this area was important, but it is no longer necessary.
- MRE and MVA positions. These positions provide useful support to the LMAC officers responsible for the respective areas, but they did not play any significant role with regard to the national government implementation of already identified policies. Advocacy for those changes is an important component of UNDP management support and partnership with LMAC, but the specific project positions are not strategically important.
- Radio operator. There is no clear rationale for continuation of UNDP civilian function in the radio operations room.
- General partnership and management support. UNDP management level partnership with LMAC remains important to ensure linkage with donors, parliamentarians, UN-system and private sector. Partnership remains important for connection to relevant best practice experience developed in other programmes, including as a channel to bring that expertise to LMAC through short-term consultancies and field visits.

74. The degree of sustainability of the LMAC strengthening brought about with the support of the EU-funded UNDP project varies significantly according to the Result.

- Result #1 – Document and prioritize clearance operations and socio-economic impact. This result is supported by the IMSMA clerk and Community Liaison Officers. As described earlier, LMAC capacity has been strengthened, but will deteriorate without external support. This will remain problematic until such time as LMAC can directly hire civilians for these functions. There has been significant strengthening of collaborative work between LMAC and demining operators, which UNDP supports. To the extent this is passed forward during rotations of each new Director and Head of Operations, it will be sustained. Further work is required to reassess the results of past priority setting and revise prioritization for the current context.

- Result #2 – Impacted communities empowered to deal with the residual risk of mines. The agreed solution is incorporation of MRE into the national school curriculum, for which no overall progress has been made. Incorporating MRE into the two week “health bloc” is a positive step. The EORE pilot for Syrian refugees is valuable in its own right and may provide input for the other MRE activities.
- Result #3 – Victims enabled to socially and economically integrate into their communities. The agreed solution is fully implementation of Law 220/2000 on rights of persons with disabilities, for which no overall progress has been made. Pilot employment training projects may be leveraged to mobilize private sector support for implementation of Law 220/2000.
- Result #4 – LMAC meets national, regional and international obligations and opportunities. This result has had multiple advances – RSHDL, ARCP, EORE, Transparency Reporting and more. These are all sustainable at their current levels, and could be enhanced with further support and partnership.

75. Issues of gender and diversity, human rights and needs of vulnerable groups are generally recognized in the mine action field. Demining is understood as a right, with different needs by gender and victim status. This understanding may have been reinforced somewhat but was not a project focus.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions regarding the EU-financed UNDP project to Strengthen LMAC (2016-2019)

76. EU-funded UNDP support contributed significantly to LMAC strengthening during Phase IV, particularly in relation to database management, quality assurance of field operations, management of community liaison, and fulfillment of international obligations and regional projection. The project document did not address integration of gender in mine action, although there were several Gender and Diversity workshops, LMAC named a gender focal point, and MRE and victim data are collected on a gender and age disaggregated basis. Some UNDP support is no longer necessary, while some of the support that UNDP has provided will remain important into the future – the latter elements are referred in the following paragraphs.
77. LMAC is a mature national mine action centre with strong national ownership. Its military nature provides institutional strength particularly in consistent application of procedures, such as those of the revised NMAS. That same military nature results in some weakness in development of non-traditional institutional capacities due to relatively frequent unplanned rotation of personnel and the need for regular interaction with civilians. Furthermore, LMAC also has a need to staff certain technical positions that are best carried out by civilians.
78. Today the Community Liaison Officers have an essential role in effective response to mine incidents and identification of suspect hazards. There are currently fewer than two dozen mine incidents each year. Civilian CLOs are able to respond faster and interact more effectively with civilians than would military personnel. The CLOs carry out the core of the residual response role, without having it formalized. Rapid residual response will remain an important requirement for decades to come. The approach and the mechanism can be designed and developed together with the CLOs. If the function is to be handled by military personnel alone, it should be piloted while civilian CLOs are still present.

79. The IMSMA database provides the record of known contamination, the results of demining, the input for prioritization and tasking, and the best estimate of the remaining problem. The quality and completeness of information in the database is important today and will remain so in the long-term.
- Currently, management of the IMSMA database and information management more broadly are among the key mine action centre functions that benefit from the stability and technical development facilitated by civilian posts. The transition to IMSMA Core, although delayed, is expected to be completed before the end of the year and should increase ease of use of the system, facilitate broad stakeholder access to the data, and provide a useful public Dashboard for mine action. Still, frequent personnel changes at any level from system managers to data entry will continue to limit capacity building and create risk to the quality of the data.
 - In the long-term, quality and availability of the mine action database will remain important for decades to come. It will continue to be an essential information platform for mine action during the residual response phase – with information about previous hazards and demining in areas where new hazards are found. It will be an essential geophysical dataset for future public and private development projects, whether for extending road and power infrastructure or planning industrial and housing estates. Much in the way that one would consult seismic risk and flood plain data when planning for construction, the records of past explosive hazards and demining will be essential information.
80. UNDP role as partner and advocate for LMAC will remain important in the long-term. This includes facilitation of contacts with donors, parliamentarians and other stakeholders; advocacy of key MVA and MRE policies and implementation with respective ministries and political actors; advocacy of APMBC; identification of useful lessons learned from the international mine action community.

Recommendations regarding future LMAC requirements and potential UNDP support

81. The 2018 LMAC Annual Report notes two challenges: fundraising for land release (resource mobilization for INGO operators) and maintaining institutional support (with expected end of EU and UNDP support by end 2019). “LMAC is still in need of institutional support whether it is through the enhancement of information management, donor coordination, reporting and fundraising or capacity building in particular to issues related to IED whether it is NMAS chapter MRE, Clearance, Quality Assurance/Control or MVA.” The evaluation shares the LMAC summary of the challenges faced and identifies below specific short and medium-term support required by LMAC. These requirements are presented to LMAC, UNDP and interested donors for discussion to determine which are priority for LMAC and of interest to donors for support in the coming phase.

Operations – Improved evidence of contamination enables LMAC to prioritize and task demining operators to efficiently address socio-economic impact of landmines and cluster munitions

82. **Recommendation:** UNDP should continue to provide specific support to efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the national demining programme based on engagement between LMAC and operators, including in context of LMAC rotation. Specific studies that would be valuable to conduct include: (a) review of past prioritization methodologies (LIS 2004 and LMAC 2011) and the extent to which prioritized communities and tasks have been resolved; (b) revision of current prioritization methodology to reflect changes on the ground and socio-economic impact of hazards

on communities; (c) assessment of the efficiency improvements from NMAS revision; and (d) review of post-clearance impact monitoring and reporting.

83. **Recommendation:** The IMSMA database will remain essential for long-term; support is important until qualified LMAC civilian staff take over. Currently the database provides essential support to strategic planning, priority setting, tasking and handover of completed tasks. It is the basis for recording progress made and projection of remaining contamination and would benefit from regular non-technical survey (NTS). Overtime, errors accumulate in any database; thorough review and cleanup should be conducted periodically to remove duplicates, overlapping records and other anomalies. The review should start from the results of cleaning done as part of the IMSMA conversion and also consider operator databases to identify any anomalies for reconciliation. In the future the database will be essential for the residual risk phase, providing the record of past contamination and clearance. This will be important for support to development actors – public and private – to understand presence or absence of risk on land to be used for infrastructure or other public or private development. UNDP should work with the government and the international community to ensure any support necessary to maintain the improved database to be useful for future development investments.
84. **Recommendation:** UNDP should support LMAC to develop a residual response mechanism pilot based on current CLO rapid response experience. Rapid response is triggered by learning of new incident/victim or reported finding of ERW, with immediate response by CLOs. Issues to be considered include whether this should be done by current CLOs or by personnel provided through NGO partners and whether in the future the function should be transitioned to military or police vs continue with civilian personnel in LMAC posts.

MRE – Impacted communities are empowered to deal with the residual risk of mines

85. **Recommendation:** UNDP should work with UN family and international community to advocate with the Ministry of Education and Higher Education to incorporate MRE into the national curriculum. The MRE Steering Committee should arrange for an evaluation of the MRE efforts in Lebanon, perhaps beginning with the two-week “health topic,” with input from the MRE operators and potentially GICHD or other specialised international support. UNDP should support attention to the differing needs and circumstances of women and men, children and adults, refugees and others. UNDP should work with the UN agencies and international community to support the EORE training under development to reduce the risk to displaced Syrians in Lebanon and when they return home.

MVA – Victims are enabled to socially and economically integrate into their communities

86. **Recommendation:** UNDP should continue its lobbying efforts with Parliament and ministries for implementation of law 220/2000 to ensure a general improvement for all persons with disabilities including mine victims. UNDP should ensure attention to different situations of women and men, girls and boys. UNDP should follow-up with employers who may have persons with disabilities in their work force in order to seek their involvement as champions for implementation of the law 220/2000. Specific studies that would be valuable to conduct at this time include: (a) type and extent of

employment of mine victims in Lebanon; and (b) survey of mine victims regarding their needs and services received considering Law 220/2000. Both studies should consider gender and age.

LMAC meets national, regional and international obligations and opportunities

87. **Recommendation:** LMAC will continue to require support to engage with donors, UN agencies, Parliamentarians, and the private sector. UNDP should maintain its strategic partnership with LMAC, which provides important benefits for engagement with the national and international community. As part of the partnership, UNDP should assist LMAC to strengthen communication with stakeholders:
- LMAC-donors (twice annual meeting of ISG; alternate quarters with MAF)
 - LMAC-donors and operators (twice annual Mine Action Forum)
 - LMAC-operators (two to four meetings annually of TWG)
 - Clear Transparency and Annual Reports
88. **Recommendation:** UNDP should support LMAC in development and negotiation of an exit strategy for international assistance. The exit strategy should present the target capabilities for LMAC to operate without further institutional support. It should recognize that LMAC will continue to require outside civilians to support the non-traditional roles required for a national mine action center until it is able to recruit its own civilian staff for these positions. It should identify support to LMAC and the national mine action programme that may be necessary even after other requirements have been met. The exit strategy should be agreed with the principal donors supporting mine action in Lebanon.
89. **Recommendation:** Resource mobilization for operational partners depends on the image and enabling environment provided by the quality of the LMAP and of LMAC management, together with specific proposals put forward by the INGOs. The single most important statement the government could make to mobilize more resources would be to accede to the APMBC. UNDP should support LMAC to ensure the enabling environment for operator resource mobilization through:
- Clear realistic national mine action strategy
 - Transparent priority setting, including consideration of community socio-economic impact
 - Transparent reporting and treaty compliance
 - Recognition of operator role in LMAC reports
 - Advocacy for accession to the APMBC
90. **Recommendation:** Resource mobilization for UNDP continuation – for which LMAC expressed strong interest – has not been a major issue in recent years, thanks to the on-going EU commitment. Going forward, LMAC request to continue its partnership with UNDP would benefit from high level government expression of support for continued UNDP work with LMAC.

Tables

Table 01: Total Landmine and CM casualties to 23 September 2019

Number of landmine/CM casualties (to 23/9/2019)

	Injured				Killed				Grand Total
	Before 2000	1/1/2000 to 13/8/2006	14/8/2006 to 23/9/2019	Total	before 2000	1/1/2000 to 13/8/2006	14/8/2006 to 23/9/2019	Total	
Male	1945	207	436	2588	683	44	68	795	3383
Female	243	23	34	300	121	2	2	125	425
Grand total	2188	230	470	2888	804	46	70	920	3808

Table 02: Casualties by type of munitions (14 August 2006 to 23 September 2019)

Number of casualties by type of munitions
(14 Aug 2006 – 23 September 2019)

		Cluster Munitions		Mines		UXO		Unknown		Total		Total
		Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	Killed	Injured	
Child 1-12 years	Male	5	33	0	1	1	6	0	8	6	48	54
	Female	0	4	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	10	10
Adolescent 13-18 years	Male	3	57	2	7	1	10	4	14	10	88	98
	Female	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Adult 19+ years	Male	36	191	8	48	5	24	3	36	52	299	351
	Female	1	15	0	0	0	4	1	3	2	22	24
Grand total		45	302	10	58	7	48	8	62	70	470	540

Table 03: Annual Landmine and CM Casualties (14 August 2006 to 23 September 2019)

		Injured														Killed														Grand Total		
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018		2019	Total
Child 1-12 years	Male	23	3	3	1	1	0	0	8	2	4	0	0	2	1	48	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	54
	Female	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Adolescent 13-18 years	Male	41	13	5	7	1	0	0	4	1	7	1	3	4	0	87	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	10	97	
	Female	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Adult 19+ years	Male	104	58	32	21	15	4	6	4	12	4	6	16	12	6	300	19	12	2	3	4	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	3	1	52	352
	Female	9	6	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	
Grand total		183	82	40	29	19	4	6	23	15	15	7	22	18	7	470	25	14	2	3	5	2	3	1	1	2	0	6	4	2	70	540

Table 04: Timeline of Lebanon Mine Action Programme

Lebanon Mine Action Programme Timeline					
Period	Year	Landmine Problem	Landmine Programme	LMAC	UNDP Support
1	1975-2000	Civil war – extensive use of landmines along areas of control	Landmines used widely Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) removes landmines from lines of demarcation	LMAA authority created under Min of Defense National Demining Office (NDO established to manage (both 1998)	
2	2000-2006	Period begins in mid-2000 with Israel departure from South Lebanon Period ends in mid-2006 with Israel extensive use of cluster munitions			UNMAS assessment
	2001		Operation Emirates Solidarity announced	NDO continues	UNDP support begins CTA and IMSMA staff
	2002-2003		Landmine Impact Survey (LIS)		
	2002-2005		Operation Emirates Solidarity (OES) MAG, DCA, Intersos conduct projects	UN MACC-SL – tripartite (UN/UAE/NDO)	
	2005		Beginning of first national NTS		
2006	Extensive cluster munition contamination during five week war with Israel	BAC to remove cluster munitions becomes high priority			
3	2006-2011	Lebanon organizes to respond to extensive landmine and CM problems			UNDP support continues CTA and QA advisor
	2007		National mine action policy established	NDO becomes LMAC LMAA established	UNMACC-SL staff become UNDP LMAC staff
	2009		LMAC takes full national responsibility	UNMACC-SL staff become UNDP LMAC staff	
4	2011-2019	Mature LMAC and LMAP respond to landmines and cluster munitions	Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020 established		UNDP support continues – IMSMA institutional UNDP support project
	2011		CCM enters into effect for Lebanon		
	2012-2019	Refugees from Syria civil war settle in high-risk areas with little mine safety knowledge	Expansion of MRE, victims increase especially among refugees to mitigate risk upon eventual return		
	2016-2017	Syrian armed factions driven out by LAF; widespread IED problems - 2017	NTS begins NMAS updated	Phase IV of UNDP LMAC Capacity Strengthening Support	
	2019				Planned end of EC/UNDP institutional support

Table 05: Landmine contamination and demining results

Extent of Landmine Contamination and Demining Results				
Year	AP	AT	Clearance (sqkm)	NTS Release
Pre-1990				
1990 -1997	16,000			
1998				
1999				
2000	22,000	4,000		
2001				
2002				
2003	69,000	2,200	6.0	
2004	2,929	287	2.1	
2005	1,366	97	2.0	2.5
2006	312	47	0.1	46.6
2007	50		0.5	7.2
2008			0.1	9.3
2009	419	6	0.2	10.5
2010	1,083	103	1.6	
2011			0.1	
2012	274	10	1.0	
2013	12	6	0.6	
2014	645	38	1.3	
2015	601	61	0.9	
2016	417	1	0.6	
2017	9,523	184	0.5	1.3
2018				
2019				

Table 06: Cluster Munition contamination and clearance results

Extent of Cluster Munition Contamination and CM Clearance Results			
Year	Clearance Results		Remaining
	CMs	CM Clearance (sqkm)	CM-CHA (sqkm)
Pre-1990			
1990- 1997			
1998			
1999			
2000			
2001			
2002			
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006	95,544	11.2	
2007	44,206	15.4	
2008	50,000	9.9	
2009	3,964	3.9	
2010	3,641	3.1	19.6
2011		2.5	19.6
2012	4,362	3.0	13.4
2013	4,470	2.5	17.0
2014	2,750	2.1	17.8
2015	3,328	1.7	16.3
2016	3,916	1.9	18.2
2017	5,525	1.4	17.2
2018			
2019			

Table 07: Explosive hazard contamination at beginning of NMAS 2011-2020

Contamination as of July 2011 – Lebanon Mine Action Strategy						
Category	Percentage cleared	Remaining areas	Remaining (sqkm)	Towns	Populations	Priority % H/M/L
Cluster Bomb strikes	67%	462	18.2	145	633,000	55/35/10
Dangerous Areas - IEDs	83%	420	16.9	182	169,285	35/45/20
Mine Fields (excluding Blue Line)	70%	679	22.4	191	22,202	58/42/5
Blue Line minefields		890	7.4	47	103,613	35/45/20

Annexes

Annex 01: Evaluation TOR

Evaluation purpose

The evaluation is necessary to account for several important processes, including the change in the type of contamination, the Risk Education challenges for host communities, refugees and internally displaced persons as well as the compliance of Lebanon to its international commitments. The purpose of this evaluation is to inform UNDP as well as key stakeholders on the results achieved to date, best programming strategy and approach for future support to Lebanese Mine Action authority i.e. LMAC. The results of this evaluation may be used for the design of a new phase of the project. This evaluation will support the development of strategy for the potential next phase of the project.

Evaluation scope and objectives

UNDP intends to undertake an independent evaluation to assess “LMAC” project’s results (expected results, specific objective and overall objective) at the macro level covering the period 2016-2019. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with relevant national counterparts. The evaluation needs to assess to what extent the project managed to mainstream gender and to strengthen the application of rights-based approaches in its interventions. In order to make excluded or disadvantaged groups visible, to the extent possible, data should be disaggregated by gender, age, disability, ethnicity, wealth and other relevant differences where possible.

The evaluation will use the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as defined and explained in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.⁴ The final report should comply with the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports.⁵

The evaluation should be able to:

- (i) Assess the level of progress made towards achieving the outcome of the project;
- (ii) Capture lessons learned and best practices from the implementation of the project with special focus on consolidated results of the different interventions (particularly Clearance progress, Risk Education, Victims Assistance, institutional capacity building of LMAC)
- (iii) Provide concrete and actionable recommendations (strategic and operational)
- (iv) Provide a comprehensive roadmap for the project, based on evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The roadmap should delineate how in its next phase the LMAC could improve, inter alia, its relevance, delivery of results and engagement with stakeholders, including local communities, Lebanese authorities and donors

⁴ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), p. 168.

⁵ [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)

Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

To define the information that the evaluation intends to generate, the potential evaluation questions have been developed (the questions are provided below under a relevant evaluation criterion). The questions may be amended at a later stage and upon consultation with the relevant stakeholders. The questions are:

Relevance: The evaluator will assess to what extent the project considers the local context and problems. The evaluator will assess the extent to which the objectives of UNDP support to LMAC are consistent with LMAC requirements and needs (including connections to LCRP, SDGs, government strategies and activities of other organizations). Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should consider, inter alia:

- Are the "LMAC" project's methodologies, outputs and results relevant within the framework of the LMAC Mine Action Strategy and its overarching objective of an impact-free country?
- To what extent does the project intervention meet the needs of local mine affected communities and does the intervention align with national priorities?
- How has the project been able to assess and address the institutional needs and priorities, including the context of emerging development priorities and changing requirements?
- To what extent were the project implementation modalities suitable to strengthen the institution and enhance its capacity, including the extent of support provided?
- With reference to activities and capacity level, was the project timeframe (including each result) reasonable to achieve the outputs and outcomes?
- How did the project promote the principles of gender equality, human rights-based approach, and conflict sensitivity?

Effectiveness: The evaluator will assess the extent to which planned UNDP support project results have been achieved. In evaluating effectiveness, it is useful to consider: 1) if the planned activities were coherent with the overall objectives and project purpose; 2) the analysis of principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should, inter alia:

- To what extent are the objectives and results likely to be achieved by end of December 2019?
- What have been the main challenges faced by the project and how has LMAC sought to overcome them?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement (or non-achievement) of the LMAC and project objectives?
- Has the LMAC systematically included knowledge management (evaluations, reviews, etc.) for relevant projects during project implementation?
- To what extent has the project been successful in establishing partnerships with key stakeholders (including private sector), especially through coordination mechanisms?
- Has the project managed risks effectively? Refer to the risk analysis matrix as part of the project document and how it was put into action.
- To what extent have the results at the outcome and outputs levels benefitted women and men equitably and to what extent have marginalised groups benefited?

Efficiency: measures how economically resources or inputs are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Under this evaluation criterion the evaluator should, inter alia:

- Were project activities cost efficient?
- To what extent has the project been effective in avoiding duplication of funding? How has coordination with different actors contributed to this?
- Were project annual outputs achieved on time?

Sustainability: The evaluation will assess the project capacity to produce and to reproduce benefits over time. In evaluating the project sustainability, it is useful to consider to what extent intervention benefits will continue even after the project is concluded and the principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project sustainability.

- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from UNDP interventions continue after the project completion?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievements or non-achievements of the interventions sustainability?
- How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?

Annex 02: Documents Consulted

- American University of Beirut, 2018, LMAC Training Needs Assessment Report
- Channel Research, Evaluation of DanChurchAid’s humanitarian mine action programmes in Libya, Lebanon and Burma/Myanmar, 27 September 2013
- GICHD, 2008, Regional evaluation of EC-funded mine action in the Middle East – 2002-2008
- GICHD, 2012, Transitioning Mine Action Programmes to National Ownership: Lebanon.
- Government of Lebanon, 2007, Lebanon National Mine Action Policy (LNMAP)
- Hamade, Kanj and Ilina Sprour, Socio-Economic benefits of mine action in Lebanon, January 2019
- Landell Mills, 2011, Mid-term Evaluation of Demining and UXO in Lebanon
- Landell Mills, 2014, Mine Action in Lebanon: Institutional Support and Clearance Activities, Mid-term Evaluation of EU funding
- Landmine Monitor, Lebanon Country Report, 1999-2018 (annual)
- Lebanon Mine Action Forum, 2nd Meeting Summary and Action Points, September 2018
- Lebanon Mine Action Forum, 4th Meeting Summary and Action Points, June 2019
- Lebanon Workshop on CM and LM Survey and Clearance, Summary and Action Points, January 2018
- LMAC, 2011, Annual Report
- LMAC, 2011, Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020
- LMAC, 2012 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2013 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2014 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2014, Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020, First Milestone Review 2013
- LMAC, 2015 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2016 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2017 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2017, Lebanon Mine Action Strategy, Second Milestone Review 2014-2016
- LMAC, 2018 Annual Report
- LMAC, 2019, Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building (presentation for MAF)
- LMAC and UNDP, 2019, Explosive ordnance risk education in Lebanon for refugees from Syria in the context of return, October 2019
- Minutes, Project Board Meeting, 10 November 2016
- UNDP, 2010, Project Document, Support to Lebanon Mine Action Programme – Phase II
- UNDP, 2011, Mine Action in Lebanon: A review of the Lebanon National Mine Action Programme and UNDP support to mine action in Lebanon – Final Report
- UNDP, 2013, Project Document, Support to Lebanon Mine Action Programme – Phase III
- UNDP, 2016, Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Center: Project Document
- UNDP, 2016, Final Narrative Report, Institutional Support to Lebanon Mine Action Programme
- UNDP, 2016, Support to the Lebanon Mine Action Programme – Phase III (Summary – Project Brief)
- UNDP, 2017, Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Center – Project Brief 00098899
- UNDP, May 2017, Interim Report: Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Center
- UNDP, May 2018, Interim Report: Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Center
- UNDP, May 2019, Interim Report: Enhancing the Capacity of the Lebanon Mine Action Center
- VVAF, 2004, Landmine Impact Survey: Lebanon

Annex 03: Key Evaluation Questions and Specific Interview Questions

Relevance

Key questions: To what extent was the UNDP support project relevant to the identified LMAC needs, especially related to reducing the level of risks and socio-economic development potentials? To what extent are the objectives still valid and support still necessary?

Sub-questions:

- Were the project methodologies, outputs and results relevant within the framework of the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy and its over-arching objective of an impact-free country?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with intended impacts and effects?
- To what extent were the project implementation modalities suitable to strengthen LMAC? To which extent UNDP's support contributes to the sustainability and effective functioning of LMAC?
- With reference to activities and capacity level, was the project timeframe (including each result) reasonable to achieve the outputs and outcomes?
- How did the project promote the principles of gender equality, human rights-based approach and conflict sensitivity? Could this be improved, and if so how?
- How relevant was the UNDP support from perspectives of LMAC and other stakeholder, and what improvements can be made?
- Which LMAC requirements will continue in the future? What new requirements may exist?

Effectiveness

Key questions: To what extent were objectives achieved at outcome level? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? Were there any unintended results of the programme?

Sub-questions:

- Which of the intended results were achieved in whole or part?
- What major factors influenced achievement (or non-achievement) of the project objectives?
- In which areas was the UNDP contribution important to achieve those results? In which areas would the results probably have been achieved in any case?
- What roles was LMAC expected to play? Did UNDP support strengthen LMAC ability to fulfil those roles?
- How well did LMAC fulfill its roles, according to stakeholders?
- How do other stakeholders see the collaboration with UNDP?
- To what extent did the crosscutting activities, particularly the capacity building and gender efforts achieve their objectives? Why and Why not?
- To what extent has the monitoring of activities and results undertaken in the course of the programme provided management with sufficient information to follow progress and makes adjustments if necessary to achieve desired results? Did management act accordingly?
- Did monitoring measure impact rather than merely operations and to ensure that Lebanon meets its international obligations?
- Were project risks managed effectively, considering the project risk analysis matrix?
- To what extent did the project contribute to achievement of the planned results of the Lebanon Mine Action Strategy?
- Have the new NMAS (shallower depth and smaller fade out) resulted in more efficient tasking of demining operations?
- Has UNDP support with more accurate data entry and analysis and coordination to reduce duplication resulted in more efficient use of resources for demining operations?
- To what extent have results at the outcome and output levels benefitted women and men equitably? To what extent have marginalized groups benefited?
- To what extent were national ownership and the development of local capacities fostered?

- To what extent were the overall development and rehabilitation priorities of Lebanon supported?
- Is victim data used effectively in design of MRE efforts?
- Have MRE activities reduced risk by changing behavior of populations at risk? Are MRE efforts effectively designed and targeted for populations facing different risks? What works best?
- Would the MRE (R#2) and MVA (R#3) results likely have occurred without UNDP involvement?

Efficiency

Key questions: Has the project been a cost-efficient way to support mine action? Were outputs provided and objectives achieved on time? Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Sub-questions:

- Could the same results have been achieved with fewer resources? Or could greater results have been achieved with the same resources?
- What alternative sources existed to provide the same support? Would any of them have been more cost efficient?
- Did the UNDP processes for recruitment of staff and contracting of other resources have an influence on the timely delivery of activities? Was that faster or slower than alternatives?

Sustainability

Key questions: Are the benefits brought about by UNDP support likely to continue after the finalization of the project? Why and why not? Have the capacity building efforts (organizational development and development of individuals) in the LMAC proven to be useful and sustainable? Why and why not? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

Sub-questions:

- To what extent do the qualifications of the local staff enable them not only to carry out their assigned tasks but also to recruit and train new staff without further external support?
- Has a suitable and user-friendly information management system been put in place to aid MA operations and sharpen decision-making by LMAC staff?
- To what extent has rotation of LMAC staff been an obstacle to development of capacity and transfer of responsibility? For which functions has rotation been a major obstacle?
- To what extent has the civilian vs military status of individual UNDP and LMAC staff been an obstacle to effective fulfillment of staff responsibilities, including interaction with civilian community members? What can be done to improve this?
- Did UNDP foresee and plan for an 'exit strategy' for LMAC to graduate from institutional support? Did this include plans for sustainability?
- Is the end state of UNDP support clearly defined and commonly agreed between actors? Is the situation sufficiently known to define an exit strategy?
- To what extent was the exit/transfer strategy successful? What obstacles were faced? How should this be addressed in the coming phase of UNDP support?
- What is the likelihood that the benefits that resulted from UNDP support will continue after project completion?
- Is there a sustainable policy and mechanism for long term response to residual threats?
- In what areas would the LMAP and LMAC benefit from a further strengthening project to achieve sustainability?
- Have key long-term requirements been assured: good database to know what has been done and details of remaining tasks; residual response capacity, including mechanism for citizen reporting; support to mine victims; and implementation of Convention responsibilities

Annex 04: Key Informant Interviewees

LMAC

- Director of LMAC: Brig. General Jihad Bechelany
- Head of Ops: Lt. Colonel Fadi Wazen
- Head of ARCP: Colonel Ahmad Lababidi
- Head of MVA: Colonel Mansour Shtay
- Head of RMAC: Major Maroun Hleihel
- Commander RSHDL: Colonel Roger Eid

UNDP Country Office

- Celine Moyroud, UNDP Resident Representative
- Fadi Abilmona, CPR Programme Manager

UNDP LMAC Staff

- Ariane Elmas, Project Manager
- Petra Al Hakim, QA/MRE Assistant
- Moustafa Saklaoui, Operations Assistant
- Mohamad Fakh, IMSMA clert
- Mahmoud Hammoud, Community Liaison Officer
- Moussa Hakim, Community Liaison Officer
- Robert Hajj Moussa, Community Liaison Officer

Donors

- Francesca Varlese, Programme Manager, Security Sector Support, EU Delegation
- Tor Hakon Tordhol, Political Officer, Embassy of Norway
- Sarah Jackson, Foreign Commonwealth Office, Embassy of UK

Demining Operators

- David Willey, Programme Manager, Mines Advisory Group (MAG)
- Silco, Chief of Operations, Mines Advisory Group (MAG)
- Jon Jensen, Programme Manager (interim), Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA)
- Southern Craib, Operations Manager, Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA)

Annex 05: Stakeholder Questionnaire

Dear Lebanon Mine Action Programme Stakeholder,

UNDP has requested an evaluation of their support to “Strengthen LMAC – Phase IV,” which extended from 2016-2019. UNDP has supported LMAC to strengthen key functions: (a) Database/IMSMA, (b) Community Liaison, (c) overall coordination of demining operations, (d) coordination of MRE and MVA, (e) overall management, (f) treaty compliance, and (g) resource mobilization. Please provide your input to the six questions below regarding support to these LMAC functions. When we meet in early October, your responses will provide me with background for our discussion. Your responses will be treated as confidential.

Name of respondent	
Organization	
Position	
Email of respondent	

1	Have you noticed any significant change since 2016 in LMAC functions supported by UNDP?

2	In your view, which of the LMAC functions required continued UNDP support in the future?

3	Are there alternative sources of future support that LMAC should consider for functions currently supported by UNDP?

4	Are there any additional LMAC functions that would benefit from UNDP support?

5	Please provide any further suggestions or comments you may have regarding UNDP support to LMAC

I hope to meet with you when I am on mission in early October, and I would appreciate your comments on the above questions before then. Please email your comments by 21 September to charles.downs@gmail.com.

Thank you in advance,
Charles Downs
Evaluator

Annex 06: Stakeholder Questionnaire Respondents

- UNDP Country Office
 - Fadi Abilmona, CPR Programme Manager
 - Marat Murzabekov, CPR Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
 - Wasim El-Chami, Programme Associate

- LMAC Officers
 - General Jihad al Bechaleny, LMAC Director
 - Lt. Colonel Fadi Wazen, Head of Operations
 - Major Ali Makki, Media and MRE section Head
 - Major Mohamed Ossman, IT section head
 - Major Maroun Hleihel, RMAC chief

- UNDP LMAC Staff
 - Ariane Elmas, Project Manager
 - Patra Al Hakim, QA/MRE Assistant
 - Mahmoud Hammoud, Community Liaison Officer
 - Moussa Hakim, Community Liaison Officer
 - Robert Hajj Moussa, Community Liaison Officer
 - Mohamad Fakih, IMSMA clerk
 - Steinar Essen, Programming Consultant

- Donors
 - Francesca Varlese, Programme Manager, Security Sector Support, EU
 - Tor Hakon Tordhol, Political Officer, Embassy of Norway
 - Sarah Jackson, Foreign Commonwealth Office, Embassy of UK

- Demining Operators and other Operational Partners
 - David Willey, Programme Manager, Mines Advisory Group (MAG)
 - Jon Jensen, Programme Manager (interim), Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA)
 - Southern Craib, Operations Manager, Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA)
 - Rt Brig Gen Badwi El Sakkal, Laminda
 - David Ligneau, Programme Manager, Humanity and Inclusion (HI)
 - Habouba Aoun, Director of Co-academic programmes, Balamand University

Annex 07: Summary of stakeholder feedback on results of UNDP support to LMAC

Which LMAC functions have improved since 2016 should UNDP support continue?			
Function	Improved	Continue UNDP support?	Continue UNDP support ([yes]-[no])
Coordination of demining	79%	48%	17%
Overall LMAC management	75%	63%	50%
Resource mobilization	75%	71%	66%
Database (IMSMA)	71%	67%	54%
Treaty compliance	67%	71%	63%
Community Liaison	63%	54%	38%
Coordination of MRE	63%	54%	29%
QA/QC	57%	54%	33%
Coordination of MVA	33%	39%	13%

Annex 08: Role of LMAC (according to the National Mine Action Policy - 2007)

- Article 6.
- The LMAC shall be the organization tasked with implementing the LNMAP in accordance with the strategic national priorities set by the Inter-ministerial committee.

- Article 7.
- The LMAC shall perform the following activities:
 1. The LMAC will manage mine action activities in Lebanon and will help ensure the provision of administrative and logistical support to facilitate the work of all mine action organisations working in Lebanon in accordance with the National Mine Action End-state Strategies and standards.
 2. The LMAC shall task, coordinate and authorize all humanitarian demining related activities including landmine and ERW survey, mapping, marking, clearance and land recovery.
 3. Preparation of Mine Risk Education priorities upon which MRE will proceed in order to limit the risk of injuries through the dissemination of effective prevention measures.
 4. The LMAC will be responsible for the national mine action information management system.
 5. The LMAC will be responsible for the accreditation of all mine action organizations in accordance with National Standards before any mine action activity is authorized.
 6. Quality control and quality assurance of all mine action activities.
 7. The LMAC shall present semi-annual reports including implementation status, performance level in comparison to set priorities and indicators to the Ministry of Defence.
 8. The LMAC shall prepare and update national accreditation and certification standards. Once these accreditation and certification standards are published, all concerned are obliged to adhere to them.
 9. The LMAC will establish regional mine action centres as necessary.
 10. The LMAC is free to ask support, information and collaboration from government agencies, international and national organisations and non-governmental organisations involved with mine action in accordance with Lebanese Armed Forces regulations.

- Article 8.
- 1. The LMAC shall manage and coordinate the implementation of mine risk education (MRE) activities in Lebanon through the National Mine Risk Education Steering Committee.
- 2. The National Mine Risk Education Steering Committee will consist of the following: a. LMAC Mine Risk Education Department Head (Chair). b. Representative of the Ministry of Education. c. Representative of the Ministry of Social Affairs. d. International and National organisations and non-governmental organisations with a concerned interest in mine risk education.
- 3. Members of the National Mine Risk Education Committee shall:
 - a. Enter a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the LMAC outlining the terms of agreement and responsibilities of each party.
 - b. Abide by the National Mine Risk Education Committee code of conduct.

- Article 9.
- 1. The LMAC shall manage and coordinate the implementation of mine victims assistance (MVA) activities in Lebanon through the National Mine Victims Assistance Steering Committee.
- 2. National Mine Victims Assistance Steering Committee will consist of the following:
 - a. LMAC Mine Victims Assistance Department Head (Chair).
 - b. Representative of the Ministry of Social Affairs.
 - c. Representative of the Ministry of Health.
 - d. International and National organisations and non-governmental organisations with a concerned interest in mine victims assistance.
- 3. Members of the National Mine Victims Assistance Steering Committee shall:
 - a. Enter a memorandum of understanding with the LMAC outlining the terms of agreement and responsibilities of each party.
 - b. Abide by the National Landmine Victim Assistance Committee code of conduct.

Annex 09: Lebanon Mine Action Strategy – Results Framework – with 2020 targets

Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020 – Results Framework including 2020 Targets		
		2020 Targets
Output #1	Affected communities enabled to better manage risks posed by mines	
Result #1.1	Requests for mine action rapid response are responded to immediately and anywhere in Lebanon	Capacity is maintained and operational without support from NGOs
Result #1.2	Residents of Lebanon have access to relevant and updated information to manage the risk posed by mines, and a permanent risk education capacity is developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 new and 125 experienced MRE activists trained • MoEHE implements in all schools of affected communities • Sustainable monitoring systems in place • 1,400 school teachers regularly include MRE in their health education activities, monitoring system in place • 250 social workers trained and monitored
Output #2	The full realization of the rights of mine victims guaranteed	
Result #2.1	All victims are provided with medical, social, psychological and economic support as part of the fulfilment of their full legal rights, as stated in the law 220/2000, “Access and Rights of People with Disability”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible victims are issued with disability card, aware of their rights, law is implemented, monitoring system in place • All eligible victims included in socio economic rehabilitation programmes
Output #3	Mine Action contributes to socio economic use through land release	
Result #3.1	Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of contamination including its socio-economic aspects is known and measured	• Data is updated on continually
Result #3.2	Contaminated land is released and returned to its owners for socio-economic use	• 100% released

Output #4	Compliance to and promotion of the universalization of the CCM and other relevant international instruments	
Result #4.1	Resources are mobilized, including from state budget, coordinated and managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International assistance allows for the implementation of the third tranche of the strategy • Full government ownership of mine action includes a sustainable resource mobilization and coordination mechanism
Result #4.2	Lebanon expertise is available to other States Parties and stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange of experience as needed • Downsizing of operations makes LMAP qualified mine action personnel available to support other MAP
Result #4.3	Lebanon receives expertise from other States Parties and stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMAP capacity development plan reviewed and updated • International training and participation to exchange of experience
Result #4.4	Advocacy towards the universalization of the CCM, in particular from the region, is undertaken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More States, in particular from the region, join the CCM as a result of Lebanon's advocacy
Result #4.5	Compliance with transparency measures is in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All concerned ministries are aware of their roles and responsibilities • Article 7 reports are accurate and submitted on time
Output #5	A sustainable capacity to manage residual risks is established	
Result #5.1	An efficient government mine action management structure is in place, including its high-level co-ordination mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource management and higher level coordination structure function effectively and automatically • An adequate and sustainable LMAC is in place

Annex 10: UNDP support to LMAC in relation to LMAS Results Framework

Lebanon Mine Action Strategy 2011-2020 – Results Framework and UNDP Support		
		UNDP Role
Output #1	Affected communities enabled to better manage risks posed by mines	IMSMA, CLO
Result #1.1	Requests for mine action rapid response are responded to immediately and anywhere in Lebanon	
Result #1.2	Residents of Lebanon have access to relevant and updated information to manage the risk posed by mines, and a permanent risk education capacity is developed	MRE assistant Advocacy with MoEHE
Output #2	The full realization of the rights of mine victims guaranteed	Advocacy
Result #2.1	All victims are provided with medical, social, psychological and economic support as part of the fulfilment of their full legal rights, as stated in the law 220/2000, “Access and Rights of People with Disability”	MVA assistant Advocacy with MoH and MoSW
Output #3	Mine Action contributes to socio economic use through land release	IMSMA, CLO
Result #3.1	Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of contamination including its socio-economic aspects is known and measured	
Result #3.2	Contaminated land is released and returned to its owners for socio-economic use	QA
Output #4	Compliance to and promotion of the universalization of the CCM and other relevant international instruments	Advocacy, convening, reporting support
Result #4.1	Resources are mobilized, including from state budget, coordinated and managed	
Result #4.2	Lebanon expertise is available to other States Parties and stakeholders	
Result #4.3	Lebanon receives expertise from other States Parties and stakeholders	
Result #4.4	Advocacy towards the universalization of the CCM, in particular from the region, is undertaken	
Result #4.5	Compliance with transparency measures is in place	
Output #5	A sustainable capacity to manage residual risks is established	Management advice
Result #5.1	An efficient government mine action management structure is in place, including its high-level co-ordination mechanism	

Annex 11: Past LIS and LMAC Prioritization Scoring Grids for Communities and Tasks

- Landmine Impact Survey Community Impact Scoring Grid

Community Impact Scoring Factors (LIS 2004)		
Code	Factor	Score
1	Human	
	Recent victims (past two years)	2 per victim
2	Socio-economic blockages	
	Types of areas with socio-economic usage blockage	1 per type
3	Explosive threat	
	Landmines (with or without UXO)	2
	UXO only (no landmines)	1
Score	Priority	LIS Results
>10	High	28
6-10	Medium	164
1-5	Low	114

- Task prioritization scoring grid (LMAC 2011)

Task Prioritizing – coded scoring system (draft 2011)		
Code	Factor	Score
A	Human	
A1	Immediate threat to life	10
A2	Successive recent accidents	5
A3	History of accident(s) involving mine detonation	2
A4	History of incident(s) involving mine detonation	1
B	Proximity	
B1	Occupied houses within 100m	3
B2	Occupied houses within 400m	1
C	Land Use	
C1	Land required for national or regional infrastructure	5
C2	Land required for local development	2
C3	Agricultural land blocked	2
C4	Grazing land blocked	1
D	Mine usage history	
D1	Confirmed mine presence	3
D2	Suspected of being mined	1
D3	Area was used for military purposes/battles or confrontational area	1
Score	Priority	Classification
10>	High	1
6-9	Medium	2
1-5	Low	3