

**Food Security Sector Working Group**  
**24 June 2014, WFP Jordan - Amman**

Chair: WFP, JHCO

Participation: ACF, ACTED, FAO, HRF, LWF, OCHA, SCJ, UNHCR

STATUS	ACTION POINTS
<p><b>1. <u>Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The VAF is a multi-sector assessment of vulnerability approach on which we have been working for around six months. Feedback has been requested from the FSSWG at different stages of the process. In line with RRP6, a targeted approach is critical.</li> <li>As WFP reaches all UNHCR registered refugees, the sector most affected by VAF targeting would be Food Security.</li> </ul> <p><i>Presentation by Alex Tyler, Senior Inter-Sector Coordinator – UNHCR</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different organisations have been applying vulnerability criteria in order to take difficult assistance decisions for a long time. Some organisations, such as Care, already have a very developed system.</li> <li>The issue is that everyone has different definitions of vulnerability. By establishing a common set of criteria/indicators and measuring at household level, we can develop a trends analysis and over time, and better understand how we responded to this crisis.</li> <li>Funding will drop off next year, and probably even more the following year; we are trying to put ourselves in a position where we can take tough assistance decisions in a fair, balanced way, with safeguards and checks in place.</li> <li>Currently we are still in phase 1, where we consider only out-of-camp Syrian refugee households. There are plans to look at camp settings in phase 2, and also to find a way to link the process to vulnerable Jordanians.</li> <li>There have been challenges to the process, as different organisations prefer different approaches, such as a more econometric model versus sector specific vulnerabilities. It is difficult to set up a framework covering everybody's needs.</li> <li>Every household will be assessed, and scored/categorized. The tool captures 15/16 indicators, including observable ones.</li> <li>Indicators are primarily welfare/food security related. The World Bank came in and helped with testing and modelling, and understanding what combination of variables works best to provide an accurate</li> </ul>	

score. There were also 70 focus group discussions with refugees around the country, and an extremely high correlation was found between WB findings and their concerns.

- The tool questions were incorporated into the Home Visits questionnaire, and a pilot has already started, with IRD volunteers conducting Home Visits. Over 400 interviews have been conducted so far.
  - It should also be noted that a very high percentage of the indicators have already been collected, during Registration for example; the Steering Committee will need to discuss what to do with this “old stock” of data, to see if it can be used fairly.
- There will be a statistician coming in to help with the modelling, looking at the pilot data.
- A central database will be set up where data related to this framework can be stored. Partners will be able to log in, upload unique identifier (UNHCR case number, for example), and will be able to see when that family was assessed and what scores they have. There will be multiple scores; welfare model, food security, etc.
  - Reports can also be generated; for example, if Education wants to know how many children are not attending school, or WASH wants to know how many households have no WASH facilities, they can run a report.
  - User access rights will also be set out in SOPs.
- Draft SOPs have been developed, and an appeals/feedback mechanism is being looked at. Other issues are still being considered such as how long the assessment is valid, when should households be reassessed, etc. Colleagues in Lebanon have also provided support by discussing lessons learned, and a small task force has been set up for developing a Communications Strategy.
- It is important to keep in mind this is not *only* about reducing assistance. For sectors such as Cash and NFIs, for example, who do not do blanket assistance, it will be a means of better identifying who needs assistance.
- The advantage of an inter-agency process is that we will have a unified approach, UNHCR will be standing by partners and WFP in answering questions, explaining how decisions are taken.

#### Comments

- WFP will be doing a senior programme staff evaluation tomorrow, to see where the process is going; senior management will then meet with partners to discuss how to operationalize the process. Any organisations interested in being involved in the operational aspects should let WFP know.
- Another element is self-targeting, meaning maybe half a percent do not need the assistance. Some people are registered, for example, only to get their children in school. This approach is being looked at.

#### Questions

**Organisations interested in taking part in the operational aspect discussions, to let WFP know.**

- In the mock-up database, it appears we are looking at an individual, when it was mentioned this is being done for households. The score would be for the household, but in the mock-up the information is linked to the head of households; the household itself will have the same vulnerability score.
  - Individual information will be available, however, in the sense that, for example, all households with a disabled child can be identified.
  - Some of this information is already available in RAIS and proGres; partners have to sign a data sharing agreement with UNHCR, and information for assessment purposes, targeting, sampling, can be provided.
- A concern was raised that some people lost track of the VAF after the indicators workshop in February, until it reappeared a couple of weeks ago, and that there should have been a way to ensure Working Groups represented were consulted throughout the process.
  - It is crucial for the VAF to be an inclusive process; indicators were shared with the Working Groups and feedback was received; a purpose document was circulated to heads of agencies, sector chairs, and Working Groups (including the FSSWG).
  - There were many consultations with the INGO forum; some NGOs were concerned about whether or not it was mandatory. It is a recommended practice. For sectors wishing to adopt it, should be a motion to do so, discussions around it.
  - There has been transparency with the process, but we can always do more. We will go back to the sectors with the results of the pilot, as the indicators need to be weighted. Part of the pilot is to test if these are the right questions; then to see how we weigh the score of the answers, and define thresholds.
- When developing the questions, did you think of how they would apply to Jordanians?
  - Doing so is beyond the scope of this process, as this is something that should be done by the Jordanian government. We are however, linking up with UNDP, looking at how to bridge the gap.
  - We cannot assess every single household in Jordan, but perhaps look at community level rather than households; poverty pockets, etc.
  - There are different issues related to vulnerability; many studies, including by the World Bank, link economic vulnerability to possessing a work permit. Jordanian vulnerability will be different. It would be a disservice to try to compare the two, would need to be thought through better.
- What about the question in the tool about income – legally Syrian refugees are not supposed to work, should we be asking them this question? Will we get an accurate answer?
  - It has already been done for 120,000 home visits, and many people do answer; the World Bank came back last week and said they strongly recommend we separate income and expenditure, but we are looking at how practical that is.

## 2. RRP6 Dashboard and mid-year review updates

**Dashboard**

- The May RRP6 dashboard was submitted, thank you to those who reported.
- This month we are very pleased to be featuring photos submitted by LWF of their activities. We would like to feature more activities done by partners other than WFP, and we really encourage partners to send in photos and summaries of their activities, to be included in the dashboard.

**Mid-Year Review**

- For the RRP6 Mid-Year Review, there was an overall reduction of \$186 million, bringing the overall appeal from \$1,200,650,591 to **\$1,014,530,914**.
- For Food Security, there was a reduction of \$35 million, from \$322,120,343 to **\$286,984,609**.
- The process for the review included a Steering Committee review at committee level, and WFP would like to put together some comments to submit to UNHCR regarding the process.
  - Although it was meant to be a light review, it was a bit difficult to get a sense of what was happening in terms of transparency from other sectors.
  - Notes from the technical interviews with the sectors were circulated, but it did not feel quite inclusive enough.
- Feedback to UNHCR is important in terms of planning for the RRP7 process which will start in September. This time a regional body helped draft the narrative, trying to lighten the load of the Sector Chairs. It has been noted, however, that it was not always clear at the country level where we stood.
- Gender analysis was not as clear as the beginning of the process, and there was not as much discussion with the government.
- Good results overall: largest reduction in the region, and probably the most credible.
- Peer review was really useful for the drafting of the strategy but a little more circulation would have been helpful. It was good to have a Steering Committee to bounce things off of, but we would have liked to draft the chapter ourselves.
- Regarding the current situation and needs analysis, we should try to bring the pieces a little more together. The VAF analysis should go into the RRP7; the review has no new data compared to the RRP6. For Food Security we used some Comprehensive Food Security Monitoring Exercise (CFSME) indications, but that was about it.
- It would also be helpful for there to be a validation process of the budgets being entered by partners into ActivityInfo.

**Organisations to send in summaries of their activities/photos for the dashboard.**

**Organisations who have feedback on the RRP6 review process to send it in by email.**

**Activity info training to be conducted. FSSWG to to coordinate.**

**3. RRP7 Planning**

- It has been decided there will be an RRP7, covering the year 2015.
- So as to avoid ending up in a situation where we do not have a body of assessments to base our appeal on, we would like to start looking at this now.
- There are some ideas on how best to do the assessment. One option would be to link it very closely to the body of data we have, find a cross-sectoral option and feed into this. For Food Security, we have a good body of data for Syrians – the CFSME will be launched in mid-July.
- We still need to discuss what the needs are in terms of Jordanians. Organisations working with Jordanians in particular, would need to start thinking about types of assessments, if any, would be needed, whether there are other assessments in the pipeline, or would we have to work through the multi-sector type assessment.
  - FAO has finalized data collection for their food security and livelihood assessments of the host community in the north of country. The data is now being analysed, and might be able to give some information which can be used for formulation of RRP7.
- In Lebanon they did a multi-sectoral needs assessment (MSNA), initially an NGO process joined later by UN agencies. The first lesson learned was that it took very long, so we need to make sure we have enough time. We need to have results in by end September, beginning of October, and we are now in late June. They had a dedicated team and dedicated chair from an NGO, which requires resources. Here we are discussing having an independent lead on the process, talking to INGO forum to see if donors can fund independently.
- Idea is to not interview refugees unless there is a serious gap, as there is a huge amount of secondary data, Education Joint Needs Assessment, work by ILO, Health and Nutrition assessments, etc. Anything from end of last year to August of this year will be very useful. VAF is ongoing and should have thousands of interviews done by September.
- There is an issue where we get information for same sector, but it is not always not comparable or compatible. FAO, for example, has been trying to use exact same Food Security methodology as WFP, but still there are differences. We should try to have some technical people discuss how to use these different assessments.

**If there are NGOs interested in participate in the assessment process for the RRP7, to talk to the head of the INGO forum.**

#### **4. Contingency Planning**

- Documents were circulated to sector for completion by organisations who have contingency stock.
- There are three planning assumptions: scenario 1 is the most likely and considers 3,000 new arrivals per day; scenario 2 is less likely and looks at 7,500 new arrivals per day; scenario 3 looks at a large scale return to Syria.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the Food Security Sector, we have established that stocks are available to accommodate for number of arrivals in scenario 1.</li> <li>• The process of planning as a team is just as important as the final product.</li> <li>• For the vast majority of sectors, the response strategy is to reorient resources from urban areas, such as medical staff, etc. This rings alarm bells and should be mentioned to the donors so they are aware of this possibility.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Plan to be updated and circulated</b></p>
<p><b>5. AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. OCHA ERF proposals</li> <li>• No proposals were received for the Food Security Sector. This would have been a good funding opportunity for NGOs.</li> <li>b. Amani campaign and GBV/CP SOP updates</li> <li>• Inter-agency campaign to raise awareness of SGBV services. WFP is supporting the initiative by hanging posters in distribution sites in urban and camp settings, distributing cards with hotline information. All sector members are encouraged to participate.</li> <li>c. Sector survey</li> <li>• Sector survey was reopened, and the deadline is now 30 June. The first time around, not many responses were received; an email was circulated regarding the reopening.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the meantime, the report of the survey based on the initial 99 responses was released, but it does not include the comments specific to each sector. Last year there were 111 responses.</li> <li>○ Survey was reopened with the understanding that the results would only be used at the sector level. So far only a total of 22 new responses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Organisations interested in participating in the Amani campaign, to contact their gender focal point.</b></p> <p><b>Sector members are kindly requested to complete the survey. Deadline: 30 June.</b></p>