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1. **VENA Update-Vulnerability analysis framework**
* Sectoral analysis and profiling
	+ Key sector-specific vulnerability indicators from consultations with sector co-leads were presented, except for protection, whose indicators have not been finalized. The team has not yet met with the sector leads for Environment & Energy.
	+ See PowerPoint slides for the vulnerability analysis frameworks per sector.
	+ Presentation of indicators found correlated to high economic vulnerability – see PowerPoint slides for specific indicators.
	+ Key questions for ATWG:
		- At the end of the VENA process, shall we know how many people will be able to meet their essential needs without assistance?

Feedback: Based on the sample, around 5% of the population are categorized as least vulnerable and are able to meet their basic needs without assistance.

* + - The last indicator to categorize people by economic vulnerability is food consumption score. How can we know that those classified as least vulnerable are able to meet their needs if FCS is based on consumption from food assistance?

Feedback: The inclusion of the FCS indicator serves as a safety net to ensure households that have high economic capacity and are not using coping mechanisms, but have poor FCS, are not excluded from assistance.

* + - For livelihoods, have you considered separating single or multiple livelihoods into different high/low vulnerability classifications? And similarly, what about the division of agriculture-based or non-agriculture-based livelihoods vulnerability groups?
		- Under health sector, the indicator of having received treatment is narrow. A household member may have received treatment but it does not measure whether or not the treatment was successful. The 30-day recall period also does not capture longer-term, sustained health care needs, and is very medically-focused. There may be a need to explore other issues beyond received treatment or not. The estimated distance/travel time should be measured in walking time (as was done for Education), as the 5km standard is different for everyone (i.e. a person who is disabled or sick/weak and walks slower).
		- For WASH, the latrine indicator on type of toilet facility fails to capture accessibility and use. A household may have a functioning toilet, but if someone cannot access or use it, then the facility type should not be the only criteria. Reconsider including whether or not all household members have access to/are using the toilet facility to determine vulnerability.
		- For Shelter, the presence of certain PSNs were included in the framework, but not others. Are there other specific PSNs that should be included? This also applies to Education.
		- For clarification, add “OR” to the frameworks, indicating that a household needs to meet only one of the criteria to be categorized as having high sector vulnerability. In addition, compound questions need to be split to ensure accuracy in the analysis. For instance, “Had sick members in the past 30 days that received treatment”, this requires the presence of two conditions: sick HH member AND receiving treatment. However, a sick HH member that did not receive treatment is probably even more vulnerable.
		- The inclusion of “High”, “Medium” and “Low” sector vulnerability (such as for Shelter and WASH) vs. just “High” and “Low” is at the discretion of the sector leads, however, the latter is preferred.
1. **UNHCR Individual Refugee Profiling feedback on questionnaire**
* DRC asked about the need to collect certain details about HH (phone, location with GPS coordinates etc.), the possible use of the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) score and how to avoid bias in expenditure questions.
	+ The response from UNHCR was that phone numbers would not be asked as they are provided by UCC, however, the GPS location is needed as this is currently not available. The reduced CSI only contains questions related to food security, so the full CSI index is preferred. The expenditure questions are based on the VENA module and have been slightly expanded on, hopefully this will address the issue of bias.
* REACH asked about how any changes in family composition will be incorporated into proGres, as this requires referral to OPM. REACH also asked whether the exercise will cover urban refugees and how data quality will be ensured.
	+ ProGres allows the establishment of individual linkages, this means both the registration composition and the newly collected composition can be preserved during the exercise while OPM processes the updates. Urban refugees are not covered for the time being. Data quality will be ensured through thorough enumerator training and close monitoring of the data as it is being collected.
* HI asked about the household approach with regards to PSN identification, inclusion of the Washington Group short set of questions, inclusion of questions related to MHPSS, accessibility of the shelter and WASH facilities for persons with mobility issues, how to capture unmet needs and finally how to link this exercise to the referral process.
	+ UNHCR agrees that questions related to individuals in the household, and particularly questions relating to PSN categories, should be asked directly to the person concerned as far as possible. The short set of Washington Group questions will be written into the questionnaire, as well as the six questions from the WHO-UNHCR Assessment Schedule of Serious Symptoms in Humanitarian settings. Questions have also been added to the shelter and WASH sections to assess whether all members of the household are able to access these facilities (if they exist). However, information on unmet needs could be better collected through another medium, such as focus group discussions. Referrals will be able to be made by the enumerator in the questionnaire and there will also be certain categories which will be automatically flagged for referral whether this has been specified by the enumerator or not.
* PRM asked how the profiling will be implemented, as part of ongoing assessments or as a separate data collection exercise?
	+ The data will be collected separately in the first phase, in the second phase partners and UNHCR staff will ensure maintenance of the data. Planned data collections should be integrated into the profiling exercise as much as possible. For instance, the multi-dimensional poverty index (MPI) from UNDP will be included and will no longer require separate data collection.
* DFID asked if the profiling included an element of verification.
	+ The profiling does not include verification of refugee status, as this is handled by the REC.
1. **WFP Prioritization**
* In 2020, WFP is unlikely to receive enough resources to cover full rations for all refugees. It is projected that resources could be enough for 100% ration for the Extremely Vulnerable Households (EVH) and 70% ration for the rest of the population tentatively beginning in April. WFP presented about planned prioritization to get feedback from ATWG. It was indicated that EVH does not appear to identify household with the largest unmet needs, which may call for alternative prioritization schemes.
* See PowerPoint for detailed review of options and possible scenarios.
* Responses from ATWG
* It may be better to identify which other categories of refugees should not to be excluded, on top of the EVH distinction. There should be a system to identify EVH but not classified as EVHI so that they are put back to EVH status.
* It was suggested to include a grey area of 5% to soften the thresholds for inclusion/exclusion, pilot the approach first and set-up an appeal mechanism. It was also mentioned that disability statistics are not reliable and should therefore not be used and that the fact that PSNs received more assistance due to their status should be considered as well.
* When is the planned prioritization likely to start?

Feedback: It is planned for April. WFP will do further analysis for response options and then conduct consultations will key refugee response partners and refugee communities.

1. **World Bank/UBOS frequent monitoring system**
* The proposed monitoring system, led and implemented by UBOS with technical support from the World Bank, will collect data on key indicators on a monthly and quarterly basis in refugee settlements. The proposed system is divided into five sectors: Core (household indicators), WASH, Education, health, and livelihood sectors. Data collection on indicators in the core sector will be collected monthly and the rest will be quarterly on an alternating basis. Agencies and partners can input into the tools and have access to data for programming. See the attached questionnaire for details.
* Responses from ATWG
* Through consultations and design of the proposed system, what sectoral information gaps were identified as needing to be collected on a monthly or quarterly basis?
* There were questions of why the need for a new system and how it compliments on the already existing monitoring systems. Members encouraged the World Bank to assess current systems and integrate surveys into existing mechanisms where possible, rather than create something new.
* How representative the data from the new system will be?
* How will the data be accessed and how will it be utilized?

Feedback: The tool will be shared to the ATWG for feedback. The World Bank and UBOS plan to pilot the Frequent Monitoring System over the next few months and assess feasibility and usefulness. The sample size will be 2,000 HH, this sample will contain the same households every month.

1. **Energy assessments**
* Dalberg is planning to conduct an assessment in Bidibidi to look at how the private sector can support the energy needs of households and what the willingness is to pay for energy.
* The Response Innovation Lab together with Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT) is conducting an assessment in Bidibidi to look at access to clean energy and map the locations of energy providers.
* It was suggested that the methodologies for the two assessments be compared to avoid overlap and that information from the VENA market assessment be consulted before collecting new data.