

Assessment Technical Working Group

Minutes for the meeting held on 28/03/2024.

Organizations in attendance: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Vision International (WVI), IMPACT – REACH, World Food Programme (WFP), Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO), IsraAID, Population Council, Action Against Hunger (ACF), Association of Volunteers in International Service (AVSI), Centenary Bank Uganda(CBU), War Child Canada (WCC), Health Right International (HRI), BRAC Uganda, Village Enterprise, U-Learn, Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA Uganda), Save the Children, Community Empowerment for Creative Innovation (CECI), Straight Talk Foundation (STF), Oxford Committee for Famine Relief (Oxfam), Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS), CHIPO, The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWOMEN), Fin Church Aid (FCA), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Handicap International(HI), Finnish Refugee Council (FRC), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC).

Total number of participants: 47

Agenda

1. Introduction remarks & changes in ATWG leadership
2. UCRRP Assessment Registry update
3. MSNA 2024 Preparations
4. REACH's presentation on assessment plans
5. WFP 's presentation on assessment plans
6. UNHCR 's presentation on upcoming assessment plans
7. AoB

Participants

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Wendy Alvarado	WFP	Raymond Mukisa	UNDP
Theodore Jaspers	REACH	Benson Khemis Soro	CECI
Festo Muriisa	UNHCR	Karlmax Kajura Allan	
Mohammed Solyman	UNHCR	Collins	CECI
Faith Kirungi	UNHCR	John Ilima	URCS
Carol Ann Sparks	UNHCR	Hiled Mugabe	ACF
Lawrence Feni	HI	Charles Alemi	BRAC
Akanya Zubedah	IsraAID	Andrew Twuach	VE
Chi-Chi Undie	Population Council	Benson Khemis	ACF
Charles Alinga Lolem	WFP	Charles Lolem	UNHCR
Ankunda, Kullein	SCI	John Mwanza	CHIPO
Samuel Mukirane	HealthRight International	Doreck Ekyampaire	ALIGHT
Alon Muhame	IPA	Abimo Pamela	WFP
Mubbalya Keresipo	SCI	Stephen Okello	AVSI
Ocan Godfrey	FAO	Philip Taremwa	OXFAM
Emma Sohi-isolani	REACH	Misak Oumo	DRC
Ochom Ben David	WCC	Joseph Kurama	IPA
Kenneth Isabirye	AVSI	Grace Kyagaba	URCS
Ronald Omara	STF	Daisy Among	FRC
Paul Atikoro	WVI	Acheng Agnes	SCI

Maria Karen Birungi	Centenary Bank	Hynstein Niyonzima	WCA
Godfrey Twesigye	WCC	Emmanuel Molo Achar	UNWOMEN
Angella Namuyomba	NRC		

Presenters

Name	Topic/ Assessment	Organization
1. Festo Muriisa	- Assessment Registry Dashboard Updates	UNHCR
2. Theodore Jaspers	- Update on the MSNA - Update on REACH's assessment plans	REACH
3. Wendy Alvarado	- Updates on WFP's upcoming assessments	WFP
4. Emma Sohi-Isolani	- Access to land among refugees and host communities in Uganda	REACH
5. Mohammed Solayman	- UNHCR's presentation on upcoming assessment plans	UNHCR

Changes in ATWG leadership

- Theodore Jaspers replaced Melle VAN-HILTEN from REACH
- Now, the co-chairs are Wendy Alvarado (WFP), Theodore Jaspers (REACH) and Bekir Yildiz (UNHCR),

Update on the Assessment registry dashboard (UNHCR)

Key highlights

- 129 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 4 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.

Q&A

Question - Is there a process for validation after assessments have been uploaded on the platform?

Answer - Yeah, a few of the assessments do have a validation process for example the FSNA but ideally, the validation of these assessments, much of it is done by the partner conducting the assessment internally by themselves and they just upload the findings on the registry.

Question - So for example, if you have an assessment, maybe a pilot in one area and then the next year you do another one in different area, but maybe same organization and same topic, how is that reflected on the registry?

Answer - You can always go back to the same uploaded assessment, and then edit it and show that now you have conducted the same assessment but in a different location.

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

WFP's presentation on assessment plans

- Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (assessing the effectiveness of WFP assistance from 2018 to 2025).
- Food Security and Nutritional Assessment - Karamoja and IPC are coming.
- Round 3 Post Distribution Monitoring (GFA and related to prioritisation) longitudinal survey begun in 2023 with 2 rounds (April and September) same time will be for 2024.
- Validation of findings and recommendations for the Decentralized Evaluation for Livelihoods, Resilience and Self Reliance was conducted yesterday and an executive summary will be shared as soon as ready.

Update on the MSNA 2024 preparations

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.

Why an MSNA in Uganda?

- To inform prioritization and targeting of humanitarian assistance to the refugees and host communities and most in need, in a context of consistently decreasing humanitarian funding.
- To compare the current status of humanitarian needs with those found during the last MSNA in Uganda conducted in April – June 20218.
- To understand how socio-economic vulnerabilities have developed over the last 5 years by reproducing the VENA analysis, for which data was collected in August – October 2019
- To enable planning around the transition and durable solutions in Uganda, by collecting data across the settlements on livelihoods, social cohesion, and integration.

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, BPRM

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.

Suggested timeline

- February – March
 - 2 months – Assembling the team.
- April – July
 - 4 months – Research design
- August – September
 - 2 months – Data collection
- October
 - 1 month - Data cleaning and preliminary analysis
- November – January
 - 3 months - In-depth analysis and reporting

Q&A

Question – This year has got several big assessments including the National Housing and Population Census (NPHC), FSNA, so, let's try to find a way of aligning this with all the assessments that will be happening?

Answer – Because of the UBOS census, and aligning it with the VENA and MSNA that happened in 2019/2018, the data collection will be between August and September, potentially starting mid-July to make up for any delays

Question – There is an increasing need for data from the host community, do you think the data will be representative of the host community if you're reaching 15km radius of the settlements in the host community area?

Answer – We think 15km radius is sufficient and practicable, given the need to arrange logs for enumerators. We know it will be representative for host communities in proximity to the settlements.

Question - Is it possible to work also a strong desk review to focus on collecting relevant indicators for comparability? how it would affect methodology?

Answer – a desk review will be done via the sectors, VENA and global cluster related indicators.

Question - Can you provide more information on the budgeting and funding of the assessment and will partners be expected to contribute?

Answer – ECHO, FCDO, Plan International and UNHCR are engaged and potentially BPRM will be coming on board. Budget on a minimum will be \$850K. Partners are not expected to contribute.

REACH's presentation on Access to land among refugees and host communities

General Objective

Provide an updated and comprehensive understanding of the various avenues through which refugee households living in refugee settlements in Uganda access land for self-reliance, as well as the social and economic dynamics which surround refugees' access to land.

Methodology

2,491 quantitative and 130 qualitative interviews were conducted between 6 September and 24 October 2023, all 13 settlements + surrounding host community.

Sampling

National & Regional Level:

- 90% confidence interval + 10% Margin of Error

Settlement Level:

- 95% confidence interval + 10% Margin of Error (West Nile)
- 90% confidence interval + 10% Margin of Error (Southwest)

Demographics

Total number of interviewed respondents, per gender, per community

Type	Male	Female	Total
Host community	510	732	1,242
Refugee participants	350	899	1,249
Total	860	1,631	2,491

% of interviewed respondents by gender and community

Type	Male	Female
Host community	44%	56%
Refugee participants	28%	72%

Key findings from the assessment

OPM Land

- 97% of refugee households (944) grow crops on their OPM land, of which 92% report the plot not large enough to grow crops.
- Most commonly reported use of grown crops among refugee households and host community members who reported growing crops (subset: n=2234, R: 81%, HC: 94%).

Access to additional land

- 29% of interviewed refugee respondents (403) reported having access to additional land outside of their settlements.
- 83% of interviewed refugee respondents accessed the land directly from the host community (403, 29%), with the majority of IDI respondents reporting having a verbal agreement.

Access to additional land – Payments

- Among IDI respondents who reported accessing additional land, cash was the predominant payment method.
- The average expense of accessing additional land (out of 40 IDI respondents) was 103,750 UGX, paid twice a year.
- Of those having reported changes in their capacity and modality of payment in the last year (22), the majority (17) attributed the changes to a reduction in General Food Assistance, noting a decreased ability to afford land, and an increased reliance on crop payments.

Unsuccessful access to additional land

- 38% of interviewed refugee households reported having unsuccessfully attempted to access additional land, with the main reported barriers being financial constraints (85%), lack of land availability (12%) and lack of formal agreements (8%).

Social cohesion

- 6% of interviewed host community respondents reported having conflicts with refugees in the area regarding land.

Conclusion

- Barriers to access: Unsuccessful attempts at accessing additional land were more commonly reported in the West Nile compared to the Southwest. Lack of land availability was more commonly reported as being a barrier in the West Nile, while the issue of documentation was reported more in the Southwest. Factors included financial constraints, breached agreements, and the far distance of the land.
- Conflicts and Tensions: The main causes of conflicts between refugees and host communities revolved around land use, payments, and the lack of formal agreements. The majority of these conflicts were typically resolved through community meetings, emphasizing the importance of local engagement.
- Impact of General Food Assistance (GFA) Cuts: Cuts in General Food Assistance were reported as a factor impacting refugees' ability to access additional land. Changes in payment capacity and methods were attributed to reduced GFA, lower crop yields, and limited employment opportunities. Cuts in GFA, combined with a high demand for land, is likely to have a negative impact on opportunities for self-reliance among refugees.

Q&A

Question – Will the workshop planned for findings discussion be online or physical?

Answer – The workshop will be both in-person and online and the details will be shared shortly.

Question – There is an outlier in the data especially on Kyangwali regarding to accessibility to additional land?

Answer – It could be due to higher land prices and social cohesion issues. A discussion will be held to further discuss the findings, to be included in the report.

Question – How does the female gender fair regarding access to additional land and what was there any investigation regarding block farms?

Answer – Regarding block farms, there was no investigation as it was not in the scope and regarding gender, there was no significant difference.

Question - The average expense of accessing additional land (out of 40 IDI respondents) was 103,750 UGX, paid twice a year. Is the amount paid twice a year or per season?

Answer – This is paid per season per acre accessed and this was mentioned by the IDI group.

Question – There are more issues with land access in the South-West as there is presumably no land there while in West-Nile, there is land. Please provide more context in your findings?

Answer – In West-Nile, the land accessibility is dynamic and is different from one landlord to another since a landlord is at liberty to increase their prices hence making affordability expensive.

Question - Did you focus also on Intersectionality issues when it comes to land access, for example, access by persons with disability?

Answer – The analysis has been made regarding the gender but there was nothing significant to report on but the question on PSN section is noted and will be put into consideration in the next assessments.

Question – What was the source of income?

Answer – The main source of income was crop production, casual labor, livestock.

Question – When will the report be shared?

Answer – In the next few weeks, the report will be shared once the technical review is finalised.

Update on UNHCR assessment plans

Participatory Assessment (PA)

- Protection risks: Understand the protection risks and challenges faced by diverse AGD groups when accessing services, and their recommendations and capacities to address them.
- Programming: Understand the perspectives of the community regarding existing programmes.
- Participation: Understand the perspectives of forcibly displaced individuals /communities on community participation and possible ways to enhance their participation.
- Solutions: Understand the situation and perspectives of host communities.

Methodology

- Quantitative data collection – by FRRM call center agents:
 - Individual remote interviews with refugee women and men of diverse age groups
- Qualitative data collection – by field teams:
 - Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with:
 - Representatives of specific groups (persons with disabilities (M/F), older persons (M/F), women, ethnic / religious minorities (M/F)
 - OPM and cross-sectoral experts
 - Host community representatives
 - Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs)

Results Monitoring Surveys (RMS)

- Household-level surveys with standard questionnaires following context-appropriate, quality methodological approaches. Used for multi-year strategies planning.
- Used to collect data for all relevant population groups.
- Facilitate and harmonise monitoring of our survey-based impact and outcome level indicators.
- Enable us to demonstrate our results to stakeholders.

Refugee Food Security and Nutrition Assessment (FSNA)

- Through support from development partners, FSNA will be conducted to monitor the situation in the refugee settlements and host districts and provide basis for timely, objectively verifiable interventions and response.
- The Karamoja FSNA is being concluded and its being done by a consultant. This assessment is usually done between February and March. In the next few weeks, preliminary findings will be shared.

Final remarks from Ted – Co-chair from REACH

- He called for partners to engage the ATWG regarding their planned and conducted assessments, in this to avoid duplication of efforts and resources.
- The members were called on to upload their assessments to the assessment registry.

