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**VENA update – Gemma Woods (UNHCR), Sarah Collman (IMPACT/REACH)**

* The team apologised for the few updates in the last couple of months since March. The COVID-19 pandemic caused an initial disruption, but since May work intensified with colleagues from UNHCR to work on the protection vulnerability analysis.
* UNHCR presented the protection-specific vulnerability framework, which was developed to see how protection aspects could be included in the VENA analysis (see presentation).
* Vulnerability in the context of protection is defined as heightened risk of rights violations due to specific circumstances / individual characteristics.
* Limitations of the VENA for protection vulnerability analysis come from the fact that it is a HH level survey, so certain issues can be under-reported or data on certain groups can be missing. In addition, the number of PSNs in certain categories are small, so this inherently leads to small sample sizes that were captured as part of the assessment.
* To address this, the protection vulnerability framework employs both data driven and expert driven approaches. Data driven protection vulnerability indicators for instance include female headed HH with no other adult male members, HH with one or more disabilities as defined by the Washington Group question set, HH with a high dependency ratio, and HH headed by elderly person with no other adult members.
* Expert driven protection vulnerability indicators are not necessarily linked to VENA data, but these are groups identified as being vulnerable from other types of qualitative and participatory assessments in the Uganda context. Indicators include PSN HH, HH with school-aged children, HH with children in harsh labour, HH with unregistered members, HH with women / girls that have no access to sanitary material, HH engaging in negative coping mechanisms, HH living in “worst” condition shelter etc (see presentation for full list).

*Feedback*

* Youri (HI): The psychological or physical impairments mentioned are only due to torture, are other types of impairments not considered?
	+ This is a specific proGres category, other types of impairments are covered through the Washington Group questions.
* Isabelle (ECHO): Are the expert driven indicators the same as the current UNHCR PSN categories? The percentage of HH falling into the protection vulnerability classification is quite high (>88%), what does this mean?
	+ Not all PSN categories are included, only the most pertinent ones (but there is a lot of overlap with EVH).
	+ High percentages can be linked to several indicators that cover large proportions of the population: inclusion of the dependency ratio (accounts for more than 50%), female-headed households with no male (accounts for more than 35%), and other indicators (children out of school, emergency coping mechanisms, etc. account for ~15-20%).
* Ernest (DFID): Is there always a correlation between protection and economic vulnerability? Is the settlement breakdown based on sampling or proGres data?
	+ There is often a correlation, but not always. For example, HH that have less ability to generate income / meet their needs, are at higher risk of rights violations or less able to maintain their shelter.
	+ The percentages shown are based on the VENA sample. The exact set of protection-specific vulnerability indicators cannot be run on the proGres data because not all indicators are available there (i.e. children out of school, use of coping mechanisms, etc.). There is also a discrepancy between HH sizes which cause high inclusion/exclusion errors when applying to the full progress dataset without doing the IPE first.
* Jordi (ECHO): The ultimate objective is to know how many people need support to meet their basic needs. How can we use the protection analysis to prioritise interventions as most people will need tailored assistance?
	+ Ideally, we should be able to use the three dimensions to identify those who are most vulnerable, but since the percentage of the population covered by the economic and protection vulnerability dimensions are so high, this is difficult.

 *Next steps*

* Finalize correlation analysis
* The report draft is moving along (80% done) but required the closure of the discussion with protection colleagues.
* The report will be shared for feedback and the final analysis workshop will be held before the end of August.
* Jordi (ECHO): The expectations are high in terms of the VENA result. At the strategic level, there are important discussions happening that need these results for decision-making. It is important to agree on the next steps and ensure the strategic-level discussions are informed by the technical-level findings. Given the funding restraints in the operation, we should have a clear roadmap for the VENA results and how these feeds into the IPE to allow for proper targeting. If this does not happen, decisions might be based on other considerations, with potentially more serious protection considerations (due to exclusion / inclusion errors). Once the VENA is concluded, there needs to be clarity on when the IPE can be implemented, so that prioritisation criteria can be used (UNHCR and WFP should be working together on this).
	+ The funding outlook is indeed not positive and this will affect the assistance that the refugees will receive. WFP has been conducting analysis to identify the most vulnerable refugees within those identified as economically vulnerable through VENA and the use of proGres data.

**Introduction to WFP’s real-time food security monitoring – Takahiro Utsumi (WFP)**

* mVAM has been scaled-up to monitor food security in Kampala as well, in addition to refugees, refugee hosting districts and Karamoja. The monitoring is conducted by phone and looks at food security, coping mechanisms, market functionality, the impact of COVID-19 and locust infestations. There are real-time dashboards to allow for close monitoring of the situation, while bi-weekly products are published for internal use, public dashboards are coming soon. mVAM tracks food security in 49 populations and provides a moving average for the situation by population group
* Please see presentation for details of findings.

*Feedback*

* Jordi (ECHO): If a new acute IPC round has been conducted, it would be good to know when the results will be available.
	+ The IPC analysis covering Karamoja, refugee areas, and urban areas have been conducted. TWG led by the government is working on the finalisation of the report.
* Jordi (ECHO): It would be useful if WFP could present an estimate in terms of number of individuals severely food insecure (equivalent IPC 3 and +) and moderately food insecure (equivalent IPC 2) per analysed area.
	+ Once the IPC report is finalised in the coming weeks, the TWG will be able to share the results.

**UBOS/WB/UNHCR Refugee HFPS COVID-19 - James Muwonge (UBOS)**

* High-frequency phone survey data can help monitor the socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 on refugees and Ugandans and inform mitigation measures.
* UBOS with the support of the World Bank is implementing high-frequency phone surveys to track COVID-19 impacts at the national level, however, refugees are not included.
* Ensuring comparability with the national COVID-19 phone survey, UBOS, the World Bank and UNHCR are collaborating to monitor impacts of the pandemic on refugees.
* The Refugee HFPS COVID-19 will conduct 2,100 monthly phone interviews for a period of 4 months.
* The data will be collected by a survey firm while UBOS will provide technical assistance and quality control support.
* The Refugee HFPS COVID-19 will cover refugees that were recently verified or registered and add a sample of refugees included in the UBOS-WB 2018 household survey.
* The next steps are: questionnaire piloting, enumerator recruitment and training, first round of data collection followed by relevant modifications for subsequent rounds.

*Feedback*

* Rick (U-LEARN): Requests to circulate the current questionnaire.
	+ The questionnaire will be shared, but it cannot be adapted for the first round, for subsequent rounds feedback can be taken into account

**CRS START Learning Grant preliminary findings - Jeremiah Mutambo (CRS)**

* In the past 18 months, several natural disasters in the form of flash flooding, landslides, mudslides and sinking terrain have plagued the Rwenzori, Teso and Mt. Elgon regions of Uganda, and with the impact of climate change these types of events are expected to increase.
* Although the use of market-based approaches, including Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA), is common in Uganda’s refugee-hosting areas, there is limited evidence and learning available on the feasibility of market-based programming to respond to natural disasters in non-refugee hosting areas of the country.
* In June 2020, with funding from the START Network, CRS and partners led a market assessment to understand the feasibility and appropriateness of market-based approaches to respond to natural disaster-affected communities.
* Please see presentation for details of findings.

*Feedback*

* Jordi (ECHO): Recommends all to attend the learning event on Tuesday.

**U-LEARN risk communications and community engagement study – Giulia Montisci (U-Learn), Rick Bartoldus (U-Learn)**

* The Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) Assessment aims to fill the knowledge gap around the perception of risk and the decision-making process of different population cohorts in translating risk awareness in behavioural change. The ultimate goal is to inform the RCCE strategies implemented by governmental and humanitarian actors in the response to COVID-19 pandemic and future similar responses.
* The assessment will cover different groups to assess if environmental and social characteristics influence the way that communities receive and process information. The refugee population, being one of the most vulnerable groups, are one target population of this assessment; host-community populations and the general population living in both high-risk and low-risk districts will also be part of the scope.
* The data collection is planned to start at the end of August and results will be disseminated with the RCCE community in mid-November.

*Feedback*

* Jordi (ECHO): In terms of behaviour change strategies, there are existing KAP studies from WASH / Health to consult (ACF Kyangwali, Oxfam Kyaka II etc.). Even though they are not COVID specific, the results can be useful as the preventative measures for COVID are not new.
* Bo (UNHCR): Question 2 and 3 are also covered by the Rapid Gender Assessment that UNHCR and UN Women are planning to conduct with a number of protection partners.
	+ U-LEARN will follow up bilaterally with the RGA team to ensure the studies are complementary.

**GTS one-pager on COVID-19 insight from refugee leaders - Elias Sagmeister (GTS)**

* Ground Truth Solutions conducted a second round of phone interviews with 6 community leaders and 95 religious leaders in the 10 most populous South Sudanese and Congolese refugee settlements in Uganda in June 2020.
* Please see one-pager for details of findings.
* Members are requested to reach out if they want to influence the kind of survey GTS is conducting for the next round in October, as this specific survey will not be repeated given the start of the UBOS/WB/UNHCR HFPS.

**UNHCR / UN Women COVID-19 Rapid Gender Assessment - Geofrey Arum (CARE)**

* The main objective of the RGA is to assess the impact of COVID-19 on refugee and host women, men, girls and boys in Uganda. This will be to further compliment the earlier assessment carried out by individual organisations, on order to get updated information, and generate targeted recommendations for interventions.
* The exercise is led by UNHCR and UN Women in collaboration with NGO partners (DRC, Alight, CARE etc.).
* The RGA tool has been reviewed (including by ATWG members) and will be uploaded to KoBo..
* The exercise will cover most refugee hosting districts and Kampala.
* By the 21st of August data collection should be concluded and next week the training of enumerators will take place.
* Initially, the interviews would be done via phone, but they are now to be conducted face to face.
* The revised questionnaire will be shared with the members so that any overlap with other initiatives can be explored.

**AOB**

* Mohamed (UNHCR): Suggests to have more frequent meetings to discuss VENA issues.
* Isabelle (ECHO): Donors should be included in the follow-up VENA meetings to provide strategic inputs.