Attendance

1. Aletta Buehler, U-Learn / IMPACT
2. Ally Hamud Said, UNHCR
3. Bo Hurkmans, UNHCR
4. Cristobal Mingo, WFP
5. Charles Alemi, UNHCR
6. Dave Van Zoonen, REACH
7. Eunice Mwende, WFP
8. Ernest Achtell, FCDO
9. Francis Xavier Ochieng, DCA
10. Handaa Enkh-Amgalan IRC / U-Learn
11. Henry Myanja, Street Child
12. James Terjaniana, FAO
13. John Barbian US Embassy
14. Joseph Kyanjo, WFP
15. Kai Kamei, GTS
16. Giulia Montisci, REACH
17. Godfrey Twesigye, World Vision
18. Lynn Julen, Caritas
19. Lisa Gutierrez, USAID
20. Marijke Deleu, U-Learn
21. Moses Otai, Child Fund
22. Melinda Manning, US Embassy
23. Mike Tauras, USAID
24. Sarah Gilbert, CRS
25. Vicky Acamango, SCI
26. Yoko Iwasa, UNHCR
27. Youri Francx, HI

Introduction of new co-chairs

Both Anders Petersson (WFP) and Barbara Rosen Jacobson (REACH) have left Uganda this month, as a result the following new co-chairs were introduced:

- Cristobal Mingo, Head of Monitoring & Evaluation, WFP
- Giulia Montisci, Country Coordinator, REACH

Review of TOR

Presentation – Bo Hurkmans (ATWG co-chair)

- The ATWGs **objective** is to coordinate needs assessments in the refugee response with the overall aim to make efficient use of resources and ensure assessments are methodologically robust.
- It is proposed to **add a specific objective around rapid assessments**: "To standardize and promote the use of a common approach and methodology for rapid assessments". To do this, the following steps are suggested:
  - Map existing tools (such as NARE, MIRA etc.)
  - Engage ISWG to select appropriate questions / indicators
  - Develop tools to support the different data collection methodologies
  - Train partners on the use of rapid assessment tools
  - Trigger for rapid assessment to come from ISWG
  - Share results with ISWG, ATWG and other coordination fora
- Additions to the **key roles** of the ATWG were proposed, such as maintaining an assessment calendar, registry, and indicator database[1] as well as reviewing data collections tool for needs assessments.
- It is proposed to **remove the role of endorsing assessment results**, as this can only be done when assessments are conducted through the ATWG, but this has not happened since the Vulnerability and Essential Needs Assessment (VENA).
- Members were asked to indicate what their preferred frequency for meetings was (noting that ad-hoc meetings can be scheduled as required):
  - Monthly
  - Bi-monthly (every other month)
  - Quarterly proposed

---

[1] As part of the situation analysis for the 2022-2023 Uganda Country Refugee Response Plan (UCRRP), REACH mapped the most relevant country wide assessments and identified the indicators used across those assessments. The overview can be found here.

Individual Profiling Exercise / Verification update (UNHCR)

Presentation – Ally Hamud Said

- The two main goals of the IPE/VRX are to verify the number of refugees in the country and to collect socio-economic indicators.
- The objectives are to confirm household compositions, issue new identifications cards, biometrically enrol individuals turning 5 and collect a more comprehensive dataset for case management as well as targeting.
- Plan:
    - Combining verification and profiling (refugees will go through the verification interviews and then continue to the profiling interviews). Verification captures family composition changes; once verified the interviewee goes through the profiling survey.
    - The third component of the exercise is to do a household visit (for 10% of verified refugees). The information will cover elements that require observation (living conditions / shelter conditions).
    - There are 3 teams working simultaneously and the plan is to expand to 5 teams with 630 staff working (current staff is 367).
    - The tentative timeline for finishing the exercise is August 2022.
    - New documentation (attestation, ID card, asylum seekers certificate, ration card when applicable) are being issued to refugees. These contain QR codes for the firs time, which will provide information on the person.
- Challenges:
    - Duration of the process; rainy seasons and road access; compliance with COVID-19 SOPs; printing of ID cards; distance between sampled households.
- Upcoming milestones:
    - Expanding the teams and launching the country-wide dashboard (late December / early January).
    - When the data will be finalized, analysis will be conducted to feed into the next phases of the food assistance prioritization strategy.
    - Syncing of some IPE data to proGres v4 is ongoing with fields such as vulnerability, occupation, and educational level data being pushed to the registration database.

Financial Service Providers (FSP) mapping assessment, 2021 (REACH)

Presentation Dave van Zoonen | [Link to report](#)

- Main objective of the research was to estimate the FSP capacity to provide humanitarian assistance, the challenges they face and the perception on the challenges faced by their clients.
- Mixed-method approach: structured and semi-structured interviews targeting FSP (Kampala level), FSP agents, aggregators, humanitarian partners and beneficiary representatives.
- Limitations: findings are indicative rather than representative.

Main findings:

- Presence of FSPs varies per agent type and per region.
- Mobile network operators (MNOs) have bigger agents network compared to banks. Banks are much more developed in the South West.
- FSPs in West Nile report non-digital mechanisms as the most suitable method for delivering cash assistance, this is the opposite in the South West.
- Mobile agents reported to have more experience in West Nile compared to the South West, while SACCOs were reported to be more present in the South West.
- Largely banks reported supporting only General Food Assistance programmes with digital mechanisms, other FSPs types (MNO) also reported other programmes (livelihoods, cash for work etc.).
- Beneficiaries mostly reported preferring mobile money for receiving assistances, the second preference is direct cash / over-the-counter.

- o The reasons for preferring mobile money are easy access/lack of transport required, flexibility, confidentiality and low cost.
    - o The main reason for preferring direct cash is that it is the most inclusive method (no need for digital literacy or owning any devices such phones). Easy access to complaints and feedback mechanisms was another important reason.
- Most of the interviewed humanitarian partners reported having a digital component in delivering their programmes, half of the partners reported using mobile money.
    - o Digital mechanisms were preferred because of efficiencies.
    - o Direct cash was preferred in some cases because of beneficiary preferences.
- Some obstacles were the lack of ID cards for beneficiaries, the limited network/connectivity in the settlements and the lack of assets (phones) among beneficiary population.

Update on the user perspectives on financial services in the Uganda Refugee Response, Jul-Dec 2022 (U-Learn)

Presentation by Aletta Buehler

- Mixed-method approach including quantitative data and qualitative data. Data is representative at settlement level. Methodology also includes a practical exercise to assess the capacity of respondents to carry out tasks with their phones.
- Preliminary findings:
    - o Most respondents (both refugees and hosts) can do simple tasks with their phones. However, only a small proportion of respondents reported being able to do more complex tasks such as sending email, use of social media etc.
    - o The majority of respondents prefers mobile money and cash as a modality for receiving assistance.
    - o Full results will be shared in February.

AOB

- REACH: Child Protection Assessment being coordinated with UNHCR and UNICEF and CP partners – data collection starting in mid-January 2022.
- UNHCR-REACH: analysis of the Participatory Assessment analysis on-going. Findings to be presented in February 2022.