

Assessment Technical Working Group

Minutes for the meeting held on 28/06/2024.

Organizations in attendance: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), International Organization for Migration (IOM), World Vision International (WVI), IMPACT – REACH, Mercy Corps, World Food Programme (WFP), Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO), World Health Organization (WHO), IsraAID, Association of Volunteers in International Service (AVSI), War Child Canada (WCC), War Child Holland, Save the Children (SCI), Oxford Committee for Famine Relief (Oxfam), Medical Teams International, European Civil and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO), The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWOMEN), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Humanity & Inclusion (HI), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), BRAC, Finnish Refugee Council (FRC), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Plan International (PI), REPSSI, ALIGHT, ADRA Uganda, Youth Social Advocacy Team (YSAT).

Total number of participants: 60

Agenda (see slides for further content)

1. Opening and introduction remarks – Theodore Jaspers (IMPACT-REACH)
2. Update on the ATWG Technical Steering Committee – Gloria Nyamungu (WFP)
3. Standardization of indicators – Theodore Jaspers (IMPACT-REACH)
4. UCRRP – Assessment Registry update – Festo Muriisa (UNHCR)
5. UCRRP – Information Center – Mohammed Solayman (UNHCR)
6. UNHCR/WFP – Food Security & Nutrition Assessment – Isaac Kabazzi (UNHCR)
7. IRC – ReBUIld Wave 2 Randomized Control Testing – Caroline Agabiirwe (IRC)
8. IMPACT-REACH – ongoing and planned assessments – Emma Sohi-Isolani, Léonie Borel, Everline Akwii (IMPACT-REACH)
9. IOM – Refugee Flow Monitoring (Andrew Luwandagga)
10. AoB

Participants

Name	Org.	Name	Org
Festo Muriisa	UNHCR	Gloria NYAMUNGU	WFP
Elise Buvarp Lavik	UNWOMEN	Jackson Mugazi	NRC
Kaamu, Cissy	PLAN-INTERNATIONAL	Everline AKWII	IMPACT-REACH
LUWANDAGGA Andrew	IOM	Emma SOHI-ISOLANI	IMPACT-REACH
Raymond Mukisa	UNDP	Lawrence Feni	HI
Haruko Kusunoki	UNWOMEN	John Jal - YSAT	YSAT
Belinda Asio	FRC	Patrick Musibi	UNICEF
Benon Baabumba	ADRA	ARINDA KENNETH	BRAC
Robert Okello	OXFAM	Allen Ankunda	UNWOMEN
Sarah Apio	NRC	Lydia Ayikoru	OXFAM
Mary H. Akol	WVI	Zaina Nakubulwa	REPSSI
Julius, Ahimbisibwe	FAO	Fred Otim	UNHCR
Lawrence Odwong	MERCYCORPS	Francis Okodi	ALIGHT
Theodore JASPERS	IMPACT-REACH	Ankunda, Kullein	SEN
ARINDA Fannah	ECHO	Greenhalgh, Dave	SER
Faith Kirungi	UNHCR	Caroline Exile Apio	UNWOMEN
Caroline Agabiirwe	IRC	Jacob Oluma	MTI
Michael Byamukama	REPSSI	Isaac Kabazzi	UNHCR
Jordan Can	AVSI	Margret KATUUTU	WFP
Anthony Odumuna	LWF	CHARLES LOLEM	WFP
Adotu Daniel	NRC	Florence Namugere	NRC
Winnie Munduru	OXFAM	Opio, Paul	FAO
Zubedah Akanya	ISRAAID	KABALI, Kenneth	WHO
Oloya, Abdu	CRS	Daisy Among	FRC
Mohammed Solayman	UNHCR	PETERSEN Morten Rugtved	ECHO
Albert Ningwa	UNHCR	Winifred Nambuusi	DRC
Niyonzima Hynstein	WARCHILD	Kibonire, Ronald	SCI
Mitala, Timothy	SCI	Jimmy Ronald Andi	UNHCR
Henry Arubaku	NRC	Simon Kibue	UNICEF
Leonie BOREL	IMPACT-REACH	Michael Abusa	UNHCR

Update on the ATWG Technical Steering Committee

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- The Technical Steering Committee now includes WFP, UNHCR, IMPACT-REACH, UNWomen, WVI, BRAC, LWF
- ToRs and a 2024 Workplan are forthcoming

Standardization of indicators

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- The ATWG's effort to standardize a set of indicators is ongoing, and will proceed throughout Q3 2024

Update on the Assessment registry dashboard (UNHCR)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- 130 assessments have been so far registered on the system.
- The year 2021 had the highest registered number of assessments (42) while 2020 had the least (1). Only 5 assessments have so far been registered in 2024.
- Overall, 68% of the registered assessments target refugees and host communities, 31% target refugees and 1% target host communities.
- UNHCR has so far registered the highest number of assessments, followed by AVSI, WFP and other partners.
- Most of the assessments conducted are focused on Livelihood sector, Education followed by Environment and Energy, and others follow.
- 8 assessments were conducted about Covid 19
- By geographic distribution, West Nile has the most assessments conducted.
- It is noticeable that within Q2 2024 just one assessment was added to the online assessment registry tool, partners are encouraged to report their assessments in the tool.

The participants were then taken through the upload process of an assessment using the [assessment registry link](#).

Update on the Information Center (UNHCR)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- The UNHCR Operational Data Portal includes an Information Center, which is a repository containing all of UNHCR's information management products related to the UCRRP.
- This Information Center allows the users to filter, search, and download reports, maps, dashboards, and factsheets easily with the existing filtering features.
- As part of the Q2 UCRRP reporting cycle which will start in July, the UNHCR IM team is planning to conduct an ActivityInfo training in the week of the 2nd of July.

The link to the online Information center is [here](#).

ReBUIILD Wave 2 Randomized Control Testing (IRC)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- Small business-oriented livelihoods programme conducted by IRC, for which a two-stage RCT is being conducted/planned, to study the effect of mentorship and business grant interventions aimed at refugees and vulnerable host microentrepreneurs, in collaboration with Stanford, Georgetown, OPA, and the GoU.
- One round of RCT launched in Kampala and Nairobi in 2022, targeting 2,000 participants in each city
- Baseline for wave 2 commencing in Q3 2024.

Q&A:

Question: *The intervention would be business cash grants and mentorship. And so, the studies will be looking at both of them, but is there at a point where we'll be looking at the impact of only the business cash grants or the impact of only mentorship, separately rather than combining both, so that you can see which of them maybe may perform better against the other, and also if maybe either of them could perform better than both of them combined?*

- **Answer:** *The difference for these two will be that for the cash control they will receive cash on the business grants only, but for the treatment groups they will receive both the business grant and they will have also received the networking intervention. So at the point when we measure, say the midline, we'll be comparing what difference is there, like what is the effect of the networking intervention alone, because the difference between the treatment and the cash control will be the actual networking intervention that would have only been done for the treatment groups. At that point, we'll measure the effect of just the networking intervention. But at end line, where we have the pure control receiving their cash grant alone, that's the time when we'll be able to compare the effect of say cash grant alone as well as a combination of cash grants and the networking intervention between the control and the treatment arms.*

Question: *Did you have specific learning questions, maybe at organizations level or programmatic level for these particular studies. I know you shared so many things that relates to learning, but if you could have one or two, which are specific to how it was put together, and then things to do with contamination. I have seen in terms of the groups, if you look at the social lifestyle of the Somalis, how they run their businesses in Kampala. If you go to places like Kabbalah Gala and other places, you realize that they run joint businesses. They do more business to one another, fellow Somalis and all this, which is contrary to the nationals. So how are you guarding against contamination between the control and treatment?*

- **Answer:** *Our research questions or one of them is that we are trying to see what the effects, the impact of microbes enterprise services on self-employment outcomes on economic outcomes and social cohesion are among the refugees and host communities by gender considering that we are having single gender groups. And then we are also trying to measure the effects of microenterprise services, here being the cash grants on economic self-reliance and self-employment among the refugees and host communities. So, to answer your question, those are some of the questions that we are trying to answer under this study. And going back to the the part where you're talking about the Somalis and so of course this has we noticed this being one of the challenges under the wave one but we noted that part of why we're having challenges in regards to them being free to share and with other information with other nationalities. We thought from those learnings that we had, having the single gender groups would help to alleviate some of those challenges that were having and also in addition to that like I mentioned we are having single nationality groups so at some point for some of these groups who may we have a single Somali groups say if it's a female group it's a female Somali group of say 20 people or eight people. And then for some other groups that we have had, we have in the treatment arm, we have the mixed nationality and single gender groups. So of course, based on the different cultural aspects that come along with some of these nationalities. We think having these single gender groups will try to address some of those issues that we're having with people or clans being to be able to share freely information among us themselves without fear of, say, cultural aspects or some of those issues that we had noted under wave one.*

Question: *You mentioned that one of the innovations you have is a networking application that you have developed for the samples you have within the research. Could you actually mention some of the benefits you are seeing that we have realized from the networking application?*

- **Answer:** *Yes, at the moment, what we have observed is basically from the pilots that we've done, as I mentioned, there was good interest in the networking intervention, but considering that we haven't done the main, main which will be the networking activities. I may not be able to share that the findings that all observations that we have from that substantially so. At the moment, we haven't done our baseline. So once we've done that and done the intervention, maybe say after six months after the intervention, when we've done our midline, we'll be able to share what our findings and observations are at that point.*

Food Security & Nutrition Assessment 2024 (UNHCR)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- Jointly funded by UNHCR/WFP/UNICEF instead of rotational funding.
- Data collection planned from mid-July to early August, with a report expected one month afterwards.

Q&A:

Question: *You mentioned a rationalized methodology. How much does the FS&A now cost? Number two, what guarantees do we have that it's going to be timely? Because last year it was everything else than timely and pretty, I must say pretty, that undermined the whole process. So we really need to have the results on time. What are the guarantees there? And finally, I think that I'm not sure, but I think last year there was nothing about access to land, how many acreage each family can access, both among the refugees and the host, which was, I think, a key question in the FSNA the previous year. So is the question you have included, is that just a yes or no question? Because I do think that having some kind of estimation of acreage for productive use is important. And I know of course it can be fraught with complications and errors, but having some kind of acreage for both refugees and host families, I think is important.*

- **Answer:** *So the FSNA, the comprehensive FSNA costs about \$360,000. The one that is rationalized costs about \$320,000. So we thought that splitting the costs between the three agencies makes it cheaper because at least every agency has to fund raise about \$120,000 opposed to, and I think this was unilaterally agreed across the three agencies as the best way forward for the future assessments. In terms of the timeliness, so within our work plan, we agreed that we're going to constitute a team that is going to focus strictly on analysis and report writing. Because what has happened in the past is that when you collect data, we have the data while we still have our regular activities. So in other words, we do the analysis and report writing alongside our other activities in office, and in a way that drags the timeline a little bit. So this time, we want to dedicate, say, about two, three weeks strictly for that, and we should work in this task to ensure that we focus on task. But also, just to mention, we tend to release the draft report or even the draft results a little bit earlier, maybe, let's say, two, three months after the assessment. Usually, it's the final report that tends to take a lot of time. This year, we intend to even make it a little bit faster. Let's just say about a month after data collection, and we have the results. So PETERSEN, we are working to improve the process to ensure that the dissemination is timely for utilization of the data. About the question on land, we did not specifically include one on acreage, but then we included one on access to arable land that was useful for production. So there is actually a question on land, not necessarily one on acreage, but we're happy to include that given that land access is an issue. So the land access question that we have is not necessarily in terms of acreage, it's more in terms of access to what they use for agriculture production. We had dropped the one on acreage because I think it was prone to errors in estimation, especially around 2020, we felt enumerators would either make mistakes on how they estimate land, given that some may have the standard plot sizes, others may have land that they also lease externally, but we're happy to include that as well if it's such an important question.*

Update on the MSNA 2024 preparations (IMPACT-REACH)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

An MSNA, or Multi-Sector Needs Assessment, is a large-scale and comprehensive assessment that aims to estimate the prevalence and severity of sectoral and humanitarian needs, in order to inform humanitarian decision-making.

- Funded by FCDO/BHC, ECHO, UNHCR, Plan International.
- Planning underway, data collection (11,700 host/refugee households in all settlements + Kampala) to occur from mid-July to early October, followed by joint validation workshops with sectors and stakeholders.
- Terms of Reference and questionnaire to be sent to the ISWG in early July.
- IMPACT-REACH and Plan International are collaborating on a qualitative module on Adolescents' Needs, in Adjumani, Bidibidi, Kyangwali, and Kampala, conducting 52 FGDs on basic needs, vulnerabilities, and experiences.

Coordination framework

- **Key coordinating body:** Assessment Technical Working Group (ATWG) and associated Technical Steering Committee
- **First point of consultations:** Sector coordination teams
 - All sector coordination teams will be systematically consulted throughout the planning, design, and analysis phases.

- **Additional key stakeholders** consulted and informed throughout the research cycle:
 - Government of Uganda, notably OPM
 - Donor agencies
 - INGOs, consulted/informed through HINGO.
 - NNGOs
 - RLOs
- **Confirmed/potential donors:**
 - ECHO, FCDO/BHC, PI, UNHCR

Suggested methodology

Methods

- Quantitative household surveys, implemented by REACH field staff and our enumerator network.
- In-depth individual interviews with vulnerable groups, implemented by REACH field staff, with potential support from partners in the field.
- Focus group discussions with adolescents and caregivers (separately), implemented jointly by REACH and Plan International

Scope

- Geographic coverage:
 - All 13 refugee settlements
 - Kampala (specific divisions)
- Population groups:
 - Refugees
 - Host communities
 - Residing within a 15km radius from the settlement borders
 - Residing in selected divisions in Kampala
- Data on disability, age, and gender will also be collected. Disaggregation for these variables will be possible at regional and/or national level.

Level of representativeness

- 95% level of confidence and 5% margin of error, applied to refugees and host communities respectively in each location.

Mobility, Livelihoods, and Access to Basic Services Assessment in Adjumani Town (IMPACT-REACH)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- This assessment focused on the needs and vulnerabilities of both host/refugees households as well as those of Adjumani Town and its district's authorities and service providers (Health, Education, WASH). The assessment consisted of 400+ quantitative surveys among refugee and host community households in select areas in Mbarara city, 10 KIIs with locally active service providers, community leaders and other experts.
- Data was collection between January-March 2024.
- Findings emphasized the challenges faced by refugees in accessing livelihood opportunities and basic services.
- Refugees often engage in pendular movements, predominantly to South Sudan, to check on friends/relatives, assets, to work on businesses or on land, or to assess the situation.
- The dissemination workshop of findings in Adjumani Town, attended by UNHCR, OPM, Town and District staff, along with locally active I/NGOs and CBOs and community leaders, sparked discussions and highlighted the need for collective efforts to support the town council in managing the pressure from the influx of refugees.
- The data, analyses, findings, and report (forthcoming) can be downloaded from the [IMPACT-REACH website's Resource Centre](#).

Area-Based Assessment in Mbarara (IMPACT-REACH)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- This assessment focused on the needs and vulnerabilities of both host/refugees households as well as those of Mbarara City and its district's authorities and service providers (Health, Education, WASH). The assessment consisted of 800+ quantitative surveys among refugee and host community households in select areas in Mbarara city, 19 KIIs with locally active service providers, community leaders and other experts, as well as 20+ FGDs with refugee and host groups, gender-separated.
- Data collection occurred in March 2024, analysis is completed.
- Data and analyses can be downloaded, and findings will be published on [IMPACT-REACH website's Resource Centre](#) and also presented during a workshop (forthcoming).

Flow Monitoring & Mobility-Tracking in the South-West (IOM)

Key highlights (see slides for further content)

- IOM and project partners conducted multi-sectoral assessments to address information gaps related to refugee human mobility and its impact on service delivery in secondary cities. The assessments address information gaps related to internal mobility including movements from settlements to host communities, in-between settlements, to secondary cities. These assessments also evaluate the impact of refugee population mobility on available services to enhance evidence-based program design.
- The refugee flow Monitoring objective was to track refugee mobility from settlements to host communities, in-between settlements and to secondary cities to inform the reasons for movement and the subsequent Mobility tracking exercise.
- Findings and factsheets will be circulated.

Thank you!