

After 5 years’ experience in Lebanon and extensive work with the security sector agencies (SSAs), we understand that relationships matter. The UK has invested for over a decade in ISF capacity, building a hard-earned network of contacts and a deep level of trust. It is critical these relationships are maintained, broadened and deepened in the next phase of delivery. The same is true of the UK’s unparalleled relations with the LAF and constructive collaboration with General Security (GS) on CT and border management issues.

Genuine partnership with the ISF and other SSAs is dependent on the perception that partners are committed, credible and ‘in it for the long haul’. Our team has these relationships, built up over many years, and solidified through consistent attention to issues that are important to Lebanese partners. This involved being ready to respond to requests for advice when they were made, in the languages that the officers worked in, and almost always face-to-face. *Our track record is clear in this regard and our relationship strategy and team composition reflects the requirements of availability, language and appropriateness. Senior ISF officers have engaged closely with us in preparing for this programme, and we believe that they trust us to assist them through a step-change in ISF’s approach and capability.*

As well as direct trust-building with individual counterparts, it is critical to understand the politics of the SSAs, both internal and contextual. Although it is simplistic to label the ISF the ‘sunni security force’, it is true that state authority partly flow along confessional lines, and that strategic decisions, senior appointments and resource allocation are viewed through a confessional-political lens. In addition to external political factors, understanding the ‘hidden wiring’ of any organisation is important for sustaining positive dynamics through the tough processes of change. Our existing knowledge, coupled by continually updated Political Economy Analysis (PEA), has helped us successfully navigate the complex landscape of Lebanese security for the last 5 years.

Added value: *Our Lebanon team includes a small number of well-regarded and highly-networked former ISF, LAF and GS officers, who work as consultants to advise our teams on how to engage in a constructive way which aligns with organisational and individual incentives and perspectives, facilitate introductions and meetings, and help us avoid the pitfalls and obstacles which many international projects encounter.*

Continual PEA and stakeholder engagement planning to sustain positive relations through the challenges of change: As a core deliverable to BEB, in the inception phase we will carry out an in-depth stakeholder mapping and analysis to understand pinch-points, blockers and champions¹, and will update this every quarter as a component of the quarterly internal review cycle. Our stakeholder mapping methodology determines power dynamics, formal and informal authority structures, incentives, and how key post-holders relate to one another within and across the political landscape. This generates a live and continually updated political picture, enabling the programme team to manage and navigate the complex Lebanese canvas, informing every stakeholder engagement and underpinning conflict-sensitive delivery of each activity.

Based on this network mapping, we create individual Stakeholder Engagement Plans for the priority actors. These enable the programme team to tailor their engagements to incentives and perspectives of counterparts, and to identify secondary and tertiary lines of influence to ‘nudge’ key stakeholder incentives to generate and maintain alignment with programme objectives. This proven approach has **three key benefits:**

- ▶ Ensuring that programme decisions are based on the analysis of dynamics, not of actors as static entities. Simple engagement strategies such as ‘inform’, ‘consult’ or ‘empower’ assume generally fixed attitudes and perspectives. By continuously mapping underlying drivers the project team and BEB will be able to more effectively plan stakeholder engagements based on current circumstances.
- ▶ Maximising programme effectiveness by focusing on key influencers who sit at central nodes of the stakeholder network, and who can act to inhibit coherence or break potential deadlock.
- ▶ Leveraging data for adaptation and lessons learning. Stakeholder engagement feeds our evidence base of ‘what works’ to minimise negative blockers, lack of buy-in and unintended consequences.

Added value: *we will share the tailored stakeholder engagement plans with BEB to support the Embassy’s Political Access and Influence (PAI) objectives with the ISF and Mol. The plans will be updated before and after each engagement which will allow the Embassy to continuously benefit and adapt their own engagement strategies to leverage further influence.*

Added Value: *Our team is already operating on the ground with established relationships, meaning our strategy is based on ‘what works’ in the complex political stakeholder environment in Lebanon. Our strategy has five key features: 1) continual, in-depth PEA and stakeholder engagement planning; 2) strong joint project governance and co-management mechanisms driving full accountability through both BEB and the ISF command chain; 3) close access to the DG and senior team, supplemented by strong relationships at operational and service delivery levels; 4) hand-picked advisers from LAF and GS to help sustain cross-agency relations; 5) measuring other donor contributions to UK objectives as KPI; and a project approach which places host community relations at its core.*

Our Technical Director Henry Smith has been Team Leader for a multi-year €2.5 million programme in Lebanon which aimed to improve the ability of Lebanese security agencies to engage with, and respond to, the needs of communities. Within this, he built sustainable relationships with both the security agencies and CSOs through combined security capacity building, CSO engagement, communications and dialogue activities. The programme is described by the EU Delegation as ‘its most innovative security cooperation programme in Lebanon’ and is regularly used by the EU to demonstrate its effectiveness in the area of security cooperation and relationship management.

¹ This will also include gender, disability and human rights champions within the programme team and the ISF.

Programme governance for ISF strategic, policy and political-level ownership: In line with principles which have proved effective on a number of BEB-led projects (e.g. support to the Land Border Regiments), we propose to put in place *a strong joint programme governance and co-management structure to foster full accountability for ISF delivery through the Lebanese command and political chain*. This will comprise a High-Level Steering Committee (HLSC), co-chaired by the ISF DG and the British Ambassador, with representation from the MOI and the Prime Minister’s Office. In line with the KPIs set out below, to promote coherence we will seek to extend membership to the other SSAs and civilian government institutions over the course of the project. The HLSC will convene quarterly to receive a strategic update briefing and give top-level direction on adaptation and programme focus. The role of secretariat to the HLSC will be held by the Strategic Implementation Management Unit (SIMU) described in section 1.2.4. The SIMU will have responsibility for planning and measuring implementation of the ISF Strategic Plan, within which all UK project initiatives will be framed. The purpose, composition and detailed terms of reference (TORs) for the SIMU and HLSC, including delegation of authority for decisions, will be agreed between the IP and the ISF during the Inception Phase.

There is compelling evidence that strong and collaborative governance structures drive beneficiary ownership. For example, Tony Hulton, our Inter Agency Coordination Lead, has been leading the LAF CIMIC JPIT since 2014. The CIMIC JPIT has pushed the project forward and enabled CIMIC to become a formalised part of the LAF (J9) and has seen CIMIC grow substantially in terms of staff, formalised systems and processes, and ingrained doctrine.

Joint UK-Lebanese project management, collocated in ISF HQ for seamless access to stakeholders: We aim for our programme management team to co-locate with the SIMU in ISF HQ by the end of the first quarter of the project, meaning that Torchlight and the ISF which will co-manage the project from inside the organisation, reporting to the ISF DG and offering access to ISF departments for capacity building and consultations. In this way, (a) ISF counterparts are responsible and accountable to their DG for implementation of a co-owned programme plan; (b) the programme is an internal process of organisational change, supported by UK advice, rather than an externally-imposed one; (c) we build essential project management skills within the ISF, progressively handing over the project management lead to full ISF ownership for sustainability and continued improvement after project exit. Every month the SIMU will convene a full project management meeting, with the participation of relevant BEB personnel (subject to agreement including the Police Attaché, CTPLO and programme team) to determine activity for the forthcoming month.

Working together, B&S and FCP, are already engaged in Lebanon on the ‘Improving Community Engagement and Dialogue’ Programme for the EU. This not only ensures that we can provide value for money by deconflicting activities between donor projects, it will also prevent any conflict between programmes and utilise our comprehensive understanding of SSAs in Lebanon.

Working across the security agencies and with civilian host government stakeholders: Lebanon is a relatively top-down environment, and one where seniority matters. Our team members have access to and good relationships with the current DGs of the ISF and GS, as well as senior officials in the LAF. *We will continue the existing relationship with General Othman through our Strategic Police Advisor, while at the same time cultivating close relationships with the second tier of leaders and with commanders at regional and local levels.* This helps to mitigate the ‘succession risk’ to the programme and reduces the impact of turnover through rotation of counterparts. We appreciate, however, that active ownership and leadership of programme work by the DG is indispensable and have selected a Team Leader and a group of Outcome Leads who have long-standing experience leading complex projects with multiple political stakeholders. Our international team is supported by well-regarded retired senior ISF officer, **Gen (rtd) Joseph Douaihy**, who as a former leader in the Territorial Gendarmerie has a close understanding of ISF relations outside Beirut. To help us foster coordination with other agencies, **LAF Gen (rtd) Bassam Boutrous** and **GS Gen (rtd)**

Dany Fares bring the team extensive experience of interagency coordination on border management and other issues, and will help us navigate the bureaucracy and political landscape of the SSAs as well as enabling access to leadership cadres in the agencies and related ministries. All our meetings with senior officers are recorded in Key Leader Engagement (KLE) reports and shared with the Authority to ensure coherence of message between operational and policy levels.

Leveraging a multiplier effect from donor partners to maximise impact and value for money: In line with KPI2 below, we place great emphasis on donor coherence and synergy. For Torchlight, this goes beyond coordination meetings and information exchange – we actively seek opportunities to bring other donors into projects through funding and in-kind contributions, and to make active contributions to other related initiatives where possible and approved by the Authority. Support to Lebanese policing is a relatively well-populated playing field: the EU has long-standing project engagements with the ISF focused capacity building and training, as well as community safety partnering interventions managed by our consortium partners FCP and B&S; the US continues to provide substantial funding support to equipment and construction, including of the Aramoun academy; and UNDP is actively piloting initiatives with municipal police units; and other bilateral donors such as the Netherlands have supported ISF CT capability, including forensics management and investigations capacity. **Added Value:** *We propose to bring key donor partners into HLSC meetings as observers, and to liaise closely to identify areas of synergy – indicatively, for example, we believe that the UNDP work with municipal police forces has the potential to act as a multiplier to the ISF’s transition to a community policing stance in some locations. We believe that over the course of the programme it is highly likely that other donors will make financial or in-kind contributions aligned with HMG’s objectives, with the potential to augment UK funding with significant additional resources, providing greater value for money for the UK spend.* We will discuss potential donor collaboration opportunities with the Authority and, should they proceed, measure these contributions and their effect in line with the KPI below and as part of our standard M&E and VFM reporting.

Driving active engagement with host communities: Because community policing is, at heart, about listening and responding to community concerns and needs, our approach puts host community engagement at its heart. Building on extensive work our team

has already completed in Akkar and Baalbek-Hermel we focus not only on the ‘supply side’ of local policing but on the ‘demand side’, building the capacity of host community actors to articulate their needs and to hold ISF to account at the local level. In target locations we sponsor and facilitate Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) which feed into regional and local police planning and delivery. Our highly qualified and experienced Lebanese advisers have an in-depth knowledge of the political and social dynamics of target locations and are critical to the programmes’ ability to build and maintain constructive community relations. Wherever possible we anticipate potential individuals who for political or interest-based reasons may oppose programme delivery, and engage early to align incentives and goals.

Managing lack of buy-in through the different phases of the programme: Whilst we have a very strong track record of relationship management, and high confidence in the success of our approach detailed above – the complex Lebanese political and institutional landscape will likely present engagement challenges throughout the programme lifecycle. This could be through a shifting focus onto other duties, change in senior personnel or conflict factors in communities. Regardless, our experience in relationship management in Lebanon has shown that we must be prepared for it. Our response is fourfold and will minimise the risk of delays:

- i. Pause delivery in areas where actions may not produce outputs or lead to outcomes – for example; it is possible to populate a training session with beneficiary personnel for the purpose of delivery; but if lack of senior buy-in means they are not the right people, then it is money wasted (our iterative and adaptive planning will ensure resources are appropriately focused elsewhere to ensure programme momentum is not lost).
- ii. Analyse the reasons for reduced buy-in and develop appropriate mitigation measures; in many cases this is about either an individual protecting his or her interests; or a perception of ‘isomorphism’, with lip service paid to western concepts which are not considered useful in practice. Once we understand motivations, tailored mitigations can then be developed.
- iii. Realign delivery with individual and organisational incentives. Our full approach is to support ISF-led change, but continual adaptation to ensure alignment with current circumstances and pressures is essential.
- iv. If obstacles persist, report clearly and quickly to the Authority, including for discussion of potential BEB intervention if the issue is at policy/political level, in line with our risk management processes.

Key Performance Indicators: We propose the following KPIs to monitor and report on the effectiveness and quality of the supplier relationship management:

KPI 1: SIMU monthly review meetings and quarterly High-Level Steering Committee briefings provide strong joint Lebanese-UK project management, governance and oversight

KPI	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Evidence/Reporting
Number of strategic SIMU monthly reviews and HLSC quarterly briefings	SIMU and SC established; 6 SIMU meetings, 2 HLSC	12 SIMU meetings, 4 HLSC	12 SIMU meetings, 4 HLSC	SIMU and HLSC notes

KPI 2: Access to and buy-in from other SSAs and Host Government stakeholders and donor partners

KPI	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Evidence/Reporting
Number of Key Leader Engagements with other SSA and Host Government senior stakeholders	10 KLE reports with identified next steps LAF and GS officers attend HLSC as observers	12 KLE reports with identified next steps LAF and GS officers represented at HLSC as full members; and MOI, MoSA and PMO officials attend as observers	12 KLE reports with identified next steps Full HLSC membership for LAF, GS, MOI, MoSA and PMO 3 donors make financial or in-kind contribution to programme objectives	KLE meeting notes and full reports HLSC meeting summaries M&E reports
Representation of SSAs and government entities on HLSC	UNDP, US and EU donor representatives attend HLSC as observers	MOI, MoSA and PMO officials attend as observers	3 donors make financial or in-kind contribution to programme objectives	
Allocation of other donor funding to support programme objectives		2 donors make financial or in-kind contribution to programme objectives		

KPI 3: Strengthening ISF and community relationships through community policing and community safety partnerships

KPI	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Evidence/reporting
Number of CSPs projects implemented with positive feedback from the communities	16 CSP projects implemented with Outcomes and Outputs achieved	16 CSP projects implemented with Outcomes and Outputs achieved	16 CSP projects implemented with Outcomes and Outputs achieved	Community perception surveys CSPs project feedback M&E reports