

## Attendance

1. Anna Maria Trzcinka (DRC / UCC)
2. Bo Hurkmans (UNHCR / ATWG co-chair)
3. Charles Alemi (UNHCR)
4. Cristobal Mingo (WFP / ATWG co-chair)
5. Ellestina Jumbe (FAO)
6. Eunice Mwende (WFP / CWG co-chair)
7. Gerald Emoyo (UNHCR)
8. Giulia Montisci (REACH / ATWG co-chair)
9. Gorgui Diouf (UNHCR)
10. Guy Grossman (UPenn)
11. Jimmy Bitek (DRC)
12. Joseph Kasoma (DRC)
13. Lisa Gutierrez (USAID)
14. Marco Derrico (FAO)
15. Michael Bruce (DRC / RINGO)
16. Mike Tauras (USAID)
17. Peter Kisaakye (Population Council)
18. Philip Kibui (UNHCR)
19. Sarah Gilbert (CRS)
20. Stanslus Okurut (WFP)
21. Tonny Ojok (WVI)
22. Veronique Njo (UNHCR)
23. Youri Francx (HI)
24. Yang-Yang Zhou (UBC)

## Update on the ATWG ToR – Bo (ATWG co-chair)

- The ToR now includes a trigger mechanisms to call meetings within 48 hours in case of emergencies.
- Details were requested on some aspects, most of them were already mentioned in the ToR.
  - o Mode of operation, schedule, structure, arrangement of the ATWG and role within the coordination structure.
  - o The co-chairs provided feedback on the above points, they will be made more explicit in the ToR.
- There was also a request on the outputs of the ATWG – a work plan needs to be developed for this year.

## Update on the rapid needs assessment (RNA) process and tools – Bo (ATWG co-chair)

- The ATWG was launched for facilitating the VENA process – involvement of the ATWG in RNA was not foreseen at the time, however, it has been included in the most recent ToR.
- The following are triggers for an RNA:
  - o High rate of new arrivals
    - >2,000 new arrivals per day (DRC) or >2,000 new arrivals per week (SSD)
    - Triggers and assessment within 24 hours
  - o Overcrowding at TC/RC
    - >50% above capacity (for more than 1 week)
    - Triggers an assessment within 72 hours
  - o Large number of newly settled refugees
    - >5,000 in a month
    - Triggers an assessment within 1 week
- Responsibility:
  - o If partners in the field are not able to manage the data collection due to capacity constraints, ATWG members will be asked to provide support.
  - o ATWG co-chairs are responsible for conducting the analysis.
  - o Dissemination of results will be done through relevant local and national coordination fora and working groups.
- Presentation of the 24-hour KI tool ([link](#)):
  - o Need to include a more detailed breakdown on type of disability (walking, hearing, talking etc.).
  - o Tool was shared with partners for feedback.

## Discussion

Q: People are not supposed to be in transit centres for long, we should therefore not wait 1 week for the trigger.

A: Indeed, the rapid assessment can happen within 72h from the moment overcrowding has been established.

## Presentation 1 – Marco Derrico (FAO – RIMA)

- Quantitative tool to understand why some households can cope better with shocks than others.
- Findings can help to build resilience and food security.
- Resilience can be defined at different levels – this tool is focusing on the household.
- Tries to measure the capacity to bounce back from a shock and under which circumstances this can happen.
- Purpose:
  - Programming and targeting
  - Impact and evaluation
    - Attribute the outcome of the intervention to the resilience
    - Examples available of where RIMA was used for assessment purposes
- Tool is quite short, it covers socio-demographic characteristics of the household, food security, resilience capacity, access to basic services, employment, assets as well as agricultural and livestock production.
- A [web-page SHINY RIMA](#) (app developed in R) was developed for very quick analysis.

### RIMA in Uganda:

- Applied in Uganda / Karamoja since 2016, impact evaluation of WFP/UNICEF/FAO.
- Host and refugee communities since 2017 – last data collection in 2021 led by UBOS.
- Panel data available for 400-600 households.
- Data was collected also during 2020 so the impact of COVID-19 can be appreciated.
- The funding channel is not sustainable just yet – the idea is that a donor becomes one of the main partners.

### The following resources are available:

- [RIMA resource page](#) with analytical reports as well as technical papers
- [Online training](#)
- Datasets
  - Round one (baseline):
    - 2017 ([Published](#))
    - 2018 ([Published](#))
    - 2019 ([Published](#))
  - Round two (2019): [Published](#)
  - Round three (2020): [Published](#)
  - Round four (2021) not yet submitted
- Reports:
  - 2018: Food security, resilience and well-being analysis of refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda ([link](#))
  - 2019: Food security and resilience of refugees and host communities in south-west Uganda ([link](#))

## Presentation 2 – Stanslus (WFP – FSLA / FSNA)

### FSLA 2021

#### Background

- Uganda is facing a prolonged dry spell

#### Objective

- To inform the emergency response in 2021

#### Methodology

- Covers 33 districts – including districts that do not host refugees
- Harmonized methodologies (data collected from households and KIs)

### FSNA 2022

- Finalized for Karamoja while the FSNA for refugees is still under planning (April / May 22)
- FSNA will inform the IPC analysis
- Tool of the FSNA largely based on the Karamoja one; WFP will share the tool

## Presentation 3 – Guy Grossman (University of Pennsylvania) and Yang-Yang Zhou (University of British Columbia / Harvard University) – Inclusive refugee-hosting in Uganda improves local development of partners

- Research question: How does the presence of refugees affect local development outcomes?
- The data used (population data, spatial data, data on the perception of migration etc.) was already collected by others – variables were created to facilitate the analysis (at parish level).
- Compared to richer countries, the presence of refugees can benefit the host community in low-income countries. This could lead to improvement of public goods and enhance acceptance of refugees.
- The model included the distance between the host and the settlements (considering the population of the settlements as well); to measure public goods the presence of schools, health facilities, roads etc. were considered.
- The model showed that access to education increased over the years (in positive relation to the increase of the refugee population, except for private schools).
- The public (negative) opinion on migrants did not change with the increased presence of refugees.

### Discussion:

- There was a lot of interest in the findings of this study, it will be important to disseminate further using local media as well.

## Presentation 4 – Giulia Montisci (IMPACT Initiatives) – Participatory Assessment UNHCR

- Assessment focusing on getting perceptions of the persons of concerns (PoC) on services provision, challenges encountered, and solutions suggested by the community in order to involve PoCs in programming and planning.
- Mixed-method approach (individual phone survey + qualitative data collection with different target groups).
- Main findings: main concern of PoCs is access / quality / quantity of food assistance; followed by health and education. Main challenges in access to services were reportedly often related to distance / transport costs.
- PoCs reported malpractices in the system as main challenges they face – malpractices are often related to request for payments.
- Perception on security is reported to be overall good both within and outside the community. The relationship with the hosts are reported to be positive, however some conflicts were reported in relationship to access to land and resources. Hosts reported considering that refugees receive a special treatment compared to them.
- 82% reported that members are exposed to GBV, however GBV reported as main security challenge only by 15% of respondents.
- The full report can be accessed [here](#).

## Update on the IPE and Verification (Gorgui Diouf – UNHCR)

- 398,683 individuals have been verified so far (25% completion rate, see next page).
- Household sampling is ongoing with a target of 10% of the verified households.
- Data has been shared with the UNHCR Regional Bureau in Nairobi, they will support with the vulnerability analysis and settlement-level analysis.
- Verification is starting in Bidibidi today (31 March) and will start in Palorinya on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April.



Q: In what kind of form are you planning to share the settlement level data?

A: In the form of a factsheet, data will cover different sectoral needs + PSN data.

Q: Are you planning to have a system in place for updating IPE data to make sure targeting reflects changing vulnerabilities?

A: Based on the IPE concept note, Protection partners are primarily responsible for maintaining the data on PSNs. The case management modules of proGres v4 (or a specific KoBo form for identifying PSNs if partners do not have access to proGres v4) will be used by partners and UNHCR staff to update specific needs.

Q: Can members still provide input on the vulnerability framework?

A: The indicator list was shared with the sector leads and will be shared with ATWG members as well

**Suggestion to have an ad-hoc ATWG in April to discuss the IPE was accepted, the date is tentatively set at 28 April.**