

Attendance

1. Bo Hurkmans – UNHCR
2. Anders Petersson – WFP
3. Barbara Rosen Jacobson – REACH
4. Marijke Deleu – U-Learn
5. Mike Tauras – USAID
6. Katelyn Medeiros - BPRM
7. Aletta Buehler – REACH
8. Kullein Ankunda - U-Learn
9. Stanslus Okurut - WFP
10. Maria Bernardez Ercilla - ECHO
11. Eunice Mwende - CWG/WFP
12. Ally Hamud Said - UNHCR
13. Joseph Kasoma - Uganda Cash consortium
14. Giulia Montisci – U-learn
15. Kai Kamei – GTS
16. Isaac Kabazzi – UNHCR
17. Sam Rutahindwa – FCA
18. Michael Ocircan – Save the Children
19. Bea Natzler – U-Learn
20. John Baptist – AVSI
21. Rick Bartoldus – U-Learn

Learning Agenda ATWG consultation

Presentation – U-Learn

- As part of the U-Learn consortium, the Learning Hub intends to increase cross-sectoral, response-wide learning in the context of the refugee response in Uganda
- The Learning Hub adopts three key approaches:
 - It curates existing resources
 - It documents new learning (good practice studies, deep dives, ad hoc assessments)
 - It convenes actors
- The Learning Hub is creating a Learning Agenda. This agenda is cross-sectoral, response-wide, and would feed into key decisions at programmatic and policy level. The agenda is based on a desk review, as well as consultations with a wide range of traditional (response actors) and non-traditional (private sector, innovators) actors.
- The draft themes of the Learning Agenda include:
 - Self-reliance (with a focus on sustainable livelihoods, private sector/innovators and cash & social protection)
 - Participation (with a focus on AAP and localisation)
 - Humanitarian-development nexus (sub-themes still to be determined)
- Deep dive assessments will be organised to fill information gaps related to the Learning Agenda themes.

Poll

- A poll conducted during the meeting provided an overview of the perceptions of ATWG meeting participants about the importance and relevance of the Learning Agenda themes.
- Among the agenda's sub-themes, sustainable livelihoods (47%) and cash & social protection (33%) were considered most relevant.
- Other suggestions for the learning agenda included:
 - Documenting evidence and mapping existing research in a user-friendly, synthesized manner
 - Strengthening monitoring and evaluation and prioritisation of vulnerable households
 - Researching secondary effects of cash, and understanding barriers for populations to access cash, as well as financial literacy
 - Summarising a wide range of studies on the socio-economic impact of COVID

2020 Refugee FSNA

Scope and methodology

- UNHCR and WFP jointly presented the refugee Food Security and Nutrition Assessment

- UNHCR first provided information on the reasons and objectives behind the assessment, and how it had been put in place. It explained that the assessment covered eight themes: demography, nutrition, health, food security, LITN, WASH, GBV and Energy.
- The assessment tools used were largely adaptations of existing approaches, such as SMART, CARI and WASH KAP. The study relied on two-stage cluster sampling in 12 locations, and a single-stage sampling in Oruchinga.
- Data quality was assured through real-time data cleaning, training, coordination and active field support.
- The implementation of the assessment respected COVID-19 SOPs, and involved the distribution of reusable masks, the use of sanitisers, gloves and masks, and the use of the family MUAC approach.

Results

- The results showed a general improvement of GAM (WHZ) rates compared to 2017. Nevertheless, GAM rates are still relatively high in Kiryandongo (8,7), Adjumani (8,3) and Palabek (8,2). That said, some settlements showed a high rate of stunting, especially in the North-West.
- The prevalence of anaemia seems to have increased, and is relatively high, both in children from 6-59 months (53%) and for non-pregnant WRA (44%). The results may indicate a shift from a situation of more acute malnutrition in 2017 to anaemia.
- Health-related results are generally encouraging, though there are relatively high rates of diarrhoea in some settlements (Nakivale, Palabek, Rhino Camp, Rwanwanja) and low rates of deworming among children (mainly in Adjumani and Kiryandongo). As for IYCF, while the timely initiation and continuation of breast-feeding shows relatively positive results, there are lower rates for the timely initiation of complementary food (mainly in Lobule, Nakivale, Palorinya and Rhino Camp).
- WASH results show a high reliance of the population on hand pumps and boreholes, as well as on public taps. A large proportion of households do not purify their drinking water.
- Households mainly use wood (62%) for their energy needs, as well as charcoal (36%)
- The food security situation shows regional differences among settlements. Generally, 67% of settlement refugees have acceptable food consumption; West-Nile is worse off, while refugees in Kampala have better consumption. 12% of settlement refugees had medium to high coping, and high coping is more pronounced in the South West than in West Nile. Livelihood coping is particularly high; 37% of settlement refugees used emergency and crisis coping strategies, and this percentage is higher in South West than in West Nile. Particularly due to the reliance on these coping mechanisms, 35% of settlement refugees are classified as moderately or severely food insecure, with higher rates in West Nile than in South West. The settlements with the highest levels of food insecurity are Palorinya, Rhino Camp, Kyangwali, Bidi Bidi and Palabek.

Feedback

- On the severity of the results, WFP clarified that food consumption is measured for households receiving blanket food assistance, which is why the proportion of acceptable food consumption might appear relatively big.

Update on prioritization to the ATWG

- WFP provided an update on its joint work with UNHCR on prioritization of the response
- Currently, food assistance is provided as a blanket distribution for all refugees. Yet due to funding shortfalls, this ration is cut to 70%, and only provides one-third of the food MEB. Only a small part of refugee households are able to meet the gap created by the small rations.
- To respond to these funding shortfalls, and to avoid another uniform reduction in rations, prioritisation of the response could be considered, by providing assistance proportionate to needs.
- The Vulnerability and Essential Needs Assessment (VENA) provided insights into needs-based programming, but was unable to make conclusions on prioritisation, as a high percentage of the population was classified as highly vulnerable. Since then, a joint UNHCR-WFP Hub is providing support to move forward.
- WFP presented a preliminary 2021 work plan for prioritization, which includes the revision of the analytical framework and beneficiary selection (mainly in the first half of 2021) and the

operationalisation if the prioritisation exercise (mainly in the second half of 2021). Prioritised assistance is expected to be launched in October 2021.

Feedback

During the discussion, UNHCR added that there will be heavy amendments to the protection vulnerability framework to focus on certain protection needs. In addition, the agency clarified that there are internal discussions on the expedition of the timeline and the operationalization of prioritisation, particularly in settlements where the IPE has already been finalised.

AOBs

- AWG to provide an overview of partner assessments in 2020 and plans for 2021
 - o 2020 assessments: to upload to the [assessment registry](#)
 - o 2021 plans: form available here: <https://forms.gle/amaPZ8JboawJ29519>