Attendance

1. Aletta Buhler, U-Learn/IMPACT
2. Ally Hamud Said, UNHCR
3. Anders Petersson, WFP
4. Ann Mbeiza, U-Learn/IRC
5. Baptist Acellam, AVSI
6. Bik Lum, UNHCR
7. Bo Hurkmans, UNHCR
8. Carol Ann Sparks, UNHCR
9. Dave Van Zoonen, REACH
10. Di Gloria Calogero, ECHO Nairobi
11. Emmanuel Tshibanda Tshisuyi, UNHCR
12. Eunice Mwende, WFP
13. Ernest Achtell, FCDO
14. Felix Obong Okello, UNHCR
15. Geofrey Arum, CARE
16. Handaa Enkh-Amgalan, IRC / U-Learn
17. Isaac Kabazzi (UNHCR)
18. John Paul Magezi, OPM
19. Joseph KYANJO, WFP
20. Joshua Mugume, CRRF
21. Kai Kamei, GTS
22. Giulia Montisci, REACH / U-Learn
23. Godfrey Twesigye, World Vision
24. Marijke Deleu, U-Learn
25. Michael Ocircan, SCI
26. Mike Bruce (CRRF – RINGO)
27. Mike Tauras, USAID
28. Neema Malowa, PRM
29. Nathan Lowanyang, WFP
30. Paul Opio, FAO
31. Parwez Anis, WCH
32. Rotival Bruno, ECHO
33. Sarah Gilbert, CRS
34. Stanslus Okurut, WFP
35. Yoko Iwasa, UNHCR

Update on IPE / GFA prioritisation (UNHCR/WFP)

Presentation 1 – Bik Lum (UNHCR) Individual Profiling Exercise / verification process

- Original time line was postponed due to the COVID-19 lockdown (2 months ago)
- UNHCR is engaging with OPM to agree on how the IPE will be organized in order to respect SOP and minimize crowds and gathering. UNHCR is also in contact with MoH.
- Communication between OPM and MoH. OPM seems positive but pending official communication.
- UNHCR proposed to combine IPE and Verification exercise to minimize the gathering of people at registration centre. Most of the exercise will be done household by household, to minimize the number of people that has to show up at the registration centre.
- UNHCR hopes to get an update from OPM by the end of this week.

Discussion

FCDO: Could you explain again the link between the IPE and verification process?

UNHCR: Intent to combine the two processes in one tool and conduct them both at the household visit. However, some individuals are not in proGres and biometric data for them is missing. Those individuals will need to be physically present at the registration centre. Appointments will be organized at the verification site for members of every household missing biometric data to complete the verification process. This will reduce but not avoid the visit at the registration centre.

FCDO: What is the timeline for the IPE?

UNHCR: In terms of schedule, the original proposal will be followed. IPE will start in Oruchinga (smallest settlement, will be the pilot / training). Plan to finish the South West before moving to the West Nile region. Plan is the same, we do not foresee much delay compared to the last plan presented. However, the rainy season might affect the movements of both enumerators and refugees toward the registration centre.

Presentation 2 - Anders Petersson (WFP) Prioritization for General Food Assistance

- The prioritization has not been discussed at the ATWG since February 2021.
- Background: GFA is big part of the assistance in Uganda. Up to now, everyone receives the same level of assistance. Due to funding shortfalls, WFP will try to match the assistance with the needs of the households.
- This prioritization is linked with the IPE process and plan A was to link the prioritization with the IPE results.
- Since IPE was delayed due to COVID-19, **Plan B** will be implemented instead:

- o **Plan B**: use pure geographical prioritization (proposed by WFP in July). WFP proposed to divide the settlements in 3 groups (group 1 highly vulnerable, group 2 mid vulnerability, group 3 low vulnerability) according to their level of vulnerabilities based on data from the 2019 Vulnerability and Essential Needs Assessment (VENA) and the Food Security and Nutrition Assessment (FSNA) from December 2020.
  - o UNHCR gave feedback on plan B and suggested that highly vulnerable households in group 3 should still have access to a higher ration.
  - o The Joint Programme Excellence and Targeting Hub (WFP / UNHCR) is supporting in identifying who are the most vulnerable HHs within group 3 (both socio-economic and protection considerations are taken into account). *The technical discussion on how to implement this is still ongoing:*
    - ▪ UNHCR proposes to use a weighted index
    - ▪ WFP proposes to use a decision tree mechanism.
  - o Plan B will be implemented in a hybrid way and will be in effect until the IPE is concluded:
    - ▪ Phase 1 (pure geographical prioritization)
    - ▪ Phase 2 (identify most vulnerable among group 3)
  - o **Back to Plan A**: GFA prioritization will be based on IPE data as it becomes available. As a result, Plan A will be implemented first in the South West followed by West Nile.

Discussion

FCDO: We understand and appreciate that plan A is not possible at this time. Is the implementation of plan B cost neutral? Using Plan B will have impact on resources needed for GFA?

WFP: Yes, both Plan B phase 1 (pure geographical prioritization) and Plan B phase 2 (prioritizing among group 3) are respecting our funding forecast.

Kampala-based refugees needs assessment, Jul-Aug 2021 (WFP)

Presentation by Stanslus Okurut (WFP)

- Assessment conducted to understand the need for assistance of urban refugees in Kampala during the 42-day lockdown.
- Methodology:
  - o Household survey using mobile phone
  - o Sample: 247 refugees interviewed (not possible to have accurate disaggregated results for some divisions due to small sample)
- Demographic:
  - o Sample: head of households' composition: 56% male 44% female. Slightly different compared to the settlement composition (more female normally). Most of those interviewed (70%) are in the age group of 20-39 year old.
- Findings:
  - o **Impact on livelihoods**: 93% reported an impact on their livelihoods (either major or minor).
    - ▪ The proportion of HH without any income earned went up after the last lockdown.
    - ▪ Comparing the first lockdown (2020) and this year's lockdown, a higher impact on earners could be noticed. The conditions of the HHs were already deteriorated before the second lockdown.
    - ▪ The recovery of livelihoods from last year's lockdown did not really happen.
  - o **Food consumption score**. Comparing data on FCS from the 2020 FSNA with that of 2021 mobile Vulnerability and Analysis Mapping (mVAM) - Needs Assessment Kampala refugees a clear worsening of the FCS overtime can be identified.
    - ▪ 89% had acceptable FCS in 2020, 67% in April and 52% now.
    - ▪ Worsening FCS is strictly linked to the deterioration of livelihoods.
  - o Refugee in settlements coped better compared with urban refugees.
  - o **COVID-19**:
    - ▪ 5% of the HHs had at least 1 member tested positive for COVID-19.
    - ▪ 8% of the HHs had at least one member vaccinated.

Discussion

John Paul Magezi: The commissioner enquired about this study. What are the next steps after this study from WFP side?

Stanslus Okurut (WFP): WFP is trying to organize support for the refugee living in Kampala. WFP will share more details.

Ally Hamud (UNHCR): Was the nationality considered when doing the sample?

Stanslus Okurut (WFP): The sample does not include this breakdown; it gives an overall pictures of refugees in Kampala. However, as the MVAM data collection has now resumed, some of this information will become available.

Rapid Assessment on impact of COVID-19 on refugee livelihoods (REACH)

Presentation by Aletta Buehler (REACH Initiative) Full brief available here

Objectives: Understanding key sectoral priorities for the Refugee Response during the COVID-19 lockdown.

Methodology: SDR of available resources and primary data collection with KIIs (sector leads).

Findings:

- Key needs identified by key expert aligned with the ones identified by REF members
  - o Livelihoods
  - o Food assistance
  - o Strengthening health facilities
- **Livelihoods** crisis had an impact on food insecurity. Refugees were not able to supplement rations adequately; as a consequence, malnutrition is on the rise.
- **Most vulnerable groups:**
  - o Urban refugees are particularly vulnerable, especially the ones living in Kampala
    - Lower remittances from abroad;
    - Cannot rely on agriculture to supplement their food intake;
    - Urban refugees are being evicted from shelter because of inability to pay the rent.
  - o Children and youth:
    - Distance learning is not available for everyone;
    - Early childhood learners not addressed adequately by the lockdown;
    - Children could not access foods at school;
    - Protection needs on the rise (early marriage / teenage pregnancies);
    - When school will reopen there will be need of WASH facilities, more teachers, more classroom to respect COVID-19 SOP.
- Existing needs and vulnerabilities are exacerbated:
  - o Increased protection and MHPSS needs
  - o Host community more resilient but cut out from assistance
- Needs can only be addressed with a longer-term response:
  - o Longer term solutions to address ration shortage;
  - o MHPSS services were not sufficiently provided before and now there is an increased need;
  - o Strengthen access to fuel and energy;

REF Good Practice Study and Tailored Evidence and Learning Service (U-Learn)

Presentation by Marijke Deleu (U-Learn)

1) **TELS**

U-Learn is launching a services provision across the response for a more evidence based response.
This support is open to a wide series of actors and includes the following services:
- Resource curation
- Documentation and research
- Synthesis and summaries
- Convene actors

It is a public good in the sense that each service's product will be public and available for consultations.
The decision to take a service will be based on the following criteria:
- relevant for the wide response;
- in line with thematic priorities of the Learning Agenda of U-Learn.

Flow of work and full ToR of TELS can be found at the U-Learn website.

2) REF Good Practice Study

Done by U-Learn in collaboration with UNHCR and the Refugee Engagement Forum taskforce.
Resources can we found at the U-Learn website (brief) and refugee response portal (full report)
The reason for conducting this study was to document the unique experience of the REF in Uganda.

Methodology:
- Secondary data review
- Observation of REF meetings
- 41 semi structured interviews

Findings:
- REF informs decision making and programme design through a two-way feedback mechanism with the Steering Group of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
- Lesson Learned:
    o Building upon existing strategy
    o Divers and inclusive
    o Fostering interpersonal relationships
    o Flexible structures
    o On-going learning and adaptation
    o Support across stakeholder groups
- Way forward for the REF
    o Keep evolving and learning
    o Ongoing innovation and improvement
    o Widening engagement with the REF across the refugee response

Update on assessment plans for 2021 (ATWG co-chairs)

ATWG co-chairs provided an overview of the assessment plan submitted and the request for data collection:
Three new assessment registered by two entities (GTS: Community perceptions (on-hold)) and WFP.

REACH informed that two assessments are currently being implemented on the topic of digital financial mechanisms in collaboration with the CWG:

- **FSP mapping:** looking at FSPs available in the different settlements, types of services offered, challenges and barriers in providing digital financial services **(REACH / USAID)**.
    o Remote KIIs with FSP
    o Results by end of September
- **Users' experiences and preferences in accessing digital financial mechanisms**. Look at individual access, barriers and preferences regarding cash assistance provided through digital financial mechanisms **(U-Learn / FCDO)**
    o Mix-method (KIIs remote, FGDs in persons, Individual Survey in person).
    o Data collection started this week and finalized by first week of October.
    o Results by November.