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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This comprehensive Baseline Study was conducted to describe the pre-intervention situation of the main stakeholders of the LANA project: “Transformative Political Identities for Gender Equality in Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon”.

The LANA project is implemented by Oxfam GB and three of its partners – ABAAD, ARDD-LA and WEO – consecutively in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq-Kurdistan and is funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs through a budget of USD 2,246,947 over a period that extends from 30 December 2013 to 29 December 2015. The following report, however, will only focus on the study conducted for Lebanon.

The two-year LANA project is the first phase of a five-year project that aims at increasing women’s participation in decision-making, both in the private and public spheres in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraqi Kurdistan.

The project was designed through a specific methodology used in other successful women’s rights campaigns in Uganda (Raising her Voice) and South Asia (We Can End All Violence against Women Campaign). This methodology focuses on individuals as actors of change. These individuals (called Change Makers) are selected because of their motivation to introduce change in terms of gender equality and equity in their communities and societies and involve other individuals in their advocacy efforts. Additional individuals from the local community, with the ability to influence other Community Members, will be constantly identified as Change Makers who will continue to lead the same objectives of the project. This approach will allow the project intervention to reach out to a large numbers of individuals. Change is expected to happen with the women and men involved in the project at different levels (attitudes, self-esteem, knowledge, practices) and in different spheres of life (personal, social, economic and political).

Simultaneously, the project aims at identifying the main ‘opinion shapers’ and decision makers in the three terms of:

a) Allies: These will consist of women’s organizations and other actors (schools, corporates, syndicates, unions, clubs and other groups), who, in cooperation with Change Makers, will constitute an Alliance that will target opinion shapers’ and policy and decision makers on issues related to the promotion of the gender equity agenda;

b) Targeted Stakeholders will include sub-national and national authorities, political parties, youth, decision makers, bar associations, private sector, regional influential entities etc. who will be targeted by Change Makers and Allies to influence their decisions regarding gender equality and to challenge the systematic process of disempowerment of women;

c) Opponents include those who are in a position to resist the intended change. Mitigating strategies will be designed towards this group.
Based on the work carried out in the first 2 years, the project will enter its second three-year phase which will be primarily focused on consolidating: a) the work at the national and local level and b) the network of allies (Alliance) that will carry out a wide regional advocacy and lobbying regional campaign and the creation of a “Gender Equality House”.

**Data Collection Methodology**

Qualitative (FGDs and interviews) and quantitative (survey) data collection tools were designed to conduct the baseline study and examine the following:

1. **Overall Objective**: The state of women rights’ implementation and the situation of social movements in relation to the gender equity agenda and women’s political participation.
2. **Specific Objective and Result 1**: Men and women from the communities’ interest or support for women’s political participation, women’s self-assessment of their role.
3. **Results 2 and 3**: Men and women Change Makers’ attitudes, self-confidence (only women), engagement and actions and gender advocacy capacity.
4. **Result 3**: Identified Allies and Targeted Stakeholders’ attitudes, and Allies’ gender advocacy capacity.
5. **Risk management during the implementation of the project**.

A Desk Review of the main project documents and of other literature – including academic articles, press articles and blogs, CEDAW reports and Shadow Reports, Human Rights and Women’s Rights Indexes - was carried out before and after fieldwork so as to provide context and interpretation threads to quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative fieldwork was carried out in Lebanon in May 2014 while the Survey data collection and input were carried out during the months of June and July 2014. Data quality control mechanisms were implemented to guarantee the quality of the collected data; mitigation measures were adopted when problems were registered during the data collection/data input process.

All primary and secondary qualitative and quantitative data collected during fieldwork, were constantly analyzed and cross-examined. By crosschecking and integrating views from different standpoints, it has been possible to point out regularities and explain apparent inconsistencies that led to reaching a meaningful assessment of the baseline situation of the main focus areas involved in the LANA project.

The following population was targeted in the baseline study:

- 270 men and women Community Members through a Survey
- 30 men and women Change Makers through a Survey
- 40 men and women Community Members and Change through FGDs
- 10 Allies and Targeted Stakeholders.

Change Makers and Community Members were identified according to the following criteria:
a) Residing in locations targeted by the project;
b) 50% men and 50% women;
c) Change Makers who were able to show greater familiarity and interest for community activities than other Community Members.

These criteria were substantially respected, however, due to convenience sampling, the selected sample consisted of more women than men. Furthermore, among the main characteristics of the surveyed population, three can be pointed out:

- Change Makers and Community Members have a mean age of 35/36;
- Change Makers are in general more educated than Community Members;
- High levels of education exist in Lebanon;

Allies and Targeted Stakeholders were identified in various sectors of the social and political life, as by project criteria. In Lebanon, relevant Allies and Targeted Stakeholders have been identified in political parties, human and women’s rights organizations, one syndicate and one professional association.

Summary Findings
The main Baseline findings against Indicators are:

OVERALL OBJECTIVE: INDICATOR 1

**Overall Objective:** Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

**Indicator 1:** Evidence of improvements to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon by EoP compared to baseline.

The analysis shows that although there have been several positive steps taken to address gender based discrimination in legislation, there are still substantial challenges that persist, especially concerning nationality, personal status, family and national decision-making, and women’s situation in the local community.

In Lebanon, the robust civil society and the democratic political forces’ demands from the government to adopt a consistent anti-discriminatory legislation, remove reservations on CEDAW (mainly related to the Personal Status Laws) and reform the Penal and Personal Status legislation remain mostly unheard. The persistence of a discriminatory legal framework is reflected in core issues within the country, such as the nationality rights and the personal rights and responsibilities within the family that are dictated by the religious sectarianism. This framework affects women’s political participation and decision-making at all levels because it allows for discriminatory attitudes, practices and behaviors especially within the family and in traditional (and sectarian) social settings.
OVERALL OBJECTIVE: INDICATOR 2

**Overall Objective:** Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

**Indicator 2:** Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline.

The women’s rights movements have obtained only partial results in their struggle for gender equity in decision-making. In all the three countries, they find huge obstacles in the tribal and sectarian political systems, sustained by a patriarchal ideology that either tends to exclude them from power or incorporate them into the institutional mainstream. This situation often divides women’s rights movement both on strategic and tactical issues.

Lebanon is characterized by a context in which the definition of gender identities and the achievement of women’s rights is a captive to the confessional and sectarian political system characterized and reinforced by strong patriarchal values. While women show some achievement in some spheres of their lives (social and economic), nevertheless many of their rights are not ratified in the legislation nor fully supported by the political system (Civil Status Law, Nationality Law, GBV Law etc.). The women’s movement, moreover, is divided on resources, finding one common goal and the means to adopt in order to achieve that goal and whether it should be confrontational or not.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE: INDICATOR 3

**Overall Objective:** Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

**Indicator 3:** Improvement in ranking of target countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights, and democracy indices, by EoP compared to baseline.

Although the three assessed countries show many similarities all attributable to the traditional setting of society and politics, it is possible to distinguish important differences between them. While Lebanon is still on the way to achieving MDG 3, it, was better ranked than Jordan and Iraq in the last Human Development Index, however, the Gender indices show negative trends for what concerns gender equality (GEI) and women’s economic empowerment (WEF) in comparison.
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INDICATOR 1

**Specific Objective:** Women in targeted communities in Lebanon enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere.

**Indicator 1:** Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline.

The targeted women from the community in Lebanon show quite high levels of self-assessment of their role in decision-making in the private and public sphere.

Most of the targeted women from the communities in Lebanon show a quite positive assessment of their role in decision-making in the various spheres of their lives, better in the private and social (around 90% of them), a bit less in the economic, and the political (around 70% of them). This trend shows that Lebanese women have, in general, a much better self-assessment of their own role in decision making than women in Jordan and Iraq.

During the FGDs, where certain themes were discussed more freely and in more depth, the large majority of women strongly expressed that they perceive ‘reputation’ as a fundamental aspect that controls and limits their personal, social, working and political life.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INDICATOR 3

**Specific Objective:** Women in targeted communities of Lebanon enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere.

**Indicator 3:** By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can:

1. Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere.
2. Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community.

Women and men Change Makers have in general quite good levels of engagement with the issue of women’s decision-making in various spheres of life. Women participate more at community level whereas men show having more inclusion and experience in political settings. Between 20% to 30% of Change Makers have no experience in undertaking public actions regarding gender issues. In Lebanon, more experience at national/political level was exhibited.
RESULT 1: INDICATOR 1

**Result 1:** Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

**Indicator 1:** Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline.

Change Makers’ attitudes towards women’s decision-making in various spheres of life, present noticeable difference. The Women Change Makers in Lebanon scored the highest percentage (score 5) in both the positive attitudes when it comes to women’s decision making in various spheres of life and to self-confidence in relation to decision-making in their lives.

RESULT 1: INDICATOR 2

**Result 1:** Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

**Indicator 2:** Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline.

The interest/support for women’s political participation is dominated by patriarchal and sectarian political systems that tend to exclude women.

Targeted women from the community in Lebanon show quite a low interest in political participation. This is motivated by a strong distrust towards the Lebanese sectarian political system, very patriarchal in its nature that does not give any room for women’s inclusion. In this context, where politics is controlled by the patriarchal political system, women feel a deep distrust and disaffection with them, even if, concerning other indicators, both targeted men and women seem to be in a better position than in other countries.

RESULT 2: INDICATOR 3

**Result 2:** Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation.

**Indicator 3:** Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline.
Taking into consideration that the main criteria for choosing Allies is “support for gender equity in decision-making”, and the large majority of the stakeholders interviewed were Allies, it obviously emerges from the data collected that almost the totality of them show positive or very positive attitudes towards women’s participation in decision-making in the private, economic and political sphere.

Nevertheless, consistent with findings in this Baseline report, Lebanon shows less hesitation in relation to women’s decision making in the private and economic sphere than the other countries.

RESULT 3: INDICATOR 1

**Change Makers**

In general, both women and men Change Makers in Lebanon have a good capacity in terms of understanding of gender concepts and women’s rights where this is strongly rooted in traditional ideas. Lebanese women Change Makers show good capacity in terms of knowledge of gender concepts and women’s rights (85%). Still, 30% of them roots gender roles in nature and/or tradition and believe that for this reason they have to be respected.

Men are in general more confident regarding their advocacy skills, especially concerning the public sphere. However, they all need capacity building in areas such as strategic planning, advocacy, media and mobilization. All Change Makers, especially men, need to be supported in the construction of connections with women’s organizations and coalitions; this need exists in Lebanon although on a lesser level than other targeted countries.

**Allies**

In general, the capacity of the Allies targeted with the baseline is quite good, but individual weaknesses can be identified either in organizational capacity on gender, in advocacy capacity or in the work with women organizations.

In Lebanon, all the three assessed allies seem to have large constituencies, good organizational gender capacity. All the Lebanese Allies have good connections with women’s coalitions.
Risk Assessment

The Risk Assessment highlighted that the main risks associated with the project are linked to the unstable political and security situation that affects the region and that threatens to overspill to neighboring countries. This could lead either to direct armed conflict/s within the countries of the LANA project or to the radicalization of political sectarian and religious identities at national and regional level, reinforcing also the patriarchal system that blocks the achievement of women’s rights.

This unstable context affects – currently or if the situation deteriorates – the LANA project and its main stakeholders. In fact, the risk assessment shows that there is:

1. A medium/high likelihood risk that political parties and governments will not be responsive to women’s rights claims and are either unwilling or unable to engage with women’s rights organizations.

2. A medium probability that local communities will not want to partake in the process of change.

3. A medium probability that religious leaders will oppose women’s participation to the program.

4. A medium probability that women organizations will not want to come together around one cause, on both national and regional levels.

However, other risks are more ‘internal’ to the project and have mainly to do with the management of the relations among Change Makers and communities, Allies, Targeted Stakeholders and Opponents. For both types of risks, mitigation measures are suggested. Based on the above findings, lessons learned are summarized in the final chapter for all the LANA project stakeholders as well as recommendations for implementation and M&E.
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE BASELINE STUDY
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE BASELINE STUDY

1.1 Lana: Transformative Political Identities for Gender Equality Lebanon - Project Focus

This Baseline Study aims at assessing the pre-intervention situation of the main stakeholders of the project implemented by Oxfam GB and its partner in Lebanon ABAAD and focusing on women’s decision-making and political participation. The project – Lana: Transformative Political Identities for Gender Equality in Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon – is funded through a budget of USD 2,246,947 over a period that extends from 30 December 2013 to 29 December 2015. The following report, however, will only focus on part of the study conducted for Lebanon.

The project is the first phase of a longer project (5 years) that aims at increasing women’s participation in decision-making, both in the private and public spheres.

The project is based on the understanding\(^1\) that the realization of women’s rights in the Middle East is constantly negotiated against patriarchal notions of gender identities mobilized amidst dynamics of conflict, nation-state building, foreign (Western) interventions and constructed notions of religious and national identity. According to this analysis, because of the current state of sectarian/confessional/tribal political systems and, thus, of patriarchal notions of gender identity, the struggle for women’s rights and for their increased participation in decision-making both at private and political level, is today finding stronger and tougher opposition.

The Overall Goal of the project is to lead women and men from Lebanon to “reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region”.

- Reference: Lana Project Proposal

1.2 LANA Project Methodology

The project is built through a specific methodology used already in other successful women’s rights campaigns in Uganda (Raising her Voice) and South Asia (We Can End All Violence against Women campaign).

\(^1\) This analysis is shared by feminist academics and women’s rights activists working on women’s situation the Middle East (Deniz Kandiyoti, Floya Anthia, Nira Yuval Davis, Cynthia Cockburn, Kumari Jayawardena, Suad Joseph just to mention some). Oxfam’s project itself was initially designed by Magda Elsanousi, at the time Oxfam GB Country Director in Lebanon.
This methodology is focused on individuals as actors of change. These individuals (called Change Makers) are selected because of their motivation to introduce change in terms of gender equity in their communities and societies and their determination to work to involve other individuals in their sphere of influence. Among these, new Change Makers will be identified who will influence other Community Members in their sphere of influence, and so on. In this way, large numbers of individuals will be reached. It is expected that during the first phase of the project (2 years), the following will be achieved in Lebanon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT TIER 1 (MEN AND WOMEN): CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th>DIRECT TIER 2 (MEN AND WOMEN): CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th>TOTAL CHANGE MAKERS (TIERS 1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>INDIRECT: MEN &amp; WOMEN FROM COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>TOTAL COMMUNITY MEN &amp; WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Years 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These individuals – both men and women - are supposed to belong to the most different walks of life (religious leaders; youth in universities or schools, school teachers, health workers, women and men beneficiaries of different existing CBOs, lawyers, judges, and ordinary people in the community) so to spread change in all areas of society.

- Reference: Lana Project Proposal

1.3 LANA Project Theory of Change

Change is expected to happen with the women and men involved in the project at different levels (attitudes, self-esteem, knowledge, practices) and in different spheres of life (personal, social, economic and political). The type and pace of individual change is not prescribed in the project. The process, however, envisages individual incremental shifts, from perception to action in both the private and the public sphere as represented by the following
In order to bring about change, in the first phase of the project, Change Makers will be supported with trainings whose design will take into account their different backgrounds and the results of the capacity assessment conducted as part of this Baseline Study. Discussions will be simulated on how “political identities and political parties are shaped around sectarian, religious, and tribal divisions in society”. In addition, with the support of Oxfam and partners’ staff (Change Makers Officers), groups of Change Makers will develop a yearly Action Plan and will take part in outreach and visibility actions while being mentored throughout the project.

The first phase of the project intends to focus on “building a platform of men and women Change-Makers from diverse backgrounds who will be working in their communities to raise awareness of gender roles and women’s political participation thus driving change one individual at a time; and increasing women’s political participation by bringing men and women together and empowering them to advocate for increased women’s political participation”. During this phase, issues such as perception of gender roles, power and control over women (and women’s bodies) and governance systems (laws and policies) will constitute the main ‘thematic’ focus.

At the same time, within the first phase of the project the main opinion formers and decision makers will be identified in terms of:

a) Allies: Women’s organizations and other actors identified as possible Allies (schools, corporates, syndicates, unions, clubs and other groups), in cooperation with Change Makers will constitute an Alliance that will target opinion formers and policy and decision makers on issues related to the promotion of gender equity agenda;

b) Targeted Stakeholders will include sub-national and national authorities, political parties, youth, decision makers, bar associations, private sector, regional influential entities etc. and will be targeted by Change Makers and Allies to influence them on gender equality and challenge the systematic process of disempowerment of women;

c) Opponents include those who are in a position to resist the intended change. Mitigating strategies will be designed towards this group.

The Alliance members - Change Makers and Allies - will be supported by Oxfam and ABAAD in the creation of an apex-forum that will plan and implement an ‘advocacy and campaigning strategy aiming at informing public opinion and advocating with decision-makers for increased women’s political participation’. In addition, a research on gender and political identities, focusing on "how governance structures based on religion/sectarian or tribal identities adversely impact women’s equal rights" will be commissioned by Oxfam and ABAAD. Finally, meetings, workshops, discussion of evaluation results, exposure visits and joint regional actions will be organized with the Alliance’s members.
The project ToC for the first phase is represented as follows:

Based on the work carried out in the first 2 years, the project will enter the second three-year phase which will be primarily focused on consolidating a) the work at the national and local level and b) the network of allies (Alliance) to carry out a wide regional advocacy and lobbying regional campaign (creation of “Gender Equality House”). During this phase, the project’s ‘thematic’ focus will be the issue of sectarian, tribal and religious identities and their impact both on women’s rights and the fragmentation of the women’s movement nationally and across the region.

- Reference: Lana Project Proposal

1.4 Purpose of the Baseline Study

The main objectives of the Baseline Study were clearly stated in the ToR:

1. Verify and document pre-intervention levels of the project indicators as defined in the Log Frame through leading and facilitating the participatory project baseline involving key stakeholders.
2. Document pre-intervention levels for the project’s assumptions and risks as identified in the Logframe.
3. Identify (through stakeholders power mapping) possible project allies and key influential institutions (champions, floaters, blockers) that have influence and power in sharing agenda pertaining.

4. Provide tested tool for Change Makers capacity assessment and potentially provide initial capacity assessment of Change Makers.

5. Based on the findings of the baseline and highly considering the project context:
   - Briefly assess/verify the project relevance and outline the project’s M&E steer
   - Recommend improvement of project Log Frame
   - Recommend possible strategies / actions for greater impact
   - Provide recommendations on the MEAL System

The Partner Capacity Assessment, also envisaged in the ToR, will be directly carried out by Oxfam with ABAAD.

The Baseline Study presented in this document provides detailed information and an analysis on the points mentioned above.

- ANNEX 2: LANA Baseline Study ToR
CHAPTER TWO: BASELINE STUDY
METHODOLOGY
CHAPTER TWO: BASELINE STUDY METHODOLOGY

The Baseline Study process included the following phases:

1. Phase 1) Methodology Finalization: ToC and LF Review; Tools Design; Indicators Guidelines Matrix.
2. Phase 2) Baseline Study Implementation: Desk Review and Fieldwork.

2.1 Phase 1 - Methodology Finalization

The finalization of the Methodology document was carried out in strict cooperation with Oxfam and ABAAD staff. The first version was finalized on 4 May 2014. A second final version was prepared after some small changes on data quality were made and after pilot testing was conducted at the end of May 2014 (see Chapter 2.2.3).

- ANNEX 3 – LANA Baseline Methodology (after tool testing – 22 May 2014)

2.1.1 ToC and LF Review

In agreement with Oxfam, no changes were introduced in the way the project’s ToC is represented.

Regarding the Log Frame, the Assessment Team agreed with Oxfam that the Results and the Specific Objective appropriately reflect the Theory of Change, and cover all the outcomes that are expected to occur with the main project stakeholders (Change Makers, Communities, Partners and Allies, Opinion Formers and Decision Makers). Nevertheless, some minor changes were introduced within the Log Frame in order to clarify the time frames of some of the indicators, clarify the Means of Verification and, in a few cases, improve the wording structure.

- ANNEX 4 – Revised Log Frame (from LANA baseline Methodology)

Nevertheless, some Results and Indicators were expressed heavily. As many different types of changes were accumulated in the same Result and/or Indicator thus making it difficult to distinguish between the different steps through which change is expected to happen, the Assessment Team clarified and/or broke down the formulation of some of the Indicators, without substantially modifying the Log Frame, as follows:

A. Specific Objective – Indicator 1: ‘perception of women...’ refers to women’s self-perception of their own participation at different levels (private and public sphere);

See in ANNEX 3 – LANA Baseline Methodology, or for a version of the same Matrix slightly revised after fieldwork in July 2014, see: ANNEX 5 – Indicators Guidelines Matrix
B. Specific Objective – Indicator 3: refers to Change Makers reporting about their own engagement and their own actions;

C. Result 1 – Indicator 1:
   • “Positive changes in their perception of gender roles” has been detailed in terms of “attitudes” but also in terms of “confidence to engage with the issue”. Confidence and self-esteem have been considered an important element to be looked at, in the process of change – and especially important for Change Makers.
   • “Report actions’ has been deleted as a repetition of Indicator 3 of the Specific Objective

D. Result 1 – Indicator 2 – percentage of non-Change Makers who “respond positively on issues related to women’s participation”, is understood in terms of “have increased their interest in participating in political processes (understood as interest in practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO or participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national)”

E. In Result 2 – Indicator 3 – show improvement in their “perception” has been clarified in terms of improvement in ‘attitudes’ (towards women’s political participation).

2.1.2 Tools Design
As it is easily to observed\(^3\), the types of changes expected to occur during the project, are all in the realm of ‘individual' and ‘social' changes, and thus all contain ‘intangible' and subjective aspects. For this reason, the tools designed for the LANA Baseline Study, were mainly aimed at collecting qualitative data. However, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect and analyze data. The survey and the use of SPSS analysis– Tool 1 and Tool 4 provided quantitative inputs while the FGDs, semi-structured interviews, desk review through the use of Tools 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 provided qualitative inputs to the study.

In particular, eight Tools were designed for carrying out the Baseline Study, as summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL SUB-SECTION</th>
<th>INDICATOR MEASURED BY THE TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1 - Survey: Part A for both Change Makers and Community Members</td>
<td>Q24. Community women</td>
<td>Specific Objective Indicator 1: Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q20. For Change Makers men and women Q21. For Change Makers women</td>
<td>Result 1 Indicator 1: Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q25. For community women Q26. For community men</td>
<td>Result 1 Indicator 2: Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) See above Section 1.3 on LANA project’s ToC; see also ANNEX 4 - Log Frame and ANNEX 5 - Indicator Guidelines Matrix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL SUB-SECTION</th>
<th>INDICATOR MEASURED BY THE TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1 - Survey: Parts B &amp; C Only for Change Makers</td>
<td>Part B - Capacity Assessment only for Change Makers - men and women <strong>B1 Knowledge</strong> <strong>B2 Advocacy Skills; B3 Commitment to Project Methodology</strong></td>
<td>Result 3 <strong>Indicator 1:</strong> Evidence of significant, positive changes (against the baseline) in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2 - FGDs: For Change Makers and Community Members</td>
<td>Part C - Engagement &amp; Actions only for Change Makers - men and women <strong>C1 Engagement – Reflecting Voicing &amp; Participating C2 Action</strong></td>
<td>Specific Objective <strong>Indicator 3:</strong> By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can: - Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere. - Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3- Stakeholder Power Assessment Matrix (Opinion Formers &amp; Decision Makers) + (Desk Review and Interviews with partners)</td>
<td>The entire tool (Where you are now in terms of attitudes etc.? What change would you like to achieve? What obstacles on the way?)</td>
<td>Specific Objective: <strong>Indicator 1:</strong> Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline. <strong>Result 1 Indicator 1:</strong> Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline. <strong>Result 1 Indicator 2:</strong> Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 4- Allies &amp; Targeted Stakeholders Questionnaires</td>
<td>Part A <strong>A1. Attitudes</strong> towards women’s decision making in private and public sphere; <strong>A2. Support</strong> for women’s participation in political processes.</td>
<td><strong>Result 2 Indicator 3:</strong> Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 5 – Allies’ Interviews</td>
<td>Part A Allies capacity assessment <strong>A1 Organization size</strong> <strong>A2 Gender Organizational Capacity</strong> <strong>A3 Advocacy Capacity and Practices</strong> <strong>A4 Advocacy Strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Result 3 Indicator 1:</strong> Evidence of significant, positive changes (against the baseline) in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks. Please note that a specific capacity assessment tool will be prepared by Oxfam for its local partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to have a full view of the Tools designed for the LANA Baseline, refer to ANNEX 3 – LANA Baseline Methodology (after tool testing – 22 May 2014)

In other words, Tool 1 and Tool 2 were designed to baseline the situation of Change Makers and Community Members in relation to changes in the following areas: attitudes, self-esteem/confidence in relation to decision making in private and public sphere (only women); self-perception of their own role and participation in decision making (only women), interest in their own/women’s participation in political processes, behaviors/practices in relation to decision making in private and public sphere (different questions for men and women).

Tool 3 was designed to select Targeted Stakeholders and Allies, and Tool 4 to baseline their situation in terms of attitudes on women’s participation and decision-making in the private and public sphere. Allies and Change Makers were then baselined in terms of gender and advocacy capacity, respectively through Tool 5 and Tool 1. (ABAAD capacity was baselined by Oxfam).

Tool 5 (for Allies) and Tool 6 were designed for Key NGOs and Academics (including partners) in order to baseline the situation of social movements in relation to the gender equity agenda and women’s political participation. Finally, women rights’ implementation was baselined through Tool 7. In addition, the risks run by the project were baselined through Tool 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL SUB-SECTION</th>
<th>INDICATOR MEASURED BY THE TOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1 - Survey: Community &amp; Academics’ Engagement</td>
<td>Part B Baseline of women’s political participation. Finally, women rights’ implementation was baselined through Tool 5 and Tool 1. (ABAAD capacity was baselined by Oxfam).</td>
<td>Overall Objective – Indicator 2: Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 6 - Key NGOs and Academics’ Interviews (Excluding allies, including partners)</td>
<td>The entire tool Regarding social movements; the same as Tool 5 – Part b</td>
<td>Overall Objective – Indicator 2: Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 7 - Desk Review Women’s Rights Implementation Part A CEDAW Implementation</td>
<td>Part B Ranking of target countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights, and democracy indices</td>
<td>Overall Objective – Indicator 1: Evidence of improvements to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq by EoP compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 8 – Risk Assessment: (Interviews with partners)</td>
<td>All the tool (risk assessment)</td>
<td>Baseline of Risks run by the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Phase 2 - Baseline Study Implementation

2.2.1 Desk Review
The Assessment Team (AT) reviewed the main background and project documents in order to finalize the Methodology Proposal. Other literature – including academic articles, press articles and blogs - was reviewed during and after fieldwork to provide context and interpretation threads to quantitative and qualitative data.

In addition, the AT consulted main CEDAW reports and Shadow Reports, Human Rights and Women’s Rights Indexes for questions related to the Overall Objective (Tool 7), and consulted the main Stakeholders websites for the Stakeholder Power Mapping (Tool 3).

- ANNEX 6 – List of documents analyzed
- Reference: Consolidation Matrix Tool 7 – CEDAW & HR Indexes
- Reference: Database Tool 3, 4 and 5 – Stakeholder Power Assessment

2.2.2 Qualitative and Quantitative Fieldwork
Qualitative fieldwork was carried out during May 2014 in Lebanon by Laura Maritano. Antonella Lizambri who took part in the initial days of the mission to Lebanon with the aim of training the first batch of the enumerators and familiarize them with the context of the tool.

- ANNEX 8 – Actual Qualitative Fieldwork Schedule

The Tools utilized during the qualitative fieldwork were:

- Tool 2 – FGDs with Change Makers and targeted Community Members
- Tool 4 – Allies and Targeted Stakeholders Attitudes Questionnaires
- Tool 5 – Allies Capacity Assessment and Interviews on social movements
- Tool 6 – Interviews with Academics, partners and other privileged observers on social movements
- Tool 8 – Risk Assessment

Because not all the necessary data was collected during the qualitative fieldwork (for more details see section 2.2.3 on sampling and data quality), ABAAD was asked to complete the data collection for Tool 3, 4 and 5 during July 2014.

- Reference: Qualitative Fieldwork – Filled tools 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8
- Reference: Database Tool 3, 4 and 5 – Stakeholder Power Assessment
- Reference: Consolidation Matrix Tool 8 – Risk Assessment

The Survey (Tool 1) data collection and input were carried out in Lebanon during June and
July 2014. Around ten enumerators for each country were hired by ABAAD to administer the questionnaires and to enter the data (for more details see section 2.2.3 on data quality).

All the administration of Tool 1 was managed by ABAAD and all the questionnaires were collected at their office.

- Reference: Database Tool 1 – Change Makers and Community

2.2.3 Sampling and Data Quality (For each Tool)

In order to obtain relevant and good quality data, since Phase 1 - Methodology Finalization, it was necessary to define sampling and data quality control methods. Sampling and quality control methods are presented below for each Tool.

2.2.3.1 Tool 1 – Sampling

The main challenge of ‘statistical’ representativeness of the sample population of men and women Change Makers and Community Members, surveyed through Tool 1 for this Baseline study, was that it was not possible to apply a simple random sampling methodology on the representative sample because no population lists existed that would pre-determine the random sample. The specific methodology of the project identified Change Makers and Community Members joining the project, one at a time, during the implementation time frame. Organizational and logistical reasons made the process of identification of Change Makers and targeted Community Members even more difficult.

For this reason in this baseline study, only the Change Makers and Community Members available at the time (and not those selected from a final list through a statistical methodology, namely simple random sampling methodology) were surveyed, making the sample not ‘statistically’ representative.

Even if not ‘statistically’ representative, we can however preserve the representativeness of the surveyed sample, and acquire important lessons about the effectiveness of the project, from the analysis of the baselined population, with more ‘qualitative’ processes.

Change Makers Sampling: When it seemed still possible to have the full list of the 120 Change Makers (first tier, first year), at the start of the Survey, it was agreed to proceed with a simple random sample of 90 Change Makers chosen from the list of 120 (confidence level 90%; margin of error 5%)4. However, in the end, a list of only 30 Change Makers became available before the baseline survey started.

These 30 Change Makers per country have all been baselined and analyzed in this report.

4 If one wanted to use the simple random sampling methodology over the final reference population of Change Makers involved over 2 years, one should have had the full list of the 970 Change Makers, and the sample size would have been bigger.
Nevertheless, because the sample analyzed has not been chosen with any statistical method (the AT analyzed the only 30 Change Makers available), the analysis carried out with Change Makers through Tool 1 in this Baseline Study, is neither ‘statistically’ meaningful nor it is size representative of any reference population (whether this is 970 or 120). From a ‘statistical’ point of view, 30 Change Makers surveyed are only representative of themselves (100%).

By using a ‘qualitative’ approach and looking at their socio-demographic characteristics, we could however say that the sample:

- tends to respect the criteria Change Makers were expected to meet,
- is distributed in the locations targeted by the project,
- is quite evenly distributed between men and women;
- has experience and interest in community activities and gender issues.

In order to remove the evident limitations of Change Makers sampling, and in order to have a more meaningful sample of Change Makers, the AT agreed with Oxfam to continue the Change Makers baseline during implementation. Recommendations on this point and how to preserve the representativeness of the sample, in a ‘qualitative’ manner, during implementation and at evaluation, are presented in Chapter 6.2.

Community Member sampling was also initially planned to use a simple random sampling methodology and randomly select a sample from a list of Community Members, the same as with Change Makers.

Nevertheless, because of the project methodology that perceives individual Change Makers identifying targeted community men and women during the project period, no lists of targeted men and women of the community were available. For this reason, it was decided to ask the 30 identified Change Makers to provide lists of men and women whom they intend to target during the project. The sample size of (270) was calculated on the hypothetical final number of Community Members targeted by the project. Thus, each of the 30 Change Makers provided a list of nine of the people whom they intend to work with during the project. The recommendation was that of choosing both men and women, from targeted locations and not already strongly involved at community level and on gender issues (not people who does not need to be ‘targeted’ because already involved, etc.).

These 270 community men and women were identified and baselined, and the analysis of the findings is included in this report.

It is evident, that in this case, the 270 men and women of the communities baselined in each country are not ‘statistically representative, for that simple reason that no simple random sampling methodology has been utilized.
Nevertheless, the representativeness (not ‘statistical’), of the 270 Community Members men and women, in relation to the final population (7,360) could be preserved in a more ‘qualitative’ manner, if the final population will resemble at least in some main aspects the baselined population of 270. This would mean that the remaining 7,090 Community Members, should be selected proportionally to the characteristics of the experimental population of 270 Community Members (location, sex, not actively involved in community activities and gender issues, age). In Chapter 6.2, we provide more details on this point.

Despite some faults in the sampling methods, the sample size of the Community Members interviewed is sufficiently wide, and the characteristics of the Change Makers and the Community Members sufficiently respect the criteria set in the project, to make possible to say that the Survey data provide rich and meaningful baseline indications about the population targeted by the LANA project. Of course, because of these shortcomings, specific measures for project implementation and for M&E will have to be carefully applied (see Chapter 6).

2.2.3.2 Tool 1 – Control Group
It was initially planned to have a Control Group for men and women from the communities, to whom to administer the community questionnaires, in order to baseline, also for them, Specific Objective Indicator 1 (Q24 community women’s self-assessment) and Result 1 Indicator 2 (Q25 and 26 community women’s interest in political participation and community men’s support for women’s political participation).

Nevertheless, because of delays in the identification of Change Makers and Community Members, and in order to not overload the local partner with further work, it was decided in agreement with Oxfam not to carry out the Survey with the Control group in Lebanon.

2.2.3.3 Tool 1 - Data Quality
The AT tried as much as possible to design Tool 1, by using culturally sensitive and locally meaningful questions. To this aim, the AT prepared a table asking, the local partner to suggest, on the basis of some examples provided, indicators for ‘traditional’ and ‘progressive’ attitudes and behaviors towards women’s decision making in private, social, economic and political spheres in their specific contexts.

- ANNEX 9 – Locally Meaningful Indicators Matrix

Feedback was provided by Oxfam and ABAAD and was partly incorporated into the questionnaires.

Once Tool 1 questionnaires were finalized in English, they were translated by qualified translators into Arabic. In order to guarantee a correct translation of the main gender and LANA project terms, a table with the translation of these terms in Arabic was prepared by the AT and crosschecked and agreed with Oxfam.
Finally, Tool 1 was tested before fieldwork in all the three countries. Two enumerators per country were remotely trained (over Skype) by the AT, and they were instructed how to verify the data (duration of the interview, unclear wording, sensitive questions etc.). The enumerators conducted 2 pilot questionnaires to persons close to them (friends, family members etc.) and provided feedback to the AT (through scanned questionnaires and a feedback sheet). Based on their feedback, some small changes, mainly in the wording of questions, were introduced into the final English/Arabic draft of the questionnaires, and thus in the Guidance Notes issued on 22 May 2014.

Some of these changes were:

• Q18 from “What is your faith/religion/religious confession" was changed into “What is your religion/religious confession?"
• Q22_1 and Q23_2 were changed from “In my household, women only decide about household matters, not about marriages, money and politics” to “In my household, women only decide about household matters, not about, money and politics”.  
• We added “father/brother/” to Q22_12_” I do not work out of the house because my husband/father/brother doesn’t allow me to do so”, to Q22_15 “I always give all my money to my husband/father/brother”.  
• Q20_18 was changed from “I didn’t get any inheritance from my parents; I had to give it to my brother/s” into “in my family women’s inheritance rights are respected”.  
• Q22_20 was changed from “I am not interested in politics – politics are for men” into “I am not interested in politics”.  
• Q23_20 as well was changed from “My wife/daughter is not interested in politics – politics are for men” to “My wife/daughter is not interested in politics”.  
• Q24 - the first three questions were left only for women with children and three more questions were designed for all women (q24_4 about choosing your education, q24_5 about your health needs and care, q24_6 about getting the driving license).  
• Section B and C have been modified by mixing the scores and related descriptions, and leaving the evidence only for sections B2 and C1.  
• The way of asking questions was changed for Q20, q21, q22, q23, q24, q25, q26 and Section B and C.  
• A page for additional comments from the respondents was created.

- ANNEX 3 – LANA Baseline Methodology (after tool testing – 22 May 2014)
Even if with some delays, the Survey (Tool 1) data collection and input were carried out in Lebanon during June and July 2014.

Data quality control started by checking the first 10 questionnaires received. First, the socio-demographic information, especially name and surname and address of the respondent, format of “date of birth”, were examined. After this, a congruency check was carried out by filtering the data according to the following criteria:

- Empty spaces for questions from Q20 to Q26
- Type of questionnaire (Change Makers, Community and Control Group) with section B only for Change Makers. In case of Change Makers, the code number had to be the same in Section A and Section B.
- Sex and the filled questions only for men as well as for women.
- Civil status with number of children
- Civil status with the education level of the husband
- Number of children and answers to Q24_1, 2 & 3.

Based on the first quality check on the first 10 questionnaires of each country, additional instructions were remotely provided to enumerators (through emails and Skype calls). The same procedure was then adopted for all the questionnaires and when incongruences became evident, the enumerators were requested to go back to the questionnaires. For Lebanon and as there was some delay in receiving the data, the AT directly adjusted by eliminating the evident incongruences (for example if the civil status of the respondent was single and with no children, did not take into consideration the answers to Q24_1, 2, 3 because these were designed only for women with children and so on).

Despite some faults in the enumerators’ training process, the timely and steady remote support provided to the enumerators by the AT, through mail and Skype calls, allowed to guarantee the quality of data collection and data input.

2.2.3.4 Tool 2 – Sampling and Data Quality

Tool 2 was designed to collect qualitative information about Change Makers and targeted men and women from the community, through FGDs. The initial plan was to carry out two FGDs with Change Makers (one with women and one with men with 6-12 participants), and the same number of FGDs with targeted Community Members (with 8-15 participants) in all the six governorates in Lebanon. However, Oxfam in agreement with ABAAD and CFUWI reduced the number of locations to 3 the governorates targeted by the project Beirut, Mount Lebanon and South & Nabatieh at the start of the baseline study implementation.

These two locations are considered as one area for the aim of the project.
Only two men took part in the FGDs with male Change Makers and only one FGD was held with men from the local communities. This FGD with men Community Members was held in Baalbek, as also was 1 FGD with community women, but this region was removed later from the project during the delivery of the Survey. Furthermore, also women and men from Tripoli took part into the FGDs although this area is no longer covered by the project. Some issues emerged during fieldwork also in relation to the choice of the women from the communities with whom focus groups were held. These in fact, because of their gender awareness and their interest in political participation, seemed more like women Change Makers than women community members (for more details on this, see Chapter 3.1).

Despite the above limitations, FGDs have been interesting and extremely useful. This was possible because during the FGDs, the participants provided clarifications, stories and concrete examples about their own life and, thus, about the life of their families and communities, which triangulated with quantitative data and analysis of secondary sources (Desk Review) and provided fundamental interpretation threads for this Baseline Study.

2.2.3.5 Tools 3, 4, 5 - Sampling and Data Quality

As mentioned in the previous section, Tool 3, Tool 4 and Tool 5 were designed to be respectively used to a) identify Opponents, Targeted Stakeholders and Allies; b) baseline Targeted Stakeholders and Allies attitudes towards women’s decision-making; and c) provide Capacity Assessment for Allies.

In relation to Tool 3, it was planned to get the partners to identify as many stakeholders as possible – from different society sectors and at different levels – that could be relevant to the project as either blockers, floaters or champions, in order to acquire the role of Opponent, Targeted Stakeholder or Ally.

In total, through Tool 3, 14 stakeholders were identified in Lebanon (8 Allies, 3 Targeted Stakeholders and 3 Opponents). These were less than what were as expected by the AT. Information about them was gathered, as planned, both through web search and by interviews with the partners and the stakeholders themselves. (See Stakeholder – Database Tools 3, 4 and 5) Consequently, the Targeted Stakeholders and Allies surveyed for their attitudes through Tool 4 were also fewer than planned. According to what was suggested in the Baseline Methodology (ANNEX 3 – Final Baseline Methodology), these should have been about 30 and should have been interviewed by very experienced enumerators. In the end, both Allies and Targeted Stakeholders were mainly interviewed either by the AT and/or by ABAAD.

Furthermore, fewer Allies and Targeted Stakeholders than planned were met and surveyed through Tool 4: 7 representatives of 6 stakeholders (5 Allies and 1 Targeted Stakeholder).
As we have seen, data regarding attitudes was collected mainly from Allies\(^6\) showed having positive attitudes towards women’s decision making in various spheres of life. This data is therefore not particularly useful, but it could become more meaningful if the Tool was conducted to a larger number of Targeted Stakeholders (see Chapter 6.2).

Finally, also in case of the Capacity Assessment, a few Allies were interviewed through Tool 5. Four Allies were interviewed in Lebanon. For this project, Tool 5 should be also used during project implementation to assess the capacity of new and already identified Allies (see Chapter 6).

The data obtained through this tool is quite interesting and allows to have a basic picture of the organizational capacity of the Allies on gender and advocacy. Nevertheless, this analysis is not the equivalent of an organizational assessment. In this Baseline, only what has been said by the Allies has been analyzed, and no documentation was reviewed (strategies, reports, policy recommendations, material and resources on gender etc.). For this reason, in Chapter 6, we suggest that Oxfam and its local partner might want either to proceed with the organizational assessment or maybe administer also to the Allies the more detailed capacity assessment that they will prepare for partners.

The limitations highlighted above, however, do not constitute a major downfall in relation to the data collected about opinion-formers and decision-makers in Lebanon. As for Tools 3, 4 and 5, they will be used as working-tools to constantly identify, map and assess decision-makers and opinion formers relevant to the project during all the implementation period (see Chapter 6 on recommendations for project implementation and M&E).

### 2.2.3.6 Tool 6 – Sampling and Data Quality

Tool 6 (also incorporated as Part b in Tool 5 for Allies), was designed to gather information and insights about social movements in Lebanon through ABAAD and other skilled observers (academics, activists including Allies etc.).

Tool 5 – Part b and Tool 6 were administered: in Lebanon, to 4 Allies and to the partners ABAAD and CFUWI.

The analysis of social movements and gender equity was finally completed with the review of news outlets and academic articles (see ANNEX 6 – List of analyzed documents). All the data collected have been extremely useful in providing a picture of the context in which the LANA project is attempting to produce change and have been thus been essential to this Baseline Study when triangulated with other qualitative and quantitative data.

\(^6\) This was expected due to the selection criteria that focused on support for gender equity.
2.2.3.7 Tool 7 – Sampling and Data Quality

Tool 7 has been designed to collect in systematic way information about CEDAW implementation and on the position of Lebanon in Human and Women Rights Indexes. Information was collected as planned, by consulting CEDAW Reports, Shadow CEDAW Reports, periodic reports on women’s Rights in the MENA Region, Press Releases, and Indexes by Human Rights Watchdogs.

The accuracy of the review and the wideness of the sources consulted has greatly contributed to provide an accurate picture of the context in which LANA project is implemented both in terms of legislation and of women’s situation on the ground.

2.2.3.8 Tool 8 – Sampling and Data Quality

Tool 8, on the Risks run by the LANA project, was filled through interviews and written exchanges with representatives of Oxfam (including security staff) and project partners, as planned. In addition, the AT constantly got updates about main political and security developments in the region from news outlets focusing on the Middle East (Al-Jazeera International, Mideastwire.com, The Daily Star-Lebanon, BBC World, and The Guardian-UK etc.).

This has made it possible to provide a quite accurate Risk Assessment in relation to the project Baseline situation. As also recommended in the final chapter of this Study (see Chapter 6), Tool 8 should also be considered as a working-tool to constantly monitor and update the security situation during all the project implementation period.

2.3 Phase 3 - Data Analysis and Report Writing

2.3.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

The data collected through Tool 1, was analyzed according to the following process:

• The AT has carried out a descriptive analysis of the general trends of the entire population interviewed, by cross-referencing variables and statistical calculation (comparison of average and percentage, calculation of score).

• Statistical processing on the recorded data was carried out by using SPSS statistical package. It was possible to carry out simple exploratory analyses, using representations of distributions by frequency tables and graphs and calculating the appropriate univariate and bivariate descriptive statistics. Where necessary, regrouping and recoding of answers was carried out according to the Baseline Methodology (ANNEX 3)

• The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, questions from Part A) Q1 to Q19, in terms of sex, age, civil status, education, employment status, religious confession, are presented and analyzed using frequency tables and cross tables (see Chapter 3.1)
• Questions useful to baseline the project Indicators (Part A: Q 20- Q26, and Part B) and Part C) were analyzed using frequency tables that show how many people selected a specific answer and the related score. These tables are fully included and commented in (Chapter 4).

• In addition, data have been analyzed by producing Additive Indexes based on the main dimensions explored by the survey for Tool 1 - Part A) Q20, Q21, Q22, Q23, Q24, Q25, Q26, for Change Makers and targeted Community Members, and Part B) and Part C), only for Change Makers, in the 3 countries. Where necessary, regrouping and recoding of answers was carried out according to the Baseline Methodology – Tool 1 - Guidance Notes and Questionnaire Structure (see ANNEX 3) and to the Additive Index Methodology as included in:

- ANNEX 13 – Tool 1 - Additive Index
  - ANNEX 13a – Tool 1 - Additive Index Methodology
  - ANNEX13b – Tool 1 – Database Recoded for Additive Index
  - ANNEX 13c – Tool 1 – Additive Index Charts

The charts created through the Additive Indexes for Tool 1 were used to visually summarize and compare the findings on the five Indicators covered by Tool 1 (see Chapters 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.10).

At EoP, the Additive Indexes will be useful to quickly check for changes over time, by comparing the highest and lowest values in relation to the Indicators mentioned above (see Chapter 6.2 for recommendations on M&E).

Finally, in relation to Tool 1, it needs to be added that, because some questions of the Survey covering indicators that did not need to be baselined (i.e. Change Makers and Community’s practices etc.) were however administered to Change Makers and men and women from the communities, some extra data are available. These data have not been analyzed in this Baseline Report, but could be of interest in the future, for example, in phase of Final Evaluation, either: a) if Oxfam and ABAAD will want to check changes in other dimensions (for example changes in ‘practices’ etc. for community and Change Makers) or, b) if they will need a comparison between Change Makers and community in relation to changes on specific indicators.

- ANNEX 14 – Tool 1 - Extra Data
  - ANNEX 14a - Tool 1 - Extra Data Matrix
  - ANNEX 14b – Tool 1 – Extra Data Tables
In addition, the data collected through Tool 4 – on Targeted Stakeholders and Allies’ attitudes, was quantitatively analyzed by producing frequency tables and Additive Index charts (see Chapter 4.9; see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5). It should be pointed out that in this case, the analysis has been carried in relation to whole figures (number of stakeholders) and not in percentage rates (percentage of stakeholders), as requested by the formulation of the related Indicator (Result 2 – Indicator 3).

Finally data related to Tool 5 – Allies Capacity Assessment, was analyzed by producing charts showing for each of the dimension analyzed (different capacity aspects), the baseline level of each one of the individual Allies examined (see Chapter 4.10; see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5).

2.3.2 Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data
Data collected during the Desk Review, FGDs and interviews was triangulated and utilized to make sense of the quantitative data about Change Makers and Communities collected with Tool 1. Despite the limitations in the process of data collection highlighted above (see Chapter 2.2.3), the insight gathered during FGDs with men and women from the communities, Change Makers, partners and allies but also through the review of academic articles and organizations’ web-sites was essential to provide interpretation threads for quantitative data.

Qualitative and quantitative data collected during fieldwork were always analyzed in relation to each other. By crosschecking and integrating views from different standpoints, it has been possible to point out regularities and explain apparent contradictions, and to, hopefully, reach a meaningful assessment of the baselines situation of the main subjects involved in the LANA project.
CHAPTER THREE: BASELINE POPULATION

In this section, we describe the population that has been covered by this Baseline Study both through quantitative and qualitative tools. This will include a description of: a) Change Makers, men and women from the communities and of b) the main decision-makers and opinion formers (Opponents, Targeted Stakeholders and Allies), identified and/or met during fieldwork in Lebanon.

3.1 Baseline Change Makers and Targeted Men and Women from the Communities and the Control Group

In this section, we focus on the main aspects that characterize the baselined Change Makers, targeted community men and women in terms of location, sex, age, civil status, education, employment, religious belonging and participation in community activities. This will allow framing the population involved in this Baseline Study and highlighting similarities and differences between community and Change Makers.

At the same time, by doing so, we will also highlight where the population analyzed corresponds or differs in some ways from the population that the LANA Project plans to cover. In particular, in the project proposal (or in further Oxfam’s decisions about the localities in Lebanon) and in the LANA Baseline Methodology, the following criteria were included for Change Makers and targeted women from the community:

- Change Makers and targeted members had to be identified in the governorates targeted by the project (Beirut, Mount Lebanon and South & Nabatieh)
- Change Makers and targeted members community were to be recruited should have been 50% men and 50% women;
- Change Makers expected to already have a certain familiarity with community activities and gender issues;
- Community men and women were expected to be recruited in the circles of those targeted by the Change Makers, but should not be the ‘usual ‘people, with existing interest and experience in community activism and gender issues, rather ‘ordinary’ people ‘fresh’ to these issues. Thus less socially active/gender sensitive than the Change Makers themselves.

4.2 Summary of the Main Findings
In terms of the basic criteria set in the project for Change Makers and targeted men and women from the communities, we can observe that they have been at least in large part, respected (for those that have not full respected we suggest corrective measures

- **Location**: Change Makers and Community Members were identified as planned within the governorates targeted by the project.
- **50% men and 50% women**: more women than men Change Makers and from the community were recruited differently from what was planned; it would be recommended to improve the balance among the sexes, when and where possible.
- **Change Makers** showed greater familiarity and interest with community activities and gender issues, than Community Members, as it had been planned. Some issues observed at this point, where some of the Community Members during qualitative fieldwork resembled Change Makers in terms of activism and gender sensitivity. Some corrective measures were introduced. The final sample of Community Members surveyed with Tool 1 meets with the criteria. As also mentioned in Chapter 6, it is recommended to keep choosing Community Members not from among the people who already have interest and experience in community activism and gender issues, but rather from among lay people who are ‘fresh’ to gender rights and issues.

The main socio-demographic characteristics of Change Makers, targeted Community Members are summarized below:

### 3.1.1 Change Makers and Community Members’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex distribution</strong></td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of sex, among the Change Makers, about two thirds are women and one third men; within the communities, women and men are more or less equally distributed (55-45%). The Change Makers and the targeted Community Members that have been baselined; have an average age of 35/36.

Change Makers and community men and women are distributed more or less equally among the three governorates targeted by the project: Beirut, Mount Lebanon and South & Nabatieh, as by project criteria. In terms of marital status, a large number of Change Makers are single (45% female and 70% male) while community men and women are more equally distributed between married and singles.

All the Change Makers have quite high level of education (more than 60% have BAs, higher diplomas and MAs), while among the Community Members there are also people with only a basic level of education (10%). There are high rates of employment registered among both the Change Makers (60% women and 80% men) and among the community men and women of (56.8% women and 81% men). In terms of religious confessions, we can say that men and women Change Makers are more or less equally distributed between Sunni, Shiite, Druze, and some Christians. Interestingly, almost a quarter of Change Makers (23.3 %) refused to answer the question about their religious belonging, as to point out their belief in the divisive character of religious belonging.

As by project criteria, Change Makers interviewed for the Survey are also much more active at community level and in activities for the promotion of gender equality, than Community Members. 50.8% of the men and women from the community said they had not participated in any community activity during the past year, in comparison to only 3.3% of Change Makers.
CHAPTER FOUR: BASELINE POPULATION AGAINST INDICATORS
CHAPTER FOUR: BASELINE POPULATION AGAINST INDICATORS

4.1 Overall Objective – Indicator 1: Improvements in CEDAW Implementation

Overall Objective: Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

Indicator 1: Evidence of improvements to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon by EoP compared to baseline.

This Indicator was baselined thanks to the analysis of the most updated CEDAW Reports, Shadow CEDAW Reports, Periodic reports on Women’s Rights in the MEA Region and Press Releases. The analysis of CEDAW implementation has been carried out in terms of progress and failures and by suggesting targets by the end of LANA project.

For further details on this section, please see CEDAW/HR Indexes- Consolidation Matrix Tool 7 - Women’s Rights Implementation.

4.1.1 Summary of the Main Findings

The analysis shows that, although many steps forward are being taken in order to address gender based discrimination in legislation, substantial challenges persist in the three countries - especially concerning nationality, personal status, family and national decision-making, and women’s situation on the ground.

In Lebanon, the strong civil society and the democratic political forces’ demands to the government for adopting a consistent anti-discriminatory legislation, removing reservations to CEDAW (mainly related to the Personal Status Laws) and reforming the Penal and Personal Status legislation remain mostly unheard. The persistence of a discriminatory legal framework is reflected in core issues for the country, like the nationality rights, the personal rights and responsibilities within the family and the religious sectarianisms. This framework affects women’s political participation and decision-making at all levels because it allows discriminatory attitudes, practices and behaviors especially within the family and in traditional (and sectarian) social settings.
4.1.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

Lebanon accessed CEDAW on 16 April 1997 and submitted three periodic reports: on 2 September 2004, on 11 February 2005 and on 7 July 2006. In the Recommendations on State Reply to Issues and Questions on Country report - 2008 the Committee invited Lebanon to submit the fourth and fifth combined periodic report before 16 May 2014, but this deadline has not been met. Therefore, for the baseline, only the last report to CEDAW (2006) was examined, together with Shadow CEDAW Reports (2007 and 2008). However, because the CEDAW reports are too old to assess recent progress, we also used additional sources from the Human Rights Watch.

The analysis led to the following conclusion: Lebanon’s most recent (2013-2014) evidence of improvement in CEDAW implementation mainly lies on adoption of legislation on violence against women and on a probable consideration to adopt a 20% gender quota for the Parliament.

Failures in the full implementation of CEDAW hinder the full application of the recently approved Law on Protection of Women and Family Members from Domestic Violence. Although this new Law represents a significant progress by the government after years of work and demands by civil society, it cannot be fully implemented without reforming the Penal Code and pinning a definition for “violence” and the amendment of mitigation measures on several relevant issues such as “honor killings”. Moreover, the failure in reform of the Personal Status Laws is an impediment for the implementation of CEDAW and for lifting all gender-based discrimination, inequalities and inequities in legislation, including sectarian settings, which contribute to domestic violence and to the persistence of discriminations on religious/ethnic basis.

The reform process in Lebanon is extremely slow and civil society demands require a political will and commitment by government to challenge some core issues that constitute the basis of these discriminations that tackle the fragile equilibrium of the country, i.e. the nationality, the personal rights and responsibilities within the family and the religious sectarianisms. All issues considered in CEDAW Articles (9) and (16), onto which Lebanon still maintains reservations.

---

7 “Accession” is an act by which a State signifies its agreement to be legally bound by the terms of a particular treaty. It has the same legal effect as ratification, but is not preceded by an act of signature. 
For a definition of key terms relating to Treaties actions see: https://treaties.un.org/pages/Overview.aspx?path=overview/glossary/page1_en.xml

4.1.3 Progress Improvements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of CEDAW</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Violence against Women</td>
<td>On 1 April 2014, the Parliament passed the Law on Protection of Women and Family Members from Domestic Violence. The Law narrowly defines domestic violence, does not provide protection for all form of abuse and fails to criminalize marital rape, which is not a crime under the current Lebanese Law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • Women and political participation | The Coalition for women in Parliament 2013, which includes more than 150 Lebanese women’s organizations, advocated for a 30% quota for women as electoral candidates. |

4.1.4 Main Failures in Progress According to Recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of CEDAW</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reservations to CEDAW</td>
<td>Art. 9 (2) on granting women equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, and to Art. 16 (1) (c) on same rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution, (d) on same parents’ rights in matters relating to their children (f) on same parents’ rights to guardianship, wardship, trusteeship and adoption of children and (g) same personal rights as husband and wife, including the right to choose a family name, a profession and an occupation have not been lifted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • Violence against Women | The Lebanese Penal Code does not define the concept of violence and makes no provision for a specific, punishable crime of violence; mitigation measures still apply in judicial proceedings and practice for the so-called honor crime. |
• Gender-based discrimination, stereotyping and inequalities within the family

15 Personal Status Law regulates the family life of the 18 legally recognized religious concessions. Inequalities exist in marriageable age, choice of spouse, witnessing of the marriage contract, dowry, and traditional division of roles within the family, wife’s name, maintenance of wife and children, parental authority, custody, polygamy, divorce, right to inheritance.

• Women and political participation

The National Commission on Parliamentary Electoral Law is tending toward adoption of a female candidate quota of 20%; the provision has not been taken yet.

• Labor

Lebanese law excludes agricultural labor from the provisions of the Labor Code, which means that agricultural workers are not granted social security. Rural women benefit from social security to the extent that they belong to one of the groups covered by Labor Code provisions.

4.1.5 Suggested Goals by the End of Program (5 years):
By End of Program, Lebanon considers lifting reservations to CEDAW, adopts 30% gender quota, initiates the legislative reform of gender discriminatory laws and adopts a unified Personal Status Law.
• Reservations on CEDAW

Lebanon lifts reservations on Art. 9 (2) and 16 (1) (c), (d), (f), (g)⁹.

• Violence against Women

- Criminalization of marital rape.
- Ensure short-term, emergency protection orders to be issued quickly.
- Address discriminatory Personal Status Laws that contribute to domestic violence (i.e. inheritance, custody of children, divorce); Amendment of Art. 22 (all provisions considered contrary to the Domestic Violence Law are annulled except in case of the Personal Status Laws and Protection of Juvenile Offenders at Risk Law).
- Development of a National Strategy/Plan to combat VAW.

• Gender-based discrimination, stereotyping and inequalities within the family

Adoption of a unified Personal Status Law applicable to all women regardless of religious sectarianisms.

• Women and political participation

Parliament to approve a Law respecting the Coalition’s call for 30% gender quota.

• Labor

Amendment of the Labor Law to include agricultural labor and related social security for women.

⁹For a summary of CEDAW Articles 9(2) and 16 (1) (c), (d), (f), (g) see table “Main failures in progress according to recommendations”. 
4.2 Overall Objective – Indicator 2: Increased Activity and Impact of Social Movements

**Overall Objective:** Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

**Indicator 2:** Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline.

This Indicator was baselined thanks to the analysis of the interviews with Allies and partners (Tool 5, Part b and Tool 6) and of academic articles, reports and news releases, as specified below for each of the three countries.

4.2.1 Summary of the Main Findings

The women’s rights movements have achieved only partial results in their struggle for gender equity in decision-making. They find huge obstacles in the tribal and sectarian political systems, sustained by a patriarchal ideology, that tend to either exclude women from power or incorporate them into the institutional mainstream. This situation often divides the women’s rights movement both on strategic and tactical issues.

Lebanon is characterized by a context in which the definition of gender identities and the achievement of women’s rights is constrained by the confessional and sectarian political systems that are characterized and reinforced by strong patriarchal values. While women show some achievement in some spheres of their lives (social and economic), many of their rights are not ratified in the legislation nor fully supported by the political system (Civil Status Law, Nationality Law, GBV Law etc.). The women’s movement, moreover, is divided on resources, finding one common goal and on the means to adopt to achieve that goal and whether it should be confrontational or not.

4.2.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

This section is based on the following data collected during fieldwork:

- Tool 5 – Section on Social Movements – RDFL – Roula Zateer – 22.05.2014
- Tool 5 - Section on Social Movements – Tayyar al-Mustaqbal – Nawal Mdallali – 22.05.2014
- Tool 5 - Section on Social Movements – Joumana Merhi - Arab Institute for Human Rights- AIHR (interviewed by CFUWI) – 07.07.2014
- Tool 5 - Section on Social Movements - Laura Sfeir - Lebanese Council to Resist Violence against Women – LECORVAW (interviewed by CFUWI) – 02.07.2014
- Tool 6- Nada Makki. CFUWI - 20.05.2014
- Tool 6 – Roula El-Masri – ABAAD – 20.05.2014 (+Skype Interview 23.06.2014)
In addition, the following articles and documents were analyzed:


See also: Overall Objective Indicator 1 (on CEDAW implementation)

From the analysis of the above information, it is possible to say that there are various active social movements in Lebanon.

The most active social movements in Lebanon are the social movements linked to the various confessional parties. All these movements are well rooted at community level and are very influential on the political scene. Among these, there are the Islamic fundamentalist movements, very active in the Beqaa Valley and Tripoli. These movements do not have gender equity agenda in their priorities. In many cases, these movements have been mobilized against the gender equity agenda of the women’s movement in order to support the interest of the sectarian system (Khattab 2010).

Nevertheless, within these movements, some individuals can be found who are sensitive to the ‘gender equity’ issue. They usually intervene in the debate as individuals and not as representatives of the religious group or the political party to which they are affiliated with. This is for example the case of the religious leaders who were mobilized by ABAAD in a campaign against GBV and, with ABAAD, are involved in ongoing ‘dialogue sessions’ (ABAAD 2012; Roula al-Masri).

Next to the confessional political movements, there is the ‘women’s movement’, which obviously has a specific ‘gender equity’ focus. The Lebanese women’s movement has been lively since the 1950s. In post-civil war years, the Lebanese women’s movement has strived to reform of number of unjust laws (dating back to the Ottoman Empire and then, and in some cases worsened, by the French colonial rule and today’s sectarianism) that were hampering the achievement of women’s rights. The laws that the women’s movement has worked to change are:

1. The Personal Status Law (governing issues such as marriage, children custody, divorce, inheritance etc.), in the attempt of having one Civil Personal Status Law rather than 15 different religious personal status codes of the 18 recognized religious sects
2. The Nationality Law, so that women married to foreign nationals can give nationality to their husbands and children;
3. The Penal Code, mainly in relation to issues such as honor killings and GBV.
It became obvious during the field interviews that the reforms of the Personal Status Law and of the Nationality Law did not succeed because the suggested reforms clashed against sectarian interests. In particular, the attempt to reform the Personal Status Law clashed with the opposition of the sectarian leaders whose best allies are the religious leaders, while the reform of the Nationality Law was especially opposed by non-Sunni groups fearing the integration of Sunni Palestinians in the Lebanese society (Khattab, 2010).

The GBV movement has been more successful mainly because it did not confront confessional and sectarian interests and it presented GBV as an isolated issue from other gender equity issues such as the civil Personal Status Law (see also Khattab 2010). This movement has been able to create a momentum around the issue of GBV that has led to a change in media and people’s attitudes and to a partial success on the political level.

“The media campaign and in general the mobilization around the issue of GBV have been useful in breaking the silence and raising awareness around this issue. Demands have been made clear and public and this has created a situation in which is no longer taboo to talk about GBV.”

“Today, media is more aware of the issue. In the past, media and especially TV channels, were not talking about GBV. Today newspapers and TV Channels report news of women victims of GBV.”

According to some observers, this is also due to the fact that ‘traditional’ media is getting closer to people’s interests, because they strongly feel the competition of social media. In addition, when mobilization is displayed through street demonstrations – rather than through conferences and seminars as it was more in the past – it becomes much more interesting for the media.

In this context, the proposed Law on GBV has been put forward to the Parliament, and approved as “Protection of Women and Family Members from Domestic Violence” law, with some amendments, on 1 April 2014. The main amendments that do not fully satisfy the GBV movement are: a) the adopted Law is not a law addressing GBV specifically but rather ‘family’s protection’; and B) marital rape is not included as a crime.

In addition to the negative impact of the sectarian system, some of the international donors who came to Lebanon in the post-war years unintentionally impeded women’s movement. This was done by a) not-challenging and thus reinforcing the sectarian system, b) by supporting duplicated campaigns, and c) by allowing funding competition to take away the voluntary basis of these activities, and thus detach them from their social basis that they were initially built upon (Khattab 2010).
In different phases, the women’s movement has broken up around funding issues, management styles and organizational cultures. Nevertheless, the strategic choice that haunted the movement was around the central dilemma of whether to directly confront the sectarian confessional political system, and thus challenge the root of the Lebanese women’s oppression; or try to obtain what is possible without adopting a confrontational attitude by challenging the root causes of the problem (Khattab 2010; Roula Al-Masri; Nada Makki).

The fragmentation of the women’s movement has stimulated some of the witnesses interviewed during this Baseline Study to talk about ‘women’s movements’ rather than one movement—and to point out that they ‘have not really been able to mobilize people at a grassroots level’ around common objectives that are based on a secular agenda. (Roula al-Masri)

The Civil Campaign for Election Reform is currently a very active social movement. The CCER includes 50-60 CSOs and NGOs who are demanding electoral reform to guarantee more transparency within the political system especially during the election process. Even if they do not have a specific gender focus, they incorporate a gender equity agenda. In the CCER proposal for a Law that regulates election procedures, 11 specific requests are included.

Among these requests:

- The request for gender quota.
- The request for having a female candidate for Presidential Elections.

Similar to the movements targeting the Personal Status Law and Nationality Law, the Civil Campaign for Election Reform has neither obtained a large grassroots support, nor has it had an impact at the political level. This is mainly because it aims at challenging the interests of sectarian and confessional leaders. The main success obtained by the CCER has been the creation of LADE, an organization that aims to monitor and report on election processes (e.g. exposure of politicians in the media, money spent by politicians on election campaigns, etc.). CCER did not prioritize the gender quota issue because the campaign did not have the capacity and decided to go for reforms that are more feasible. The attempt to have a female candidate (from Zahle) for the Presidential election has been opposed by the family of the candidate. (Nada Makki; Roula al-Masri)

Finally, it has been pointed out by one of the interviewees (Roula al-Masri) that there is the teachers’ movement. This is a civil society movement that is led by the syndicate for teachers’ rights. They also do not have a gender equity agenda. However, this movement is mainly constituted by women, is cross-confessional and is having some impact in securing teachers’ rights and benefits.
In view of what was analyzed, it seems to us that at the moment the women movement in Lebanon is trapped in the dilemma of whether to directly confront the sectarian confessional political system, and thus challenge the root of the Lebanese women’s oppression; or try to obtain what is possible without adopting a confrontational attitude by challenging the root causes of the problem.

4.2.3 Suggested Target
A renewed active cross-confessional and anti-sectarian social Lebanese movement with a specific focus on gender equity. A movement that is able to overcome differences and competition and get a large grass-root support to influence main opinion formers and decision makers.

4.3 Overall Objective – Indicator 3: Improved Ranking in Human Rights

This Indicator, concerning the ranking of target countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights and democracy indices was baselined through the analysis of different annual/periodic reports on women’s rights for MENA region. In particular, human development goals were considered, at global and regional level, along with more specific indices developed by different watchdogs and by the UN (i.e. MDG3 reports, Gender Equality Index, Gender Inequality Index, World Economic Forum Index and Human Development Index).

For further details on this section, please see CEDAW / HR Indices- Consolidation Matrix Tool 7 - Women’s Rights Implementation.

4.3.1 Summary of the Main Findings
Lebanon is still on the way to achieving MDG 3. Lebanon is better ranked than the other targeted counties of Jordan and Iraq in the last Human Development Index. Nevertheless, the Gender indices show negative trends for Lebanon for what concerns gender equality (GEI) and women’s economic empowerment (WEF) and for existing gender inequalities.

The table below compares Lebanon’s most recent indices and related rankings relevant to this Indicator based on information grouped in CEDAW / HR Indexes- Consolidation Matrix Tool 7 - Women’s Rights Implementation.

10. Millennium Development Goal 3 “Promote Gender equality and empower women”.
4.3.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

The Human Development Index 2013 places Lebanon at 72nd position out of 187 countries (where 1 is the Highest and 187 is the Lowest).

According to the National Millennium Development Goals Report for the Arab Countries of 2003, Lebanon had probably the chance to meet MDG 3 mainly because there was no gender gap in educational attainment. The focus, since then, should have been made on improving women’s access to economic activities and decision-making positions at the national level. The last National Millennium Development Goals Report for the Arab Countries (2008), confirmed data of the precedent Report regarding Lebanon with evidence in comparing the discrepancy between the significant progress towards achieving gender equality in educational attainment and women’s weak participation in economic and political life and in national decision-making.
At the time this baseline assessment was conducted, and by reviewing the latest figures and indices, it seems that there is a little probability that Lebanon can meet MDG 3 by 2015. Moreover, other data available through the civil society and other watchdogs confirms that Lebanon is far from being able to meet MDG 3.

The Gender in Arab Millennium Development Goals Report (2006) categorizes Countries in accordance with data availability for the measurement of MDGs achievement: 1 data point indicates that data are available for one year, and at least 2 data points indicates data are available for at least two years. As shown in the table below, all indicators for Lebanon have data points, except Indicator 10 related to the ratio of illiterate women to men aged 15-24 years.

The Gender Equity Index, by Social Watch, which measures the prevailing gap between women and men in education, the economy and political empowerment in a given country, examines 168 countries in 2012 (1st position = narrowest gap; 168th position = widest gap) and it ranks Lebanon as 0.55 (122nd position).

The Gender Inequality Index, by different UN agencies, which reflects inequalities in achievements between women and men in reproductive health, empowerment and the labor market, examined 17 Arab countries in 2011 (1st position = highest inequality; 17th position = lowest inequality) and it ranks Lebanon as 0.44 (10th position).

Regarding Lebanese women’s political participation, according to 2013 World Bank report, the proportion of seats occupied by women in the Lebanese Parliament is only 3% (this data is confirmed by UN Data, 2012), and there are no women Ministers.

Finally, the World Economic Forum index, Global Gender Gap Report 2013, that measures the magnitude of gender-based disparities in health, education, economics and politics, examines 136 countries (1st position = lowest disparities; 136th position = highest disparities) and it ranks Lebanon as 123 against 122 in 2012, 118 in 2011 and 116 in 2010. Therefore, we can affirm that during the last three years in Lebanon there has been a regression in women’s empowerment and political participation.

The table below summarizes Lebanon’s main annual/periodic reports most relevant to the baseline.
As a conclusion we can affirm that the slow advancement, and, in some cases, regression of Lebanese women’s situation is supported by the latest ranking of selected indices. Figures show that Lebanon recorded negative changes in ranking during the last few years, especially in women’s economic empowerment, political participation and national decision-making processes, while a slow positive change was recorded in health and education sectors.

### 4.3.3 Suggested Target by EoP (5 years)

By EoP, GEI, GII and WEF show positive changes, MDG 3 indicators show improved performance and HDI show more positive trends.
4.4 Specific Objective – Indicator 1: Perception of Women’s Political Participation

**4.4 Specific Objective:** Women in targeted communities of Lebanon enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere.

**Indicator 1:** Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline.

For baseline Indicator 1: “Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline”. Result 1 was assessed through:

- **a)** Tool 1, Part a), Q24 (only for women) aimed at measuring targeted women Community Members’ self-assessment of their role in the private, social, economic and political spheres.
- **b)** Tool 2, in which some statements similar to that of Tool 2 were analyzed and discussed.

### 4.4.1 Summary of Main Findings

![Self Assessment of Women’s Role](image)

**Score**
0 = I don’t know
1 = excluded from decision making
2 = little involvement / only consulted
3 = high/exclusive involvement in decision-making
The targeted Lebanese women in the community showed high levels in the self-assessment of their role in decision-making in both the private and public sphere. During FGDs, when there was a possibility to discuss in-depth and practical examples the meaning of ‘participation in decision-making’ it clearly emerged that women’s participation in decision-making is still strongly hampered by patriarchal ideologies and tribal and sectarian political systems.

Most of the targeted women from the communities in Lebanon show a quite positive assessment of their role in decision-making in the various spheres of their lives, better in the private and social (around 90% of them), a bit less in the economic, and the political (around 70% of them). This trend is visible also from the chart above, which also shows us that Lebanese women have in general a much better self-assessment of their own role in decision making. Nevertheless, during the FGDs the notion that these Lebanese women perceive ‘reputation’ as a fundamental dimension to be preserved in their lives emerged strongly. They link it to women’s sexual behavior and say that it limits their personal, social, professional and political lives.

4.4.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon
The group of 153 community women that was assessed through Tool 1, Q24 is of an average age of 36 years. In the following table, we summarize the situation for each question and score. This data is then analyzed also in relation to the 2 FGDs held with:

- a) 11 community women in Baalbek on 25 May 2014 and
- b) 8 community women in Qurnayel on 25 May 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24 – ROLE SELF-ASSESSMENT – ONLY WOMEN (153 COMMUNITY WOMEN)</th>
<th>I DON’T KNOW</th>
<th>I AM EXCLUDED</th>
<th>I AM CONSULTED (THE HUSBAND / OTHER FAMILY MEMBER TAKE THE DECISION)</th>
<th>I DECIDE/I TAKE PART (EXCLUSIVE INVOLVEMENT / JOINT INVOLVEMENT)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are you involved in making different types of decisions:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/ only women with children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _1: On your children’s education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _2: On healthcare needs of your children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _3: On the number of children you want to have?</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _4: On choosing your education?</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _5: On your health needs and care?</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _6: On getting a driving license?</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 _7: On purchasing household assets within your household?</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, we can observe that women from the community consider they are involved in decision-making or make decisions themselves mainly in:

a) the social sphere, with around 88% of women freely choose to meet their friends, and with slightly less (78-79%) women have the final decision of how they dress, and in attending and/or being actively part of the community activities;

b) the private sphere – above 80% - with the exception of decision related to children (48% to 57% decide/take part in these decisions) and to purchasing household assets (only 35% of women decide/take part in these decisions);
c) the economic sphere the involvement in decision making decreases to 51% in relation to owning property, (37.9% declared they were excluded or only consulted and 11.1% answered they did not know); to 45.8% in relation to decisions regarding their work inside the house (with 20.3 % declared they were excluded or only consulted and 34% answered they did not know in relation to the household work. Whereas it is quite high in relation to having a job outside the house (73.9%) and for having a bank account (85.6%);

d) finally, the percentage of those who freely decide or are involved in decision making in the political sphere decreases: 73.2% decide freely about how to vote, 66% whether to take part in demonstrations, 64.1% on being part of a political organization and 57.5% on nominating themselves as candidates for political elections – in all cases the rates of “I do not know” response was around 10%.

During FGDs with 11 community women in Baalbek, with Shia and Sunni women aged 19-52, (4 unmarried, 1 divorced) and in Qurnayel with 8 Druze women aged 45-59 (2 unmarried, 1 divorced), a slightly different picture emerged. This was probably due to the fact that, as we have seen in Chapter 3.1, the community women selected in Lebanon for the FGDs were actually responding to the Change Makers profile than to that of the Community Members’ (nevertheless, very useful insights were obtained). The large majority of women in both places, in fact, perceived themselves as involved in decision-making in all spheres including the political.

Nevertheless, they all felt that the limitation to their freedom in all these spheres came from the issue of ‘reputation’. In fact, these women, next to a positive assessment of their role in decision-making, and to progressive attitudes towards gender roles, when it came to ‘reputation’ they all said that it is ‘very important for woman to have a good reputation’.

The issue was discussed in detail. It emerged that reputation is essentially connected to the control of women’s sexuality and body. As the women mentioned, reputation “is about morals, attitudes and behaviors”. Criteria for having a good reputation are:

• “dressing properly”; “taking care of the house and raising children properly”;
• “respecting – not betraying - the husband”;
• “not having sexual relationships with men other than one’s husband”;
• “not staying out late at night” and
• “not meeting men out of the workplace, even if it is a meeting intended for work”.


All women felt that it was essential for them to maintain a good reputation and in most cases even to avoid women with a ‘bad’ reputation, but at the same time, they felt that many of the criteria used for good and bad reputation were limiting their freedom and were applied to women but not to men. Some women stated:

- “Clothing is a criterion but it is limiting for women”;
- “Another limit is time. A woman should be back home at a certain time, not to go out at night. Otherwise, other people will be gossiping. This is limiting.”
- “For example, a woman who has a job should not be meeting a man outside the workplace, even if it is for work. I try to avoid this. But this is limiting”.

Some women, focused explicitly on the limitation to their sexual freedom. A divorced woman said: “Sex is a biological need. Religion accepts it, for example in the case of ‘temporary’ marriages in Islam. Women would like to have sexual relationships, but they are scared because of society”. Another woman added, “If men betray women, this does not give them a bad reputation. Men make mistakes but then society will forget and forgive. The case is not the same for women who betray their men”.

We could conclude that community women in Lebanon in general show a quite good self-assessment of their role in decision-making in most spheres of life – better in the private and social, but less in the economic and political. However, even those who feel they are quite in control of their lives, perceive that “having a good reputation” – understood in terms of respecting social norms of sexual behavior - is an essential social criteria they have to abide to, while at the same time being a limiting factor in their freedom in all the spheres of life.

4.4.3 Suggested Target

We could expect that, if the project is successful, community women will state by the EoP that they perceive improvement in their decision-making roles especially concerning their political and economic life, but also in their social and private life.
4.5 Specific Objective - Indicator 3: Change Makers Reporting Increased Participation and Gender Equality

4.5 Specific Objective: Women in targeted communities of Lebanon enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public spheres.

Indicator 3: By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can:

- Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere.
- Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community.

The above indicator was assessed through:

1. Tool 1, Part c), sections C1, related to engagement and section C2 related to actions; and
2. Findings on women’s political participation from the FGDs carried out thanks to Tool 2.

4.5.1 Summary of Main Findings

Engagement on Women's Decision Making - Women CM

C1 - ENGAGEMENT ON WOMEN’S DECISION MAKING

Score:
1 = no engagement
2 = low level engagement
3 = High level of engagement
Public Actions Initiated on Gender Equality

Score:
1 = no actions initiated
2 = community level actions initiated
3 = national level actions initiated

Women and men Change Makers have in general quite good levels of engagement with the issue of women’s decision-making in various spheres of life. Women participate more at community level but men show being more included and having more experience in political settings. Although 20 to 30% of Change Makers have no experience in undertaking public actions on gender issues, many exhibited experience in public actions at national/political level.

A large majority (80%) of women Change Makers in Lebanon, have reflected and voiced needs and concerns about women’s decision-making, but as we will see below in more detail, very few of them have done so in a political party setting. Participation is higher at community than at national level. More than 40% of the women Change Makers in Lebanon have some experience in initiating community public actions in favor of increased women’s participation, and more than 25% at national level; just more than 30% have no experience at all.

Men Change Makers in Lebanon are slightly less engaged (reflecting and voicing) than women Change Makers with needs and concerns about the women’s role in decision making, but at the same time, when they do it, they do it more in political settings than women Change Makers. Finally, men Change Makers, similarly to women have a good experience in initiating actions at community level, but have no experience at national level.
4.5.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

In the following table, the AT summarizes the situation in relation to the engagement of 30 Change Makers: 20 women and 10 men with an average age of 36.

Although there was no specific set of questions for Change Makers in Tool 2 about their engagement and actions on the issue of women’s participation in decision-making, it has been however possible to gather some insights from the discussions that took place during the FGD with 7 women Change Makers and the FGD with 2 men Change Makers in Beirut on 21 May 2014.

C1) ENGAGEMENT with the issue of women’s participation in decision-making
(20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN- 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. REFLECTING</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, A BIT</th>
<th>YES, A LOT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1_a) Reflecting: Have you recently reflected about the issue of women’s participation in decision-making in relation to your own life and especially in relation to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_a).1 Your personal life – relations within the family?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_a).2 Your social life?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_a).3 Your economic situation?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_a).4 Your political views?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_b) Reflecting: Have you recently reflected about the issue of women’s participation in decision-making in relation to the women of your community?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_c) Reflecting: Have you recently reflected about the issue of women’s participation in decision-making in relation to the situation of your country?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_d) Reflecting: Have you recently reflected about the issue of women’s participation in decision-making in relation to your culture/tradition?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. VOICING</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES, A BIT</td>
<td>YES, A LOT</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e) Have you voiced your worries/needs on the issue of your/women’s participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.1 With your mother and sisters?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.2 With all your family – males included?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.3 With friends/colleagues?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.4 In community groups?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.5 In women’s groups?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.6 On social networks?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.7 In a political organization?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_e.8 Other? Explain</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. PARTICIPATING</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, A BIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f) Did you recently take part in any public initiative or event on the issue of women’s participation in decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f.1 CBO meeting</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f.2 Community meeting</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f.3 Political party meeting</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f.4 Street demonstration</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1_f.5 Other</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the data presented in the above table, it is possible to say that in relation to questions about Reflecting on women’s participation, between 60 and 70% of women Change Makers affirm to reflect ‘a lot’ and in relation to various spheres of their life (especially in relation to their own private life and in relation to other women of the community), while this figure is lower in the case of men (30% in relation to the economic sphere, 40% in relation to the political, and 50% in relation to the social).

In relation to Voicing, we can observe that more women do it in the private and social settings, but when it comes to ‘voicing’ in political organizations, 60% of men state that they do it in comparison to only 15% of the women.

Regarding Participating in public initiative and events around the issue of women’s participation in decision-making, we can observe that more than 50% of the Change Makers have not tackled the issue of women’s participation in decision-making in community and/ or political activities. For those who have done so, we can observe that more women than men have done it within CBOs and community activities, while more men discussed this issue in political parties’ meetings.

C2) Initiating public actions supporting women’s participation in decision-making
(20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2) Initiating public actions supporting women’s participation in decision-making</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NO %</th>
<th>COMMUNITY LEVEL %</th>
<th>NATIONAL LEVEL %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2) a) Action: Have you ever initiated public actions supporting women’s participation and decision-making in their households?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>42,1</td>
<td>21,1</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2) b) Action: Have you ever initiated public actions supporting women’s participation and decision-making in community life?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2) c) Action: Have you ever initiated public actions supporting women’s participation and decision-making in the economic life of your community/country?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2) d) Action: Have you ever initiated public actions supporting women’s participation and decision-making in the political life of your country?</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning their experience in initiating community actions in favor of women’s greater role in decision-making, around 20% of women Change Makers have also initiated actions at national level but none of the men has done so. Women Change Makers have initiated more public actions, at both community and national level, supporting women’s increased role in decision making in the private and community life. However, more men than women seem to have initiated community actions in relation to women’s decision-making in the other spheres. Actions supporting women’s participation in the political life of the country are those with the highest percentage of the (No) response (55.5% women; 50% men).

A confirmation on the above analysis can be gathered from the FGDs held with CMs in Lebanon. Women Change Makers who took part into FGDs in Lebanon were all somehow active within the network of CFUWI, a women’s empowerment organization, collaborating with ABAAD in the LANA project and had taken part into community and national actions in favor of gender equity. They had thus all reflected, voiced and participated quite a lot into activities and actions at community and national level in favor of gender equity.

At the same time, however, they also strongly stated that women’s participation in the political sphere in Lebanon is strongly hampered by the patriarchal nature of the sectarian system and that this was their reason for a low level of interest in formal party politics.

“It is not a problem for me as a woman to take a public stand. The problem is that political parties are manipulating everything we do. Everything turns into a political/religious issue”.

“I had initiated a struggle for an environmental issue (a land fill near my village) – but because it was owned by an important politician. I had lot of troubles and I had to stop the struggle”.

“Even in open-minded groups, men fail to see the role of women. Once, in an organization with women and open-minded men, we were invited to an event, but the men of our organization could not work out which women to invite as they literally did not see the women around them”.

“Political parties are very confessional. The elected people – all men – are only interested in being elected again. All leaders are men. Women are only working on social issues and women’s issues. In addition, when leaders select women for political issues (Lebanese Forces, Tayyar al Mustaqbal, Kataeb, etc.) these women are either direct relatives or linked in way to their families.”
“In some cases, when women become candidates for non-confessional parties, they are later replaced by men. Politicians are interested in safeguarding their seats and working for their interests, they are not interested in Lebanon”.

(See also Result 1 Indicator 1 on Change Makers’ attitudes also towards gender equity in the public sphere and Result 3 Indicator 1 on Change Makers capacity).

Men Change Makers (only 2 actually – see Chapter 3.1) were active in community and/or political activities, interested in the issue of women’s rights, but had never really took part or initiated actions on these issues nor were they very supportive of women’s participation in street demonstrations or in high-level political roles. (See also Result 1 Indicator 1 on Change Makers’ attitudes also towards gender equity in the public sphere and Result 3 Indicator 1 on Change Makers capacity).

In general, we can observe that, from the data collected, it emerges that in Lebanon women Change Makers are definitely more motivated than men Change Makers in personal engagement through reflecting and voicing needs and concerns of women’s role in decision making. At the same time, they do it less in a political setting as they feel excluded by the patriarchal and sectarian dominated political system. Finally, men Change Makers have less experience than women Change Makers in initiating actions in favor of greater women’s role in decision-making and even if they in general support the cause, still they believe that some restrictions should be administered when it comes to high-responsibility roles.

4.5.3 Suggested Target
It would be desirable that by the EoP, women Change Makers had acquired a greater ability to publicly engage with the issue of women’s decision-making role in private and political sphere. At the same time, it would constitute an improvement, if by EoP male Change Makers were able to:

1. Declare a greater personal engagement (reflecting and voicing) with the issue of women’s decision making role;
2. Believe that there are less limitations to women’s role in decision making positions, and
3. Acquire experience in initiating public actions in favor of women’s participation in the private and public sphere.
4.6 Result 1 – Indicator 1: Change Makers and Perception of Gender Roles

4.6 Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

Indicator 1: Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline.

Indicator 1 for Logframe level “Result 1 was baselined through:

A. Tool 1 part b) Q20 (for women and men) and Q21 (only for women) to measure Change Makers attitudes and the level of confidence for the private, the social, the economic and the political sphere and

B. Tool 2. Quantitative data of Tool 1 are reported in percentages and trends are matched with results of FGDs with Change Makers realized during fieldwork.

4.6.1 Summary of the Main Findings

Score
1 = very negative attitudes
5 = very positive attitudes
Women Change Makers in Lebanon have very positive attitudes (score 5) towards women's decision-making in various spheres of life and exhibit high level of self-confidence. Men Change Makers have also demonstrated positive attitudes towards women's decision-making. This shows that the space for women’s decision-making in the private and public sphere in Lebanon can be well approached.

Almost the totality of Women Change Makers in Lebanon manifested very positive attitudes towards women's participation in all spheres of life, with the same reservations seen above towards the sectarian and patriarchal Lebanese political system. As the women from the communities, they also agree that having a ‘good reputation' is essential in women’s lives but they also have very clear that this is something that greatly limits their life in all its dimensions. This is further confirmed by the fact that, while they have high levels of self-confidence in all spheres of life, a good half of them would never wear clothes that could trigger gossiping about them.

Lebanese men Change Makers, also display positive attitudes towards women’s participation in decision-making), but at a lesser degree than women do. In particular, a good part of men Change Makers (30%) do not believe that women have the capability to hold positions of high responsibility at work or a political setting. When it comes to the issue of ‘reputation', men explain this issue as a norm set by rules that regulate women’s sexual behavior as rooted in religion and tradition and in opposition to Western values. They do not perceive the negative and limiting aspects of it, as women do.
4.6.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

The surveyed group in Lebanon constituted of 30 Change Makers (20 women and 10 men). In the following tables, the AT summarizes the situation in relation to Tool 1 questions and scores. Data were then integrated with observations from the FGDs, one with 7 women Change Makers and one with 2 men Change Makers held in Beirut on 21 May 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q20 – Attitudes towards… – WOMEN (20 WOMEN CHANGE MAKERS)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _1. Women should always ask men what they would like to have for dinner/lunch</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _3. Women have the right to freely choose if they want to learn to drive or not, regardless of affordability of buying car</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _5. Women have the right to choose their career</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _8. At times, honor killing is necessary</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _10. Women should do what men decide in order to avoid altercations</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _12. Women should do what men decide in order to avoid altercations</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _14. Men have the right to physically discipline their wives and daughters when it is necessary</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _16. Daughters have the right to freely choose their future husband</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _25. Women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _32. Girls should be educated to obey men, since when they are small – it will be better for their future life</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _4. Women should never speak in public in front of men, it is not appropriate</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _6. Women should be able to have independent social life and to choose relatives, friends and neighbors</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _11. Women should never leave the house, only to visit their close family</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _13. Women have the right to go out with their friends as much as they want – it is up to them to decide</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _15. Women should wear what suggested by the husband/father/brother/mother/grandmother</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _17. Women should not take part into community activities, even if these are only for women</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _19. Girls should not be allowed to go to the University in another city – it is bad for their reputation</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _20. Women should take care about their reputation, because, for a woman, to have a good reputation is the most important thing</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _23. Women should have their social life with women, and men with men</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _28. Women have the right to freely decide how to dress</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>45,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender norms and behaviors regarding property and finances</td>
<td>Q20 - Attitudes towards…. – WOMEN (20 WOMEN CHANGE MAKERS)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _2. I want my daughter to work, so she will be more free to decide about her life</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>90,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _7. Girls should be encouraged to become economically independent when they reach adulthood</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _18. Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work out of the house</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _22. Women have the right to work out of home</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _24. Women have the right to register their parents’ inheritance/assets/properties on their names</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _26. Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _27. A woman working should give the money she earns to her husband/father</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _29. I do not want my daughter to work out of the house, otherwise she will not be a good wife and mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _36. Women are not suited for a job which implies high stress and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _38. Women have the right to have their own bank account</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>75,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _9. A man is better equipped in the public sphere to represent women’s need/demands</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _21. I think more women should hold roles of public responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>90,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _30. Women should not take part into elections as candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _31. Politics is a men’s affair</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _33. Public protest/street demonstration is not a women’s issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _34. More political education would be very useful for women</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _35. I think that a woman in politics is a resource for the community/country</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _37. Women should vote for the political party or the candidate supported by their family or husband</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _39. Women should be free express their political opinions – wherever they are</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _40. Women should be better represented in parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>85,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the section related to private settings we can observe, at baseline point, attitudes of agreement or strong agreement to women’s rights regarding the freedom to choose their career (100%), the right to learn to drive (100%), the right to choose their future husband (90%) and the number of children they want. Whereas 85% agrees or strongly agrees that women have the right to decide how many children they want to have, and that women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children.
Moreover, 100% disagree or strongly disagree that “Girls should be educated to obey men, from the time they are still children – it will be better for their future life”. 100% of respondent’s disagree/strongly disagree with the statement about physical discipline of their wives.

95% of the women Change Makers disagree/strongly disagree to “At times, honor killing is necessary”, however, interestingly, one woman Change Maker out of twenty (5%) agrees with the statement. It is also interesting to observe, that we find that 40% of the respondents agree that women should always ask men what they would like to have for dinner/lunch compared to 55% that “disagree/strongly disagree – which denotes how, in a context where positive attitudes towards women’s decision making are dominant, still 40% of the women think that they should do something to please their husbands (cooking what their husband’s desire) and not simply choose what is more convenient for them who have to prepare it.

Regarding the social sphere the large majority of women agrees/strongly agrees with the statements on women’s right to be free to decide about their social life, in terms of choosing friends (95%), and having men and women friends (90%), and to freely decide to go out (80%) and to freely decide how to dress (85%). Furthermore 95% are in disagreement/strong disagreement with the statements ‘Women should never speak in public in front of men, it is not appropriate’ and ‘Women should not take part into community activities, even if these are only for women’, and 90% with the statement ‘Girls should not be allowed to go to the University in another city – it is bad for their reputation’.

However, despite this positive attitudes towards women having a free and independent social life, reputation is very important for a woman: 80% agrees/strongly agrees with the statement “Women should take care about their reputation, because, for a woman, to have a good reputation is the most important thing”, while 10% disagrees/strongly disagrees and 10% “does not know”.

Also during the FGD with 7 women Change Makers in Lebanon, it emerged that all the women had very positive attitudes towards women’s decision-making in all the spheres of life. Interestingly, however, as in the case of the community women who took part into the FGDs in Lebanon (in Baalbek and Qurnayel; see Chapter 3.1), all pointed out that women’s reputation is, if not “the most important” thing for a woman, surely a “very important” thing. “Reputation is a concern. Women have to be careful about what people could say. This is true in some neighborhoods in Beirut, in Tripoli and elsewhere. It is limiting, but a woman needs to keep certain behaviors to be respected and to have a role and the possibility of doing things.”; “One gets adjusted but makes things very difficult for women. It would be great to change it but it is very difficult because it is a matter of culture - it also depends on regions, confessions, individual cultures in different regions”. “Reputation is the key to success; without good reputation you have no chance of having success”. Moreover, and as explained very clearly by community women (see Specific Objective Indicator 1), for women reputation has to do with ‘behaviors’ which have to do with their sexual freedom.
Also concerning the economic sphere, we find the large majority of Lebanese women Change Makers who agree with the most positive statements about women’s freedom to decide in the sphere of their life. Within the interviewed group, 100% agrees/strongly agrees with the statements “Girls should be encouraged to become economically independent when they reach adulthood” and “I want my daughter to work, so she will be freer to decide about her life”. 100% disagrees/strongly disagrees with “Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work out of the house”, 95% disagrees/strongly disagrees with the statement “Women are not suited for a job which implies high stress and responsibilities” and 90% of women Change Makers agrees/strongly agrees with the statement “Women have the right to register their parents’ inheritance/assets/properties on their names”.

However while 70% disagrees/strongly disagrees with the fact that “Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land” another 20% agrees/strongly agrees and 10% does not know. Moreover, 80% disagrees/strongly disagrees with “A woman working should give the money she earns to her husband/father/brother”, but 10% does not know and 10% agrees/strongly agrees.

It seems thus that women Change Makers in Lebanon have very strong positive attitudes towards women’s decision-making in the economic sphere. Nevertheless, as also it happened for the private sphere, when it comes to the males in the family, above in relation to cooking, here in relation to let them having women’s inheritance or women’s earned money, some hesitations appear.

The FGDs with 7 women Change Makers in Lebanon, confirmed the very positive attitudes of women Change Makers in relation to women’s decision-making in the private, social and economic sphere, also because most of them seemed to have jobs, a certain freedom of movement and a quite high degree of control of their lives (see Chapter 3.1).

In general, women Change Makers from Lebanon have also very strong positive attitudes regarding women’s political participation. Women Change Makers almost totally agreed on all statements. In fact, we can observe high percentages of agreement/strong agreement to the different statements such as: “More women should hold roles of public responsibilities” (100%), “More political education would be very useful for women” (100%), “A woman in politics is a resource for the Community/Country” (77%), “Women should be better represented in parliament” (90%) and “women should be free to express their political opinions” (100%). Moreover, the table shows high levels of disagreement to the statements:

“Women should not take part into elections as candidates” (100%), and “A man is better equipped in the public sphere to represent women’s need/demands” (95%). “Politics is a men’s affair” (100%). Also the statement “Public protest /street demonstration is not a women’s issue” presents 95.5% of disagreement/strong disagreement.
Reservations regarding the Lebanese political system emerged also in the FGD with 7 women Change Makers in Lebanon. (The same happened at the FGD with community women – see Result 1 Indicator 2 on interest in political participation). When asked if they were interested in taking part into political activities, 4 of them said they had a ‘big interest’, but 1 said ‘little interest’ and 2 ‘no interest’. They clearly attributed their lack of interest to the sectarian, confessional and patriarchal character of Lebanese politics:

“It is not a problem for me as a woman to take a public stand. The problem is that political parties are manipulating everything we do. Everything turns into a political/religious issue.”

“I had initiated a struggle for an environmental issue (a land fill near my village) – but because it was owned by an important politician I had lot of troubles and I had to stop the struggle”

“Even in open-minded groups, men do not see the role of women. Once, in an organization with women and open-minded men, we were invited to an event, but the men of our organization could not work out which women to invite as they literally did not see the women around them”.

When asked if they were interested in being part of a political organization (party), only 1 of them answered ‘big interest’, 2 of them said “little interest' and 4 of them replied 'no interest. Again, they explained: “Political parties are very bad. Very confessional. Moreover, the elected-usually all men- are only interested in being elected again. All leaders are men. Women are only working on social issues and women issues. Plus, when leaders select women for political issues (Lebanese Forces, Tayyar al Mustaqbal, Kataeb) these women are all relatives and linked to the families.”

“In some cases, some women are candidates for non-confessional parties, but then are replaced by men. Politicians are interested in safeguarding their seats and working for their own interests, they are interested in Lebanon”.
### 4.6.2.2 Men Change Makers’ Attitudes in Lebanon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q20 – Attitudes towards... – WOMEN (20 WOMEN CHANGE MAKERS)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _1. Women should always ask men what they would like to have for dinner/lunch</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _3. Women have the right to freely choose if they want to learn to drive or not, regardless of affordability of buying car</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _5. Women have the right to choose their career</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _8. At times, honor killing is necessary</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _10. Women should do what men decide in order to avoid altercations</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _12. Women have the right to decide about how many children they want to have</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _14. Men have the right to physically discipline their wives and daughters when it is necessary</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _16. Daughters have the right to freely choose their future husband</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _25. Women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _32. Girls should be educated to obey men, since when they are small – it will be better for their future life</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _4. Women should never speak in public in front of men, it is not appropriate</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _6. Women should be able to have independent social life and to choose relatives, friends and neighbors</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _11. Women should never leave the house, only to visit their close family</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _13. Women have the right to go out with their friends as much as they want – it is up to them to decide</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _15. Women should wear what suggested by the husband/father/brother/mother/grandmother.</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _17. Women should not take part into community activities, even if these are only for women</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _19. Girls should not be allowed to go to the University in another city – it is bad for their reputation</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _20. Women should take care about their reputation, because, for a woman, to have a good reputation is the most important thing</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _23. Women should have their social life with women, and men with men</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20 _28. Women have the right to freely decide how to dress</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In case of men Change Makers in Lebanon, we find that most of them support women’s decision making in all the spheres of life, but less than women Change Makers. Within the section related to women’s decision-making in the private sphere we can observe, attitudes by men from the community very similar to women: men agree/strongly agree to women’s rights regarding the freedom to choose their career (100%), the right to learn to drive (90%) and, the right to choose their future husband (90%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q20 – Attitudes towards…. – WOMEN (20 WOMEN CHANGE MAKERS)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _2. I want my daughter to work, so she will be more free to decide about her life</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _7. Girls should be encouraged to become economically independent</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _18. Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work out of the house</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _22. Women have the right to work out of home</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _24. Women have the right to register their parents’ inheritance/assets/properties on their names</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _26. Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _27. A woman working should give the money she earns to her husband/father</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _29. I do not want my daughter to work out of the house, otherwise she will not be a good wife and mother</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _36. Women are not suited for a job which implies high stress and responsibilities</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _38. Women have the right to have their own bank account</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _9. A man is better equipped in the public sphere to represent women’s need/demands</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _21. I think more women should hold roles of public responsibilities</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _30. Women should not take part into elections as candidates</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _31. Politics is a men’s affair</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _33. Public protest /street demonstration is not a women’s issue</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _34. More political education would be very useful for women</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _35. I think that a woman in politics is a resource for the community/country</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _37. Women should vote for the political party or the candidate supported by their family or husband</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _39. Women should be free express their political opinions – wherever they are</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 _40. Women should be better represented in parliament</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case of men Change Makers in Lebanon, we find that most of them support women’s decision making in all the spheres of life, but less than women Change Makers. Within the section related to women’s decision-making in the private sphere we can observe, attitudes by men from the community very similar to women: men agree/strongly agree to women’s rights regarding the freedom to choose their career (100%), the right to learn to drive (90%) and, the right to choose their future husband (90%).
Moreover, 90% disagree/strongly disagree to the statement that “Girls should be educated to obey men, since when they are small – it will be better for their future life”. Similar to what we found among women, we also found that 40% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that women should always ask men what they would like to have for dinner/lunch compared to 60% who “disagree or strongly disagree”. Moreover, 100% of men disagree or strongly disagree to the statement “At times, honor killing is necessary”, and 90% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that refers to physical discipline of their wives.

However, we have contradictory figures regarding decisions about the number of children. While 90% agree or strongly agree with the statement “Women have the right to decide about how many children they want to have”, simultaneously, 50% disagree on the fact that “Women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children”.

Regarding women’s decision-making in the social sphere, men Change Makers have (slightly) more conservative attitudes than women Change Makers do. They declare their support for it, but at a lesser degree than women do. 70% agree or strongly agree with the statements on the women’s right to be free to decide their independent social life, in terms of choosing friends, having men and women friends, freely deciding to go out (60%) and freely deciding how to dress (60%).

Instead, we observe higher percentages of disagreement and strong disagreement with the statements “Women should never speak in public in front of men, it is not appropriate” (90%), “Women should not take part in community activities, even if these are only for women” (100%) and “Girls should not be allowed to go to the University in another city – it is bad for their reputation” (80%).

As women’s explicitly did, men Change Makers have also expressed that reputation is very important for a woman: 70% agree or strongly agree with the statement “Women should take care about their reputation, because, for a woman, to have a good reputation is the most important thing”, while 10% strongly disagree and 20% said they did not know.

Regarding women’s decision-making in the economic sphere, we notice the same trend: the majority of men Change Makers supports women’s decision making in this sphere, but at a noticeable lesser degree than women Change Makers do and with some contradictions.

For example, 100% of male respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement “I want my daughter to work, so she will be more free to decide about her life”; 60% of male respondents agree or strongly agree with “Girls should be encouraged to become
economically independent when they reach adulthood”, (30% disagree or strongly disagree and 10% said they did not know; and while 80% agree or strongly agree with the statement “Women have the right to register their parents’ inheritance/assets/properties in their names”, 80% disagree or strongly disagree with the other statement “A working woman should give the money she earns to her husband/father/brother” and only (20% agree); 70% disagrees with the statement “Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land”.

At the same time, the AT wants to highlight that while 90% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work out of the house” and 18% agree, however 30% agree with the statement “Women are not suited for a job which implies high stress and responsibilities”.

Finally, men Change Makers in Lebanon have very strong and positive attitudes regarding women’s political participation. In fact, the AT was able to observe high percentages of agreement/strong agreement to different statements such as: “More women should hold roles of public responsibilities” (90%); “More political education would be very useful for women” (100%); “A woman in politics is a resource for the Community/Country” (90%); “Women should be better represented in parliament” (90%) and “Women should be free to express their political opinions” (100%). Moreover, the table shows high levels of disagreement to the statements: “Women should not take part into elections as candidates” (90%); “A man is better equipped in the public sphere to represent women’s need/demands” (80%) and “Politics is a man’s business” (100%). The statement “Public protest /street demonstration is not a women’s issue” was answered with 90% of disagreement or strong disagreement.

In Lebanon, only 2 men Change Makers took part into the FGD. The discussion with these two men, as well as the discussion with the men Community Members from Baalbek, showed that they totally supported women’s decision-making role but they made some reservations. Similar to results of the Survey, where 30% agreed with the statement “Women are not suited for a job which implies high stress and responsibilities”, one of the Change Makers who attended the FGD debated his belief that “Women can work but not too much, not 12 hours per day as they do not have the physical ability” and also that “Women do not have the strength to be Prime Ministers or Presidents, and that such tasks need a lot of traveling and women do not have the physical ability. Women do not have the physical ability for high-level political responsibility, not for long hours of work. Women are different from men; they are biologically different. God created men stronger than women”.

Moreover, the 2 men Change Makers strongly highlighted the importance of ‘reputation’ for women. While one of the two men at the FGD, agreed with the statement “Women should take care of their reputation, because having a good reputation is the most important thing

11 As mentioned earlier in Chapter 3.1 the men community members resembled the Change Makers because of their political involvement.
for a woman”, the other answered ‘I don’t know’. This was widely discussed with 6 men Community Members in Baalbek. While all of them supported women’s decision-making in all spheres of life, 5 of them totally agreed with the statement related to reputation. When asked to explain the concept of reputation they explained, “Society puts limits to women. The criteria for ‘bad’ reputations are: divorced women; having sexual relationships before marriage; doing things against tradition; the way a woman dresses, etc.” They also explained that having a relation with a woman, or a man, with a bad reputation was a negative thing. They also briefly discussed men with a ‘bad reputation’ and they linked it to sexual behavior, in particular, ‘homosexuality’. When asked if they had friends with a ‘bad reputation’, they answered: “No, we do not have friends with bad reputation, because this will affect us. This will reflect on us. Also for example, we cannot be friends with a gay person, because this would give us a bad reputation as well.” One of them concluded, “We are against prostitution. The freedom you talk about is because of western values. This already creates problem in western societies. Moreover, it does not apply at all to our society. Freedom is different in different cultures. In our culture, prostitution is bad. For the other things, we believe in women’s rights. We believe that women should have the same rights as men. Women should have all the rights.”

Interestingly one of the men Change Makers at the FGD widely talked about his support for women’s participation in the economic sphere, in terms of “relieving men and society from an economic burden”. “Women are half of the society. If women work, they will bring more income for the family. From an economic point of view, now women are a burden for society and their families. This is why they should be part of economic life, so that they can share the economic burden”.

4.6.2.3 Women Change Makers’ Confidence in Lebanon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21 - Confidence – Only women (WOMEN CHANGE MAKERS)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _1. If I needed to divorce, I would not be scared to go to a lawyer and ask for it.</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _3. If I think that the criticism I receive from men in the family is too much, I tell them.</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>65,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _5. I would never dare reply back to my husband when he tells me off, I want to avoid trouble.</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _2. I am too shy to dare talking in a community meeting with men.</td>
<td>55,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _7. I would never wear inappropriate clothes that other people could be gossiping on.</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _10 I can stand alone in social situation where the majority of people are men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _4. I would never dare to look for a job out of the house if my husband does not agree.</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _9. I would never dare opening my own bank account; my husband would get too angry.</td>
<td>65,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21 _11. I feel a social pressure to get married; it is an indicator of my personal worth.</td>
<td>42,1</td>
<td>47,4</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows the level of self-confidence women have in the private, social, economic and political spheres. In general, we can say that women Change Makers have a high level of confidence for all examined spheres. Regarding personal life, women feel confident about going to a lawyer to get a divorce (85%), retort to the husband (85%) and stand alone in social situation where the majority of people are men (100%). The same rates were also exhibited when asked about their confidence in the economic sphere; however, some of them (70%) expressed disagreement with the statement “I would never dare to look for a job out of the house if my husband does not agree”. High percentages, were also found in relation to women's confidence in the political sphere: 90% of the women disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “I would go to a street demonstration for women’s rights only if my family members agree”, 90% of the women disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “I would love to join a political organization but I am afraid of what other people would say” and 70% with “I will never be confident enough to be a candidate for elections, even at community level”. However, besides these results, it is interesting to underline a statement, which divides the respondents in two groups: 50% “would never wear inappropriate clothes that other people could gossip about” while the other 50% would, as to highlight again the importance of the issue of reputation.

In conclusion, Women Change Makers in Lebanon seem to have very positive attitudes towards women’s decision-making and a high level of confidence in all spheres of life. Nevertheless, they feel strongly limited as far as their political participation is concerned. On the one hand, they have to preserve their ‘good reputation’ and consequently to the limits imposed to them by society on their social and sexual freedom; and on the other hand, by the sectarian patriarchal Lebanese political system. Also Men Change Makers show support for women’s participation in all the spheres of life, but with some more hesitation (especially on women’s capability of having roles of responsibility) compared to women Change Makers, and they also confirm the importance for women of having a ‘good reputation’ – however they do not see this as a limitation but as rather as a part of their religion and culture in a way that is different to Western values.

4.6.3 Suggested Target
Men Change Makers in Lebanon improve their attitudes towards women’s participation in decision-making, especially in relation to women having roles of responsibility. Women Change Makers have already very positive attitudes and quite high-level of self-esteem, but there is always room for improvement.
4.7 Result 1 – Indicator 2: Communities’ Reactions to Women’s Political Participation

4.7 Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

Indicator 2: Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline.

Indicator 2 for Result 1 was baselined through:

A. Tool 1, Part a) Q25 (only for women) and Q26 (only for men) aiming at investigating respectively the interest of interviewed women in political participation and men’s support to women’s political participation. This was done by focusing on five aspects of political participation: practicing the right to vote, being a member of a CBO, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities and taking on a political role;

B. Tool 2 FGDs with women Community Members.

4.7.1 Summary of the Main Findings

Q25 - WOMEN’S INTEREST IN POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some/little interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score:
- 0 = I don’t know
- 1 = no interest
- 2 = some/little interest
- 3 = High interest
It appears well, that the interest/support for women’s political participation is dominated by patriarchal and sectarian political systems that tend to exclude women.

Targeted women from the community in Lebanon show quite a low interest in political participation. This is more highlighted in terms of participation to community activities where (around 30% show strong interest and 50% some interest) but this falls very low (60% of no interest) when it comes to participation into political parties and assuming political roles. This is motivated by a strong distrust towards the Lebanese sectarian political system, which is very patriarchal in its nature and that does not give any room for women’s inclusion. In this context, where politics is manipulated by the patriarchal political system, women feel a deep distrust and disaffection.

Women are right to perceive that they have very little space in the Lebanese politics. Lebanese men from the Community Members, in fact, expressed quite low level of support to women’s political participation. Around 20% have little or no support for women’s voting in local or national elections and more than 60% of them have little or no support for women’s participation into political organizations.
4.7.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon

The group, analyzed through Tool 1, is composed of 153 community women (average age of 36) and 118 community men (with average age of 38). Data collected through Tool 1 has been triangulated with data collected through the following 3 FGDs held, on 25 May 2014, with:

a) 11 community women in Baalbek;
b) 8 community women in Qurnayel and
c) 6 community men in Baalbek.

The following tables summarize the data collected through Tool 1, in relation to each question and score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q25 – Interest in political participation (153 Women Community Members)</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>Little interest</th>
<th>Big interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in?</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _1. voting in local elections?</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>36,2</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _2. voting in national elections?</td>
<td>29,6</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>39,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _3. voting in community based structures?</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>27,6</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _4. voting in other relevant events to the country?</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>27,0</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _5. be a formal member (leader) of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>35,5</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>32,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _6. actively participate in activities of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _7. passively participate in activities of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>49,3</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _8. be a formal member of a political organization/political party?</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>60,5</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _9. actively participate (work, organize) in activities of a political party?</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>17,8</td>
<td>14,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _10. passively participate (attend) in activities of a political party?</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>65,1</td>
<td>15,8</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _11. sign a petition?</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>38,8</td>
<td>37,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _12. write a letter/a document?</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>27,6</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _13. go to a street demonstration?</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>39,5</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>23,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _14. being a candidate at national elections?</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>59,2</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>16,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _15. being a minister?</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>59,9</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _16. being the prime minister/president?</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>59,9</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>16,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally we can observe that women from the community are almost equally divided (30%, 30%, 30%) between the three levels of support (no interest, little interest, high interest) in regards to the questions about their interest in voting and participating into civic and community based activities. Nevertheless, the number of women who declare having ‘no interest’ reaches 60% when asked about their interest in taking part into political activities and organizations.

During the FGDs with women Community Members, the same data emerged in Qurnayel, but a slightly different data emerged in Baalbek. In Qurnayel, the majority of the women responded in negative terms when asked about their interest in taking part in political organizations and political activities, while they had responded positively about voting and participation in community organizations. They justified their disaffection to politics by pointing at a) the sectarian system “I refuse to enter politics because politics is very bad, it is responsible for the misery of Lebanese people.”; “It is all so complicated. There is a sectarian system. Politicians have their own interests and are not interested in the Lebanese people” and b) the patriarchal system “This also means that politics is a matter of inheritance always within the same families. Political roles are passed from father to son”. These two systems reflect the true nature of the Lebanese political system.

In Baalbek, women instead stated being interested in political participation. Nevertheless, they also pointed at the same problems addressed by women in Qurnayel: “The main problem is that there is no transparency and voting is useless. This is why many people are not interested in voting”; “We all would like to take part in politics, but in reality there is no such thing as participation. All political parties are not interested in Lebanon”. As we have seen, this greater political interest expressed by women from Baalbek might be due to the fact that, as we have seen in Chapter 3.1, these women had already been somehow involved in issues related to political participation through RDFL and Tayyar Al-Mustaqbal and also seemed to respond more to the Change Makers’ ‘profile than to the community women’s profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q26 –Support for women’s political participation (118 COMMUNITY MEN)</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>Little interest</th>
<th>Big interest</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _1. voting in local elections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _2. voting in national elections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _3. voting in community based structures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _4. voting in other relevant events to the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _5. be a formal member (leader) of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _6. actively participate in activities of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25 _7. passively participate in activities of a civil society organization / women organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While 70% of men show high support for women exercising their right to vote, 30% of them have little or no support for women voting in local and national elections. A similar trend has to be noted in relation to men Community Members’ support towards women’s participation in CBOs where about 65% support this, but 35% has little or no support. Support percentages decreases further when coming to women assuming political roles (55% - 60% support, 45% - 40% little or no support); women taking part into political/civic activities (50% - 50%) and women being part of political organizations (33% support, 67% little or no support).

During the FGDs with community men, in Baalbek, similar results emerged. Men expressed great support for women political participation, in terms of the right to vote and participate in community activities, some of them (20%) showed concerns in relation to women being part of political organizations, of women’s organizations and becoming a President or a Prime Minister. This low percentage of men expressing inconsistency to women’s political participation in the FGD, compared to the Survey, might be because men, like women, in Baalbek had already been exposed to these issues through RDFL and Tayyar al-Mustaqbal (Chapter 3.1).

Based on the above analysis, we could conclude that politics in Lebanon remain a ‘men’s affair’. This is reflected by both women and men, even in different ways. On one hand, community men show little support for women’s political participation (a percentage is still questioning women’s right to vote, and the majority does not consider women suitable for political activities and roles) while on the other hand, community women feel excluded by the Lebanese political system and have little motivation for being part of it because of its interconnectedness to the sectarian/patriarchal system that is limited by sectarian restrictions that are governed by dominating male elites.

### 4.7.3 Suggested Target

By EoP, community women become more interested and motivated in their own political participation and community men increase their support for women’s political participation.
4.8 Result 2 – Indicator 3: Decision Makers and Perception of Women’s Political Participation

**Result 2:** Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation.

**Indicator 3:** Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline.

Indicator 3 of Result 2 has been baselined through Tool 4 Part a) on attitudes (a1) attitudes towards women decision making in private and economic sphere; a2) attitudes towards women’s participation in the political sphere). Quantitative data are reported in relation to the number of the stakeholders to whom the questionnaire was administered.

The stakeholders interviewed through Tool 4 were selected through Tool 3 – the Stakeholder Power Assessment Matrix. The selected stakeholders were distinguished as:

- **Allies** – stakeholders with whom to work in alliance
- **Targeted Stakeholders** – neutral stakeholders with high power and that could exert influence
- **Opponents** – stakeholders towards whom, if needed, mitigating strategies should be adopted.

For more details on how the Stakeholder Power Assessment has taken place, see Chapter 3.2 – Stakeholder Power Mapping.

As planned, Tool 4 was conducted with Allies and Targeted Stakeholders, in order to baseline their attitudes towards women’s decision-making and political participation.

As described in ‘Sampling and Data Quality’ Chapter 2 - 2.3, fewer Allies and Targeted Stakeholders were covered by Tool 4 than actually planned mainly for organizational reasons. This has not posed a major problem, as Tool 4 (together with Tools 3 and 5) will be used as a working-tool during implementation, in order to complete the assessment of the stakeholders that have been already identified as well as to assess new stakeholders that will be involved in the project. *(See recommendations for M&E in Chapter 6.2; CEDAW/ HR Indexes- Database Tools 3, 4 and 5).*

In this section, the AT analyses the data on Allies and Targeted Stakeholders’ attitudes as collected for this Baseline study.
4.8.1 Summary of Findings

Please, note that in the following tables, figures are expressed in whole numbers (not in percentages).

**A1 - Attitudes Towards Women’s Participation in Decision Making Private & Economic Sphere**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A2 - Attitudes Towards Women’s Participation in Decision Making Political Sphere**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Political Organization</th>
<th>Women Organization</th>
<th>Political Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Interviewed Allies and Targeted Stakeholders (vertical axis): 7

**Score (horizontal axis)**

1 = very negative attitudes
5 = very positive attitudes
More Allies than Targeted Stakeholders were interviewed with Tool 4. 6 were Allies while only 1 was a Targeted Stakeholder.

Taking into consideration that the main criteria for choosing Allies is “support for gender equity in decision-making” and that the majority of the stakeholders interviewed especially in Lebanon were Allies, it becomes obvious that the collected data illustrates that the totality of the Allies show positive or very positive attitudes towards women’s participation in decision-making in the private, economic and political sphere.

4.8.2 Detailed Findings for Lebanon
Tool 4 was administered in Lebanon to 7 stakeholders precisely to:

- 3 national Allies
  - Lebanese Democratic Women League (RDFL) - NGO
  - Tayyar al-Mustaqbal - Future Movement, Women Section – political party
  - Lebanese Council to Resist Violence against Women (LECORVAW) – women organization
- 2 local Allies
  - Lebanese Association of Women’s Affairs – women organization
  - Qurnayel Women’s Association – women organization
- 1 regional Ally
  - Arab Institute for Human Rights (AIHR) – human rights organization
- 1 Targeted Stakeholder
  - Kataeb - Political party

As expected, and as most of the stakeholders interviewed, through Tool 4 are Allies, who were chosen because of their support to women’s participation, the majority of them expressed positive attitudes towards women’s decision-making in the private and economic spheres and also in relation to women’s political participation. The majority of these stakeholders ‘Strongly agreed’ to the positive answers and ‘Strongly disagreed with the negative questions.

The only questions that showed a more even distribution of answers were the ones related to the private sphere. While one stakeholder disagreed with the statement “Women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children” another one responded with “I don’t know” to a question related to the economic sphere “Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land”. Also in relation to the political sphere most of the respondents strongly agreed with the most positive statements and strongly disagreed with the most negative ones, with the exception of “Women have excellent political skills – they use them all the time in their daily life” where one respondent ‘Disagreed’.
### A1) Attitudes towards women’s participation in decision making in private and economic sphere

**How much do you agree with women...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QA1_1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA1_3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA1_5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA1_7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA1_9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QA1 _private/Economic sphere?

- **Girls should be encouraged to become economically independent when they reach adulthood**
- **Women have the right to have their own bank account**
- **Women have the right to work out of home**
- **Women should renounce their inheritance if their brothers need the money/property/land.**
- **Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work**

### Women Decision Making/ private/Personal relations?

- **Women have the right to decide about their children’s education**
- **Women’s will should be respected when they say they do not want to have any more children**
- **Women should do what men decide in order to avoid altercations**
- **It is good that women decide about the way to spend household money**

### A2) Attitudes towards women’s participation in decision making in political sphere

**How much do you agree with women...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QA2_1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2_21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Political Life/Voting?

- **voting in local elections?**
- **voting in community based structures?**
- **voting in national elections?**
- **voting in other relevant events to the country?**

### Political Life/political organization?

- **being a formal member of a political organization/political party**
- **being a candidate at national elections**
- **being the Prime Minister/President**
- **making a speech before an organized group**
- **actively participating (work, organize) in activities of a political party**
- **passively participating (attend) in activities of a political party**
- **being a Minister?**
- **going to a street demonstration**
- **Women should be better represented in our parliament**
### A2) Attitudes towards women’s participation in decision making in political sphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you agree with women…</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _4. being a formal member (leader) of a civil society organization / women organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _7 actively participating in activities of a civil society organization / women organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _10 passively participating in activities of a civil society organization / women organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _12 being a candidate at local elections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _14 A woman must ask her husband whom to cast her vote for</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _16 Women have excellent political skills – they use them all the time in their daily life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _18 Women have not the strength to lead a country, you need men for this</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA2 _20 Women’s nature is to take care of house and kids, not of politics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.8.3 Suggested Target:

More than suggesting a target, in this case it is worth suggesting widening the number of stakeholders to be involved in the project through Tool 3, and to administer Tool 4 to a larger number of Allies and Targeted Stakeholders, including those who have already been identified (see Chapter 6.2 on recommendations for M&E; see CEDAW / HR Indexes – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5).
4.9 **Result 3 – Indicator 1: Regional Learning**

**Result 3:** Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and alliance members through joint learning and actions

**Indicator 1:** Evidence of significant, positive changes (against the baseline) in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks.

Change Makers’ capacity at baseline (Result 3 - Indicator 1), has been assessed through Section B of Tool 1 (only for Change Makers). In this section of the survey questionnaire, three sets of questions were elaborated on:

- B1: knowledge about gender and women’s rights concepts,
- B2: advocacy skills and
- B3: commitment to project methodology.

Allies capacity at Baseline (Result 3 – Indicator 1) has been assessed through Tool 5 - Part a), where questions were asked about:

1. Organization Size;
2. Organization’s capacity on Gender;
3. Advocacy capacity and practices in regard to: community and outreach and involvement, decision makers lobbying, and opinion formers influencing;

A value was assigned to every Ally’s answer according to the Guidance Notes for Tool 5 (in ANNEX 3 – LANA Baseline Methodology). All scores are registered in Stakeholder - Database Tools 3, 4 and 5.

This chapter analyses, in the first section, LANA project Change Makers’ capacity and, in the second section, the Allies’ capacity.
4.9.1 Summary of Main Findings Change Makers’ Capacity Assessment

**B1 - KNOWLEDGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Change makers (Female)</th>
<th>Change makers (Male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No understanding</td>
<td>No understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some understanding</td>
<td>Some understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good understanding</td>
<td>Good understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Knowledge of gender definition**
- **Knowledge and awareness about women’s right**

**Score**

0 = I don’t know
1 = no understanding of gender concepts / very little knowledge of women’s rights
2 = some understanding of gender concepts / some knowledge about women’s rights
3 = good understanding of gender concepts / good knowledge of women’s rights

**B2 - ADVOCACY SKILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Change makers (Female)</th>
<th>Change makers (Male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Skills</td>
<td>No Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some Skills</td>
<td>Some Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent Skills</td>
<td>Excellent Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Communication**
- **Advocacy**
- **Organization**

**Score**

1 = no skills or very few skills
2 = some skills
3 = good/excellent skills
In general, both women and men Change Makers in Lebanon have better capacity in terms of understanding of gender knowledge. Moreover, Lebanese women Change Makers show good capacity in terms of knowledge of gender concepts and women’s rights (85%). Still, 30% of them root gender roles in nature and/or tradition and believe that for this reason they have to be respected. In terms of advocacy skills and practices, they all perceived them either as good or excellent.

Men are in general more confident regarding their advocacy skills, especially concerning the public sphere. However, they all need capacity building in some areas, whether strategic planning, advocacy media or mobilization skills.

Change Makers exhibited a good level of commitment to the methodology of the project in terms of time availability, but in general, they expressed that they were not ready to go ‘very far’ to overcome some specific obstacles that constrain gender equity when conflicting with community and family.

All Change Makers, especially men, need to some extend to be supported in forging links with women’s organizations and coalitions.
4.9.2 Summary of Main Findings – Allies’ Capacity Assessment

The sample of the Allies whose capacity has been baselined was not as large as expected, as already mentioned in Chapter 2.2.3. Thus, in this section, we recommend to continue expanding the network of Allies and to baseline their capacity as soon as they join the project.

Furthermore, it is necessary to signal, as already done in Chapter 2.2.3, that the assessment is totally based on what the Allies has directly declared, and the documentation of what was declared (strategies, reports, policy recommendations, material and resources on gender, etc.). However, to properly assess the capacity of the Allies, individual gender organizational assessments should be carried out. For this reason, in Chapter 6, we suggest that Oxfam and ABAAD might want either to proceed with the organizational assessment as it is or conduct a more detailed capacity assessment to the Allies the same as for partners.

In general, the capacity of the baselined Allies is quite good, but individual weaknesses can be identified either in organizational capacity on gender, advocacy capacity or in the work with women organizations.

In Lebanon, all the three assessed allies seem to have large constituencies and good organizational gender capacity.

The first two national Allies are women’s organizations (RDFL and LECORVAW) whose work focuses essentially on women and does not include men. They have weaknesses also in M&E system of their projects and programs and on lobbying capacity towards decision-makers and decision-formers that could be strengthened during project implementation.

The third national Ally, is the women’s affairs section of a major political party, Tayyar al-Mustaqbal. They have big power at the political level – especially on the Sunni electorate – and they can rely on a wide constituency. They are already quite active and trained on gender issues and political participation (by RDFL). They also are owners of a number of media outlets.

The Tunis-based AIHR, with an office in Beirut, is an active organization in Tunisia, with connections in Lebanon, Egypt and Morocco, and has taken part into the Tunisian human rights’ movement that has led to improvements in the Tunisian Constitution, but they do not have a string capacity in terms of gender analysis and resources and also no large resources for media lobbying. All the Lebanese Allies have good connections with women’s coalitions.
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CHAPTER FIVE: LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Project Implementation

5.1.1 Patriarchal ideology, tribal and sectarian systems and women’s participation in decision-making

Women’s participation in decision making in the various spheres of life has not been adequately achieved.

The most evident output that emerges from this Baseline Study, is that the ideology of “honor and shame” that poses the main limitations to women’s enjoyment of their rights in all the spheres of their lives- from the private to the social, from the economic to the political- is paramount in all contexts.

Even among all the most liberal Change Makers, Allies and men and women from the communities who have been addressed through this study, even when many legal and economic obstacles to the achievement of women’s rights have been removed, the statement “Women should take care of their reputation because for a woman reputation is the most/a very important thing” received an almost unanimous consensus. In all contexts, it was highlighted how ‘honor’ and ‘good reputation’ depend on women’s behavior with men.

Because women’s ‘reputation’ is strongly linked to family’s honor, where the family is main unit of power. The family imposes strong social norms in order to guarantee that it is not violated by external factors and that it is not permeated by exogenous traditions that would endanger the exercise of the authority that is conventionally held by the men of the family. The reputation of a family, tribe, neighborhood, town, or, in some cases, political factions, is dramatically linked to the behavior of its women, especially the young and unmarried. In these contexts, women’s behavior is mainly seen as related to their sexuality and reproductive power. Within the powerful social segment of the family, appropriate women’s behaviors guarantees the originality of kinship and social identity; the control of women’s reproductive power is essential to ensure life and kinship’s continuity, the latter being often a matter of political, economic and tribal interests controlled by men. Women’s behavior embodies the family’s honor and vice versa, thus protecting women’s bodies means protecting family’s honor. The women themselves often consciously accept these norms and behaviors to one or another extent.
Tribal systems in Middle East are commonly informed by a patriarchal ideology, which recognizes men as holders and guardians of power and honor and relegates women’s role within the house and private spheres, thus very much limiting their social and political representation and participation, also at the community level. Patriarchal ideology is thus strictly interconnected to tribal and sectarian male-dominated power systems. It is used as a tool to maintain power in the hands of tribal and sectarian male-dominated groups who use it to mobilize and manipulate at moments of power struggle or when a group’s dominance is put into question.

In these contexts, religion is often used to support these male-dominated systems. The use of women’s bodies in conflicts for power based on identity belonging on a controversial “culture of honor” is after all critically visible in the most recent events in the Middle East where women are tortured, raped and killed as a means to terrorize families and communities. Because ideologies have the power of creating and reinforcing very concrete situations on the ground, the norms imposed on women, which are part of the ‘honor’ ideology, have very powerful consequences on women’s likelihood to decide on issues related to their bodies and lives in the private, social, economic and political spheres, children they want to have, whom they want to marry, the people they want to meet, the opportunity to work, their inheritance rights and their political participation.

5.1.2 The struggle for change in Lebanon

In this Middle Eastern context, women and civil society organizations in Lebanon have attempted to create improvements in order to guarantee the full enjoyment of rights for women and have achieved some changes in legislation as well as advancements in education and the economic sphere; nevertheless, these have not widely translated into real changes in women’s participation to the decision-making sphere.

Some pieces of research (such as The World Bank, 2013, Opening Doors. Gender Equality and Development in Middle East and North Africa), have highlighted how in the Middle East context, even when some obstacles have been removed, patriarchal ideology, strictly interconnected to tribal and sectarian political/power systems, remain dominant and reinforces women’s exclusion from the decision-making in the private and the public spheres.

In Lebanon, only legislations that do not upset the religious system can pass (for example the law on GBV was approved in terms of a Family Law, while the Nationality Law was turned down because it can affect the sectarian system and disturb its balance). In addition, changes in women’s educational and economic status, have not really led to an increased participation in decision-making especially in the political sphere. Women remain strongly limited by the ideology of ‘honor and shame’.
So while improvements in legislation, in educational and economic status, in protection systems, have certainly to keep happening, also changes in ideologies, in attitudes, in women’s confidence and in daily practices have to be brought about.

### 5.1.3 The LANA project ToC

The LANA project (ToC) aims at changing women and men from within themselves and to empower them to bring about radical changes in society.

In order to do so, the first phase (2 years) of the LANA project aims at challenging this situation by adopting an approach that focuses on individual gradual changes in attitudes, women’s confidence and in Change Makers and allies’ capacity. These changes will be transmitted to other individuals through a kind of ‘snow-ball’ effect, in a way that should lead to the creation of a platform/network of people, united in coalition, who will, in a second phase, be able to create a movement able to bring about changes in women’s participation.

The steps envisaged in the first phase are:

- **a)** Building a basis of Change Makers men and women, with increasing positive attitudes, self-confidence (only women), increased ability in engagement and actions and increased gender advocacy capacity (Results 2 and 3 and related activities)
- **b)** Involving a large number of men and women from the communities and supporting them in increasing their interest or support for women’s political participation, and improve women’s self-assessment of their role (Result 1, Specific Objective and related activities)
- **c)** Involving large numbers of stakeholders and building an alliance including Change Makers (Result 3 and related activities). In particular:
  - Continue to identify relevant opinion formers and decision makers (Opponents, Targeted Stakeholders and Allies)
  - improve the Allies and Targeted Stakeholders’ attitudes
  - increase Change Makers and Allies gender advocacy capacities
  - Build an alliance between Change Makers and Allies
  - Manage the Opponents

It is evident that it will not be possible to implement these activities and achieving these results, without facing and questioning, at some point, patriarchal ideology first, and its interconnectedness with tribal and sectarian power systems, then, as a fundamental factor of women’s exclusion from decision-making. It is very possible that this will create a backlash that will have to be accurately managed by the supporters of women’s rights.
In this conclusion, we highlight the main aspects that define LANA project’s stakeholders position in relation to women’s decision-making in Lebanon at this moment in time and we provide some recommendations that could support the process of planning activities and choosing implementation strategies while taking into account both the context in which the LANA Project will be implemented and its specific Theory of Change.

5.1.4 Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Lebanon
Lebanon is characterized by the striking contrast between the noticeable progress done by women in many spheres of life, and the permanence and pervasiveness of sectarian power structures and patriarchal ideology, which hamper women’s participation in decision-making especially in the public and political spheres (Overall Objectives Indicators). This Baseline Study shows how all Change Makers, men and women Community Members as well as stakeholders who were met are deeply affected by this system and, if change has to happen, they need to be supported in facing the controversial issues at the basis of this situation.

5.2 Women Change Makers and Allies
In this context, women Change Makers have high levels of education and employment (Chapter 3) and a quite good control over their lives, and show high levels of positive attitudes, confidence (Result 1 Indicator 1), engagement and actions (Specific Objective Indicator 3) and good gender advocacy capacity (Result 3 Indicator 1), while at the same time have strong awareness that their participation in the political sphere is strongly limited by the existing power structures and associated ideologies. In relation to this last point, it is interesting to point out the number of women Change Makers who refused to answer the question on religious belonging (Chapter 3).

As in the case of the targeted Lebanese women, representatives of the 6 Allies and 1 Targeted Stakeholder surveyed in this Baseline study, seem to be very aware of the mechanisms at the basis of women’s discrimination in Lebanon and to have very positive attitudes towards increased women’s decision-making in all spheres of life and also the weaknesses within the women movement (differences in strategies, competition for funding etc.). The 5 surveyed Allies, furthermore, seem to have quite good gender advocacy capacity, but they would need support in identifying better / new strategies to deal especially with decision-makers. However, it should be pointed out, that a stronger effort should be made to select more appropriate type and number of Allies in Lebanon. (Result 3 indicators).

5.2.1 Recommendations:
• Keep recruiting women Change Makers by using the selection criteria provided by the project (women from various project locations, those who have some experience / interest in community activities and gender issues, etc.). There is also a possibility to slightly increase the number of men involved (keeping in mind that women outnumber men in Lebanon).
• Identify the specific needs for capacity building for individual Change Makers and Allies, especially in terms of strategy identification and coalition work.
• Keep widening the range of Allies and Targeted Stakeholders (see also below)
• Identify and contribute to filling specific capacity gaps (see also below)

Furthermore, it seems that in Lebanon, those who should be the major agents of change in the LANA project, women Change Makers and Allies are very ‘mature’ in relation to the analysis and understanding of the context in which they live in. No specific strong capacity building and awareness sessions are thus required with these subjects. Both women Change Makers and Allies seem to be very ready to directly tackle and discuss:
- The profoundest and most controversial issues that pose as the main challenges that restrain women’s participation into the political life,
- The role of sectarianism and patriarchy and how these impact the unity of women’s rights movement,
- Strategic issues (confrontational / non-confrontational approach towards religious/political opponents),
- Practical issues that would provide effective strategies for their work and minimize negative competition for funds.

5.3 Women from the community
In Lebanon, targeted women Community Members, have good levels - slightly lower than women Lebanese Change Makers- of education and employment (see Chapter 3) and a quite good control over their lives; they can self-assess positively their role in decision-making in various spheres of lives, and at the same time, they do not hesitate to identify the strong control that is imposed on them, in the public sphere, through the issue of ‘reputation’ (Specific Objective Indicator 1). They relate their quite low interest in political participation in the political sphere, to the limitations imposed by existing power structures that exclude them from participation (Result 1 Indicator 2).

It has to be added, that initially, women Community Members were chosen with characteristics a bit too similar to those of the Change Makers (especially in terms of interest in activism and gender issues), but it seems that this tendency has been slightly corrected in the identification of all the final community women surveyed.
5.3.1 **Recommendations:**
- Continue selecting them from among women who do not already have big familiarity with gender issues and advocacy activities, thus with characteristics different than those of the Change Makers’ especially concerning social activism and gender sensitivity (that is different then what was done at the beginning).
- Provide some basic gender awareness training especially to those who have never or only lightly been exposed to related topics.
- Carry out a need assessment to identify specific advocacy capacity building needs.

5.4 **Men Change Makers and Men Community Members**

Lebanese men Change Makers and men Community Members, show some substantial resistance in their attitudes to women’s increased decision making in various spheres of life, especially in the political sphere. This resistance is basically rooted in religion and tradition (Result 1 Indicator 1). Nevertheless, they show some good levels of engagement at community level, and also in the political sphere (actually more than community women) (Specific Objective Indicator 3); they have some good understanding of gender concepts and women’s rights, they positively assess their advocacy capacity but with some weaknesses in some specific areas such as strategic planning and building connections with women’s coalitions (Result 3 Indicator 1).

5.4.1 **Recommendations**

The AT recommends providing substantial in terms of awareness and capacity building on gender concepts, women’s rights, women political participation, mobilization with men Change Makers and men Community Members before being able to tackle and discuss the root causes of discrimination against women’s (ideology and powers structures).

Specific capacity needs assessments should be carried in order to identify their specific weakness in terms of advocacy skills.

5.5 **Stakeholders**

As explained in Chapters 2 and 3, the stakeholders surveyed in these Baseline study have been fewer than planned, nevertheless, some basic findings can be summarized. As expected, the attitudes of 6 Allies and 1 Targeted Stakeholder examined in this survey, towards women’s decision making in various spheres, including the political sphere, were all very positive, also due to the fact that these are women’s and human rights organizations and women’s sections of political parties (Result 2 Indicator 3).

The surveyed 3 national and 1 regional Allies in Lebanon also showed good capacity in terms of gender advocacy, with some gaps that could be better identified and filled during project implementation (Result 3 Indicator 1).
Opponents are mainly found in radical religious political parties as also highlighted in the Risk Assessment (Chapter 5).

5.5.1 Recommendations:

- Keep expanding the identification of stakeholders, in more different areas of society (exploring for example syndicates etc. - see Chapter 3 and Stakeholder – Database Tools 3, 4 and 5);
- Substantially involve the identified Allies and targeted stakeholders in project activities while identifying and providing support on specific capacity building needs.
- Discuss and identify (confrontational or non-confrontational) strategies to deal with the main opponents.
ANNEXES
ANNEX 1 – TOR FOR LANA BASELINE STUDY
1. BACKGROUND:
The proposed Phase 1 initiative (two years) is part of a longer term five year initiative aimed at bringing about change in the lives of women across Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon.

The phase I of the project is intended to address the focal problem identified: “increasing level of women’s disempowerment and lack of participation in social, economic and political spheres” and in particular the first three identified root causes: 1) Perception of women’s role; 2) Power and control and 3) Governance systems. During phase I, the project will focus on building a base of men and women change-makers, from diverse backgrounds, working in their communities to raise awareness of gender roles and women’s political participation thus driving change one individual at a time; and increase women’s political participation by bringing men and women together and empowering them to advocate for increased women’s political participation. The concept of Change Makers is centred on recruiting women and men who believe in gender equality and equal power relations. They are provided with educational materials and simple messages and in turn, they start to change others and recruit more Change Makers who would carry on the same mission, multiplying the impact of the project.

Oxfam believes a combination of factors coalesce to strengthen women’s position to advocate for their rights and play an active role in the development of their countries. This includes strong, cohesive networks that allow a diversity of women to raise their voices collectively; training and mentoring that enable women to increase their skills and confidence to participate in and influence governance systems and processes; will to transform discriminatory attitudes, values and behaviors that subordinate and marginalize women; accountable states able to ensure gender equality; and inclusive civil society organizations that respond to the needs of grassroots communities, with strong links between local and national CSOs.

Oxfam recognizes four broad spheres that influence women’s opportunities to participate in decision making including:
• The personal (a woman’s personal capacity, confidence and context have a strong influence on her capacity to act and be heard);
• The political (includes participation in public and traditional decision-making structures and processes and access to leaders who can influence change);
• The social (includes norms and attitudes as upheld by the media or cultural institutions as well as civil society organizations, particularly women’s organizations, which provide women with a platform or strengthen their capacity to have their voices heard);
• The economic (gendered norms and responsibilities for housework and care work drastically reduce women’s access to paid work and makes them more dependent on men and reduces their capacity to get organized and participate in decision-making structures and processes).

The project will adopt Asia We Can campaign methodology. This approach is based on two interlinked models of change. The first one pertains to the process of attitude-belief-practice change among individuals and is based on the ‘Stages of Change theory’ developed by psychologists Prochaska and DiClemente in 1982 and refined in 1992. This psychological theory of change has been further adapted by women’s rights interventions in Uganda (Raising Voices) and South Asia (We Can End All Violence against Women campaign).

Individual Attitude, Beliefs and Practice Change

So, what is different about this approach?

a. A positive approach
   • It is simple and engaging
   • It is a positive driving force
   • The message is ‘Change is possible and desirable’
   • It reflects ownership
• It reflects a move from individual to collective action
b. A full circle approach (see figure above)
• Engages people from all walks of life
• Engages both women and men
• Engages policy makers as well as ordinary women and men
• Intervenes at every stage of personal change
c. Scale and outreach through an Inverse Pyramid
• The approach is about achieving scale, directly reaching out to a large number of people and triggering change (unless a large number of people are changing, there will not be societal change) e.g. South Asia campaign mobilized 5 million Change Makers.
• Those directly engaged by the project then further reach out to a smaller number, thus making the total outreach very large. For e.g. in South Asia campaign each change maker talked to 10 people within their sphere of influence, thus making the total outreach 50 million
• The outreach needs to be spread across a wide cross section of the society
• The approach focuses on concrete changes in actions and behavior rather than just stopping at awareness creation. The approach moves from personal changes to collective actions and to changes in institutions
d. Space for Individual expression of change
• The onus of change is on individual
• Individual has the responsibility and control over the type of change and pace of change
• As a result, the change is not prescribed by the project
• There is a wide diversity in the type of changes that individuals make
e. Interactive Communication and Learning Materials
• The project relies on centrally developed communication material to reach out the messages without any dilution or misinterpretation in handing it down through stakeholders
• The communication materials are not prescriptive
• The material is designed to trigger analysis of the situation and a need to change among individuals, leaving them to arrive at a decision to change and the type of change that they would like to make
• Material is based on everyday lived experiences of women and men and unpacks complex concepts like justice, violence, equality, control and discrimination through these lived realities
f. Diverse alliance, flexible alliance structure
• The alliance comprises a large number of organizations and institutions with an outreach amongst a wide cross section of the society. The alliance includes traditional development actors like NGOs as well as non-traditional actors like schools, corporations, syndicates, unions, clubs and other groups
2. PROJECT OUTLINES:

Overall Goal (5 years approach): Women and men reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region.

Specific Objective (2 years project): Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere.

Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation.

Result 3: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and key stakeholders through joint learning and actions.

(Please refer to detailed Logframe in Annex 1)

Project implementing partners

The project will be implemented with 3 partners, one in each country:

- Arab Renaissance for Democracy and Development-Legal Aid (Jordan)
- Women Empowerment Organization (Northern Iraq in Kurdish Territory)
- ABAAD – Resource Centre for Gender Equality (Lebanon)

Detailed location:

- Iraq: Northern Iraq in Kurdish Territory
- Jordan: Zarqa governorate
- Lebanon: All six governorates i.e. North (Tripoli), South (Sidon), Beqaa (Zahleh), Beirut (Beirut), Mount Lebanon (Baabda) and Nabatiye.

Targeted Beneficiaries and targeted groups

Direct and indirect beneficiaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direct tier 1 (men and women): Change Makers</th>
<th>Direct tier 2 (men and women): Change Makers</th>
<th>Indirect: Men and Women from the communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total per year</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total (2 years)</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>22,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is expected that most of or all changes makers for Direct tier 1 Change Makers for year 1 (total of 360) will be identified by the start of the baseline data collection. Other Change Makers will be identified at later stage.

**Target groups**

Target groups will also include sub-national and national authorities, including bar associations, private sector that will be targeted by Change Makers to influence gender equality on issues of importance for women. Women’s organizations at national level will be targeted to join leading community Change Makers in collations to build alliances to target policy makers on issues related to enforcing mechanisms to implement endorsed laws and to promote actual implementation of full citizenship.

Political parties and youth will be targeted to influence their agenda pertaining women’s rights and full citizenship that are currently influenced by political identities based on tribal, sectarian and confessional interests.

**3. PURPOSE OF CONSULTANCY:**

The consultancy aims at implementing the baseline for the project. This baseline aims to provide pre intervention information that will help Oxfam and stakeholders undertake informed decisions on the project direction. The specific objectives are:

- Verify and document pre intervention levels of the project indicators as defined in the logframe through leading and facilitating the participatory project baseline involving key stakeholders
- Document pre intervention levels of the project assumption and risks as identified in the logframe
- Identify (through stakeholders and power mapping) possible project allies and key influential institutions (champions, floaters, blockers) that have influence and power in sharing agenda pertaining to women’s rights in target countries
- Provide initial partners’ capacity assessment
- Provide tested tool for Change Makers capacity assessment and potentially provide initial capacity assessment of Change Makers (if all 360 tiers one Change Makers are identified by data collection time)
- Based on the findings of the baseline and highly considering the project context,
  - Briefly assess/verify the project relevance and outline the project M&E steer.
  - Recommend improvement of project logframe and MEAL system
  - Recommend on possible strategies / actions for greater impact
4. INDICATIVE APPROACH:
The baseline will be designed based on the logframe, indicators and some pre-identified data collection methods and tools that will be adapted for the purpose of the baseline of this programme.

Oxfam is highly expecting the consultant to engage during preparation, planning, implementation and analysis of the baseline with Oxfam staff, partners, allies, Change Makers identified and women and men beneficiaries proportionately as appropriate. In delivering this, Oxfam would like the baseline to include but not limited to the following:

- Targeted beneficiaries (women and men);
- Partners and stakeholders involved in the project at different levels:
  - Implementing partners (ARDD-Legal Aid in Jordan, ABAAD in Lebanon and WEO in Northern Iraq in Kurdish Territory)
  - Identified allies comprised of civil society organization, private and public sector organizations. Most of the allies will be identified by the time of the implementation of the assignment
  - Change Makers: It is expected that at least half of the Change Makers will be identified by the start of the assignment. It is possible (to be confirmed) that all Change Makers are identify by the start of the data collection
  - Civil society organizations, community-based organizations/groups and community leaders, local regional and national policy and decision makers, relevant private sector actors, etc.
  - Oxfam staff involved in and contributing to the project’s implementation e.g. Country and Field teams.

The baseline methods are expecting to include a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.

5. KEY TASKS:
The assignment, as mentioned earlier, involves the participatory preparation and implementation of the project baseline. For the assignment, it is expected that the consultant will consider the need for participation and downward and upward accountability at different levels including communities, partners, Oxfam, donors and other relevant stakeholders.

The following specific tasks are to be carried out:
1. Contact with Oxfam and partners’ teams to ensure:
   o Gathering expectations for the baseline process
   o Reviewing available resources for carrying out the baseline
   o Common understanding on the ToR

2. Desk review of the project’s key documents including but not limited to:
   o Project proposal and logframe
   o Pre-identified data collection tools to be adapted (as used in similar projects such as AMEL, “We Can” campaign, “Raising your Voice” campaign, Oxfam power analysis tools or developed by other organizations....)
   o Other relevant project M&E systems
   o Report from inception workshop
   o Documents relevant to the approach

3. Desk research of key stakeholders and power analysis including document review, internet research and eventually remote key informant interview

4. Review the logframe and when relevant suggest recommendations for improvement and output indicators for key project activities

5. In consultation with Oxfam, partners and allies, develop 1st draft data collection methodology and tools and stakeholders’ database including review and adaptation of pre-identified means of verification and data base models. It is critical that some of the MoV are adapted to each country context

6. Develop in consultation with Oxfam and partners first draft proposal for baseline implementation (in English) including:

   5.1. Proposed indicators to be measured at the baseline: Review of the logframe indicators and recommendations for additional outputs indicators if relevant
   5.2. For each indicator, suggested data collection methods, tool and sampling strategy
   5.3. For stakeholders and power analysis, suggested method, tools and sample including suggested data base and list of stakeholders identified during desk review
   5.4. Suggested capacity assessment tool and method for partners and Change Makers
   5.5. Field implementation plan including specificities for each country
   5.6. Tools and template for analysis and reporting
   5.7. Data entry and analysis plan
7. Translate relevant tools in Arabic, (Kurdish translation will be done by WEO colleagues) implement field test of tools and methods suggested and collect feedback from Oxfam, key partners’ staff, allies and when possible Change Makers

8. Review and finalize proposal for baseline implementation based on feedback collected and field test findings
   7.1. Final agreed indicators to be included in the baseline English
   7.2. For each indicator, agreed data collection methods and tool, sampling strategy and guidance notes. Tools and guidance notes should be provided in both English and Arabic.
   7.3. Final method, tools, database and sample for stakeholders and power analysis. English
   7.4. Final capacity assessment tools and methods for partners and Change Makers both in English and Arabic
   7.5. Final field implementation plan with protocols for the enumerators and supervisors including specificities for each country English
   7.6. Field manual for enumerators. (both in English and Arabic)
   7.7. Tools and template for analysis and reporting (both in English and Arabic)
   7.8. Data entry and analysis plan English

9. Recruit and train the enumerators

10. Implement the baseline including quantitative and qualitative data collection, entry, analysis and quality control. All data must be disaggregated per gender and targeted locations and descriptive analysis statistic and analysis of significant differences and correlation must be provided.

11. Render first draft baseline report to Oxfam and partners for comments:

12. Finalize the baseline report within a week of receiving comments.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS:
   • Inception report/ First draft proposal for the implementation of baseline as described in task 5
   • Final proposal for the implementation of baseline as described in task 7 (please refer to detailed plan for language specificities)
   • A draft report of the baseline. The feedback will be provided within one (1) week after the submission of the draft report in English. The report will be of maximum 50 pages and be structured as follow (Details of the report outlines will be shared and discussed with the consultant upon contracting)
     - Title
     - Contents
     - List of acronyms
     - Executive summary
o Introduction and background/Context
o Objectives key tasks of assignments
o Assignment performance and key outputs
  - Project description and baseline indicators,
  - Baseline methodology, including sampling strategy (specifics on the design, methodology, and sample size calculations)
  - Limitations of the study
  - Baseline findings against the baseline indicators, risks, assumption, and capacity assessment. Presentation of the findings should include narrative and tables, using descriptive and statistics as well as analysis of the results
  - Stakeholders and power mapping
o Indicator Tracking Table
o Recommendations on the indicators, MEAL strategy and programme intervention;
o Appendix includes at least:
  - For each indicator, agreed data collection methods and tool, sampling strategy and guidance notes. Tools and guidance notes should be provided in both English and Arabic.
  - Final method, tools, database and sample for stakeholders and power analysis. English
  - Final capacity assessment tools and methods for partners and Change Makers both in English and Arabic
  - Final field implementation plan with protocols for the enumerators and supervisors including specificities for each country English
  - Field manual for enumerators (both in English and Arabic)
  - Tools and template for analysis and reporting (both in English and Arabic)
  - Data entry and analysis plan English
  - List of documents consulted
  - Lists of Oxfam team and stakeholders’ representatives discussed/consulted throughout the assignment
• Final Project Baseline Report (in English). The final report will be produced in one week (7 days) following date of submission of comments. It will include changes/modifications, agreed between Oxfam, partners and the consultant.

7. TIMELINE:
Oxfam is expecting the completion of the consultancy tasks as described in this ToR over a maximum period of 2 months starting early April and ending end of May 2014 latest. Applicants are kindly requested to indicate in their offers the actual required number of days versus team size involved and the financial rates.
8. TEAM COMPOSITION:
Upon the conclusion of an open and competitive bidding process, Oxfam will select and commission a technically qualified independent Consultant/Consultancy Firm with an efficient and effective team composition taking into consideration the social, cultural, environmental and political/security issues.

9. GOVERNANCE & MANAGEMENT OF THE BASELINE SURVEY:
- The Consultant will directly report to the Lana programme manager
- The Consultant will work closely and in consultation with Oxfam and partners project teams in Lebanon, Jordan and Northern Iraq in Kurdish Territory.

10. BUDGET:
- The budget for this task is of maximum 45,000 USD including all type of expenses (travel, per-diem, transportation, calls, taxes etc.).
- Payment will be done in two instalments: 25% upon contract signature and 75% upon approval of the final report by Oxfam.

11. CONSULTANT PROFILE
The ideal consultant will have at least 7-10 years of relevant experience. The consultant should have the following skills and competencies:
- Proven record in the development and implementation of robust baseline for women empowerment and governance programmes in the NGO sector.
- Good knowledge and extensive practice applying participatory approaches and qualitative methods to monitoring and evaluation.
- Good understanding of gender justice work and method for assessing changes related to the active participation and women leadership.
- Experience of integrating gender dynamics within participatory data collection.
- Experience in assessing capacities in particular related to women participation and leadership.
- Relevant geographical experience in the Middle East, ideally including previous work in Jordan, Lebanon and Northern Iraq in Kurdish Territory and familiar with women reality in the Middle East.
- Ability to communicate fluently in English and Arabic and write reports in English.
- S/he is expected to propose efficient and effective team composition taking into consideration the social, cultural, environmental and political/security issues. Team of senior /junior consultant and local/international consultant can be an asset.
- Excellent verbal/written communication skills and strong report writing skills in English.
- Ability to work with a diverse team and under pressure to produce agreed deliverables in a timely manner.
- The consultant must be collaborative, willing to share thoughts, ideas, and make constructive criticism.

After reviewing applications, Oxfam reserves the right to suggest teaming up consultants.
12 EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EOI):
Oxfam invites the submission of an EOI from an organization or individual with the experience and skills described above. The EOI must include:

a) A cover letter of no more than 1 page introducing the consultant/organization and how the skills and competencies described above are met, with concrete examples (Organization profile outlining similar experience including type of task, employer, project title, location, achieved outputs). The cover letter should also reflect the number of days to complete the assignment and total financial offer (cost). The cover letter should also indicate consultants’ availability for the proposed period.

b) An outline of no more than 5 pages of the proposed process and key considerations including:

   a. Key considerations for the baseline
   b. Proposed outline methodology for the baseline
   c. Proposed timeframe and team size
   d. Detailed financial offer / costs with requested terms of payment. It is expected that the financial offer would include a primary budget breakdown of costs (fees, travel, accommodation, taxes...etc).

c) Team composition, management arrangements, CV and detailed work plan of proposed team members including contactable referees

d) One example of a report from previous similar assignment in the MENA region (preferably in one of the countries of assignment).

Period of validity:
The Expression of Interest shall be valid for a period of minimum 60 days, starting from the submission date.

13 OTHER TERMS:
1. Notice of Non-Binding Solicitation.
   Oxfam reserves the right to reject any and all bids received in response to this solicitation, and is in no way bound to accept any proposal. We additionally reserve the right to negotiate the substance of the finalists’ proposals, as well as the option of accepting partial components of a proposal if appropriate. Quantities are estimates only at this time and will be subject to change.
2. Confidentiality
   All information provided as part of this solicitation is considered confidential. In the event that any information is inappropriately released, Oxfam will seek appropriate remedies as allowed. Proposals, discussions, and all information received in response to this solicitation will be held as strictly confidential, except as otherwise noted.

3. Notification
   Prior to the expiration of the validity of the proposal, Oxfam shall notify the successful company that submitted the highest scoring proposal in writing and will invite for contract negotiations. Oxfam reserves the right to invite the second ranking company for parallel negotiations.

4. Right to Final Negotiations
   Oxfam reserves the option to negotiate on the final costs, and final scope of work, and also reserves the option to limit or include third parties at Oxfam’s sole and full discretion in such negotiations. Upon failure to reach agreement on the contents of the contract as stipulated in this document, Oxfam has the right to terminate the negotiations and invite the next-best rated company for negotiations.

5. Communication
   All communication regarding this solicitation shall be directed to appropriate parties at Oxfam. Contacting third parties involved in the project, the review panel, or any other party may be considered a conflict of interest, and could result in disqualification of the proposal.

6. Acceptance
   Award of a proposal does not imply acceptance of its terms and conditions. Oxfam reserves the option to negotiate on the final terms and conditions.

(Annex 1= Project Logframe)

Please submit the EOI and requested documents (as mentioned above) by 10 March 2014, addressing to: lebanonjobs@oxfam.org.uk quoting the reference code in the subject line of your email.
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INTRODUCTION

The LANA Baseline Methodology presented here, has been prepared on the basis of a) Oxfam ToR for LANA Baseline; b) proposal submitted by the Assessment Team (March and 19 April 2014) and of the feedback received from Oxfam and Partners (see Feedback Table).

This Baseline Methodology includes a number of tools that have been designed to baseline (and thus monitor) different types and levels of changes expected to occur during the implementation of the LANA project – at different levels among the project stakeholders.

Change Makers and Community Members will be baselined, through Tool 1 and Tool 2, in relation to changes in the following areas: attitudes, self-esteem/confidence in relation to decision making in private and public sphere (only women); self-perception of their own role and participation in decision making (only women); interest in their own/women’s participation in political processes, behaviours/practices in relation to decision making in private and public sphere (different questions for men and women).

Targeted Stakeholders and Allies are selected through Tool 3, and baselined, in terms of attitudes and practices on women’s participation and decision-making in the private and public sphere, through Tool 4.

Allies and Change Makers are also baselined in terms of gender and advocacy capacity, respectively through Tool 5 and Tool 1. (Partners’ capacity will be baselined by Oxfam).

The situation of social movements in relation to the gender equity agenda and women’s political participation will be baselined through Tool 5, for allies, Tool 6 for Key NGOs and Academics (including partners). Finally, women rights’ implementation will be baselined through Tool 7. In addition, the risks run by the project will also be baselined (Tool 8).

As it is possible to notice, the types of changes expected to occur during the project, are all in the realm of ‘individual’ and ‘social’ changes, and thus all contain ‘intangible’ and subjective aspects. For this reason, the tools designed for the LANA Baseline Study, are mainly aimed at collecting qualitative data. However, these (mainly) qualitative data will be collected and analyzed through both quantitative (survey, scoring systems, SPSS analysis – Tool 1 and Tool 4) and qualitative (FGDs, semi-structured interviews, desk review – Tool 2, Tool 5, Tool 6 and Tool 7) methods and tools.

Many of the tools have been designed as adaptations of tools made available by Oxfam and partners. In particular, the following documents were consulted, and many of them utilized as ‘starting point’:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT ANALYSED</th>
<th>ESPECIALLY USEFUL PARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANA Project Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA proposal</td>
<td>All (Part 1 Context Analysis on relation polarization political debate / ethnic/religious identity and link with women's situation; Part 2, on project methodology and strategy; Part 3, on Risk Analysis; Part 4, on project ToC; Part 5, on MEAL system; Part 6, on main stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Log Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA partners contact info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Inception Workshop documents (February 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Inception Workshop document on clarifying the ToC</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA MEAL intro slides</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Can / Raising Her Voice slides</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E documents from similar projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 2 – List of Indicators to be measured at baseline (used as model for Indicator Guidelines Table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 2 – FGD and scoring exercise on Participation in political processes (used for definition of political participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 3 – Adapted Transparency and Participation Tool (used as model for allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 4 – Opinion Formers Attitude Survey (used as model for Stakeholder Questionnaire – LANA Baseline Tool 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Development Programme (EDP) - Baseline Survey (Emily)</td>
<td>On areas of decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Evaluation of Uganda Raising Her Voice Project (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Report ‘Humanas’ (Chile, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative Methods to Assess Women Leadership (2010,</td>
<td>For allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Women’s Learning Partnership-WLP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner and Oxfam GB assessment to prepare for funding agreement between</td>
<td>Step 4 – Scoring Matrix LANA Baseline - for allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB and…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Assessment for partners ‘Progressio’</td>
<td>Sheet 2 on commitment and capacity / Sheet 3 scoring table (for allies capacity assessment – For allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Capacity Assessment Tool (Oxfam)</td>
<td>Definition of Champion, Floater and Blocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Analysis Map (Oxfam)</td>
<td>Definition of Champion, Floater and Blocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Analysis: In depth. Tips for doing a Power Analysis</td>
<td>On dimensions of power etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Analysis &amp; Power Mapping (Oxfam, slides, by Richard English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL framework and plan (Oxfam format)</td>
<td>To be adapted/filled for LANA project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ABAAD (Lebanon)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANA budget for ABAAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular on ABAAD’s creation (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD’s Summary Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner assessment to prepare for funding agreement between Oxfam GB and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Skype Call Oxfam-ABAAD (13/3/2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD email - answers to Baseline AT’s questions (15/04/2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD list of primary stakeholders for LANA project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD-Resource Centre for Gender Equality, World Vision, Heterogeneous</td>
<td>Useful for hints on locally meaningful issues about gender equity (for definition of locally meaningful indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trends…and one outcome. Field study to monitor the attitudes and trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of women and men towards women’s rights in Lebanon. By Dr. Zaheer Hatab,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut, September 2013 (in Arabic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ARDD-LA (Jordan)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANA budget for ARDD-LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA in Jordan – PPT presentation (assessment by ARDD-LA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAAD-Resource Centre for Gender Equality, World Vision, Heterogeneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trends…and one outcome. Field study to monitor the attitudes and trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of women and men towards women’s rights in Lebanon. By Dr. Zaheer Hatab,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut, September 2013 (in Arabic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, initial contacts – through Skype interviews - have been taken with main project partners, in order to get and provide clarifications on the project, on the documentation needed, on baseline expectations and planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact person(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2014</td>
<td>OXFAM GB Lebanon</td>
<td>Sarah Barakat (Programme Manager), Jessica Elias (LANA Project officer), Yathrib Elzein (Programme Quality Coordinator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2014</td>
<td>ABAAD Lebanon</td>
<td>Roula El Masri (Liaison Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2014</td>
<td>ARDD-LA Jordan</td>
<td>Adel Daboobi (Project Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2014</td>
<td>WEO Iraq (Kurdistan)</td>
<td>Jwan Pishtewan (Project Manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) LOGICAL FRAMEWORK REVIEW

As requested in the ToR for this baseline, the project Log Frame has been reviewed, during the Desk Review, against secondary data and analyses about the context, and especially against the Theory of Change at the basis of the project and against similar projects’ M&E plans.

During the Log Frame review, the following questions were asked: Is the project Theory of Change clear? Is it correctly represented in the Log Frame? Are Results and Specific Objective correctly formulated? Are the Indicators coherent with what they want to measure? Are the Means of Verification efficient and effective? What are the Output Indicators? What are the most appropriate MoV to collect data about Output Indicators?

Theory of Change

From the documents that the Assessment Team has received (mainly project Proposal and Regional Inception Workshop Program), it is evident that a great deal of time and space have been dedicated by Oxfam and partners to discuss, refine and internalize the Theory of Change at basis of the project. This is, in fact, clear and well spelled out. The ToC of the LANA project is represented by is 2 diagrams.

Diagram 1, describes the process of change that each project stakeholders should be accompanied through, the activities that can be carried out in order to bring about change and the expected changes. The process envisages individual incremental shifts, from perception to action in both the private and the public sphere.

Diagram 1

Diagram 2 translates this process of change, as it should happen in the LANA project (first 2 years) and for all its stakeholders, in terms of project final Results and Specific Objective.
Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq enjoy increased participation in decision-making within the private and public sphere (SO)

Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation (R1)

Change makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation (R2)

Improved capacity and cooperation of NGOs (i.e. project partners) and key stakeholders that will allow for more relevant and effective work on improving women’s political participation (R3)

Log Frame Review
After an in-depth examination of the Log Frame, the Based the Assessment Team’s has made the following considerations about the LANA Project’s Log Frame:

IV. The Log Frame Results and Specific Objective correctly reflects the Theory of Change, and cover all the changes that are expected to happen in the main project stakeholders (Change Makers, Communities, Partners and Allies, Opinion Formers and Decision Makers);

V. Nevertheless, at times, Results and Indicators are quite ‘dense’, many different types of changes are collapsed in the same Result and/or Indicator, so that it is not always possible to distinguish between the different steps through which change is expected to happen. Even if we have not modified the Log Frame, in the Indicators Guidelines we have clarified and/or broken down the formulation of some of the Indicators, as follows:

a. Specific Objective – Indicator 1: ‘perception of women...’ refers to women’s self-perception of their own participation at different levels (private and public sphere);
b. Specific Objective – Indicator 3: refers to Change Makers reporting about their own engagement and their own actions;
c. Result 1 – Indicator 1:
   • “positive changes in their perception of gender roles” has been detailed in terms of “attitudes” but also in terms of “confidence to engage with the issue”. Confidence and self-esteem have been considered an important element to be looked at, in the process of change – and especially important for Change Makers.
   • “report actions’ has been deleted as a repetition of Indicator 3 of the Specific Objective
d. Result 1 – Indicator 2 – percentage of non-Change Makers who ‘respond positively on issues related to women’s participation’, is understood in terms of “have increased their interest in participating in political processes (understood as interest in practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO, participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national)”

e. In Result 2 – Indicator 3 – show improvement in their “perception” has been clarified in terms of improvement in ‘attitudes’ (towards women’s political participation).

Finally, within the Log Frame, we have simply specified the timing of some of the Indicators, clarified the Means of Verification and in a few cases simply slightly modified the wording to avoid misunderstandings.

PLEASE, NOTE that highlighted Indicators will not be base-lined.
## Specific Objectives

| Indicator 1: Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline |
| Indicator 2: Number of cases that highlight decision-makers and opinion-formers taking an open progressive stand on women’s rights and full citizenship at local and national level by EoP; |
| Indicator 3: By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can: |
| - Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere |
| - Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community; |

## Results

| Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation |
| Indicator 1: Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline; |
| Indicator 2: Number of cases that highlight decision-makers and opinion-formers taking an open progressive stand on women’s rights and full citizenship at local and national level by EoP; |

| Annual reports and indices for Arab states for democracy and human rights watchdogs (baseline and endline - 2 years and 5 years) |
| Survey with a representative sample of women Change Makers and women Community Members (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| FGDs with Change Makers and Community Members (not Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years) |
| Portfolio of evidence comprising opinion polls, media coverage, case studies (endline – 2 years) |
| Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years) |
| Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| FGDs  with  Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years) |
| Indicator 2: Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline; | Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| Indicator 1: Number of joint statements or advocacy initiatives undertaken by the fora at national level compared with advocacy strategy developed by EoP; | Advocacy strategy and Portfolio of comprising case studies, media coverage, record of joint statements etc. (endline – 2 years) |
| Indicator 2: Level of satisfaction of fora’s members in relation to agreed criteria (e.g. effectiveness and representation, women’s leadership, women’s organizations) by EoP | Member feedback, interviews with active members using satisfaction scoring (midterm and endline – 2 years) |
| Indicator 3: Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline; | Opinion formers and decision makers questionnaire (baseline and endline – 2 years) |

| Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation | FGDs with Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
2) INDICATORS GUIDELINES FOR BASELINE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOG FRAME LEVEL</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR DEFINITION AND RATIONALE</th>
<th>UNIT OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>BASELINE DATA COLLECTIO N AND ANALYSIS TOOLS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR BASELINE DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR BASELINE DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective: Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more</td>
<td>Indicator 1: Evidence of improvements to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>“Evidence of “ refers to the set of written documentation - National and Shadow CEDAW Reports, feedback from CEDAW committee, press releases - about CEDAW implementation “Improvements in</td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence (written documentation)</td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence comprising National and Shadow CEDAW Reports, feedback from CEDAW committee, press releases (baseline and endline - 2 years)</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and key stakeholders through joint learning and actions</td>
<td>Indicator 2: Number of joint regional actions on women’s political participation undertaken by partners and alliance members, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks by EoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result 3: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and key stakeholders through joint learning and actions</td>
<td>Indicator 3: Changes in perception of improvement in the baseline (fora) by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with partners and targeted stakeholders (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of ToR and report from exposure visits (endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence comprising record of joint regional statements policy papers, newsletter, website (endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 2: Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics**

Key NGOs and academics (including partners and allies) refer to privileged observers—including partners and allies—who, thanks to their grassroots, political or academic experience, can provide an insight on social movements and their activities.

Social movements' refer to large formal/informal groupings of people mobilized for action around specific social or political issues.

Report increased activity of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women. "Report increased activity of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women" refers to the increased inclusion of the gender equity agenda in the actions by social movements, as compared to baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicator 2:</strong> Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline</th>
<th><strong>TOOL 5: Allies Interviews – Part b) on social movements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key NGOs and academics</strong> (including partners and allies)</td>
<td>Interviews with key NGOs and academics (including partners and targeted stakeholders) at baseline and final evaluation (baseline and endline -2 years and 5 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOOL 7 Desk Review on Women Rights Implementation – Part a)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objective: Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon, and Jordan</th>
<th>Indicator 1: Improved perception of women in targeted communities</th>
<th>Annual reports and indices for Arab states for democracy and human rights watchdogs (baseline and endline – 2 years and 5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making”</td>
<td>Tool 7: Desk Review on Women Rights Implementation – Part b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted women Community Members + Control group (women), Survey with a representative sample of women Community Members –</td>
<td>Tool 5: Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 4 for Stakeholders (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 3 – Round Table with high level stakeholders (both Allies and Change Makers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tool 2: Fieldwork (Interviews) – Part b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese and Iraqi women increased participation in decision-making within the private and public sphere</td>
<td>of their role and decision making by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>decision making” refers to improvements in the way women (non-Change Makers) perceive their own role and participation in decision making at household, community (and national) level, by EoP compared to baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3: By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can:</td>
<td>Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere</td>
<td>“Percentage of Change Makers” refers to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerator: # of women and men Change Makers who can report; Denominator: total # of women and men Change Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Report increased and positive engagement with the issue of women’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community:**

  "Report increased actions to promote gender equality and..." refers to the increase of community and national level - actions in favor of gender equity, women’s participation and leadership, both in the private and public sphere promoted by Change Makers themselves, as reported by them by EoP against the baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1: Percentage of targeted men and women</th>
<th>Change Makers + Control Group (same sample of Change Makers)</th>
<th>Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers</th>
<th>Enumerators (Survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline:** | **Numerator:** # of women and men Change Makers who show positive change  
**Denominator:** total # of women and men Change Makers  
"demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles" refers to the changes in terms of attitudes towards gender roles but also in terms of their self-esteem and confidence to engage with the issue of gender equity, by EoP, against the baseline |
| **as for Community Members** | **Makers** (baseline and endline – 2 years)  
**TOOL 1:** Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members  
**FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, mid-term and endline – 2 years)**  
**TOOL 2:** Change Makers and Community Members FGDs |
| **Indicator 2:** Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP | **Targeted Community Members + Control group**  
"Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers)" refers to  
**Numerator:** # of women and men non Change Makers who show positive changes;  
**Denominator:** total # of women and men non Change Makers  
Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)  
**TOOL 1:** Change Makers and Enumerators (Survey)  
**AT + Fieldwork Assistant (FGDs)** |
| Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women's political participation |
| Indicator 3: Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women's political participation by EoP compared to baseline; |
| “Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers” refers to: Numerator: number of women and men targeted opinion formers and decision makers |
| “show improvement in their perception of women's political participation” refers to positive difference between attitudes towards women's political participation by EoP compared to baseline; |
| Targeted opinion formers and decision makers |
| Opinion formers and decision makers questionnaire (List of targets from partners) (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| AT (Power Analysis) |
| AT – Fieldwork Assistant |
| With high profile Stakeholders (Allies (with Allies, include Tool 5) |
| Enumerators (Tool 4 - Questionnaire for less high profile stakeholders/ |
| AT |

“respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation” refers to positive changes in their interest towards their own/ women’s participation in political processes (such as practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO, participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national) measured by EoP against the baseline; 

Community Members Survey – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members 

FGDs with Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline, mid-term and endline – 2 years) 

TOOL 2: Change Makers and Community Members FGDs 

TOOL 3: Stakeholder Power Assessment (to identify Allies and partners) 

TOOL 6: Key Power Analysts (Power Tool 6)
(understood as women practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO, participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national)” measured by EoP and that measured at baseline, as expressed by targeted opinion formers and decision makers

"Evidence of” refers to refers to the set of oral and written documentation about practices and strategies developed thanks to regional exchanges among partners and targeted key stakeholders (in Fora)

"Targeted key stakeholders” refers to ‘alliance members’ and specifically to allies and Change Makers who, together with partners, take part into regional exchanges

“significant, positive changes in the strategies and/or practices of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3: Change to refer to women’s issues related to women's rights, and against the baseline of their role targeted men and Change Makers</th>
<th>o t h e r t a r g e t e d stakeholders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOOL 4:</strong> Stakeholders Questionnaire (both Allies and other targeted Stakeholders – on attitudes and practices)</td>
<td>allies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of” refers to the set of oral and written documentation about practices and strategies developed thanks to regional exchanges among partners and targeted key stakeholders (in Fora)

**Targeted key stakeholders” refers to ‘alliance members’ and specifically to allies and Change Makers who, together with partners, take part into regional exchanges

“significant, positive changes in the strategies and/or practices of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A l l i e s (including C h a n g e M a k e r s)</th>
<th>P L E A S E , N O T E T h a t a s p e c i f i c c a p a c i t y assessment toll will be prepared by Oxfam for partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with allies (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td><strong>TOOL 5:</strong> A l l i e s Interviews – P a r t a ) c a p a c i t y assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey with C h a n g e M a k e r s

AT – Fieldwork Assistant (together with Tool 4 for Allies)
| Partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning” refers to improved strategies and/or practices – especially in terms of participation into women’s organizations, coalitions and networks - as reported by partners, Change Makers and allies (Fora) by EoP, against the baseline (baseline and endline – 2 years) | Tool 1: Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part b) capacity assessment – for Change Makers only |

**PLEASE NOTE THAT:**

- through Tool 1, all the following aspects will be baselined for both Change Makers and Community Members (not Change Makers): attitudes, self-esteem/confidence (only women), self-perception of their own role and participation in decision making (only women), interest in their own/women’s participation in political processes, behaviors/practices (different questions for men and women) – even if baseline not always requested in the Log Frame

- through Tool 4, not only stakeholders’ attitudes but also stakeholders’ practices will be baselined, even if not requested in the Log Frame

In addition, the risks mentioned in the LF will be also base-lined (Tool 8- Risk Assessment). In order to fill this tool, main partners, allies and key observers will also be interviewed, while being interviewed with Tool 5 and Tool 6.

3) ANNEXES
FEEDBACK TABLE
TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR ENUMERATORS – TOOL 1 AND TOOL 4
TOOL 1: CHANGE MAKERS and COMMUNITY MEMBERS SURVEY - INCLUDING CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR CHANGE MAKERS
- Guidance Notes
- Questionnaire Structure
- Questionnaire
- Guidelines for Enumerators
- Data Entry Sheet

TOOL 2: CHANGE MAKERS and COMMUNITY MEMBERS FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS
- Guidance Notes
- Record Sheet

TOOL 3: STAKEHOLDER POWER ANALYSIS
- Guidance Notes
- Stakeholder Power Assessment Matrix
- Stakeholders Database (for Tool 3, 4 and 5) - Sheet 1

TOOL 4: STAKEHOLDERS QUESTIONNAIRE
- Guidance Notes
- Questionnaire
- Guidelines for Enumerators
- see Tool 3) Stakeholders Database (for Tool 3, 4 and 5) - Sheet 2

TOOL 5: ALLIES INTERVIEWS – INCLUDING CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ALLIES
- Guidance Notes
- Record Sheet
- see Tool 3 > Stakeholders Database (for Tool 3, 4 and 5) - Sheet 3

TOOL 6: INTERVIEWS WITH KEY NGOS AND ACADEMICS (PARTNERS INCLUDED, ALLIES EXCLUDED)
- Guidance Notes
- Record Sheet

TOOL 7: DESK REVIEW ON WOMEN RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION
- Guidance Notes
- Record Sheet

TOOL 8: RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX
- Guidance Notes
- Risk Assessment Matrix
- Record Sheet
ANNEX 3 – REVISED LOG FRAME FROM LANA BASELINE METHODOLOGY
ANNEX 3 – REVISED LOG FRAME FROM LANA BASELINE METHODOLOGY

LOG FRAME AND BASELINED INDICATORS (after Log Frame Review for baseline Methodology – May 2014)

PLEASE, NOTE that that **highlighted** Indicators have not been base-lined. Changes in the Log Frame are in track-changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION LOGIC</th>
<th>OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Goal – 5 year approach</td>
<td><strong>Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region</strong></td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence comprising National and Shadow CEDAW Reports, feedback from CEDAW committee, press releases (baseline and endline – 2 years and 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1: Evidence of improvements to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>Interviews with key NGOs and academics at baseline and final evaluation (baseline and endline - 2 years and 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2: Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>Annual reports and indices for Arab states for democracy and human rights watchdogs (baseline and endline - 2 years and 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3: Improvement in ranking of target countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights, and democracy indices by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1: Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>Survey with a representative sample of women Change Makers and women Community Members (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objectives</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1:</strong> Percentage of targeted men and women (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women's political participation by EoP against the baseline;</td>
<td><strong>Result 1:</strong> Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women's political participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2:</strong> Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women's political participation by EoP against the baseline;</td>
<td><strong>Indicator 2:</strong> Number of cases that highlight decision-makers and opinion-formers taking an open progressive stand on women's rights and full citizenship at local and national level by EoP;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs with Change Makers and Community Members (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence comprising opinion polls, media coverage, case studies (endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td>Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td>FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation

**Indicator 1:** Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline;  

**Indicator 2:** Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline;  

**Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)**  

**FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years)**  

**Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)**  

**FGDs with Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years)**

### Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women's political participation

**Indicator 1:** Number of joint statements or advocacy initiatives undertaken by the fora at national level compared with advocacy strategy developed by EoP;  

**Indicator 2:** Level of satisfaction of fora’s members in relation to agreed criteria (e.g. effectiveness and representation, women’s leadership, women’s organizations) by EoP  

**Indicator 3:** Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline;  

**Advocacy strategy and Portfolio of comprising case studies, media coverage, record of joint statements etc. (endline – 2 years)**  

**Member feedback, interviews with active members using satisfaction scoring (midterm and endline – 2 years)**  

**Opinion formers and decision makers questionnaire (baseline and endline – 2 years)**

### Result 3: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and key stakeholders through joint learning and actions

**Indicator 1:** Evidence of significant, positive changes (against the baseline) in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks:  

**Indicator 2:** Number of joint regional actions on women's political participation undertaken by partners and alliance members, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks by EoP  

**Interviews with partners and targeted stakeholders (baseline and endline – 2 years)**  

**Review of ToR and report from exposure visits (endline – 2 years)**  

**Portfolio of evidence comprising record of joint regional statements policy papers, newsletter, website (endline – 2 years)**
ANNEX 4 – INDICATORS GUIDELINE MATRIX

INDICATORS GUIDELINES MATRIX FOR BASELINE STUDY (REVISED JULY 2014)

Please, note that this is the Indicators Guidelines Matrix included in the LANA baseline Methodology, but with some further specifications that the AT has added in July 2014, following fieldwork (in red).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOG FRAME LEVEL</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR DEFINITION AND RATIONALE</th>
<th>UNIT OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>BASELINE DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS TOOLS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR BASELINE DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR BASELINE DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective: Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region</td>
<td>Indicator 1: Evidence of improvement to the implementation of CEDAW in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>“Evidence of “ refers to the set of written documentation - National and Shadow CEDAW Reports, feedback from CEDAW committee, press releases - about CEDAW implementation</td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence (written documentation)</td>
<td>Portfolio of evidence comprising National and Shadow CEDAW Reports, feedback from CEDAW committee, press releases (baseline and endline – 2 years and 5 years)</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2: Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq report increased activity and impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination</td>
<td>“Key NGOs, women’s organizations and academics” refers to privileged observers – including partners and allies - who, thanks to their grassroots, political or academic experience, can provide an insight on social movements and their activities</td>
<td>Key NGOs and academics (including partners and allies)</td>
<td>Interviews with key NGOs and academics (including partners and targeted stakeholders) at baseline and final evaluation (baseline and endline -2 years and 5 years)</td>
<td>TOOL 5: Allies Interviews – Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3: Improvement in ranking of targeted countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights, and democracy indices, by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>“Improvement in ranking” refers to positive changes in ranking, by EoP, against the baseline</td>
<td>Annual reports and indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOL 6: Key NGOs and Academics Interviews (excluding allies, including partners)</td>
<td>Desks review (academic articles, news reports, blogs etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOL 4: Survey with a sample of women and men – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members men: Q20 (only for women) and Q21 (only for women) and C2 for men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOL 2: Change Members Survey – Part C) for Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOL 1: Change Members – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members Survey with a sample of women and men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Social movements" refer to large formal/informal groupings of people mobilized for action around specific social or political issues

“report increased activity of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women” refers to the increased inclusion of the gender equity agenda in the actions by social movements, as reported by key observers by EoP, against the baseline

“report increased impact of social movements rejecting all forms of discrimination against women” refers to the increased inclusion of the gender equity agenda in the initiatives of opinion formers and decision makers as reported by key observers by EoP, against the baseline

b) on social movements

Annual reports and indices for Arab states for democracy and human rights watchdogs (baseline and endline – 2 years and 5 years)
| **Specific Objective:** Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq enjoy increased participation in decision making within the private and public sphere | **Indicator 1:** Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline | **Targeted women Community Members + in Jordan:**
**Control Group (women)** |
|---|---|---|
| **Percentage of Change Makers**
- Report increased and positive engagement with women’s issues
- **Report increased** |
| “I mproved p erception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making” refers to improvements in the way women (non-Change Makers) perceive their own role and participation in decision making at household, community (and national) level, by EoP compared to baseline |
| **Survey with a representative sample of women Community Members – (baseline and endline – 2 years)** |
| **Evidence of** |
| **Tool 1:** Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part a) – Q24 for women Community Members (+ Control Group – women – only in Jordan) |
| **Tool 2:** Change Makers and Community Members FGDs |
| **NEW** |
| **Tool 3:** Interviews with Community Members |
| **Tool 4:** Questionnaire Stakeholders |
| **Tool 5:** Allies |
| **Tool 6:** Key NGOs and academics |
| **Control Group – only in Jordan** |
| **Enumerators** |
| **Survey with a representative sample of women Community Members – (baseline and endline – 2 years)** |
| **Tool 1:** Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part b) on social or academic observers – including Ally NGOs and academics |
| **Interviews with Community Members** |
| **Questionnaire Stakeholders** |
| **FGDs with women Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline, mid-term and endline – 2 years)** |
| **Change Makers FGDs** |
| **Change Makers + Control Group** |
| **ONLY JORDAN** (same as for Community Members) |
| **Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers** |
| **Enumerators** |

**BASELINE DATA**

**Tools**

**TFOR BASELINE RESPONSIBLE DATA ANALYSIS**

**ACTION**

**REGISTERED**

**RA TIONALE**

**REPORT INCREASED**

**CHANGE MAGNITUDE**

**ENSEMBLE**

**WORKING GROU P**

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**FOR BASELINE**

**REPORT INCREASED**

**CHANGE MAGNITUDE**

**ENSEMBLE**

**WORKING GROU P**

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**FOR BASELINE**
participation in the public and private sphere

- Report increased actions to promote gender equality and women’s participation and leadership in each targeted community;

and positive engagement with the issue of women’s participation” refers to Change Makers’ reflecting on issues related to women’s decision making in the private and public sphere, voicing worries and needs in relation to these issues, participating into various kinds of initiatives supporting women’s participation, either in the private or the public sphere, as reported by themselves by EoP, against the baseline.

“Report increased actions to promote gender equality and ...” refers to the increase of – community and national level - actions in favor of gender equity, women’s participation and leadership, both in the private and public sphere promoted by Change Makers themselves, as reported by them by EoP against the baseline.

| Indicator 1: Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers |
| Change Makers + Control Group (same as for Community Members) |
| Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| Enumerators (Survey) |
| AT + Fieldwork Assistant (FGDs) |

Members Survey – Part C) for Change Makers only - QUESTIONS C1 and C2 for men and women Change Makers

Findings from FGDs (Tool 2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Objective:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Methodology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rise to gender equality and women’s participation in political processes</td>
<td><strong>TOOL 1: Change Makers and Community Members Survey</strong> – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members <strong>Q20 (for men and women) and Q21 (only for women)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for both Change Makers and Community Members</td>
<td><strong>FGDs with Change Makers</strong> (baseline, midterm and endline – 2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstration of positive changes in their perception of gender roles</td>
<td><strong>TOOL 2: Change Makers and Community Members FGDs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“demonstrates positive changes in their perception of gender roles” refers to the changes in terms of attitudes towards gender roles but also in terms of their self-esteem and confidence to engage with the issue of gender equity, by EoP, against the baseline</td>
<td><strong>Indicator 2:</strong> Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“responds positively on issues related to women’s political participation” refers to positive changes in their interest towards their own women’s participation in political processes (such as practicing right to vote, taking part in political</td>
<td><strong>Targeted Community Members + In Jordan: Control group (men / women)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers</strong> (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOOL 1: Change Makers and Community Members Survey</strong> – Part a) for both Change Makers and Community Members <strong>women: Q25</strong> - <strong>Community Members men: Q26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FGDs with Community Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enumerators (Survey)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation</td>
<td>Indicator 3: Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers “show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation” refers to positive difference between attitudes towards women’s political participation (understood as women practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO, participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national)” measured by EoP and that measured at baseline, as expressed by targeted opinion formers and decision makers – including Allies (excluding Blockers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formers and decision makers</td>
<td>Allies (including Change Makers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Evidence of&quot; refers to the set of oral and written documentation about practices and strategies developed thanks to regional exchanges among partners and targeted key stakeholders (in Fora)</td>
<td>PLEASE, NOTE that partners’ Capacity will be baselined by Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Targeted key stakeholders&quot; refers to ‘alliance members’ and specifically to allies and Change Makers who, together with partners, take part into regional exchanges</td>
<td>Survey with Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASE, NOTE that partners’ Capacity will be baselined by Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;significant, positive changes in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning” refers to improved strategies and/or practices – especially in terms of participation into women’s organizations, coalitions and networks - as reported by partners, Change Makers and allies (Fora) by EoP, against the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5 – LIST OF ANALYZED DOCUMENTS (DESK REVIEW)
# Annex 5 – List of Analyzed Documents (Desk Review)

LANA Project – Baseline Study - List of Analyzed documents

1) LANA project documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Analyzed</th>
<th>Especially Useful Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANA Project Documents</td>
<td>All (Part 1 Context Analysis on relation polarization political debate / ethnic/ religious identity and link with women's situation; Part 2, on project methodology and strategy; Part 3, on Risk Analysis; Part 4, on project ToC; Part 5, on MEAL system; Part 6, on main stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Log Frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA partners contact info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Inception Workshop documents (February 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA Inception Workshop document on clarifying the ToC</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANA MEAL intro slides</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Can / Raising Her Voice slides</td>
<td>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E documents from similar projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAL – Supporting Women’s Transformative Leadership in Changing Times in ME &amp; NA – Baseline Methodology Design (S. Khayyo, 2013)</td>
<td>Table 2 – List of Indicators to be measured at baseline (used as model for Indicator Guidelines Table) Tool 2 – FGD and scoring exercise on Participation in political processes (used for definition of political participation) Tool 3 – Adapted Transparency and Participation Tool (used as model for allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA Project Documents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Useful for hints on locally meaningful issues about gender equity (for definition of locally meaningful indicators)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA proposal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1</strong> Context Analysis on relation polarization political debate / ethnic / religious identity and link with women’s situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2</strong> project methodology and strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 3</strong> Risk Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 4</strong> project ToC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 5</strong> MEAL system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 6</strong> main stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA Log Frame</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA action plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA partners contact info</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA Inception Workshop documents (February 2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop Agenda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA Inception Workshop document on clarifying the ToC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA MEAL intro slides</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We Can / Raising Her Voice slides</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On methodology, ToC and expected changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2 – List of Indicators to be measured at baseline (used as model for Indicator Guidelines Table)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tool 2 – FGD and scoring exercise on Participation in political processes (used for definition of political participation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tool 3 – Adapted Transparency and Participation Tool (used as model for allies capacity assessment – LANA Baseline Tool 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tool 4 – Opinion Formers Attitude Survey (used as model for Stakeholder Questionnaire – LANA Baseline Tool 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise Development Programme (EDP) - Baseline Survey (Emily)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midterm Evaluation of Uganda Raising Her Voice Project (2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-term Report ‘Humanas’ (Chile, 2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative and Qualitative Methods to Assess Women Leadership (2010, by Women’s Learning Partnership-WLP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner and Oxfam GB assessment to prepare for funding agreement between Oxfam GB and…</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Assessment for partners ‘Progressio’</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Capacity Assessment Tool (Oxfam)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Analysis Map (Oxfam)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Analysis: In depth. Tips for doing a Power Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Analysis &amp; Power Mapping (Oxfam, slides, by Richard English)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAL framework and plan (Oxfam format)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ABAAD (Lebanon)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANA budget for ABAAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circular on ABAAD’s creation (2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABAAD’s Summary Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner assessment to prepare for funding agreement between Oxfam GB and ABAAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes Skype Call Oxfam-ABAAD (13/3/2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABAAD email - answers to Baseline AT’s questions (15/04/2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABAAD list of primary stakeholders for LANA project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABAAD-Resource Centre for Gender Equality, World Vision, Heterogeneous trends…and one outcome. Field study to monitor the attitudes and trends of women and men towards women's rights in Lebanon. By Dr. Zaheer Hatab, Beirut, September 2013 (in Arabic)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) CEDAW and Women’s Rights Reports
CEDAW Country Report Lebanon
http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/reports.htm#1

CEDAW Country Report Jordan
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/cedaws51.htm

CEDAW Country Report Iraq (combined 4th, 5th and 6th)

---

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) requests States parties that ratified it to submit to the Secretary-General a report on all measures that they have adopted to implement the Convention within a year after its entry into force and then at least every four years thereafter or whenever the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) so requests. Source: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/reporting.htm#guidelines
Declarations, Reservations and Objections to CEDAW

Statements by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women

Shadow Reports on CEDAW by Lebanese NGOs Last reports submitted to 40th session:

• CFUWI
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/CommitteeFollowuponWomen.pdf
• KAFA
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/CommitteeFollowuponWomen.pdf
• Association Najdeh et al. (on Palestinian women refugees)
http://www.iwraw-ap.org/resources/pdf/40_shadow_reports/Lebanon_SR_on_Palestinian_refugee_women_English.pdf

Shadow Reports on CEDAW by Jordanian NGOs - Last reports submitted to 51st session:

• National Coalition (AWO, Mosawa et al.)
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/AWO-Mosawa_forthesession_Jordan_CEDAW51.pdf
• Jordanian Women’s Union
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/JordanianCoalitionforthesession.pdf

Shadow Reports on CEDAW by Iraqi NGOs Last reports submitted to 57th session:

• NGO’s Coalition of CEDAW Shadow Report (IWN, RWC, “No to violence Against Women in Kirkuk”)

National Millennium Development Goals Report (Arab Countries)
http://www.arab-hdr.org/mdg/national.aspx

Gender in Arab Millennium Development Goals Reports

UNOG Press Releases: CEDAW, OHCHR, Special Rapporteurs
http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B9C2E/0000CPressReleases?ReadForm&count=10000&expand=15.1&count=10000&unid=355ECD2E45353D1FC1257CBF0024A368#1.15.1
2- Indices by HRs Watchdogs

Gender Statistic Programme-Gender Indicators for the Arab Countries


Social Watch - GEI (Gender Equity Index)

- Lebanon: Arab NGO Network for Development (ANND)
  http://www.socialwatch.org/node/14367
- Jordan: Jordanian Women’s Union
  http://www.socialwatch.org/node/12034
- Iraq: Iraqi Al-Amal Association
  http://www.socialwatch.org/node/12034

UN DATA-Indicators for Women and Men

UN Gender Statistics

UNDP- GII (Gender Inequality Index)
http://www.arab-hdr.org/data/indicators/2012-34.aspx

UNDP-HDI (Human Development Index)

WEF index- The Global Gender Gap Report

World Bank - Gender Equality Data and Statistics
http://datatopics.worldbank.org/gender/country/lebanon

4) Bibliography (academic articles, reports, news, blogs etc.)

ABAAD, 2012, “We Believe...Partners to End Violence Against Women and Girls” – Final Narrative Report, ABAAD, Beirut


LSE – Middle East Centre - http://www.lse.ac.uk/middleEastCentre/home.aspx


Rabar, Ruwayda Mustafah - Blogs by Ruwayda Mustafah Rabar on Iraqi Kurdistan- http://rudaw.net/english/opinion/28052014


The Kurdish Women’s Movement in Iraq, in Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication 4 (2011) 337–353

The World Bank, 2013, Opening Doors. Gender Equality and Development in Middle East and North Africa


Zayani, Mohamed, 2012, Civil Society and Democratic Change in the Arab World: Promises and Impediments, in Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East 2012 Volume 32, Number 3.
# ANNEX 6 – ACTUAL QUALITATIVE FIELDWORK SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEBANON</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Laura Maritano & Antonella Lizambri  
Fieldwork support: Nada Makki and Fatme Zoughbi – CFUWI |  |
| **Sunday 18 May 2014** | **Travel from Rome to Lebanon** |
| **Monday 19 May** | **9-10: planning meeting with Oxfam**  
**10-12: finalization after Tool Testing**  
**14-16: meeting with ABAAD + CFUWI - planning** |
| **Tuesday 20 May** | **9-11.30: Tool 1 & 4 finalization + printing**  
**11.30-14.00: Enumerators Training (only Nada Makki)**  
**14-16.00: Interview with Nada Makki – review Tool 3 // Tool 6 on social Movements // start Tool 8 on Risk Assessment**  
**16-16.30: Security Brief for Oxfam**  
**20-21: Roula al-Masri – Tool 6 on Social Movements** |
| **Wednesday 21 May** | **10-12: FGD – Change Makers - Women**  
**12-14: FGD – Change Makers - Men**  
**14-16: Finish Tool 8 with Nada & Fatme** |
| **Thursday 22 May** | **Send last finalized tools for enumerators Lebanon + instructions**  
**10 – Sarah – various (payment, Malek contract, various ABAAD/CFUWI)**  
**13 - RDFL (women organization) - Review Tool 3 – Tool 4 - Tool 6**  
**15 – Tayyar al Mustaqbal – Tool 4 - Tool 6**  
**19 – Skype call with Jwan – WEO – fieldwork planning**  
**20.30 - Finish Tool 8 with Roula al-Masri** |
| **Friday 23 May** | **Antonella Lizambri leaves. Laura Maritano continues fieldwork**  
**11 - FGD Community – women – Baalbek – Beqaa Valley (RDFL Centre)**  
**13 – FGD Community – men – Baalbek - Beqaa Valley (RDFL Centre)**  
**16 - FGD Community – Qurnayel - Mount Lebanon (CFUWI focal point)**  
**12:30-13:30 Debriefing ARDD-LA (Ms. Samar Muhareb –Director)** |
| **Wednesday 29 May** | **Travel** |
ANNEX 7 – LOCALLY MEANINGFUL INDICATORS MATRIX

Country: Lebanon
Partner: ABAAD

LOCALLY MEANINGFUL INDICATORS MATRIX
To the partners of the LANA project:
This Matrix is aimed at supporting the identification of indicators that are meaningful in specific contexts, and that can help to baseline attitudes, awareness, behaviors and practices of the Change Makers, Community Members and other stakeholders of the LANA project.

You find here two tables, one for COMMUNITY MEMBERS and CHANGE MAKERS and one for MAIN STAKEHOLDERS (Decision makers and Opinion Formers).

Please, fill the parts in light brown, with statements that make sense in your context, taking into consideration the Type of Change and Theme to which they refer.

Please note (see Examples), that the statements are expressed ‘incrementally’ (low, medium, high) – so that in the future it will be possible to track possible changes.

Please, try to identify statements and issues that are particularly meaningful in the context/s where the project is being implemented. If you work in very different contexts, please specify if the indicators is valid only for a specific context /a specific community.

Please, add lines if you have more relevant statements.

COMMUNITIES AND CHANGE MAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>INDICATOR (LOW / ‘CLOSURE’ / PRE-CONTEMPLATION)</th>
<th>INDICATOR (MEDIUM &gt; SOME OPENING UP / CONTEMPLATION)</th>
<th>INDICATOR (HIGH &gt; CHANGED/READY FOR CHANGE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWARENESS</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>EXAMPLE &gt;</td>
<td>Women must always do what men say</td>
<td>Women should obey their men, but if they disagree they can say it</td>
<td>Women have the right to decide about themselves and their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Economic Rights</td>
<td>EXAMPLE &gt;</td>
<td>Women have the duty to take care of the family and should not work</td>
<td>Women should only do small jobs at home</td>
<td>Women have the right to work out of home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td>Please, specify context if needed</td>
<td>Women have the right to inherit from their parents</td>
<td>Women have the right to inherit from their parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Political Rights</td>
<td>EXAMPLE &gt;</td>
<td>Women can vote but no take part into elections</td>
<td>They can take part to local elections but not to national elections</td>
<td>Yes, in my country women have the right to take part in all lections as candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDES TOWARDS</td>
<td>Gender norms and behaviors in private sphere</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>Women should never say no to sex with their husbands</td>
<td>Women should never say no to sex with their husbands, but if they really do not want they can lie and say they are ill</td>
<td>Women should be able to freely decide when to have sex with their husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender norms and behaviors in a social setting</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>Women should never leave the house, only to go their close family</td>
<td>Women should never go out unaccompanied</td>
<td>Women have the right to go out alone as much as they want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If women do not wear the veil, it means they are bad</td>
<td>I think women should wear the veil, but I do not care about what the others do</td>
<td>I think women should be able to freely decide about the veil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender norms and behaviors regarding property and finances</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>I do not want my daughter to work out of the house, otherwise she will not be good wife and mother</td>
<td>A woman can work out of the house, but should give the money they earn to their husbands</td>
<td>I want my daughter to work, so she will be more free to decide many things about her life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender norms and behaviors concerning participation in political life</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>Women should be as modest as possible, and should not appear too much in public, so they should not take part into political life.</td>
<td>If women want to take part into political life they can, but they should remain modest and do not appear in public.</td>
<td>If women were more into political life – as much as men are – the world would be better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM / CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>Private/personal life</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>I never dare replying my husband when he keeps telling me they I do not do things in the right way. In the end, he is right.</td>
<td>I have decided that next time I will tell my husband that he is wrong when he keeps telling me they I do not do things in the right way.</td>
<td>I recently told my husband to stop putting me down and keep telling me they I do not do things in the right way. I do things well!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Social life | EXAMPLE | I do not feel comfortable in social situations out of my family. | I do not feel comfortable to go shopping alone. | I enjoy being in social and community situations. | I enjoy doing shopping with my...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Economic life</th>
<th>Political life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td>My husband doesn't want me to work, so I will not.</td>
<td>I would love to work to have my money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My husband doesn't want me to have a bank account, so I will not.</td>
<td>I would love to have my bank account to save some money for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My brothers do not want to give me my inheritance, but what can I do?</td>
<td>I think my brothers should allow me to have my inheritance – I would like to talk to them about this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have decided that I should get a job out of the house.</td>
<td>I decided that I should have my own bank account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td>I decided that I should get a job out of the house.</td>
<td>I decided that I will go to a lawyer to claim my inheritance rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political life</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>I will never be able to be a political woman… not even in my community… I am too shy….</td>
<td>Having joined the community activities/committees (SAY WHICH ONE) is making me happier and more brave in my daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am acquiring the confidence to have a bigger role in community / national political life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOUR /PRACTICES (decision making)</td>
<td>In private settings</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>My husband makes all the decisions about… but I decide about…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never decide about…. (Family issues: children education, etc.)</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no social life beyond my family</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never go to community activities</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a few friends, and we meet up at times</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I only sometime go to community activities with all my family</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have many friends and I often meet them also out of my house</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take part in many community activities, such as….</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not work out of the house nor at home: I do not make money</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make some money with some small work and my husband allows me to keep it and I spend it all on my kids</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got myself a job and I keep my money on my own bank account</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not carried out any actions, to promote women’s</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to carry out the following actions, to promote women’s</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have carried out the following actions, to promote women’s participation and</td>
<td>Locally Meaningful Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women should obey their husbands, so they should not take part into political life they can, nor do they dare to work, so she will be more brave in political life beyond my family and more brave in political life.

Women can vote otherwise she will not be good wife out of the house, but they should give the money/land they inherit from their parents to their brother need.

Women should never say no to sex with their husbands. They want to community / national elections but women have the right to take part to elections. They can take part to elections as entry to them about this – I would like to talk to them and give them violence – this is not allowed orders – this is not allowed to community / national elections but women have the right to take part to elections. They can take part to elections.

In political life participation and leadership: - In my community.... - At national level....

In private life participation and leadership: - In my community.... - At national level....

Please, specify!

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator

Locally Meaningful Indicator
## ANNEX 8 – MAIN LANA PROJECT TERMINOLOGY (ENGLISH/ ARABIC)

### ENGLISH – ARABIC TRANSLATION OF MAIN GENDER TERMS USED IN THE LANA BASELINE METHODOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>ARABIC</th>
<th>تعريف المصطلحات باللغة العربية/ Definition of terminology in Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>التغيير</td>
<td>التغيير</td>
<td>يشير إلى الفروق بين الذكور والإناث التي يتم تناولها إجتماعياً والتي تتغير مع مرور الزمن وتشهد اختلافات واسعة داخل وبين الثقافات نفسها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التوزيع في النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>التوزيع في النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>يشير إلى مكانة الرجل والنساء في مجتمع أو منظمة ما وبدي مساهمة كل منهما في هذا المجتمع أو المنظمة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التمييز على أساس النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>التمييز على أساس النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>أي تفرقة أو استبعاد أو تقيد يتم على أساس أدو النوع الاجتماعي المؤسسة إجتماعياً والأعراف التي تمنع أي شخص، ذكر أو أنثى، من التمتع بكامل حقوق الإنسان.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المساواة في النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>المساواة في النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>المساواة في الحقوق والمسؤوليات والفرص بين النساء والرجال، وفقًا لمصالح واحتياجات وأولويات النساء والرجال سواء.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>والإتصال القائم على النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>والإتصال القائم على النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>الإتصال والتعاون في توزيع المناقب والمسؤوليات بين المرأة والرجل، وبناء الإتصال على الاعتراف بالنوع الاجتماعي بأن الرجل والنساء لديهم احتياجات وسلوكيات مختلفة، وإنه لا بد من تحديدها ومعالجتها بطريقة تصحح النمط الناصب بينهما. وبالتالي قد تكون هناك حاجة إلى برامج وسياسات مخصصة للنساء للوصول إلى المساواة في التمتع بالموارد والمشاركة في التنمية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الهوية النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>الهوية النوع الاجتماعي</td>
<td>تدل على مفهوم الذات الفردية باعتقادها نذراً أو أثناً، التي تميز عن الجنس البيولوجي الفعلي.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الاستحقاقات والاختيار، وعدم التمييز، وحقوق إيجابية</td>
<td>الاستحقاقات والاختيار، وعدم التمييز، وحقوق إيجابية</td>
<td>يتم تعريفها على أنها إحدى حقوق المساواة بين النساء والرجال الذي يؤدي إلى تبعية المرأة للرجل. العدالة في النوع الاجتماعي هي عملية تختلف عن &quot;تمكين النساء&quot; وذلك عن طريق إتخاذ مفهوم المساواة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إدراج النوع الاجتماعي هو عملية تقييم الآثار المرتبطة بالنساء والرجال في أي نشاط، بما في ذلك التشكيليات والسياسات والبرامج في جميع المجالات وعلى جميع المستويات. وتعني أيضاً استراتيجية لجعل اهتمامات وتجارب النساء والرجال يعد أساسياً من تصور وتنفيذ ورصد تقييم السياسات والبرامج في جميع المجالات السياسية والاقتصادية والاجتماعية بحيث تستفيد كل من النساء والرجال على قدم المساواة وذلك يتمتها عدم المساواة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| المفهوم | تعريف
|---|---|
| Gendered (adjective) | النوع الاجتماعي من المنظور النسائي أو الجنس.
| Gender norms and behaviors | قواعد وسلوكيات النوع الاجتماعي.
| Gender roles | أدوار النوع الاجتماعي في السلوكيات المحتملة إجتماعياً، والمهام والمسؤوليات الخاصة بالرجل والمرأة على أساس الاختلافات من منظور إجتماعي يحدث الكيفية التي ينتفع منها أن يفكر، ويشعر ويتصرف على أساس جنسه/ها. ويمكن أن تتغير أدوار النوع الاجتماعي من خلال الاختيار الفردي، والاستجابة للأحداث، وعملية مثل الأزمات الإجتماعية والاختلافات في النظرة، ويزداد المستويات التعليمية للنساء، والغير من النوع الاجتماعي.
| Gender based violence | العنف القائم على النوع الاجتماعي.
| Domestic violence | العنف الأسري/المزلي.
| Violence against women | العنف ضد النساء.
| Political Participation | المشاركة السياسية في الهياكل والمعنويات السياسية الرسمية، حيث يستطيع أن يتخذ كل من الرجال والنساء القرارات المتعلقة باستخدام الموارد المجتمعية المقابلة فيما سويه؟.
| Self-esteem/ confidence | تقدير الذات / الثقة بالنفس.
| Self-assessment | التقييم الذاتي.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>الجنس</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Women’s Empowerment**

تمكين النساء

- يتم تفعيل التمكين الاجتماعي والاقتصادي والسياسي والقانوني للنساء من خلال توفير وضمان
- تعزيز الحقوق والمساهمات إلى اللون والمشاركة المتساوية التي سيسبقه في تجربتها، والتي لا
- تمكن النساء من الوصول إلى السلطة على نحو متساوي مع الرجال. وهذه هي السمة الرئيسية
- التي تشكل تقديم العمل القائم على النوع الاجتماعي.

**Women’s Rights**

حقوق النساء

جميع حقوق الإنسان مع إيلاء اهتمام خاص لقضايا النساء والحقوق التي تتعلق بالنساء، مثل مجالات
- الجنسية والتنافسية، (مثال: الاقتصادية، ومثال: المشاركة) السياسية، والاجتماعية، والعيا...

**Women’s sexual and reproductive rights**

الحقوق الجنسية والإنجابية للنساء

الحقوق الأساسية للأزواج والأفراد في أن يقرروا بحرية ومسؤولية العدد المرغوب فيها من الأطفال.
- والمساعدة بين الوالدين. كذلك حقهن في الوصول إلى المعلومات والوسائط التي تمكنهن من القيام
- بذلك كي يتعاملوا بأعلى مستويات الصحة الإنجابية.

**Women’s decision making**

صنع القرار للنساء

عملية العرفية للنساء في التوصل إلى قرار من بين المبادرات الممكنة.

**Women’s decision making in the private sphere**

صنع القرار للنساء في المكان الخاص

عملية العرفية للنساء في التوصل إلى قرار من بين المبادرات الممكنة فيما يتعلق بالبيئة الشخصية
- والسرية والظروف. كلاً ما يتم في المكان الخاص.

**Women’s decision making in the public sphere**

صنع القرار للنساء في المكان العام

عملية العرفية للنساء في التوصل إلى قرار من بين المبادرات الممكنة فيما يتعلق بالبيئة العامة (على
- سبيل المثال، المجالات السياسية والاجتماعية).

**Decision Making**

صنع القرار

العملية العرفية للنساء في التوصل إلى قرار من بين المبادرات الممكنة.

**Decision Makers**

صنع القرار

شخص لديه/ها القدرة والقوة والمكنونة لإتخاذ قرار.

**Change Makers**

صنع التغيير هو/هي الشخص الذي/التي لديه/ها المبادرة والقدرة والاستعداد لتغيير المجتمع نحو
- الأفضل.

**Capacity assessment**

تقييم القدرة

تقييم القدرة هو تحليل للقدرات المرجوة مقابل المقترحات الموجودة: هذا يولد فيها إمكانات
- والاحتياجات التي تؤكد على صياغة الاستجابة المناسبة لتنمية القدرات.
DETAILED FINDINGS FOR LEBANON

Population analyzed through the Survey (Tool 1)

The group of respondents, involved in the baseline study in Lebanon, is composed of 30 Change Makers (CM) and, 270 men and women from the communities in the Governorates of Beirut, Mount Lebanon and South & Nabatieh (these two considered as one area for the aim of the project). They are distributed evenly between the three areas, except for a slight majority of Change Makers in the Beirut area (which is reasonable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEIRUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOUNT LEBANON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH LEBANON AND NABATIEH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two thirds of the Change Makers are women (female 66.7% vs male 33.3% or in other words: 20 women and 10 men), while the community group is more balanced with 56.5% women and 43.5% men (153 women and 118 men).
As for the age, the two groups have almost the same arithmetic average age (36). In both groups, males are slightly older than women (37) are. There is a difference of one year between men and women Change Makers and nearly three years between men and women from the communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>36.48</td>
<td>35.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the interviewed people, 48% of CM and 49.8% of Community Members are above 36 years old. 31% of Change Makers and 20% of Community are between 36-45 years old. However, it has to be pointed out that 26% of female Change Makers are under 26, and a similar percentage can be found among men and women from the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Clusters</th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 26</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of marital status CMs have a higher number of singles, 53.3%, (female 45% vs male 70%), while there is a balance among the members of the community group with 49.8% married and 43.9% singles. 6.7% of Change Makers (more men than women) and 3.7% of persons from the community (more women than men) are divorced.
Given the high percentage of single members, 56.7% of the CM predictably live with the family of origin. 36.7% of CMs lives with the family (spouse, partner, sons/daughters) and we can suppose that this percentage includes all CMs who have reported to be married, part of those living together with a partner and widows. The Community Members are equally divided into “I live with my family of origin” (46.9%) and “With my family” (46.9%). In both groups, Change Makers and community, there are only a few cases living on their own.

In relation to the age they had the first child, women CMs and Community had a similar average age (23.4 and 23.8) while for men we have some differences: CMs men had the first child at 28.6 years on average compared to Community men that had it at 30.5 years on average.
The education level is higher within the Change Makers group that does not register people with a low level of education; in the community group, one out of ten people has a low level of education. There are no huge differences between men and women’s education level among Change Makers (women have more MAs than men) and in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and write</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of employment, in Lebanon we register high rates of employment both among the Change Makers (60% women and 80% men) and among men and women of the community (56.8% women and 81% men). 15% of women Change Makers and 22.9% of the women from the community declare they are housewives. 10% of women Change Makers are students, but among male Change Makers no students are present. Also within the community, we find 12.4% of female students and 10.2% of male students.
Those who are employed, among Change Makers and within the community, are mainly employed in the private or in the governmental sector. 17.6% of women Change Makers and 9.7% of women from the community work in the NGO sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed professional (doctor, engineer, lawyer, pharmacist, social worker, teacher, banker)</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed business owner/trader (shopkeeper, company)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employment</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker (Occasional labor/employment)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not work (looking for work)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not work (I have never searched work)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not answer</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>CHANGE MAKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngo</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not answer</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of religious confessions, we can say that men and women Change Makers from the community in Lebanon are more or less equally distributed between Sunni, Shiite and Druze. In the community there is a higher percentage of Christians (4.8% Maronites and 2.6% Greek Orthodox, 1.1% Catholic and 0.4% Protestant) against 3.3% (Maronites) in the Change Makers group. It needs to be pointed out that almost a quarter of Change Makers (23.3%) refused to answer the question about their religious belonging. Also during the qualitative fieldwork, some of the Change Makers interviewed refused to answer similar questions. This shows that Change Makers have more awareness than men and women of the communities of the divisive character of religious belonging in Lebanon and thus prefer to avoid talking about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confession</th>
<th>Change Makers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Community Members</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Druze</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shiite</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maronite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greek Orthodox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No Answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change Makers interviewed for the Survey in Lebanon are also much more active at community level and in activities for the promotion of gender equality, than Community Members. 50.8% of the men and women from the community said they had not participated to any community activity during the last year, against only 3.3% of Change Makers. However, 20.6% of women and 25.5% of men in the community, and 50% of women and 60% of men Change Makers, declare they took part into activities promoting gender equality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the last year, have you participated in any community activities?</th>
<th>Change Makers</th>
<th>Community Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I participate in activities promoting gender equality</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To conclude, in Lebanon, Change Makers and community men and women are distributed more or less equally among the three governorates targeted by the project: Beirut, Mount Lebanon and South & Nabatieh, as by project criteria. In terms of marital status, a large number of Change Makers are single (45% female and 70% male) while community men and women are more equally distributed between married and singles. All the Change Makers have quite high level of education (more than 60% have BAs, higher diplomas and MAs), while among the community there are also people with only a basic level of education (10%). In Lebanon we register high rates of employment both among the Change Makers (60% women and 80% men) and among men and women of the community (56.8% women and 81% men). In terms of religious confessions, we can say that Change Makers and men and women from the community in Lebanon are more or less equally distributed between Sunni, Shiite, Druze, and some Christians. Interestingly, almost a quarter of Change Makers (23.3%) refused to answer the question about their religious belonging, as to point out their belief in the divisive character of religious affiliation in Lebanon. As by project criteria, Change Makers interviewed for the Survey in Lebanon are also much more active at community level and in activities for the promotion of gender equality, than Community Members. 50.8% of the men and women from the community said they had not participated to any community activity during the last year, against only 3.3% of Change Makers.

Finally, in Lebanon, the Change Makers group covered by the Survey (Tool 1) is much more active at local and community level, less religious or more aware of the divisive power of religious affiliation in Lebanon, is made up of more women, is slightly younger and with more single people, and more educated than the community group. No substantial differences in the dimensions examined were found between women and men of the same group in Lebanon.
Change Makers met during FGDs (Tool 2)
In Lebanon, 2 FGDs discussions were held with Change Makers, one with women and one with men. The Change Makers women were an heterogeneous group of 7 women aged between 20 and 45, from different Governorates (including Tripoli and the Beqaa that were then scrapped from the project) and different religious backgrounds (Muslim, Christian and Druze). The youngest were students at AUB, the others were professional women (a teacher, a journalist, a businesswoman) and activists and some of them were single. The men Change Makers who took part into the FGD were unfortunately just two. One aged 24 from Tripoli (town that is not covered by the project) and Sunni. One aged 26 from Mount Lebanon and Druze; both with a university degree and some experience in social and political activities.

Community Members met during FGDs (Tool 2)
2 FGDs with women Community Members were held in Lebanon, one in Baalbek (Beqaa) and one Qurnayel (Mount Lebanon). In Baalbek, 11 community women both Shia and Sunni, 19-52, of which 4 unmarried and 1 divorced took part in the discussion. A couple of them had been involved with political activities of Tayyar al-Mustaqqbal, and trained on political participation by RDFL. The first impression was that these women already had a quite high gender awareness and political commitment and they seemed closer to the expected profile of Change Makers than to that of community women.

A similar impression, was gathered when interviewing community women in Qurnayel. These were 8 Druze women, middle-class, aged 45-59 among whom 2 unmarried and 1 divorced, most of them were employed. They also showed a quite strong level of gender and political awareness. This was communicated to Oxfam, ABAAD and CFUWI and some corrections measure were introduced in the selection of the Community Members for the Survey. Thanks to this, as we have seen above, the criteria for the choice of the people to be covered by the Survey now meets with the criteria set up by the project.

Finally, one FGD discussion was held in Baalbek with community men. The group was made by 6 young men between the age of 18 and 29, all university students or with a University degree, all unmarried and both Shia and Sunni. One of them had been involved in political activities with Tayyar al-Mustaqqbal. As already mentioned, the Beqaa Valley, has been then scrapped from areas where project activities will be implemented.

To conclude we can say that even if the group of men and women from the community met in Lebanon during the qualitative fieldwork did not fully respect the criteria envisaged the project (only 2 Change Makers men met; community men and women who seemed Change Makers), nevertheless these discussions were very interesting because they provided reflections, stories, concrete examples, about themselves but also about other people, on the issue of gender and politics in Lebanon, and have been utilized in this Baseline analysis.
In addition, as discussed above and in Chapter 6, some corrective measures were taken, and will have to be taken during implementation, to ensure a stricter adherence, in the especially in the selection of men and women from the community, to the criteria set by the project.
ANNEX 10 – STAKEHOLDER POWER ASSESSMENT

In order to select the Targeted Stakeholders and Allies to be baselined in terms of attitudes (through Tool 4) and the Allies to be baselined in terms of capacity through Tool 5, a Stakeholder Power Assessment has been carried through Tool 3.

Tool 3 was designed to identify relevant opinion-formers and decision-makers in each country according to two main dimensions: a) Support for gender equity in decision-making in the various spheres of life; b) Power/Influence at various level (community, national, international). Tool 3 was built as a Matrix to collect information about the following dimensions (see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5):

- Organization’s name
- Informant/ Document analyzed
- Organization type (governmental, non-governmental, private etc.)
- Sector of work (politics, media, business, social etc.)
- Level of work (local, national, regional, international)
- Organization website, contact person, email and phone number
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the private sphere (evidence)
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the private sphere (score: low/medium/high)
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the public sphere – community level (evidence)
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the public sphere – community level (score: low/medium/high)
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the political sphere – local/national level (evidence)
- Support for gender equity in decision making in the political sphere – local/national level (score: low/medium/high)
- Power/influence at local/community level (evidence)
- Power/influence at local/community level (score: low/medium/high)
- Power/influence at district/national level (evidence)
- Power/influence at district/national level (score: low/medium/high)
- Power/influence at regional/international level (evidence)
- Power/influence at regional/international level (score: low/medium/high)
- Role (champion, floater, blocker) – specify in which sphere at what level of power (see matrix below)
- Possible role in the project (allies, targeted stakeholders, opponents (see matrix below)

The mapped stakeholders were assigned the role they will have in the project (Allies with whom to work, Targeted Stakeholders to be influenced, and Opponents towards whom, if needed, to adopt mitigating strategies) through a second chart (below). Thanks to this chart, it was decided to which stakeholder administer Tool 4 and Tool 5.
The Stakeholder Power Assessment has been carried out through information collected on the web and other information provided by partners and from the stakeholders themselves. All the information related to Tool 3 is included in Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5).

Nevertheless, as described in Chapter 2.2.3, it was possible to identify less stakeholders than expected and it was not always possible to collect all the needed information about identified stakeholders. Information was collected through Tool 3, for 21 stakeholders in Jordan, for 14 stakeholders in Lebanon and 19 in Iraqi Kurdistan. It is therefore recommended to use the Stakeholder Power Assessment Matrix (Tool 3) as a working tool to be: a) completed for the already identified stakeholders and, b) continuously updated anytime new stakeholders are identified (see Chapter 6.2 for recommendations on M&E).

In this section, we briefly present the findings about the main stakeholders (Allies, Targeted Stakeholders and Opponents) identified through Tool 3 in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraqi Kurdistan and we briefly suggest recommendations on how to improve and enlarge stakeholders’ networks. For more details on individual stakeholders’ Interest and Power/Influence, see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5.

Further detailed information about baselined stakeholders is contained in other parts of this Baseline Report. In particular:
SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

As planned in the project proposal, it can be pointed out, all partners in the three showed commitment in the identification opinion-formers and decision-makers relevant to women’s political participation and decision-making and coming from different sectors of society (and not in the usual circles of supporters). In Lebanon, relevant Allies and Targeted Stakeholders have been identified in political parties, human and women’s rights organizations, one syndicate and one professional association. In Jordan, Allies and Targeted Stakeholders have been identified among women’s rights non-governmental organizations, associations, governmental organizations and institutions, universities, private and media sectors. In Iraqi Kurdistan, the main identified stakeholders were governmental and linked to the KDP, but also other types of stakeholders were included (social workers’, lawyers and journalists’ syndicates and a women empowerment radio, one human rights and one women’s rights organization). Despite this achievement, it is recommended, not only to design effective strategies to actively involve the stakeholders already identified in the LANA project, but also, as explained, to continue the effort of widening the number and the type of stakeholders involved in the project in order to achieve more sectors of society, as also envisaged by the LANA project proposal.

LEBANON

In Lebanon, the following main stakeholders were identified:
- 8 Allies
  - 4 national Allies:
    - 3 local Allies
    - 1 regional Ally
  - 3 Targeted Stakeholders
  - 3 Opponents

Of the four national Allies, 2 are non-governmental women organizations with their main focus on women’s rights (RDFL and LECORVAW), 1 is the Women Section of a professional body, the Bar Association, and 1 is the Women Section of a political party, Tayyar Al-Mustaqbal (Future Movement), representing mainly the Sunni electorate. They all have support for women’s participation in decision-making and also influence and power at national level.
The three local Allies were chosen in relation to the areas where the project is being implemented: the Lebanese Association of Women’s Affairs for South Lebanon, the Qornayel Women’s Association for Mount Lebanon and the Beirut association for social development for Beirut area. The first two work more on women’s rights while the third one more generally on social and economic rights (but on this one, more information should be collected).

The first two local allies have high level of support for women’s decision making in all spheres of life, with medium level of power at local level but no power at all at national or regional level. Furthermore, in Lebanon, was identified one regional Ally: the Arab Institute for Human Rights (AIHR). This is an organization based in Tunisia, with a branch in Beirut, and other two branches in Morocco and Egypt, working mainly with political parties, trade unions and all civil society organizations to promote women’s political participation. Thanks to its connections with civil society throughout the Arab region, they have medium level of power/influence on civil society in this region.

Three were the identified Targeted Stakeholders in Lebanon: 2 political parties (Kataeb and Lebanese forces, both with a Christian basis) and 1 syndicate, the Teachers Syndicate. Kataeb is seen as having positive neutrality in relation to issues regarding women’s political participation (support the 30% quota system in municipal election) and medium/high level of support at national level and in the regions where Kataeb has power on. Further information should be collected about the Lebanese Forces and the Teachers Syndicate.

This last one seems particularly interesting to be explored for its great potential, as teachers are mainly women from different backgrounds and with a high level of power/influence on youth at national level.

Finally, the three main Opponents identified in Lebanon are: the Hezbollah Party (especially in the Beqaa and South regions affiliated with Hezbollah) and 2 religious institutions: Dar Al-Fatwa (the leading Sunni religious institution in Lebanon) and the Shiite Higher Council. No detailed information has been collected for these stakeholders, but if there is the need to, then further information should be gathered and mitigating strategies should be designed.

To conclude, it seems appropriate say that in Lebanon, the main stakeholders have been identified according to the main criteria set in the project and relevant to women’s decision making and political participation in the Lebanese context (political parties, human and women’s rights organizations, one syndicate and one professional association among Allies and Targeted Stakeholders; religious institutions and parties among the Opponents).

However, in order to build a wider a more influential network of opinion formers and decision makers in Lebanon, it is recommended (see also Chapter 6):
a) to work hard to involve all the Allies and Stakeholders identified; 

b) to widen number and type of Allies and Targeted Stakeholders involved, especially human and women’s rights organizations for the Allies, and syndicates and professional associations for Targeted Stakeholders. 

c) to identify possible mitigating strategies for the Opponents

Furthermore, in terms of MEAL system, we recommend:

a) to complete the collection of the information for the identified stakeholders; 

b) to repeat the power mapping for all new stakeholders identified (weather these are Allies, Targeted Stakeholders or Opponents)

ANNEX 11 – CHANGE MAKER CAPACITY ASSESSMENT – DETAILED FINDINGS

LEBANON - CHANGE MAKERS CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

In Lebanon, the capacity of 30 Change Makers, 20 women and 10 men, was assessed. 

B1: Knowledge – men and women (20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ‘Gender' refers to</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>Refers to the biological differences between men and women</td>
<td>Refers to differences between men and women that depend on religion and/or tradition and should be respected</td>
<td>Refers to the characteristics, roles, activities, behaviors and attributes that a society or culture considers appropriate for men and women – and they can be criticized and changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Gender roles are</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>What men and women should do according to nature</td>
<td>The roles that tradition assigns to men and women, and that should be respected</td>
<td>Norms of behavior socially and culturally shaped that we can change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Women’s Rights
h) Women’s economic
reproductive rights
g) Women’s sexual and
d) Gender equity
b) Gender roles are
i) Women’s social rights
rights
f) My country
c) Gender equality
a) ‘Gender’ refers
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ANNEX 11 – CHANGE MAKER CAPACITY ASSESSMENT – DETAILED FINDINGS

LEBANON - CHANGE MAKERS CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

In Lebanon, the capacity of 30 Change Makers, 20 women and 10 men, was assessed.

B1: Knowledge – men and women (20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ‘Gender’ refers to</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>Refers to the biological differences between men and women</td>
<td>Refers to differences between men and women that depend on religion and/or tradition and should be respected</td>
<td>Refers to the characteristics, roles, activities, behaviors and attributes that a society or culture considers appropriate for men and women – and they can be criticized and changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>85,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Gender roles are</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>What men and women should do according to nature</td>
<td>The roles that tradition assigns to men and women, and that should be respected</td>
<td>Norms of behavior socially and culturally shaped that we can change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Gender equality</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>Does not have any meaning, because sexes are different and you have treat them differently</td>
<td>Is difficult to achieve because women and men have different duties and rights that can change only in special cases, when family or society deem it necessary or useful</td>
<td>Is achieved when women and men are treated equally as human beings and have equal rights, responsibilities, power, opportunities and resources in all spheres of public and private life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>85,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### d) Gender equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Is not relevant because men and women have naturally different duties and they must abide to them</th>
<th>Refers to meeting individuals’ different needs and expectations and to accordingly provide them with empowerment opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e) Women’s Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Women must have the rights that are spelled out in our religious book/s</th>
<th>The rights that women have in a country must be decided by each country accordingly to tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f) My country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Has not signed CEDAW</th>
<th>Has signed CEDAW, but a lot of work has still to be done for women’s rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### g) Women’s sexual and reproductive rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Are granted by each society according to their rules</th>
<th>Should be fully granted in terms of freedom to decide the number and timing of children she wants to have, and in terms of access to birth control, pre-natal and post-natal care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>95,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Women’s economic rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Are part of the family economy and women’s father, husband or male relatives can provide them with all what they need</th>
<th>Sometimes are to be renounced, if family decides to not give women their inheritance share, or if impose them to not work except in family's business</th>
<th>Are a basic human rights and women should fully enjoy their right to inheritance and to work in whatever and whenever they like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) Women’s social rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Are granted enough, women can easily go out if accompanied by family members</th>
<th>Should be fully granted in terms of opportunities of access and participation to education, social and cultural events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>95,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k) Women’s political rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I don't know</th>
<th>Are not relevant, women cannot participate in politics because they are not allowed to speak in public and to move alone</th>
<th>Are granted as opportunity to participate to public life when family agrees</th>
<th>Should be granted as basic human right in terms of opportunity for representation in political, administration of the state and civil service spheres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>95,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of knowledge of gender definitions, Change Makers show some contradictions and weaknesses. In relation to the definition of ‘gender’ 85% of women and 90% of men provide the correct definition (gender as social construct) but when answering about gender roles, we have 30% of women, and 20% of men (20% of men say ‘don’t know’) who root gender roles in nature and tradition while stating that ‘they should be respected’. Furthermore, it is possible to observe certain confusion in relation to gender equity and equality. It has to be mentioned that there are no huge differences between men and women on the way they answer.
In terms of knowledge and awareness about women’s rights, the large majority (around 80%) of men and women Change Makers, provide the right answer, with women having greater knowledge about CEDAW, women’s economic rights and women’s Sexual Health and Reproductive Rights.

**B2: Advocacy skills - men and women (20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you assess your skills at this moment in time?</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Communication – interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interpersonal skills are not that great</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>75,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have excellent interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Communication – talking to diverse audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am shy and I tend not to express myself with people</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am ok in relating to Community Members but I have never dared talking to high profile people</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to talk to a big variety of audiences, from Community Members to high profile people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Communication – public talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not able to talk in front of people I do not know</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to talk in small groups</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to talk in public occasions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Communication – writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like / I do not have the habit of writing</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write small pieces of writing (short articles etc.)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Communication – IT skills</td>
<td>Some IT skills - Word Internet</td>
<td>Active in social networks</td>
<td>Very active on a variety of social networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Listening skills</td>
<td>I find difficult to listen to other people’s problems</td>
<td>I like listening to others if they say things I consider interesting or relevant</td>
<td>I love listening to other people because I always learn a lot from them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Negotiation</td>
<td>I am bad in negotiating a situation where people disagree - I do not believe in mediation</td>
<td>I do not like negotiating among people in conflict, it is very difficult</td>
<td>I am often called to negotiating conflict/disagreement among people, because I am able to understand different points of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Advocacy – influencing skills</td>
<td>Able to influence individuals (ex. Friends, family)</td>
<td>Able to influence small groups (ex. Class, university group, community group)</td>
<td>Able to influence large groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>55,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Advocacy – identifying allies</td>
<td>I think that everybody has a potential and don’t focus on special persons</td>
<td>I am able to understand the special potential of some people to bring about a change</td>
<td>I am quite capable to look beyond the obvious and to identify the proper ally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>75,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>30,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Advocacy – Networking (in organizations)</td>
<td>I am not able in keeping in touch with interesting network</td>
<td>I have built an interesting network</td>
<td>I have wide networks of people across</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>of people in my own environment (school, university, community etc.)</td>
<td>different environments/places etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26,3%</td>
<td>73,7%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**k) Advocacy – Networking with women organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am not connected to any women organization/coalition</th>
<th>I have some connections with women organizations/coalition</th>
<th>I am actively involved with women organizations / coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**l) Time management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am pretty disorganized</th>
<th>I am an organized person and manage my time well</th>
<th>I am very good in time management and can work under pressure and with tight deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**m) Strategic planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In my group, we do not do any planning for my community/political activity – we just try to follow whatever comes up</th>
<th>In my group, we have started thinking that some planning would be good</th>
<th>In my group, we have a strategy for next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
<td>52,6%</td>
<td>36,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n) Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A good leader is someone who knows what he/she wants</th>
<th>A good leader is someone who is able to convince others of what he/she believes</th>
<th>A good leader is someone who is able to give voice to what people want</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>65,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**o) Community mobilization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have never done anything to mobilize my community</th>
<th>I have joined community mobilization activities</th>
<th>I have lead community mobilization activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>45,0%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>80,0%</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, we can observe that most of Change Makers men and women assess their advocacy skills in a positive manner (either good or excellent skills) in most of the examined area. More women than men consider excellent, their communication skills (interpersonal, talking to diverse audiences, public talking, writing skills and IT skills), as well as negotiation skills (70% women and 60% men), advocacy – identifying allies (75% women and 40% men), leadership skills (65% women and 60% men), time management skill (60% women compared to 50% men), community mobilization skills (50% against 10%).

However, the major differences between men and women, and where men show some weakness are: a) connection with women coalitions (where 40% of men are not connected and 40% have some connections with women organization/coalitions, while 45% of women are actively involved with women organizations/coalitions and another 45% have some connections; b) community mobilization activities (where only 10% of men have lead some, and 80% has participated in; while 50% of women have lead some, and 45% have participated in). More men than women (50% vs 40%), however, feel confident about being able to influence large audiences. Areas of weakness for both women and men are leadership skills and strategic planning.

**B3: Commitment to project methodology – men and women (20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not committed</td>
<td>Committed but not essential</td>
<td>Very much committed, very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 a) Commitment – self: How much are you committed to bring about changes – in terms of having more power to decide on issues relevant to you – in your own life?</td>
<td>Female 100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 b) Commitment – community: How much are you committed to work inside your community to bring about changes in favor of greater women’s participation to decision-making?</td>
<td>Female 5,0%</td>
<td>95,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 10,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>70,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is possible to see from the above table, women Change Makers seem to be more committed to project methodology than men Change Makers, in bringing about changes in relation to women’s role in decision-making. This is true for all spheres and the difference increases while going from the private to the public and political sphere: in relation to Change Makers’ own lives (100% women and 90% men); to work in the community to bring about those changes (95% of women and 70% of men); to work in politics to obtain these changes (60% women and 30% men with 20% of men not committed).

This is also reflected in the time availability of women and men Change Makers. The time that women and men Change Makers interviewed declared to be able to dedicate to advocacy activities in favor of gender equality and equity is in fact different: 40% of men are only available for this activity once a month, and 40% up to 4 times a month. 55% of women instead are available 4 times a month while 30% of them even 5 or more times a month.

When asked about obstacles to women’s full participation in decision making most (B3_e, open question) of Change Makers talked about traditions, religion and sectarianism.
When asked about obstacles that they expect to meet in relation to their work in community and society (B3_f, open question), most of them mentioned the opposition to change from some parts of society, including families, and also from political party’s leaders.

Finally, when asked, “How far are you ready to go to overcome obstacles (to women’s participation in decision making)?” Change Makers answered to this questions as follows: almost 45% “not very far” (same for men and women), 38% said they can “contradict my family’s opinion” (45% of women and 22.2% of men) and 17% that they can “break up with community” (10% of women and 33.3% of men).

| B3_g) Overcoming obstacles: How far are you ready to go to overcome obstacles? (20 CHANGE MAKERS WOMEN – 10 CHANGE MAKERS MEN) | Q1 Sex |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male | Total |
| Not very far | Count | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| % within Q1 Sex | 45,0% | 44,4% | 44,8% |
| Breaking up with community | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| % within Q1 Sex | 10,0% | 33,3% | 17,2% |
| Contradicting my family’s opinion | Count | 9 | 2 | 11 |
| % within Q1 Sex | 45,0% | 22,2% | 37,9% |
| Total | Count | 20 | 9 | 29 |
| % within Q1 Sex | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

To conclude, in Lebanon, Change Makers have in general a quite good knowledge of gender concepts, even if some hesitations persist. While more than 80% provides the rights answer when asked to identify the correct definition of gender, when asked about gender roles, about 20-30% of them root gender roles in nature and tradition while stating that ‘they should be respected’. In large majority, they also have good level of knowledge and awareness about women’s rights. In general, most of Change Makers men, women assess their advocacy skills in a positive manner, and about half of them have some connections with women’s coalitions. Finally, just less than half of them said they were not ready to go “very far” in order to overcome the obstacles on the way of achieving gender equity.

In particular, women Change Makers are more knowledgeable on gender concepts and women’s rights, have a better assessment of their advocacy skills, have more time availability and are more committed to bring about changes about gender equity in decision making in private and public spheres, than men Change Makers. In addition, they have more experience in leading community activities and have better connections with women organizations and coalitions, even if they need support especially in strategic planning and leadership skills.
Suggested Target: By EoP, increased knowledge and improved advocacy skills for both women and men Change Makers. Men Change Makers enabled to carry out community activities to bring about changes about gender equity in decision-making, and are more connected to women’s organizations and coalitions. Women Change Makers have carried out more community and political activities in coalition with other women’s organizations.

ANNEX 12 – ALLIES CAPACITY ASSESSMENT-DETAILED FINDINGS

LEBANON - CHANGE MAKERS CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

During the desk review, and in cooperation with ABAAD and CFUWI, 8 Allies had been identified for Lebanon through Tool 3 (see Chapter 3.2 – on Stakeholder Power Mapping; Stakeholder - Database Tool 3, 4 and 5). During fieldwork, 4 Allies were interviewed thanks to Tool 5 about their organizational capacity on gender and advocacy (2 Allies were interviewed during qualitative fieldwork on 22 May 2014 and 2 other Allies were interviewed during July 2014 by CFUWI and the AT reviewed interviews and scoring). The following 4 Allies were interviewed:

- 3 national Allies
  - Roula Zateer - Responsible for Baalbek area - RDFL
  - Laura Sfeir- President - Lebanese Council to Resist Violence against Women (LECORVAW)
  - Nawal Mdallali - Organizational Affairs Assistant – Women Sector - Tayyar al-Mustaqbal (political party)
- 1 regional Ally
  - Joumana Merhi - Director of Lebanon Branch - Arab Institute for Human Rights (AIHR)

It is important to mention that of the interviewed Allies, 1 is a political party (Tayyar al-Mustaqbal), 2 are women’s rights organizations (RDFL and LECROVAWA) and 1, the regional Ally, is a human rights organization mainly based in Tunisia but with an office in Beirut (AIHR).

Results of the capacity assessment are reported, for all the Allies interviewed, in the following comparative charts, and integrated below with descriptive information included in Tool 5 for every section.
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1) ORGANIZATION SIZE

- **Score 1** 1.1 How many paid staff work in your organization?
  - Small (up to 5)
  - Small-Medium (5-10)
  - Medium (10-15)
  - Large (15-30)
  - Very Large (more than 30)

- **Score 1.2**
  - up to 10
  - 11 to 20
  - 21 to 50
  - 51 to 100
  - more than 100

The allies identified by ABAAD / CFUWI in Lebanon are all large organizations with more than 30 paid staff, with the exception of LECORVAW that has only 7 employees. It has also to be mentioned that AIHR, in Tunisia has an office with 30 people, but in Beirut has an office with 1 paid staff (as in Morocco and Egypt.)

Furthermore, they can all count on a quite large basis of volunteers: 61 for LECORVAW, more than a hundred in the Arab Region and 15 in Lebanon for AIHR, about 70 active volunteers for RDFL (with other 300 on whom they can count); finally a large basis for Tayyar al-Mustaqbal that is one of the main political parties in Lebanon.
The two women organizations have mostly (LECROVAW) or all (RDFL) women in decision-making positions within the organization. AIHR also have 3 women out of 12 in the Board of Directors, 2 out of 3 as Executive Directors and all women as program managers. Tayyar al-Musaqbal that is a political party – and thus extremely involved into the sectarian/patriarchal dynamic of Lebanese politics – has however made some kind of effort in involving women at decision-making level. Specifically there are 3 women members (out of 22) in the Executive Office and one of them is responsible for all the Syndicates all over Lebanon; 2 women in the Political Office (out of 20); in addition, they have 3 candidates for the parliamentary elections (which should have taken place in November 2013, but they didn’t yet).
Within women organizations (RDFL and LECORVAW) all members, staff and volunteers are aware about gender concepts and receive trainings on this. For RDFL, having been trained on gender for a year is a condition to become a member. In AIHR this true for most of the employees and volunteers. Within Tayyar al-Mustaqbal, in the Executive Office, out of 22 members, 5 are aware of gender issues, and among these, the General Secretary is aware that he cannot exclude women from high-level meetings. In the Political Office, out of 20 members, 7 are aware of gender issues and women’s rights.

2) ORGANIZATION CAPACITY ON GENDER: GENDER STRATEGY AND ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We do not have but we are committed to have one</td>
<td>We are having activities to define our gender strategy</td>
<td>We have a gender strategy for mainstreaming gender in all levels of organization but not in projects and programs</td>
<td>We have a full gender strategy for mainstreaming gender in all levels of organization and all project and programs, shared with all members/staff (participatory processes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Do you have a Gender Strategy for mainstreaming gender in all levels of organization and all project and programs?

2.4 What kind of gender sensitive analysis and research does your organization carry out about gender equity (for example: needs assessments, baseline studies, evaluation reports, policy analysis)? How does this feed into your organizations strategic planning?

2.5 What kind of gender sensitive analysis and research does your organization carry out specifically about gender equity in decision making? How does this feed into your organizations strategic planning?
The 3 women and human rights organizations mainly work on women’s rights and gender equity. LECORVAW, is specialized and has a strategy in favor of gender equity and especially against GBV (but, as you can see below n 2.8, LECORVAW only targets women and their families as primary targets. Men are also targeted through awareness raising activities but not with the same level as women). It implements assessment needs, baseline studies, evaluation reports for all projects implemented as well as studies on Gender issues and women’s rights, and they feed into the organization’s strategy, vision and mission; but it has not produced ‘specific’ (not ‘indirect’) research on women’s decision making.

RDFL has a Strategic Plan, produced every three years, on women’s rights that so far does not include, if not marginally, work with men (thanks to the LANA project RDFL plans to include more work with men in the next strategy). They have carried out 2 pieces of research on GBV and a study on political parties with a gender perspective – and thus on an important dimension of women’s decision-making - which are used to feed into their strategic planning. Furthermore, they have also produced:

- toolkits for women’s rights
- toolkits on GBV and Personal Status Law
- toolkit to monitor elections in a gender perspective

AIHR has a gender strategy and it is implemented at organizational level and program level: a) the institute analyses the capacity of the employees and provides capacity building in order to women have the access in the organization to decision-making positions; b) the institute implement baseline studies and assessments for the community that helps the institute in planning their projects and programmes.
The political party, Tayyar al-Mustaqbal, produce a yearly Strategy for the country – every year and within this plan are envisaged activities such as:

- political education for elections, encouraging women to be leaders in the party
- prepare women to be part of the political scene (plan to implement 30% quota for women in the party)

There is the plan to implement the 30% quota within the party, also because there is an interest of the party towards women as they are 56% of their voters. Said Hariri encourages women to be candidates in elections. Finally, the Constitution of the party includes a commitment to implement international conventions, including CEDAW. Nevertheless, there is no direct research on women’s issues (here is no research Centre). Some material was prepared by the Legal Committee who does training on women’s rights – both inside the party and in the communities.

2) ORGANIZATION CAPACITY ON GENDER: ‘GENDERED’ PROJECTS AND M&E

- 2.6 Sex-disaggregated data in MEAL systems
- 2.7 How many ‘gendered’ projects do you have? In other words, how far have you taken into account issues of gender equality in all the phases of the PCM (problem identification, assessment, identification of a project methodology and activities that take in
- 2.8 Are men and women equally targeted by the organization’s projects and programs?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>We do not collect sex disaggregated data</td>
<td>We collect sex disaggregated data for a few projects only</td>
<td>We collect sex disaggregated data for at least half of the projects</td>
<td>We collect sex disaggregated data for the majority of our projects</td>
<td>We collect sex disaggregated data for all our projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One or two only in some of these aspects</td>
<td>Some of projects in some the aspects</td>
<td>Most of the projects in most of the aspects</td>
<td>All projects in all aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Organization works only with women / only with men</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Organization works mainly with women / mainly with men</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Organization targets men and women in the same way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two women organizations (LECORVAW and RDFL) mainly work with women and in favor of gender equity. LECORVAW work only with women and their families. RDFL however is planning, thanks to the LANA project, to include men more in their projects. They both focus on the issue of gender equity (GBV in the case of LECORVAW, GBV but also women’s political participation in the case of RDFL). Nevertheless, RDFL does not have a proper M&E system for its projects and programs and thus for them does not collect (disaggregated) data (they only produce basic activities reports). Differently, LECORVAW, has an M&E system for their program against GBV which covers women but not men.

In addition, the AIHR works a lot on women’s rights and it has a special program for promoting gender equality as well as working on the integration of the gender approach in all the programs implemented. In addition, AIHR targets both women and men in the same way. Finally, AIHR has M&E system for all its program and projects that collects sex-disaggregated data.

Tayyar al-Mustaqbal, as a political party has ‘naturally’ a male constituency. For this reason, its Women Section targets mainly women, in order to encourage and empower them to take part into the political activities of the party. They do not have a proper MEAL system and thus do not collect (disaggregated) data.
Three of the organizations interviewed produce some kind of publications: leaflets, information material, toolkits on different issues related to gender equity. In particular, LECORVAW has produced a variety of tools on gender and GBV (booklets, leaflets, training manuals.).

As already mentioned above, RDFL has produced toolkits for women’s rights, toolkits on GBV and personal status Law, toolkit to monitor elections in a gender perspective. Tayyar al-Mustaqbal (Women section) has produce fliers and posters on individual activities or as part of a campaign for women’s political participation. Nevertheless, AIHR has not produced any tool on gender and women’s rights.
All the organizations have as their priority of challenging women’s discrimination. Nevertheless, all of them work much less on other forms of discrimination based on other forms of diversity. No work has been done on gay & lesbian rights, as it is a too difficult issue. LECORVAW works only on gender discrimination. Some have worked a bit on the issue of Palestinian and Syrian refugees (Tayyar al-Mustaqlbal, RDFL), and AIHR works in general on human rights.
AIHR and LECORAW have a large constituency in Lebanon (AIHR in Tunisia too) where they are engaged in several trainings and projects. Many of the beneficiaries that undertake trainings related to women’s and human rights provide support in different projects and activities. Nevertheless, they are not consulted. RDFL is mainly a service provider, so there is not a wide involvement of their constituency in decision making. The same is true for Tayyar al-Mustaqbal, and also for their Women Section, also thanks to the fact that they are a large political party. Tayyar al-Mustaqbal is engaged with its constituency through trainings and projects as well as through consultation meetings held in the region.
3) ADVOCACY CAPACITY AND PRACTICES: DECISION-MAKERS LOBBYING

![Bar chart showing scores for advocacy capacity and practices regarding lobbying]

- **3.2.1** Do you have a department/specific human resources dedicated to decision makers lobbying?
  - 1: No human resources specifically dedicated
  - 2: Some members of staff do this along other commitments
  - 3: A few members of staff specifically dedicated to this
  - 4: There is a specific department for this
  - 5: A large part/ Most of our staff is dedicated to this

- **3.2.2** Have you carried out lobbying activities towards decision makers during last year? What kind of feedback do you receive from them? Are you formally consulted?
  - 1: No lobbying activities
  - 2: Only some small contact made with decision makers (policy papers sent)
  - 3: Some acknowledgement from decision makers about stakeholder initiative / Organization provides some capacity building to decision makers
  - 4: Organization is regularly consulted by high level decision makers in formal occasions
  - 5: Organization policy proposals are taken on board by decision makers

Tayyar al-Mustaqbal is itself one of the prominent decision-makers in Lebanon. The other three organizations do not have a specific department for lobbying decision makers. In case of LECORVAW and AIHR, the Board of Directors is in charge of lobbying. RDFL does not have any specific person assigned to this task.

In addition, AIHR carried out lobbying activities in Tunisia – but not in Lebanon – in relation to several human rights issues, and after the Arab Spring, especially on women’s rights – participating in the movement that in Tunisia has positive amendments to the Tunisian Constitution, in January 2014, when the Tunisian government lifted the reservations to CEDAW. LECORVAW and RDFL have carried out lobbying activities – as part of coalitions working on these issues - with members of Parliament on GBV, on quota and on women’s participation for the new government, but not with much success.
3) ADVOCACY CAPACITY AND PRACTICES: OPINION-FORMERS INFLUENCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.1</strong></td>
<td>No human resources specifically dedicated</td>
<td>Some members of staff do this along other commitments</td>
<td>A few members of staff specifically dedicated to this</td>
<td>There is a specific departments for this</td>
<td>A large part/ Most of our staff is dedicated to this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.2</strong></td>
<td>No influencing activities</td>
<td>Only some small contact made with opinion formers (press releases, media analysis papers, policy papers sent etc.)</td>
<td>Some acknowledgemen t from opinion formers about stakeholder initiative / Organization provides some capacity building to opinion formers</td>
<td>Organization is regularly consulted by high level opinion formers in formal occasions</td>
<td>Organization policy proposals are taken on board by opinion formers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tayyar al-Mustaqbal, is one of the main opinion formers in Lebanon as it directly owns media outlets, such as a TV channel, Future TV, the newspaper al-Mustaqbal (in Arabic) and some shares in the Daily Star (newspaper in English).

The other three organizations have some members of staff dedicated to dealing with media. AIHR just recently developed a specific department, to work with media in Tunisia, even this is not their focus of activities. RDFL does not have a specific department to work with media, but recently has a person specifically devoted to social media. LECORVANW does not have any specific department dedicated to this, but they have a communication coordinator, responsible to maintain a good relationship with the media and in charge of Social Media.
4) COALITION WORK WITH WOMEN’S ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>No coalition work and/or No belief in coalition work – it is too difficult</td>
<td>Been doing some coalition work but it ended up badly</td>
<td>Been doing some coalition work</td>
<td>We are more and more involved in national and/or regional networks and alliance and we have been doing some planning with them</td>
<td>We are steadily involved in networks and alliances (national or regional) and we do a lot of strategy work with them – including planning of joint actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the organizations have some or good connections with women coalitions. Tayyar al-Mustaqbal is part of the main progressive coalitions: CFUWI, Campaign on Nationality Law, GBV Campaign. With RDFL, they work on political participation in political parties and part of the civil campaign for Elections Reform (to include gender quota). LECORVAW is part of different networks on the International, National and Regional Level. Finally, during the last two years, AIHR has started working in coalition with other women’s organization and other stakeholder (syndicate, unions etc.)

To conclude, in Lebanon, two of the three assessed national Allies, are women’s organizations (RDFL and LECORVAW). They are both quite strong in terms of organizational capacity on gender (women in decision-making positions, gender strategy, production of tolls and
resources on gender) but their work focus essentially on women and does not include men. They have weaknesses also in M&E system of their projects and programs and on lobbying capacity towards decision-makers and decision-formers, that could strengthened during project implementation.

The third assessed national Ally, the women’s affairs section of a major political party, Tayyar al-Mustaqbal. They have big power at political level – especially on the Sunni electorate – and they can rely on a wide constituency, already quite active and trained on gender issues and political participation (by RDFL). They also owners of a number of media outlets, which is important, even if the work on media Lebanon, by women’s organizations, has already been quite successful (see also Chapter 4.3 on social movements and media in Lebanon).

All the national Allies have good connections with women’s coalitions, as well as the regional Ally, the Tunis-based Arab Institute for Human Rights, which also has an office in Beirut. This is an active organization in Tunisia, with connections in Lebanon, Egypt and Morocco, and has taken part into the Tunisian human rights’ movement that has led to improvements in the Tunisian Constitution, but they do not have a strong capacity in terms of gender analysis and resources and also no large resources for media lobbying.

**Suggested Target**

In Lebanon, by the EoP, the national allies have improved their capacity in the respective areas of weaknesses, especially in terms of decision-makers lobbying. The regional Ally has improved capacity on gender analysis and media lobbying.
ANNEX 13 – RISK ASSESSMENT

LEBANON - CHANGE MAKERS CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

In this section, we analyze the risks associated with the LANA project overall and in Lebanon, Jordan, Iraqi Kurdistan as expressed in the project Log Frame. We also suggest some possible mitigation measures for these risks if they were to materialize.

The risk assessment has been carried out through Tool 8, by asking the main project partners to provide their own assessment of the issue. In particular, information has been collected:

- in Lebanon, during an interview with Nada Makki (CFUWI) and an interview with Roula al-Masri, (ABAAD) in Beirut, respectively on 21.05.2014 and on 22.05.2014
- in Jordan, during an interview with Adel Daboobi (ARDD_LA) at ARDD-LA office in Amman on 27.05.2014
- in Iraqi Kurdistan, during an interview with Jwan Pishtewan (WEO) at WEO office in Erbil on 27.05.2014
- for the overall program, thanks to the written input of Sarah Barakat and Jessica Elias (Oxfam GB – Lebanon Office) (24.06.2014).

For the detailed data obtained during the Risk Assessment, see Risk Assessment – Consolidation Matrix - Tool 8.

In addition, updates about main political and security developments in the region were gathered from the analysis of main international news outlets focusing on the Middle East (Al-Jazeera International, Mideastwire.com, The Daily Star-Lebanon, Rudaw - Iraqi-Kurdistan, BBC World, The Guardian – UK etc.).

Because the Middle Eastern situation has seen some dramatic developments (spread of ISIS and the ‘Caliphate’ in Iraq and Syria, with increased risks for Lebanon, Jordan and Iraqi Kurdistan; Iraqi Kurdistan ready to declare independence after conquer of Kirkuk; Gaza crisis) in the months between fieldwork (May-June 2014) and the moment of writing this report, the AT has integrated some reference to these developments in this assessment.
SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS
The Risk Assessment highlighted that the main risks associated with the project are linked to the unstable political and security situation (Risk 4.1) that affects the region and especially the Syrian crisis, and now the worsening of the Iraqi crisis (ISIS and the Caliphate), not to mention the Gaza crisis, that threaten to overspill to neighboring countries. This could lead either to direct armed conflict/s within the countries of the LANA project or to the radicalization of political sectarian and religious identities at national and regional level, reinforcing also the patriarchal system that blocks the realization of women’s rights.

This unstable context affects - and could affect even more if the situation deteriorates – the LANA project and its main stakeholders. In fact, the risk assessment shows that:

- there is a medium/high likelihood risk that political parties and governments will not be responsive to women’s rights claims and are either unwilling or unable to engage with women’s rights organizations (Risk 2.1, 4.2 and 4.4)
- in the communities especially in Lebanon and Kurdistan there is a medium likelihood risk that they will not want to partake in the process of change (Risk 1.2)
- there is a medium likelihood that religious leaders especially in Lebanon will oppose women’s participation to the program, but a high likelihood that tribal leaders will oppose the project in Iraqi Kurdistan (Risk 1.3)
- there is a medium likelihood risk that women organizations will not want to come together around one cause, both internally to countries and regionally (Risk 3.4)

The general unstable political situation – and consequent reinforcement of divisive patriarchal systems - is mostly out of the control of the project partners, and the only possible mitigation measures would be: contingency planning and close monitoring of the situation; slow down / cancel project activities; lobby on main stakeholders involved in conflict to stop the conflict (Risk 4.1)
However, other risks are internal to the project and thus project partners should adopt some important mitigation measures. These will include:

- In case governance systems were not responsive on women's rights claims, intensify project activities especially campaigning and lobbying with decision makers, traditional media and social media, through demonstrations, trying to build a critical mass of support for women's rights agenda. (Risk 4.2 and 4.4)
- In case governance systems were unable to work due to political instability, continue working mainly through communities (and not through governments, as it is already mainly the case for Lebanon). However, relations should be kept and work could be done with decisions makers (as part of the APEX FORA) that are/would influence the governance system i.e. political parties, religious leaders, etc. More work should be done also in the media and social media (Risk 2.1)
- Use a participatory approach with communities and Change Makers from early phases of the project. (Risk 1.2)
- Address the community challenges (Risk 1.2) by:
  - adopting a community-based approach using key entry points;
  - identifying topics that can be accepted within the communities;
  - try to contact and meet women in the places they usually attend (community women centres, but also, for example, in Primary Health Care centres, which are usually attended mainly by women and are accepted by family male members);
  - identifying proper strategies to highlight the benefits of women empowerment;
  - distancing the project from any party politics and/or foreign agenda;
  - creating alliances with CBOs or CB groups,
  - involving religious leaders in appeals to communities;
  - utilizing Oxfam’s learning on community mobilization from other similar projects to avoid facing same challenges and setting up a pilot to learn as we go and fix emerging issues.
  - finally, on a more practical but not less important level, by making sure that meeting venues and times are accessible and suitable for different groups of women, and especially in context, where women’s freedom of movement is strongly hampered by social norms (for example in Iraqi Kurdistan). In these contexts, reimbursement of expenses for local transpiration of women from the community and women Change Makers should be considered.
• Continuously monitor and adapt the strategies to engage with religious leaders (including considering the possibility of involving them as Change Makers) (Risk 1.3)
• Members of the project alliance, should identify an effective way of working together, especially by addressing in roundtable discussions the two most divisive issues: a) issue of competition for visibility and resources; b) issue of finding ‘one agreed goal’ and focus on objectives/benefits for women in Lebanon, by focusing on what is of more benefit for women in the region (Risk 3.4)

Here below, we present the findings according to each of the risks identified for each level of the Log Frame.

RESULT 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation.

Risk 1.1: The reputation and credibility of the project partners in the communities where these work does not remain the same but gets worse.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Likelihood: the likelihood for this risk to materialize is considered low in all countries and also for the overall program, as partners are well consolidated and rooted within local communities.

Impact: Partners assess that this risk if materialized will have a high impact in Lebanon.

Cause of the Risk: Some causes of the deterioration of partners credibility, could be external to the project, such as, the opposition from political parties towards a project that is challenging sectarian ‘political identities’.

Some other causes are internal to the project and have to do with bad implementation work especially in relation to communities and Change Makers (talking about things that are too difficult to be accepted; raising too high expectations; lack of positive role models; bad coordination with Change Makers and communities; risk of being associated to specific political parties’ agendas.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: around 50 % (internal causes).

Mitigation measures: Good management of Change Makers communities and main stakeholders involved: talk about things in such a way that they are acceptable; do not rise people’s expectations too much; try to keep good relations with political parties but do not appear to be associated with them.
Risk 1.2: No willingness of women and men in the communities to partake in the process of change

**Likelihood:** The likelihood that this Risk will materialize is considered medium in Lebanon.

**Impact:** The impact is expected to be between medium to high for the overall program.

**Cause of the Risk:** Main causes of this risk can be of different kinds. Some are external, such as the economic and/or the political crisis and/or the security situation, forcing people to focus on daily life to meet their basic needs and moving their attention away from gender equity issues. Other causes are more linked to the project management such as the ability to create good connections with communities and Change Makers.

**Capacity of the project to directly influence the Risk:** Around 50%

**Mitigation measures:** The manageable aspects of the project in relation to this risk concern the creation of good connections with communities and Change Makers through the following practices: use a community-based approach using key entry points; identify topics that can be accepted within the communities; do not ‘advertise’ that delicate topics are addressed in sessions with targeted community women; try to contact and meet women in the places they usually attend (community women centres, but also, for example, in Primary Health Care centres, which are usually attended mainly by women and are accepted by family male members); distance the project from any party politics and/or foreign agenda; create alliances with CBOs or CB groups.; involve religious leaders in appeals to communities; re-direct strategies to avoid more losses if the risk occurs; identify proper strategies to exploit at the most the benefits of women empowerment; improve communication, monitoring and management; utilize Oxfam’s learning on community mobilization from other similar projects to avoid facing same challenges and setting up a pilot to learn as we go and fix emerging issues.

On a more practical but not less important level: make sure meeting venues and times are accessible and suitable for different categories of people. In places where women’s freedom of movement meets social and practical obstacles (especially Iraqi Kurdistan), consider reimbursement of expenses for local transportation (taxi) for women Change Makers and targeted women from the community.

Risk 1.3: Religious/tribal leaders are not receptive to programme focus and approach and do not allow women to engage/participate in the programme

**Likelihood:** The likelihood for this to happen is considered medium in Lebanon.
Impact: The impact is considered between medium and high in Lebanon depending on communities.

Cause of the Risk: Some external and some internal. Some topics tackled or terminology used within the project might be too problematic for religious and political leaders. In Lebanon because the project might be seen as challenging religious – and thus, political - identities at the basis of the patriarchal system.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below/around 50%

Mitigation measures: Continuous follow-up, monitoring, and engagement especially in relation to religious and tribal leaders; redesign different more specific strategies to engage with religious institutions (such as more involvement of them as Change Makers); do not ‘advertise’ that delicate topics are addressed in your sessions; try to contact and meet women in the places they usually attend (community women centres, but also, for example, in Primary Health Care centres, which are usually attended mainly by women and are accepted by family male members).

RESULT 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation.

Risk 2.1: Governance systems are not in place and functioning e.g. parliament, ministries etc.

Likelihood: This risk is considered having a medium/high likelihood to materialize especially in Lebanon.

Impact: The impact is considered however low for Lebanon, where women movements have learned to work without an institutional framework.

Cause of the Risk: The cause could be political and security instability, either caused by confessional bickering between political parties in Lebanon, delays in finding an agreement in Kurdish parliament, or by regional changes – such as the ISIS in Iraq, or the overspill of the Syrian conflict to neighboring countries.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below 50%

Mitigation measures: The project could be continuing working mainly through communities (and not through governments, as it is the case for Lebanon. However, relations should be kept and work could be done with decisions makers that are/would influence the governance system i.e. political parties, religious leaders, etc. More work should be done also in the media and social media.
RESULT 3: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and key stakeholders

Risk 3.1 for 2.1

Risk 3.2: The newly enforced laws hinder and/or undermine the role of CSOs in the governance systems

Likelihood: The likelihood for this Risk to materialize is considered low in all the three countries.

Impact: Nevertheless, the impact of such a thing would be high in all countries.

Cause of the Risk: Governments might want to prevent the work of CSOs and NGOs on this issue, if this conflicted with other interests and/or for political or security related reasons (especially in Lebanon).

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below 50%

Mitigation measures: Empower and increase sense of project ownership among NGOs, CSOs and local communities; maintain good relations with officials.

Risk 3.3: Women’s rights agenda does not remain high on the national and international levels.

Likelihood: The likelihood for this Risk to materialize is considered in general low at international level and medium/low at national level.

Impact: The impact would be high if the donors stopped providing funding for women’s rights programs. Furthermore, it would cause public opinion to turn away even more from gender equity campaigning, causing the campaigning to fail.

Cause of the Risk: The causes of the risk are mainly external: political instability at national level and economic crisis at international level.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below / around 50%

Mitigation measures: It would be possible to try to address the Risk by increasing networking, campaigning, lobbying and advocacy activities toward national decision makers and international donors, especially by linking women’s rights to other hot issues (poverty, war etc.).
**Risk 3.4: Women’s right organizations and their allies are not willing to come together around one cause**

**Likelihood:** The likelihood for this Risk to materialize is considered medium.

**Impact:** The impact would be medium.

**Cause of the Risk:** The causes of the Risk are partly depend on the ability of project Allies and Targeted Stakeholders to satisfactorily address the thorny issues that have constantly hampered women’s rights organizations’ effectiveness: competition for funding and visibility in the media and within communities; lack of coordination and different agendas; different leadership styles and no room for new people; different views about the way to strategically address – confrontationally or not - the main opponents (See also analysis of social movements Indicator 2, Overall Objective).

**Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk:** around 50%

**Mitigation measures:** The mitigation of this risk is mainly under the control of the project, as it concerns the identification, by the members of the project alliance, of an effective way of working together. To this aim, the following practices are suggested: use a participatory and inclusive approach as early on as possible to ensure project ownership by project allies; include all allies (and other CSOs?) in capacity building and learning opportunities; make MoU with allies, follow up their work, involve them actively and give them visibility. In addition, explicitly address this risk in roundtable discussions with concerned NGOs in order to find solution for the two most problematic issues: a) issue of competition for visibility and resources; b) issue of finding ‘one agreed goal’ and focus on objectives/benefits for women in Lebanon.

**Risk 3.5: Negative attitudes towards foreign funded CSOs dominate the public space**

**Likelihood:** The likelihood for this risk to materialize is considered low to medium in Lebanon, if political parties and religious leaders want to use this issue as a way to condition internal politics.

**Impact:** The impact might be medium.

**Cause of the Risk:** Some causes might be internal (talking about sensitive topics such as extra marital affairs, homosexuality, love among young people, women working until late at night); some causes might be external (foreign policies in the region with increased interference of international actors with Middle East politics)
Mitigation measures: Concerning the part of the risk that is under the control of the project, the following mitigating measures are suggested: avoid very sensitive topics; openly respond to queries and explain that project was set by local NGOs as per identified needs and explain Oxfam’s and partners’ ways of working; clarify that you have non-religious-political affiliation; explain that money is for social and not for political issues; make your point in community meetings, on social media (for example through some bloggers) and other media.

Risk 4.1: Both security and political situation in target communities and countries deteriorates.

Likelihood: High in Lebanon.

Impact: High impact at all levels of society. Priorities shift and women’s rights become low on the agenda.

Cause of the Risk: Sectarian conflict in Lebanon. Spillover of the Syrian and Iraqi crisis to neighboring countries and regions.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below 50%

Mitigation measures: Contingency planning and close monitoring of the situation; slow down / cancel project activities; lobby on main stakeholders involved in conflict to stop the conflict.

Risk 4.2: Governments are not responsive to claims for protecting and advancing women’s right.

Likelihood: the likelihood is medium/high.

Impact: medium in all the three countries

Cause of the Risk: Deteriorated political and security situation and priorities shift. Women’s rights claims clash with sectarian, religious, patriarchal political systems.

Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk: Below / around 50%

Mitigation measures: intensify project activities especially lobbying with media and decision makers, trying to build a critical mass of support for women’s rights agenda.
Risk 4.3: There are major natural and/or man-made disasters in the targeted countries

**Likelihood:** Low for natural disasters. For man-made disasters see above Risk 4.1

**Impact:** High in both cases (for man-made disasters see above Risk 4.1)

**Cause of the Risk:** Natural causes. For man-made disasters see above Risk 4.1

*Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk:* None for natural disasters. For man-made disasters see above Risk 4.1

**Mitigation measures:** Update action plans, also depending on affected areas. Introduce gender agenda in humanitarian situation and/or add humanitarian dimension to gender equity agenda). For man-made disasters see above Risk 4.1

Risk 4.4: Newly elected governments and political parties are not responsive and willing to engage with existing CSOs, including human and women’s rights organizations

**Likelihood:** Medium likelihood in Lebanon. In general, it is highlighted that elected governments and political parties might be not cooperative but not blocking.

**Impact:** Medium

**Cause of the Risk:** More urgent issues (conflicts) and women’s rights are not seen as a priority.

*Capacity of project to directly influence the Risk:* around 50%,

(As it partly depends on women’s rights, organizations’ ability to work with newly elected governments and political parties, partly on who the newly elected governments and parties will be).

**Mitigation measures:** intensify project activities especially campaigning, lobbying with media and decision makers, social media, and demonstrations.
ANNEX 14 – LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR M&E

These recommendations concern the way the LANA project should be monitored by re-utilizing the main tools used for the Baseline, slightly modified taking into account the new aim and the learning from this Baseline Study.

The Indicators Tracking Table for M&E (ANNEX 15a), a development of the Indicator Guidelines matrix used for this Baseline Study (ANNEX 5) is the main document to be taken into consideration when monitoring the project, as it provides for each level of the Log Frame and for each Indicator, the following information:

- Indicator definition and rationale
- Unit of analysis
- Baseline
- Target
- Data collection Tools for M&E
- Responsible for data collection
- Data analysis method
- Responsible for data analysis
- Data collection & analysis frequency

The Indicator Tracking Table for M&E also contains indications about M&E of Indicators that have not been baselined.

In this section, we also provide an overarching recommendation about the choice of Change Makers, men and women from the community, and on the use of the Control Group, in relation to the validity of the samples utilized for the Baseline with Tool 1.

In this section are presented, in order of priority:

- M&E actions to be carried from the start
- Tools to be used anytime need arises
- Tool to be used at Mid Term
- Tools to be used at EoP (Evaluation)

SEE ANNEX 15b – M&E Action Plan

For detailed guidance notes and formats of the tools to be used during M&E, please see:
ANNEX 15c - M&E Tools

M&E actions to be carried out as soon as possible

Tool 1
Change Makers selection for meaningful sampling
As explained in Chapter 2.2.3, in order to obviate to the evident limitations in fact of Change Makers sampling, and to have a more meaningful sample of Change Makers baselined, the AT agreed with Oxfam to continue the Change Makers baseline during implementation.

In particular, it was agreed to proceed as soon as possible with the baseline of all the Change Makers of the first tier of the first year (which means other 90 Change Makers to be surveyed as soon as possible).

In addition, we suggest to baseline also the Change Makers of the first tier of the second year (240).

Finally, all of the Change Makers (360) surveyed in the first and second year should be then surveyed at EoP. In the analysis at EoP, it will be necessary to take into account of the different times in which the different Change Makers have joined the project.

In this way, the final sample of 360 Change Makers will not be a sample ‘statistically’ representative of the final Change Makers population (as originally it was not possible to use simple random sampling methodology), but surely we will have a good understanding of the effectiveness of the project about all the surveyed Change Makers, whose number (360) remains however significant.

Furthermore, the AT suggests, that the representativeness of the surveyed Change Makers can be ‘guaranteed’ in a ‘qualitative’ manner, also:

during project implementation, by making sure that all the partners continue to identify Change Makers according to the criteria specified by the project proposal (location, sex, some activism) as they did, at least in part, for the Change Makers baselined in this study (see Chapter 3);

While selecting new Change Makers, it would also be especially recommended – depending on the country context, to consider the possibility to improve the balance between men and women in the choice of Change Makers as to reach the 50/50 balance suggested by project criteria.

By verifying, at EoP, that the mentioned criteria have actually been respected (as done in this Baseline report for the 30 surveyed Change Makers, see Chapter 3).

In this way, we will not have a sample ‘statistically’ representative (as originally it was not possible to use a simple random sampling methodology), but surely we will have a good understanding of the effectiveness of the project about all the surveyed Change Makers, whose number (360) remains however significant.

In addition, to ‘qualitatively’ ‘extend’ the representativeness of all the baselined Change
In addition, to ‘qualitatively’ ‘extend’ the representativeness of all the baselined Change Makers, in relation the final Change Makers population, Tool 1 – Part A) Q1-Q19 (about the socio-demographic characteristics) could be administered, to all the other Change Makers that join the project. In phase of evaluation, the proportion – in terms of socio-demographic characteristic - of the sample and the reference population will have to be verified.

*Targeted community men’s and women’s selection for meaningful sampling*

As explained in Chapter 2.2.3, the (even if not ‘statistical’) representativeness of the 270 Community Members men and women, in relation to the final population (7360) could be preserved, if the final population will resemble at least in some main aspects the baselined population of 270. This would mean that the remaining 7090 Community Members, should be selected proportionally to the characteristics of the experimental population of 270 Community Members (location, sex, not actively involved in community activities and gender issues, age).

This would mean to administer Tool 1 – Part A) Q1-Q19 to all the other new 7090 Community Members who will join the project and constantly monitor the data and proportions through frequency tables, to make sure the validity of the initial sample is guaranteed. In phase of evaluation, the proportion – in terms of socio-demographic characteristic - of the sample and the reference population will have to be verified. In this case, that sample of baselined Community Members, would not become a ‘statistically’ meaningful, but could provide, if surveyed again at EoP, a good sense of change created by the project that is representative also for al the final group of Change Makers.

The suggested process is however quite complex, would not give ‘statistical’ validity to the sample, would require a quite strong M&E effort and a certain rigidity in the selection of the remaining Community Members, and can thus could result limiting for the free expression of Change Makers in the choice of the people they want to work with.

In alternative to a rigid application of the above process, and at the same time in order to preserve the representativeness of the baselined sample the AT suggests that Oxfam and partners could/should adopt a ‘softer’, more ‘qualitative’ and reasonable approach:

During implementation, by making sure that all the partners continue to identify targeted community men and women according to the criteria specified by the project proposal (location, sex, less active than Change Makers) and maintaining a certain proportionality with the socio-demographic characteristics of the baselined Community Members (see Chapter 3).

It is especially recommended, while selecting new Change – depending on the country context, to consider the possibility to improve the balance between men and women in the choice of Change Makers as to reach the 50/50 balance suggested by project criteria (see Chapter 3).
It is especially recommended, while selecting new Community Members, especially in Lebanon, to keep choosing them not among the ‘usual ‘people, with already interest and experience in community activism and gender issues, rather among ‘ordinary’ people ‘fresh’ to these issues.

By verifying at EoP that the mentioned criteria have actually been respected (as done in this Baseline report, see Chapter 3).

All this, while also bearing in mind, that a sample of 270 people, if surveyed again at EoP, even if not ‘statistically’ meaningful, is however a sample sufficiently large to measure changes brought about by the project.

**Redoing the Control Group**

We have seen in Chapter 2.2.3 and Chapter 3.1, that the validity of the baseline Control Group (only in Jordan) in relation to the ‘experimental’ group of men and women from the community, was hampered by noticeable difference is sex and age between the two groups especially concerning:

**Age:**
- community group: average age 33.8 of the members
- control group: an average age of 42.9

**Sex**
- community group: female: 45.2%; male: 54.8% (122 women, 148 men)
- control group: female: 35.7%; male: 64.3%

Furthermore, the Control Group, is slightly more active at community level than the experimental group.

For this reason we strongly advice to build a new Control Group, again of 70 people, according to the required criteria (location different from that of the experimental group, not targeted by the project; similar to community in terms of sex, age and low levels of activism,). In phase of analysis it will be necessary to compare the differences in % increase between the two groups for the relevant indicators.

In other words, to summarize Tool 1 during implementation, the for data collected at baseline through Tool 1 to be valid, specific recommendations about selection of Change Makers and targeted Community Members, and of a new Control Group, should be carefully applied.

The additional Change Makers, and if Oxfam and partners will decide, a new Control Group will have to be baselined as soon as possible. Baseline of Change Makers should be continuing
also during the second year (first tier). The new Community Members targeted by the project will also have to be surveyed with the part of Tool 1 about their socio demographic characteristics. At the EoP, and during the evaluation process, Tool 1 should be administered again to the same baselined Change Makers, men and women from the community and Control Group.

**Tools to monitor Indicators that have not been baselined (to be designed by Oxfam)**

- Oxfam and partners will need to design the following tools:
  - Capacity Assessment for partners (Result 3 Indicator 1). This tool should be used as soon as possible to baseline partners’ capacity and again at EoP to check for progress.
  - Documentation systems to collect data about implementation activities and outputs, and related Indicators. These documentation systems will be used during implementation but the data will be analyzed at EoP. In particular:
    - CEDAW reports, Shadow CEDAW Reports, periodic reports on women’s Rights in the MENA Region, Press Releases, press releases etc. (Overall Objective Indicator 1)
    - News, blogs, reports and academic articles on social movements in the three countries and across the MENA Region (Overall Objective Indicator 2)
    - Indexes by Human Rights Watchdogs (Overall Objective Indicator 3)
    - Change Makers’ registrar for initiated actions (date, place, agenda, proceedings, list of participants and other related materials) (Specific Objective Indicator 3)
    - Advocacy strategy, case studies, media coverage, record of joint statements of alliance forum (Result 2 Indicator 1)
    - Evidence of joint regional actions by women for a, with reference to women’s coalition, comprising record of joint regional statements policy papers, newsletter, website (Result 3 Indicator 2)

**5.2.2 Tools to be used anytime need arises (Monitoring)**

**Tool 1**

Tool 1 should be utilized to continue the baseline a sample of Change Makers (Tool 1 – Part a, b and c) and to continually survey the socio demographic characteristics, of all the new Community Members and Change Makers (Tool 1 – Part – Q1-Q19 only), as they join the project, following the recommendations presented in the previous section.

**Tools 3, 4 and 5**

Tool 3, 4 and 5 are all aimed at mapping and monitoring stakeholders. They should be used consequentially:

Tool 3 is useful to map all stakeholders (Champions, Floaters and Blockers) and to select among them respectively the Allies (to include in the alliance with Change Makers), the Targeted Stakeholders (those who could be moved towards more favorable positions) and the Opponents (towards whom to adopt mitigating strategies if needed).
This should be used anytime the project partners identify new stakeholders, whether champions, floaters or blockers.

It should also be gradually completed for the stakeholders that have already been identified but for whom not enough information has been collected. Data Analysis should be carried out according to the Guidance Notes for Tool 3.

The tool can be used during evaluation to assess whether any of the stakeholders moved from one role to another during implementation.

ANNEX 15C – M&E TOOLS (TOOL 3)

Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5

Tool 4 needs to be used anytime new Allies or Targeted Stakeholders (not Opponents) are identified, in order to measure their attitudes at the moment in which they become part of the project.

It should also be utilized to interview Allies and Targeted stakeholders that have already been identified but not yet interviewed, especially in Lebanon and Kurdistan.

At EoP, during evaluation, Tool 4 will have to be administered again to all the baselined Allies and Targeted Stakeholders and data compared with baseline data by producing frequency tables and Additive Index charts (for Chapter 4.9 on Result 2 Indicator 3; see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5).

It needs to be pointed out that in this case, the analysis will have to be carried in relation to whole figures (number of stakeholders) and not in percentage rates (% of stakeholders), as requested by the formulation of the related Indicator (Result 2 – Indicator 3).

Furthermore, in phase of analysis, it will have to be taken into account that, because the Allies are selected in the first place for their support for gender equity, the results of the questionnaire of attitudes, will give in general positive results, as it had to be expected. Toll 4 should be thus administered to a larger number of Targeted Stakeholders.

Finally, in phase of data analysis, it will necessary to keep into account the fact the different Allies and Targeted Stakeholders have joined the project at different times.

Reference: M&E Tools (Tool 4)

Reference: Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5

Tool 5 should be used only for Allies, in order to baseline their capacity at the moment they join the project. As for Tool 4, it should also be utilized to interview Allies that have already been identified but not yet interviewed, especially in Lebanon and Kurdistan.
At EoP, during evaluation, Tool 5 will have to be administered again to all the baselined Allies and data compared with baselined data by producing charts showing for each of the dimension analyzed (different capacity aspects), the baseline level of each one of the individual Allies examined. (See Chapter 4.10; see Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5). These charts will be then compared to the charts elaborated at baseline for each Ally, to check progress in the dimensions examined. In phase of data analysis, it will necessary to keep into account the fact the different Allies have joined the project at different times.

As already mentioned in Chapter 2.2.3, the main limit of Tool 5 is that it is based only on what Allies say and not on a proper review of documents (strategies, reports, policy recommendations, material and resources on gender etc.) nor on interviews with different level staff. In other words, Tool 5 does not provide a proper full organizational assessment of the baselined organizations, but allows having a basic picture of the Allies’ organizational capacity on gender and advocacy. For this reason, we suggest that if Oxfam and partners will want to have a more in-depth picture, they could either proceed with a proper organizational assessment or administer also the Allies more detailed capacity assessment that they will prepare for partners.

Reference: M&E Tools (Tool 5)
Reference: Stakeholder – Database Tool 3, 4 and 5

Tool 8

Tool 8 should be continually revised and updated according to changes in the context, in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraqi Kurdistan, in order to monitor the risks for the project

See M&E Tools (Tool 8)
See Risk Assessment – Consolidation Matrix Tool 8

5.2.3 Tool to be used at Mid Term (Monitoring)

Tool 2

As it was anticipated in the Baseline Methodology (ANNEX 3), Tool 2 to be used during project monitoring, is different from the Tool 2 used at Baseline. Indeed, Tool 2 has been modified in order to be better able at identify changes – positive and negative wanted and unwanted - during project implementation. The modifications to this Tool have been inspired to the Outcome Mapping and Most Significant Change techniques.

This tool should be used every six months or more frequently, to qualitatively monitor changes among Change Makers and targeted men and women from the communities and thus to readdress actions during the project implementation period.

Data should be analyzed in both quantitative and narrative manner as done at baseline.
The same - or a similar qualitative tool - should be used for evaluation.

ANNEX 15c- M&E Tools (Tool 2)
Tools to monitor Indicators that have not been baselined (to be designed by Oxfam)
Oxfam and partners will need to design a tool to monitor, at Mid-Term, fora members’ satisfaction through member feedback, interviews with active members using satisfaction scoring (Result 2 Indicator 2).

5.2.4 Tools to be used at EoP (Evaluation)
Tool 1

As we have seen above, in relation to Tool 1, during implementation, specific recommendations should be followed in order to provide/preserve “qualitative” representativeness to the baselined population.

At EoP, during the evaluation process, Tool 1 should be administered again to all the same baselined Change Makers, the baselined men and women from the community and from Control Group.

In the questionnaires (for Change Makers and Community Members, thus also for the Control Group) to be administered at EoP, a new set of questions on the changes happened during the implementation should be included. These questions should be covering changes happened during the implementation period and should allow to understand if changes, related to the dimensions explored in the survey, happened or not, if they were positive or negative, if were created by the project or from external circumstances and if were planned or unexpected. Data analysis should be then carried out, by comparing frequency tables and additive index charts obtained by the endline survey, with those obtained for this Baseline Study, those obtained in following baselines, and check for changes in the Indicators.

ANNEX 15c- M&E Tools (Tool 1)
See Database Tool 1 – Change Makers and community

Tool 6

Tool 6 (and Tool 5 Part b) should be used during evaluation to assess progress in the Overall Objective in relation to social movements.
A question on the changes happened in terms of social movements and gender equity during the project time frame, has been added in this version of the tool (both in Tool 6 and Tool 5 Part b).
The analysis will be carried out in a narrative manner and will be integrated with academic articles, reports, news and blogs collected also by Oxfam and partners team also during implementation (see above; see Indicator Tracking Table). During project implementation, reports, articles, books, blogs etc. elaborated by key observers should be collected by Oxfam and partners to support the evaluator’s analysis.

ANNEX 15c - M&E Tools (Tool 6)

Tool 7

Tool 7 should be used at during evaluation to assess progress in the Overall Objective in relation to CEDAW and HR Indexes.

This analysis will be carried out in a narrative manner and will benefit of the material (CEDAW reports, HR Indexes reports etc.) collected by Oxfam and partners during implementation (see above; see Indicator Tracking Table).

ANNEX 15c - M&E Tools (Tool 7)

See CEDAW / HR Indexes – Consolidation Matrix Tool 7

Tools 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8

As we have explained above, these tools should be used during monitoring. For use of Tools 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 during evaluation, please see above in this chapter.

5.2.5 Capacity building of M&E staff

Relevant project staff should be trained to use the tools to be used for monitoring, which are, as we have seen:

- Tool 1 – Part a) Q1-Q19) selection of community men and women and Change Makers
- Tool 1) Part a) Q1-26) to baseline the new Control Group
- Tool 1) Part a) Pat b) and Part c) to baseline new Change Makers
- Capacity Assessment for partners (to be designed by Oxfam and partners)
- Documentation systems for indicators that have not been baselined
- Tool 3, 4 and 5 (for new stakeholders and allies)
- Tool 8 (to constantly monitor the risks for the project)
- Tool 2 (to qualitatively monitor, through FGDs, changes among Change Makers and targeted men and women from the communities)
- Satisfaction form and interviews for fora members (to be designed by Oxfam and partners).
ANNEX 15 – INDICATOR TRACKING TABLE (ITT)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOG FRAME LEVEL</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR DEFINITION AND RATIONALE</th>
<th>UNIT OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TARGET (EoP - 2 YEARS)</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS FOR M&amp;E</th>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective: Women and men increasingly reject all forms of discrimination that give rise to gender inequality, contributing to a more equal, violence-free and democratic society in the MENA region</td>
<td>Indicator 3: Improvement in ranking of target countries in human rights, particularly women’s rights, and democracy indices, by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>“Improvement in ranking” refers to positive changes in ranking, by EoP against the baseline</td>
<td>Annual reports and indices</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.4</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.4</td>
<td>Annual reports and indices for Arab states for democracy and human rights watchdogs (baseline and endline – 2 years and 5 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective: Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere</td>
<td>Indicator 1: Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>“Improved perception of women in targeted communities of their role and participation in decision making” refers to improvements in the way women (non-Change Makers) perceive their own role and participation in decision making at household, community (and national) level, by EoP compared to baseline</td>
<td>Targeted women Community Members + in Jordan: Control Group (women)</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.5</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.5</td>
<td>Survey with a representative sample of women Community Members – (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective: Women in targeted communities of Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq enjoy increased participation and decision making within the private and public sphere</td>
<td>Indicator 3: By EoP compared to baseline, percentage of Change Makers who can:</td>
<td>“Percentage of Change Makers” refers to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Report increased and positive engagement with women’s participation in the public and private sphere</td>
<td>Numerator: # of women and men Change Makers who can report; Denominator: total # of women and men Change Makers</td>
<td>Change Makers + Control Group (same as for Community Members)</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.6</td>
<td>see Chapter 4.6</td>
<td>Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA ANALYSIS METHODS**

- **TOOL 1:** Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part a) – Q24 for women Community Members (+ Control Group – women – only in Jordan)
  - Frequency Tables and Additive Index
- **TOOL 2:** Change Makers and Community Members FGDs
  - Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of the info collected during FGD
- **TOOL 7:** Desk Review on Women Rights Implementation – Part b) on HR Indices
  - Consolidation Tables + Narrative
**Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation**

**Indicator 1:** Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers who demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles by EoP compared to baseline;

- **“Percentage of targeted men and women Change Makers”** refers to:
  - Numerator: # of women and men Change Makers who show positive change
  - Denominator: total # of women and men Change Makers

- “demonstrate positive changes in their perception of gender roles” refers to the changes in terms of attitudes towards gender roles but also in terms of their self-esteem and confidence to engage with the issue of gender equity, by EoP, against the baseline

**Change Makers + Control Group (same as for Community Members)**

See Chapter 4.7

See Chapter 4.7

Survey with a representative sample of Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)

**TOOLS**

- **TOOL 1: Change Makers and Community Members**
  - **Survey – Part a** for both Change Makers and Community Members Q20 (for men and women) and Q21 (only for women)
  - FGDs with Change Makers (baseline, mid-term and endline – 2 years)

- **Frequency Tables and Additive Index**

**METHODS**

- **Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of the info collected during FGD**

**Result 1: Women and men in targeted communities are mobilized and have improved perceptions of gender equality and women’s political participation**

**Indicator 2:** Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers) in targeted communities who respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation by EoP against the baseline;

- **“Percentage of women and men (not Change Makers)”** refers to:
  - Numerator: # of women and men non Change Makers who show positive changes
  - Denominator: total # of women and men non Change Makers

- “respond positively on issues related to women’s political participation” refers to positive changes in their interest towards their own/women’s participation in political processes (such as practicing right to vote, taking part in political organizations, taking part in political activities, being a member of a CBO/CSO, participating in civic activities at various levels – local/national)” measured by EoP against the baseline

**Targeted Community Members + In Jordan: Control group (men / women)**

See Chapter 4.8

See Chapter 4.6

Survey with a representative sample of Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline and endline – 2 years)

**TOOLS**

- **TOOL 1: Change Makers and Community Members**
  - **Survey – Part a** for both Change Makers and Community Members - Community Members women: Q25 - Community Members men: Q26
  - FGDs with Community Members – not Change Makers (baseline, mid-term and endline – 2 years)

- **Frequency Tables and Additive Index**

**METHODS**

- **Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of the info collected during FGD**

**Result 2: Change Makers and their allies are actively engaged in joint advocacy for increased women’s political participation**

**Indicator 3:** Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers who show improvement in their perception of women’s political participation by EoP compared to baseline;

- **“Number of targeted opinion formers and decision makers”** refers to:
  - Numerator: number of women and men targeted opinion formers and decision makers l- including Allies (excluding Blockers)

**Targeted opinion formers and decision makers – including Allies (excluding Blockers)**

See Chapter 4.9

See Chapter 4.9

Opinion formers and decision makers questionnaire (List of targets from partners) (baseline and endline – 2 years)

**TOOLS**

- **TOOL 3: Stakeholder Power Assessment (to identify Allies and other targeted stakeholders)**

- **See Tool 3 Guidance Notes**

**METHODS**

- **Frequency Tables and Additive Index**
### Result 3: Improved cooperation and capacity of project partners and alliance members through joint learning and actions

| Indicator 1: Evidence of significant, positive changes (against the baseline) in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning by EoP, with emphasis on women’s organizations, coalitions and networks: |
| “Evidence of” refers to the set of oral and written documentation about practices and strategies developed thanks to regional exchanges among partners and targeted key stakeholders in Fora |
| Allies (including Change Makers) |
| see Chapter 4.10 |
| TOOL 4: Stakeholders Questionnaire (Allies and Targeted Stakeholders – Part a) on attitudes |
| Frequency Tables and Additive Index |

| Note that “Targeted key stakeholders” refers to ‘alliance members’ and specifically to allies and Change Makers who, together with partners, take part into regional exchanges |
| “significant, positive changes in the strategies and/or practices of partners and targeted key stakeholders based on regional learning” refers to improved strategies and/or practices – especially in terms of participation into women’s organizations, coalitions and networks – as reported by partners, Change Makers and allies (Fora) by EoP, against the baseline |
| PLEASE, NOTE that partners’ Capacity will be baselined by Oxfam |
| TOOL 5: Allies Interviews – Part a) capacity assessment |
| Charts showing for each of the dimension analyzed (different capacity aspects), the baseline level of each one of the individual Allies examined |

| TOOL 1: Change Makers and Community Members Survey – Part b) capacity assessment – for Change Makers only for Change Makers men and women > B1, B2, B3 |

| TOOL 2: Change Makers – Part a) Survey with Change Makers and (baseline and endline – 2 years) |
| Frequency Tables and Additive Index |

| Survey with a representative sample of the info collected |
| Qualitative Analysis |
| Quantitative and Additive Index |

| Frequency Tables of the info collected |
| Qualitative Analysis of the info collected |