

COVID-19 CWC Task Team – Minutes of Meeting on 10/5/2021

Participants: ACF, Alight, CAFOMI, CECI, CRS, CTEN, FCA, GTS, HI, IRC, U-Learn, UNHCR, UNICEF

Main Points of Discussion	Action Points
<p>1. Review of previous minutes</p> <p>Action points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U-Learn and UNHCR will facilitate further discussions on taxonomy (activity in the AAP Task Team workplan) during the next meeting. <i>(Done)</i> • UNHCR to share the MoH FAQs on COVID-19 vaccines through the Task Team mailing list for partners to share with staff for purposes of sensitization. <i>(Done)</i> UNHCR to also update Task Team on key messages for community sensitization, based on the MoH key messages along with any additional information that refugees should be aware of. <i>(Key messages to be shared)</i> • UNHCR and U-Learn will disseminate the invitations for organizations to nominate participants for the AAP Training Course <i>(Done)</i> • UNHCR and U-Learn will discuss internally about whether the scope of training could cover non-refugee context and will revert. (Feedback was provided - the upcoming training will focus on refugee context but the need for has been noted and will be taken into account in further planning / any opportunities that arise). <p>Minutes endorsed</p>	
<p>2. Presentation on new deep dive assessment on user experiences, preferences and barriers to financial services (U-Learn) (see presentation for further details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U-Learn is conducting its 2nd Deep Dive Assessment on assessing user experience in digital finance, working closely with the Cash Working Group. The purpose of the presentation to the AAP Task Team today is to present the research plan for the next deep dive assessment, get feedback on the known AAP mechanisms in place specifically for digital finance services and on groups of interest for the AAP Task Team members. • Why an assessment on digital finance? Humanitarian assistance is shifting more and more towards cash and voucher-based intervention (CVBI). How can we better tailor the transfer mechanisms on recipients preferences and needs? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objective: Understanding user preferences and experiences when receiving digital financial assistance to support the creation of feedback loops between users, implementers and policymakers so as to ensure that the design of financial services is tailored to people in need. • Topline research questions: What are user preferences regarding digital financial assistance according to age, location, community type, gender etc.? What initiatives are already systematically collecting user preferences and experiences in Uganda? • Proposed methodology: Mixed methods (FGDs, KIIs, Individual survey, etc). Coverage –all refugee settlements and host communities. Representativeness - tentatively settlement level (refugees) national level (host). Tentatively based on Connectivity Needs and Usage Assessment (CoNUA) toolkit • Tentative timeline: Secondary data review and consultations (April), Development of TOR and tools (May), Data collection and analysis (June / July), report writing and product development (August), dissemination (September). Whole process in close collaboration with Cash Working Group and key stakeholders, and subject to change based on budget and staff capacity. • Questions for the AAP Task Team: (1) In addition to the vulnerabilities / disaggregation listed (gender, age, community type), would you suggest any other disaggregation to explore? (2) Are you aware of any feedback mechanisms put in place by financial services providers or humanitarian organizations to support the feedback loop between recipients and FSP? <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other possible disaggregation suggested: female-headed vs male headed household; literacy level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further suggestions / input can be share with Giulia (giulia@ulearn-uganda.org) and Aletta (aletta.buehler@impact-initiatives.org).
<p>3. Key findings of 5th COVID-19 Rumour Tracking Bulletin (Ground Truth Solutions) (see presentation for further details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 81% responded that they are able to distinguish between rumours and facts around COVID-19 • Overall, “downplay” has been the most common type of rumour since the rumour tracking started (36% in this Bulletin). However “vaccine” has emerged for the first time, also at 36%, followed by origins (13%), prevention (6%) and cure (4%). 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downplaying COVID-19 (36%): Our race / ethnicity is immune (24%), only old people can die (17%), COVID-19 is not dangerous (16%), COVID-19 is not real (15%), Government is playing up COVID-19 for politics (15%), etc. • COVID-19 vaccine (36%): Bioweapon (38%), negative side effects (37%), ineffective (10%), President is reluctant to be vaccinated (6%), Eligibility misconception (4%). Examples of rumours related to negative side effects- vaccine will cause HIV, damage mental faculties, sterilize women, change skin colour, cause death, etc. • COVID-19 origins (13%): Divine punishment (52%), manufactured for profit (24%), Bioweapon conspiracies (20%), etc. • Key recommendations: Countering vaccine misinformation to reduce vaccine hesitancy through providing communities with accurate information; Community motivations should inform communications around the vaccine to counter hesitancy; figures in high-visibility positions of authority to be vaccinated publicly where possible to help build trust in vaccine; avoid repeating rumours when trying to debunk them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further questions on the Rumour Tracking Bulletin can be addressed to Kai (kai.kamei@groundtruthsolutions.org)
<p>4. AAP Task Team workplan – Activity on common taxonomy/understanding of AAP and related concept (see presentation for further details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the activities in the 2021 Workplan of the Task Team was to “agree on a common taxonomy / understanding of AAP and related concepts” which UNHCR and U-learn were to lead. (Timeline: April – May) • Various AAP-related terms are used by organizations depending on their organizational policies and guidelines, with some focusing on particular components of AAP. It is important for the Task Team to share a common understanding as a basis for activities in the Workplan and promote harmonized discussions and learnings. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IASC Definition of AAP: Active commitment to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organisations seek to assist. • Taking account: Giving communities influence over decision making in a way that accounts for their diversity, and allows the views of the most at-risk to be equally considered; Giving account: Transparently and effectively sharing information with communities; Being held to account: Giving communities the opportunity to assess and if appropriate sanction your actions. • 5 IASC Commitments to AAP: (1) leadership / governance; (2) transparency; (3) feedback and complaints; (4) participation; (5) design, monitoring and evaluation • For discussion: (1) Do we agree to refer to the IASC definition and commitments in our inter-agency discussions in the Task Team, and as the basis for proceeding with related work of the Task Team? – Members agreed. 	
<p>5. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting on Monday, 24 May 2021 at 11:30–12:30. • For AAP Training course, AAP Task Team members who are interested to participate will also need to submit an application. 	

AAP Task Team TOR, endorsed meeting minutes, inter-agency rumour tracking bulletin and other key documents from the AAP Task Team can be accessed on the Uganda refugee response portal at: <https://ugandarefugees.org/en/working-group/253?sv=0&geo=220>