Response Option Analysis for Jere, MMC and Konduga (Borno)

Food Security and Livelihoods

September 2017

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Overview of the Process 2
Phase I. Setting sector objectives and targets 5
Step 1 Validation of assessment findings and recommendations for reports revision 5
Step 2 Revision of assessment reports 7
Step 3 Identification and profiling of the most affected groups by LGA 8
Step 4 Agreement that lack of purchasing power is (among the) underlying factors in priority needs 13
Step 5 Definition of sector-specific objectives of assistance 15
Phase II. Sector response options analysis 18
Step 1 Identification of response options not accepted by local/national authorities 19
Step 2 Identification of response options based on needs and objectives of intervention & target group 20
Step 3 If/when cash is proposed, compare the possible CTP modalities 25
Step 4 If/when cash is proposed, how much should be transferred 27
Step 5 If/when cash is proposed, for each of the preferred modalities, compare AVAILABLE transfer mechanisms 34
Step 6 Comparative analysis of sector response options 38
Step 7 (optional) Weighted scoring of sector response options 47
Step 8 Final recommendations on sector response options for targeted groups and locations 50
Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Task Team for Basic-needs Focused Response Option Analysis 53
Annex 2: Mission Report: Sector groups consultations 57

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Overview of the Process

PHASE I	Step	Participants	Time required
	1. Validation of assessment findings and recommendations for report revision	Session facilitator; Data analyst/report writer; Sector experts; Information management officers	3-4 hours per sector
	2. Revision of assessment reports	Data analyst / report writers	2 weeks (not on a full time basis)
	3. Identification and profiling of the most affected groups by LGA	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Protection experts	1 hour per sector
	4. Agreement that lack of purchasing power is among the underlying factors	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers	30 minutes
	5. Definition of sector-specific objectives of assistance	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers	1 hour per sector

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

PHASE II	Step	Participants	Time required
	1. Identification of response options not accepted by local/national authorities	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	15-30 minutes
	2. Identification of response options based on needs and objectives	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	1.5 hours
	3. If/when cash is proposed, compare CTP modalities	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	1.5 hours
	4. If/when cash is proposed, how much should be transferred	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	2 hours
	5. If/when cash is proposed, compare available transfer mechanisms	Cash experts	1 hour
	6. Comparative analysis of sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	1.5 hours
	7. Weighted scoring of sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	30 minutes
	8. Final recommendations on sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	30 minutes

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

PHASE III	Step	Participants	Time required
	1. Presentation of the sector plans and putting together the assistance package by group/location	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1.5 hours
	2. Identification of potential synergies across sectors	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour
	3. Agreement on appropriateness of MPG for recurrent expenditures	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour
	4. Estimation of MPG value based on recurrent sector expenditures	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour
	5. Adjustment of the response options based on agreement of where MPG can be used	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour
	6. Consideration of cross-sector themes for selected response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	2 hours
	7. Decision on sectoral one-off transfers, amount and timing	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour
	8. Final recommendations	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts; Protection experts	1 hour

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Phase I. Setting sector objectives and targets

Step	Participants	Time required
1. Validation of assessment findings and recommendations for report revision	Session facilitator; Data analyst/report writer; Sector experts; Information management officers	3-4 hours per sector
2. Revision of assessment reports	Data analyst / report writers	2 weeks (not on a full time basis)
3. Identification and profiling of the most affected groups by LGA	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Protection experts	1 hour per sector
4. Agreement that lack of purchasing power is among the underlying factors	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers	30 minutes
5. Definition of sector-specific objectives of assistance	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers	1 hour per sector

Step 1 Validation of assessment findings and recommendations for reports revision

Guidance

Objective / output	• Findings are validated or rejected and/or further explained • Recommendations for additional analysis to be conducted on available raw data (especially the Basic Needs Assessment) • Recommendations to re-draft/improve assessment reports (especially the Basic Needs Assessment)
Question to answer	What are the needs and the available local resources?

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator, who should be familiar with all findings • (preferably) Data analysts involved in the assessments to be presented (or at least in the key ones) • Sector experts • Information management officers, particularly critical if data analysts of sector assessments are not available
Required inputs and resources	• Findings of specific sectors assessments (to be shared in advance by the sector experts) • Findings of basic needs assessment • Findings of service system assessment • Findings of market assessment • Findings of transfer mechanisms and financial service providers assessment, • Findings of capacity assessment • Findings of cash acceptance assessment
Available tool	NA
How to complete the step	1. Assessment reports to be compiled in advance by the facilitator 2. Presentation of findings of each assessment by relevant participant, to make everyone familiar 3. Discussion around key findings: ✓ Are they plausible according to the experts? ✓ If they are not plausible, what can be said instead? Why? ✓ Why do you think this is the situation? How can the findings be better explained (why and how)? ✓ Looking at the row data (when available), what additional analysis you would like to be carried out? What would it help you understand? How would your sector use it? ✓ Any other observations? 4. List of recommendations to revise assessment reports
Estimated time required	• 3-4 hours with each sector group, depending on number of assessments to be covered and familiarity of the participants with their findings
Notes	NA

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

See Nathalie Cissokho's mission report (CaLP, on behalf of the ERC-MPG Consortium), in Annex 2.

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Step 2 Revision of assessment reports

Guidance

Objective / output	Revised and finalised assessment reports
Question to answer	What are the humanitarian needs and the available local resources?
Actors to be involved	Data analysts/reports writers of all the assessments to be revised
Required inputs and resources	Output of Step 1 in Phase I
Available tool	NA
How to complete the step	It will depend on the outputs of Step 1in Phase I
Estimated time required	Two weeks of work by data analysts/reports writers to revise the assessment reports according to recommendations
Notes	NA

Working session output

Nothing to report.

Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Step 3 Identification and profiling of the most affected groups by LGA

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Table with number of households and individuals in each targeted administrative area, their respective needs ranked by priority/severity, and the specific protection concerns/issues affecting them
Question to answer	What are the priority needs, for which target groups, and where?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator, who should be familiar with all findings • Sector experts • Information management officers • Protection experts • **Optional**: Data analyst involved in the BNA
Required inputs and resources	• Basic needs assessment • Other sectoral assessment of the target population and their needs • Expertise/knowledge brought by protection experts
Available tool	b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Table 1: Population groups size

Blanket targeting of sanitation interventions and access to potable water

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

		IDPs in collective centres • Blanket; main priority for hygiene commodities	IDPs in host communities • Blanket; second priority for hygiene commodities	IDPs in informal camps • Blanket; main priority for hygiene commodities	Residents
	Jere (households)	85	36,591	3,108	?
	Konduga (households)	36	4,609	2009	?
	MMC (households)	43	62,004	1201	?
	Total (households)	**164 HH**	**103,204 HH**	**6,318 HH**	**?**
	Jere (607,063)	444	232,239	17,760	288,430
	Konduga (188,177)	242	27,367	10,646	213,811
	MMC (1,030,217)	220	344,547	6,227	712,173
	Total (individuals)	**906 individuals**	**604,153 individuals**	**34,633 individuals**	**1,214,414 individuals**
	Table 2: Population group profiles				
How to complete the step	1. Does it make sense to break down by LGAs? Would you like to focus on just 1 LGA? 2. Pull out tables with severity of needs from the BNA. 3. Which groups is the sector most interested in targeting? 4. Where? Who? How many? 5. What are the protection concerns affecting this group? 6. What do they need the most?				
Estimated time required	1 hour with each sector group				
Notes	This cannot start until assessment reports have been revised				

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

Table 1: Population groups size

	Blanket targeting of sanitation interventions and access to potable water			
	IDPs in collective centres • Blanket; main priority for hygiene commodities	**IDPs in host communities** • Blanket; second priority for hygiene commodities	**IDPs in informal camps** • Blanket; main priority for hygiene commodities	**Residents**
Jere (households)	85	36,591	3,108	?
Konduga (households)	36	4,609	2009	?
MMC (households)	43	62,004	1201	?
Total (households)	**164 HH**	**103,204 HH**	**6,318 HH**	**?**
Jere (607,063)[1]	444	232,239	17,760	288,430
Konduga (188,177)[2]	242	27,367	10,646	213,811
MMC (1,030,217)[3]	220	344,547	6,227	712,173
Total (individuals)	**906 individuals**	**604,153 individuals**	**34,633 individuals**	**1,214,414 individuals**

[1] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.
[2] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.
[3] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Table 2: Population group profiles

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	Source of information	Location	IDPs in collective centres	IDPs in host families	IDPs in informal camps	Residents (2016)
Severity of impact on group by LGA and sector (1 least severe – 5 most severe)	BNA (p.5)	Jere	3	4	4	3
		Konduga	3	3	3	3
		MMC	2	2	2	2
How many households?	DTM XV, only informal settlements	Jere	85	36,591	3,108	?
		Konduga	36	4,609	2009	?
		MMC	43	62,004	1201	?
How many individuals?	DTM XV, only informal settlements	Jere (607,063)[4]	444	232,239	17,760	288,430
		Konduga (188,177)[5]	242	27,367	10,646	213,811
		MMC (1,030,217)[6]	220	344,547	6,227	712,173
Protection concerns?	Protection experts, sector experts, other assessments	Jere Konduga MMC	**More severe issues of access to justice in Konduga.** Polygamy has to be taken into consideration when it comes to deciding who to give assistance.	Hosting family and IDPs know one another; they have higher social capital and can more easily access justice. **More severe issues of access to justice in Konduga.**	Access to justice: **more severe issues of access to justice in Konduga.** Restriction of movement within the camps; domestic violence; GBV and exploitation; discrimination against certain groups that are being neglected (e.g. people with disabilities). The highest concentration of Unaccompanied and separated children is in camps	
Priority needs (in order of preference) and identification of underlying cause (see graph below)	BNA, validated by sector experts	Jere	Food Shelter housing health commodities potable water hygiene commodities household commodities	Food Shelter housing health commodities potable water hygiene commodities household commodities	Food Health commodities potable water shelter commodities	Food shelter/housing potable water shelter commodities
		Konduga	Food health commodities Healthcare services shelter commodities	Food shelter commodities health commodities shelter/housing	Food health commodities health care services shelter/housing	Food health commodities health care services

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

		MMC	Food potable water health commodities shelter/housing sanitation facilities	Food potable water shelter/housing health commodities	Food shelter/housing health commodities potable water	Food health commodities shelter/housing household commodities

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Step 4 Agreement that lack of purchasing power is (among the) underlying factors in priority needs

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Cash: relevant or not
Question to answer	Are financial constraints confirmed as one of the underlying factors for priority needs in the target population groups?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator, who should be familiar with all findings • Sector experts • Information management officers
Required inputs and resources	BNA dashboard with underlying causes of needs.
Available tool	NA
How to complete the step	1. The session would start with listing – in order of importance – the underlying factors mentioned by the targeted population groups, for each priority need. 2. Is "lack of purchasing power" / "financial constraints" among them? If so, then CTP should (must!) be considered as a response option in Step 2, Phase II.

[4] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.
[5] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.
[6] Source: Nathalie Cissokho's mission report, feedback from WASH sector.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	3. If time allows for it, the facilitator would ideally support the group in coming up with a basic problem tree, showing the linkages among different concurrent factors and articulating a short paragraph that explains the situation, as well as possible differences by group and/or by geographic area.
Estimated time required	30 minutes
Notes	If "lack of purchasing power" / "financial constraints" is among the underlying reasons why the need remains unmet, then CTP should (must!) be considered as a response option in Step 2, Phase II.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

YES, financial constraints are either the most important (in Jere and MMC) or the second reason (in Konduga, where the primary reason is security risks) for the needs remaining unmet. CTP is therefore appropriate with respect to the needs and the related objective.

In Konduga the main constrain to meeting food needs is reported to be security. Many of the people living in Konduga are farmers and security issues are limiting their capacity to produce. They also cannot move around. There are military operations in Konduga and security incidents are frequent. Markets are not consistently open; if they have cash, they cannot buy because the market is not operating regularly. It was stressed that there are disruptions, from time to time, but the market generally works. In addition, Konduga is a large LGA and the findings cannot be generalised.

Production is the 5th reason. IDPs access to land: landlords (who are very often also community leaders) give access to their land for farming, and provide seeds and tools; the farmers will keep part of the produce. There is no formal agreement; it is based on mutual trust

d) Lessons learned

Nothing to report.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Step 5 Definition of sector-specific objectives of assistance

a) Guidance

Objective / output	SMART objective
Question to answer	What objective are we aiming to achieve (for each group and/or each location) in the established timeframe?
Actors to be involved	• Facilitator, who should be familiar with all findings • Sector experts • Information management officers
Required inputs and resources	• Basic needs assessment • Other sectoral assessment of the target population and their needs
Available tool	Table 3: Response objectives
How to complete the step	1. How would the situation/status of the group look like after the sector has intervened to address the problem? The objective should not be the intervention itself (i.e. distribute hygiene kits). The solution/modality to be used to achieve the objective will be identified in Phase II of the process. Instead, the objective describes the situation that the sector would like to attain after having implemented its interventions. 2. In first place, the sector has to decide if they intend to target different groups of affected people, and each of them with a specific objective (in other words, the objectives are group-specific), or if – alternatively – they intend to achieve a specific objective for each targeted location (the objectives are location specific). The most affected groups are identified and profiled in Step 3, Phase I. 3. In this regard, it may help to look at the severity of needs; if the priority needs differ significantly across groups, then a group specific approach should be preferred. If the priority needs differ mostly by geographic area, then there the sector may consider different objective by location. 4. Secondly, the group has to establish the desired timeframe of the objective. For instance, is six (or 12) months a legitimate timeframe? Note that there can multiple objectives with different timeframes. 5. Have you checked if the objective is SMART? In other words, is it: ✓ Specific: The objective has to be specific to the problem that has been detected and be aimed at addressing it directly. The objective should not be vague. By reading the objective, one should be able to understand what the sector is trying to achieve. ✓ Measurable: it should be possible to measure progress towards the complete achievement of the objective and/or to what extent the intervention has delivered a satisfactory/quality result. ✓ Achievable: within the relevant timeframe and with the capacities and resources of the sector. ✓ Relevant: to the humanitarian need that it seeks to address.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	✓ Time-bound: the objective statement should specify the timeframe within which the objective is to be achieved.
Estimated time required	1 hour with each sector group. The necessary time will depend on the number of objectives.
Notes	This step cannot start until assessment reports have been revised and completed.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Targeting is based on vulnerability, not status. Some are using HEA and some others are doing household survey. The purpose is to reach the most vulnerable, including residents. In ADRA there will be life-saving activities first, and then transition to early recovery. According to WFP, it is possible that food security will overlap with socio-economic vulnerability; in other words, they could be proxy of each other.

Table 3: Response objectives

	Location	Group 1: food insecure households	Group 2: farmers	Group 3: food market actors
Objective 1	Jere Konduga MMC	Ensure that the food insecure households (or socio-economically vulnerable) have the means to procure nutritious and diversified food (regardless of their status and in the three LGAs). Target population (in IPC 3-4-5, according to Cadre Harmonise, March 2017)(or socio-economic vulnerability criteria) MMC: 312,909 people Jere: 136, 314 people	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

		Konduga: 116,232 people		
Objective 2	Jere Konduga	NA	Ensure farmers in Jere and Konduga have the means, support and conditions to resume farming production for own consumption and market (micro-production as well as subsistence production)	NA
Objective 3	Konduga	NA	NA	Advocate with Government and police to improve security conditions in Konduga, including to relocate marketplaces in safer locations

d) Lessons from pilot

There was some level of disagreement around the reasons why needs are unmet. One participant did not feel the BNA finding for Konduga to be accurate and did not think that security would be a major issue for people. Nathalie's mission report did not highlight such an issue, at the stage of findings validation.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Phase II. Sector response options analysis

Step	Participants	Time required
1. Identification of response options not accepted by local/national authorities	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	15-30 minutes
2. Identification of response options based on needs and objectives	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	1.5 hours
3. If/when cash is proposed, compare CTP modalities	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	1.5 hours
4. If/when cash is proposed, how much should be transferred	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts	2 hours
5. If/when cash is proposed, compare available transfer mechanisms	Cash experts	1 hour
6. Comparative analysis of sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	1.5 hours
7. Weighted scoring of sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	30 minutes
8. Final recommendations on sector response options	Session facilitator; Sector experts; Information management officers; Cash experts , Protection experts	30 minutes

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Step 1 Identification of response options not accepted by local/national authorities

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Exclude/disregard response options that would not be accepted by local/national authorities.
Question to answer	Are there any response options that the local and/or national authorities would not
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts
Required inputs and resources	For cash: OCHA government acceptance study, as part of feasibility analysis (where available); alternatively, cash experts' knowledge For other response options: sector experts' knowledge of the context; technical guidelines of the sector; other assessment reports.
Available tool	NA
How to complete the step	1. The facilitator collects the necessary information ahead of the session, for instance by interviewing the members of the group and via email exchange. 2. At the working session, participants will confirm the list of response options and approaches that are not accepted/approved by the local and/or national authorities, for these to be explained and duly documented.
Estimated time required	15-30 minutes
Notes	The response options that are not accepted by local and national authorities will not be proposed in Step 2. If cash is not an accepted option, these steps will be skipped: Step 3, Step 4, Step 5.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

There is no particular response option that is not accepted, except for in-kind distribution of fertilisers (to be confirmed), which could be used to produce explosives.

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Step 2 Identification of response options based on needs and objectives of intervention & target group

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Ranked list of response options according to suitability to objective.
Question to answer	Which response option is most suitable for each of the top three objectives (ranked)?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator; • Sector experts; • Information management officers; • Cash experts
Required inputs and resources	BNA dashboard: • the way population groups are used to meet their needs; • their assistance preferences Output of Step 4 in Phase I. Output of Step 1 in Phase II.
Available tool	Table 4: Response options: Suitability check to objective 1 Table 5: Response options: Suitability check to objective 2**Error! Reference source not found.**Table 6: Response options: Suitability check to objective 3 Red Cross Movement Tool #M313
How to complete the step	1. The facilitator prepares one table per each objective, noting the objective statement in the top row of the table, the underlying factors as per basic needs assessment and **Step 3 in Phase I** (row underneath the objective), and the three most common ways through which the targeted groups are used to meet those needs, by looking at the BNA findings. For instance, they may mostly buy the relevant commodities or services from the market, or they may be receiving the service from the government.

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

	2. In first place, the group will retain only response options that are acceptable to local/national authorities. Discard response options identified at **Step 1 of Phase II**, if there are any. The facilitator quickly reminds the group about those response options. 3. Then the group considers and acknowledge the underlying factors, as well as the three most common ways through which the targeted groups are used to meet those needs. 4. After having completed that, the group considers which response options beneficiaries prefer, and the facilitator notes the ranking order in the second row of the table. 5. Therefore, the facilitator will support the group in identifying and briefly describing response options belonging to all possible categories, when they apply to the objective: (1) in kind (e.g. distribution of food parcels, water trucking, provision of housing, distribution of pharmaceuticals); (2) direct service provision (e.g. emergency health services, education); (3) Cash Transfer Programming (i.e. cash based interventions), regardless of their specific modality, which will be looked at in Step 3, Phase II. At this stage, the group should not discuss the specific CTP modalities, but consider CTP as one overarching typology. 6. If none of the response options is sufficient in isolation, what combinations could be considered to better meet the needs and what are the pros and cons of these? These will be noted in the 7. The facilitator moderates a discussion based on this guiding question: What are the pros and cons of each response options in isolation, with regard to their ability to help targeted groups in effectively meeting their needs? The facilitator notes down the answers in the table as appropriate. 8. In this step, the group will have to disregard the operational feasibility of response options (e.g. their costs, their scalability, implementing agencies' capacities, etc.). They will only have to focus on "suitability" / "appropriateness" to the objective.
Estimated time required	1.5 hour
Notes	All response options (or the three most suitable ones) will be compared at **Step 6**, based on their operational feasibility.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

Table 4: Response options: Suitability check to objective 1

OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure that the food insecure households (or socio-economically vulnerable) have the means to procure nutritious and diversified food (regardless of their status and in the three LGAs).						
Underlying factors	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. …				
How beneficiaries are used to meet the need	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. ...				
Criteria	**Possible answers**	**RESPONSE OPTIONS**				
		In-kind transfer	**Direct service provision (if applicable)**	**CTP (any)**	**Combination 1**	**Combination 2**
Beneficiary preference	1, 2, 3 (order of preference)	Jere: 2/3 Konduga: 1 MMC: same as others	NA	Jere: 1 Konduga: 2/3 MMC: same as others	NA	NA
Ability to meet needs (from sector specialist point of view)	Description	Direct food provision	NA	CTP	NA	NA
	Positive	• In Konduga, WFP uses in-kind more than CTP because of market situation • IRC uses also in Konduga • Market disruption is limited because procurement can be local (the great majority; Kanu)	NA	• If given to women, the transfer is more likely to be spent in food. The group did not report domestic violence concerns, if giving the money to women. Men and community leaders shall be sensitised and the protection monitored in Post-distribution Monitoring.	NA	NA
	Negative	• Gathering of large number of people in distribution who can be a target of insurgents • Transportation of heavy loads and security on the road	NA	• Protection concern that when CTP is given, men use it to marry a second wife	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

		• Food distribution is a risk as such: Security people think that food distribution put them at risk				

Table 5: Response options: Suitability check to objective 2

OBJECTIVE 2: Ensure farmers in Jere and Konduga have the means, support and conditions to resume farming production for own consumption and market (micro-production as well as subsistence production)						
Underlying factors	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. …				
How beneficiaries are used to meet the need	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. ...				
Criteria	**Possible answers**	**RESPONSE OPTIONS**				
		In-kind transfer	**Direct service provision (if applicable)**	**CTP (any)**	**Combination 1**	**Combination 2**
Beneficiary preference	1, 2, 3 (order of preference)					
Ability to meet needs (from sector specialist point of view)	Description					
	Positive	• Recipients are made accountable to use the assistance they receive, for the intended purpose • The agency has more control on how the assistance is used • Quality of the farming inputs is higher than what they would buy	• NA	• Stimulate local supply chain of farming inputs, which ultimately supports the farmers who can sell their seeds • Freedom of choice • Flexibility • No long queues at distribution points	•	•
	Negative	• The package must be tailored to the specific need of the farmer. Recipients may sell the inputs for quality issues. If we give them seeds and fertilisers, we shall also give	• NA	• Not conducive	•	•

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

		them tools to work because, for instance, returnees don't have tools anymore. • Army and government are concerned about fertilisers being used to produce explosive.				

Table 6: Response options: Suitability check to objective 3

OBJECTIVE 3: [objective statement]						
Underlying factors	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. …				
How beneficiaries are used to meet the need	1, 2, 3 (order of frequency)	1. … 2. … 3. ...				
Criteria	**Possible answers**	**RESPONSE OPTIONS**				
		In-kind transfer	**Direct service provision (if applicable)**	**CTP (any)**	**Combination 1**	**Combination 2**
Beneficiary preference	1, 2, 3 (order of preference)					
Ability to meet needs (from sector specialist point of view)	Description					
	Positive	•	•	•	•	•
	Negative	•	•	•	•	•

d) Lessons from pilot

It is difficult for agencies to think of response options without mentioning what they are already doing. It is also somewhat challenging for them to voice the negative aspects of the interventions they are implementing.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Step 3 <u>If/when cash is proposed</u>, compare the possible CTP modalities

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Preferred CTP modality (max 2) and frequency
Question to answer	When a CTP is the most suitable response (or an element of the most suitable response) which CTP modality is most appropriate for the objective?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts
Required inputs and resources	Definitions of modalities below
Available tool	Table 7: Comparative table of CTP modalities (below) Red Cross Movement Tool #M313
How to complete the step	1) Facilitator and/or cash experts to introduce the key terms. See the definitions below. 2) Facilitator and/or cash experts to present possible cash modalities for the objectives chosen by the group (including rationales). 3) Consensus reached about which cash modalities should be assessed. 4) Participants to discuss the advantages and disadvantages per each of them and make final recommendations, including on frequency.
Estimated time required	1.5 hours
Notes	Defining terms: • <u>Modality</u> – refers to the different types of cash or voucher transfer – e.g. conditional (cash for work, etc.), unconditional, restricted, unrestricted, multipurpose, etc. A single transfer can generally be categorized in terms of several of these variables e.g. a conditional, unrestricted transfer. • <u>Unconditional unrestricted cash</u> – are provided without a condition to be performed prior to receipt, and funds can be used freely by beneficiaries, although some suggestions and nudges can be given. E.g. multipurpose cash transfers, or transfers that are suggested to be used for the children's wellbeing, their health and education. • <u>Unconditional restricted cash</u> – are provided to beneficiaries without a condition to be performed prior to receipt, but funds can only be used to meet particular needs, or they may be disqualified from further assistance. This includes both commodity and value vouchers • <u>Conditional unrestricted cash</u> - are only provided to beneficiaries upon performance of a specific precondition (e.g. work, training attendance, school attendance, etc.), but can be used freely. Examples include: cash (in exchange) for work; cash (in exchange) for training attendance; transfers based on attending health check-ups; transfers given in exchange for school attendance.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	• Conditional restricted cash - are only provided to beneficiaries upon performance of a specific precondition (e.g. work, training attendance, school attendance, etc.), and can only be used to meet particular needs. Typically, these are transfers in multiple tranches, which are contingent on appropriate use and/or other conditions. E.g. transfer for purchase of productive asset following attendance of training, scholarship for school fees having attained a particular grade, etc.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Table 7: Comparative table of CTP modalities

Objective	CT Modality and example from proposed response options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Comments and recommendation (including frequency)
		Note. Advantages and disadvantages should consider both the risks related to achieving the objective and the risks for beneficiaries.		
Objective 1: food security	Unconditional unrestricted cash Example: multipurpose grant	• Flexibility and possibility to diversify diet • Dignity • More scalable than voucher	• Not all cash is used for food • May not be spent to buy nutritious food • More prone to fraud, although it depends to transfer mechanism	• Mobile money is more prone to fraud •
	Unconditional restricted cash Example: vouchers	• Can enforce the consumption of specific food items, especially if aiming at improving nutritional status • In a context where the food traders need support, the voucher stimulates	• Can still agree with the vendor to receive cash instead of spend it in the shop, but they lose value of the transfer. • Retailer keeps some of the value if they do not have change • Less scalable than cash transfer	• Monitoring of vendors has to be very close, because they will always try to trick the system
	Conditional unrestricted cash	•	•	•
	Conditional restricted cash Example	•	•	

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Objective 2: farming	Unconditional unrestricted cash	•	•	•
	Unconditional restricted cash Example	•	•	
	Conditional unrestricted cash	•	•	•
	Conditional restricted cash Example	•	•	
Objective 3:	Unconditional unrestricted cash	•	•	•
	Unconditional restricted cash	•	•	•
	Conditional unrestricted cash	•	•	•
	Conditional restricted cash			

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Step 4 <u>If/when cash is proposed</u>, how much should be transferred

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Amount and frequency of CTP transfer
Question to answer	How much should the transfer be? And how frequently should it be given?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts
Required inputs and resources	Findings of relevant assessments, such as: • Household Economy Approach assessment (baseline and/or outcome review) • Basic needs assessment • Multi-sector market assessment Previous/existing minimum expenditure basket for the sector Sector's technical guidelines/standards Sphere standards Market prices of items, possibly by location if prices differ substantively National poverty lines and how they are calculated (there could be more than one)

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

Available tool	Table 8: Typical recurrent and one-off expenditures by sector and category Table 9: Sector expenditures Table 10: Recurrent expenditures gap (one-off expenditures have been stricken through as not applicable here) Table 11: One-off expenditures gap (recurrent expenditures have been stricken through as not applicable here)
How to complete the step	<u>Ahead of the face-to-face working session</u>: 1) The facilitator should draft a preliminary, context-specific list of key commodities and services that are relevant to the sector (Table 8). This is the "sector-specific basket" (e.g. "food basket", "NFI kit", etc.). Sectors in-country may already have this information as part of their technical guidelines/standards. More generically, reference could be made to the Sphere standards. 2) Consulted via email by the facilitator, sector experts will confirm the list of items in the sector basket, the frequency of consumption or utilisation of those items (Table 8), the minimum required quantity per person or per household during the period of reference – according to country-level sector and/or Sphere standards - and the unit price. The price information could be found/collected through their logistic/supply chain team. This will provide information to populate Table 9. 3) The facilitator will populate the columns "Actual expenditures" of Table 10 and Table 11, with the median (or mean, if stable) expenditure figures found in the basic needs assessment. It is very important to complete these columns ahead of the working session, and possibly using an Excel sheet. 4) Finally, the facilitator should collect information around the national poverty lines and how they are calculated. Generally, there can be more than one poverty line, including relative and absolute, food-related and food/non-food related. The more ground is covered ahead of the working session via email exchanges, the shorter and more effective will be the meeting. <u>At the face-to-face working session</u>: 5) The facilitator will present the breakdown of expenditures of a hypothetic household (Table 8), differentiating between recurrent and one-off and expenditures (see definitions below), as well as services and commodities. Participants will add anything missing or amend where needed. 6) With the facilitator's support, participants will populate/finalise Table 9, by adding any additional basic items for their sector, required quantity per person or per household, and unit costs. 7) Estimate and compare the recurrent costs of meeting those basic needs with the amount households are currently spending on that set of items, <u>by each period of reference</u>, and estimate the total expenditure gap(s) accordingly. Be careful not to mix expenditures that refer to different periods (e.g. the monthly expenditures with weekly expenditures, for instance); to avoid confusion, you could find a common denominator and convert all expenditures to that period of reference (e.g. make them all monthly expenditures). With the information that has been generated, populate Table 10. Estimate the total expenditure gap.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	8) If information is available, they will compare the total of recurrent costs with the poverty line(s) and relevant items. 9) Compare the one-off costs of meeting those basic needs with the amount households are currently spending on that item, and estimate the expenditure gap accordingly. With the information that has been generated, populate **Error! Reference source not found.**. Pay attention to the period of reference, as flagged above. Finally, note when – over the year – the one-off purchases/expenditures tend to happen.
Estimated time required	2 hours
Notes	Definitions: • (Expenditures) reference period: consumption and utilisation of commodities and services may be more or less frequent, ranging from recurrent to one-off events. Some goods or services, once they have been utilised, they have to be repurchased; some others can be reutilised multiple times or have a specific timeframe. The reference period refers to the frequency of expenditures, which reflects the interval at which the commodity or service has to be repurchased. • Recurrent expenditures: these expenditures are repeated over time, as the commodity or service is consumed and must be repurchased on a regular basis. As a convention, the maximum reference period would be the quarter. The most common recurrent expenditures within a household are those for food, water, and hygiene items. The recurrent costs can be covered by an MPG that is given regularly. • One-off expenditures: these are non-frequent expenditures, and include seasonal or exceptional costs. A one-off expenditure is, for instance, the deposit for accommodation rental, or the fees to register a business. The seasonal costs occur on a regular but non-frequent basis, at specific times of the year. Examples of seasonal expenditures are education-related expenditures, or the purchase of agricultural inputs ahead of the sowing/planting season. Exceptional costs are of a varied nature and may also arise from the emergency itself. Examples include the costs related to the repair of a house or purchase of furniture; the medical costs to treat an injury. The one-off costs can be covered by sectoral top-ups.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

At the beginning WFP was giving 23500 NGN, now they switched to per capita assistance.

Table 8: Typical recurrent and one-off expenditures by sector and category

Sector	Category	Frequency	Type of expenditure faced by a household
CCCM / shelter / NFI	Communication	One off	Phone, etc.
		Recurrent	Phone credit, internet bill
	Energy	One off	Stove, heater
		Recurrent	Cooking, lighting, charging, heating. Includes kerosene, electricity, firewood, charcoal, etc.
	Household items	One off	The improved NFI kit for north-east Nigeria: • Synthetic Mat • Blanket • Mosquito net • Foldable mattress • stainless plates • stainless cups • table spoons • kitchen knife • serving spoon • Solar lamp • cooking pots (7"5" litres)
		Recurrent	
	Housing and shelter commodities	One off	Rent (quarterly or every six months, or every year), furniture, construction materials, permissions, repair, etc.
		Recurrent	
	Transport	One off	Vehicle purchase
		Recurrent	Any other not related directly to other basic needs (fuel and fees)
Education	Education	One off	• School fee • Canteen fee • Notebook • Ruler • Scissors • Maps • Pencils

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

			• Rubber • Geometric set • Mats • Sandals • School uniform • School Bag • Text Book(s)
		Recurrent	Transport
Food security	Food	One off	Land, agricultural inputs
		Recurrent	Staple, vegetable, meat, milk, condiments, oil, sugar, salt
Health	Healthcare	One off	Baby kit, critical event, delivery, immunisation
		Recurrent	Medicine, healthcare fees, transportation
Early Recovery	Productive assets	One off	Land, workspace, agricultural inputs, non-farming assets/inputs, livestock, livestock vaccination
		Recurrent	Veterinary fees, livestock feed
WASH	Potable water	One off	Jerry can, 25 l, non-collapsible Jerry can, 10 l, non-collapsible
		Recurrent	90 l/day for HH of six= 2700 litres a month treatment, transport
	Sanitation / household hygiene	One off	Clothing, sanitation construction / repair Initial hygiene kit (for three months distributed annually): • Bucket with lid, HDPE, 20 L • Kettle with lid, plastic, sanitary cleansing, 2 L • Torch light, rechargeable • Child potty with lid • Bathing soap, 250 grams • Laundry soap, 200 grams • Rope • Clothes pins • Female undergarments, medium size • Reusable sanitary pad set (2 holders, 3 winged pads, 2 straight pads)
		Recurrent	• Bathing soap, 250 grams • Laundry soap, 200 grams • Toothbrush • Toothpaste, large, 140 g • Diaper, disposable

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Table 9: Sector expenditures

Sector	Item	gms/day/pp	frequency	Kc/day/pp	gms/HH/day	gms/HH/month	kg/HH/month	Price/kg- Naira (MPM)	Price/HH/month - Naira
Food security	Rice	150	Month	540	750	22,500	22.50	481	10,823
	Millet	0			0	0	0.00		0
	Maize	250		913	1250	37,500	37.50	175	6,563
	Beans	75		255	375	11,250	11.25	282	3,173
	Palm oil	10		88	50	1,500	1.50	561	842
	Groundnut	15		85	75	2,250	2.25	329	740
	Sugar	10		39	50	1,500	1.50	515	773
	G/nut oil/Veg Oil	20		177	100	3,000	3.00	656	1,968
	Salt	5		0	25	750	0.75	150	113
	Onion	8		3	40	1,200	1.20	200	240
	Total			**2,100**					**NGN 25,232.25**

Table 10: Recurrent expenditures gap (one-off expenditures have been stricken through as not applicable here)

Sector	Category	Number of persons	Desired expenditure for recurrent costs *Minimum Expenditure Basket*	Actual expenditure for recurrent costs (from BNA)	Expenditure gap *MPG amount*
Food	Food commodities	5 persons	NGN 25,232	NGN 8,000	NGN 17,232
Health	Health commodities	6 persons		NGN 1,500	
	Health services	6 persons		NGN 1,500	
WASH	Potable water	6 persons	NGN 2,900	NGN 1,200	NGN 1,700
	Hygiene commodities	6 persons	NGN 1,200	NGN 1,500	-NGN 300
	~~Hygiene facilities~~	-		~~NGN 1,200~~	

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Shelter / NFI	Housing (rent)		NGN 5,000	NGN 2,700	NGN 2,300
	~~Shelter commodities~~	-		~~NGN 3,000~~	-
	~~HH items~~	-		~~NGN 2,000~~	-
	Energy commodities			NGN 1,600	
	Transport services			NGN 1,000	
	Communication services			NGN 1,000	
	~~Communication commodities~~	-	-	~~NGN 1,000~~	-
Education	Ed services			NGN 2,000	
	Ed commodities			NGN 2,000	
		Total	**NGN 34,332**	**NGN 31,200**	**NGN 20,932**

Table 11: One-off expenditures gap (recurrent expenditures have been stricken through as not applicable here)

Sector	Category	Desired expenditure for recurrent costs *Minimum Expenditure Basket*	Actual expenditure for one off expenditures (from BNA)	Expenditure gap	When one-off costs are required (time of year)
Food	~~Food commodities~~				
Health	Health commodities				
	Health services				
WASH	Potable water	NGN 1,000			At identification
	Hygiene commodities	NGN 11,110			At identification
	~~Hygiene facilities~~		-		-
Shelter / NFI	~~Housing (rent)~~	-	-	-	-
	Shelter commodities		-	-	-
	HH items		-	-	-
	~~Energy commodities~~	-	-	-	-

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

	~~Transport services~~	-	-	-	-
	~~Communication services~~	-	-	-	-
	Communication commodities				
Education	Ed services				August-September
	Ed commodities				August-September
	Total	**NGN 12,110**	**NGN 0**	**NGN 0**	

d) Lessons from pilot

The list of items should be prepared in advance, with the unit costs. Sectors may already have this information as part of their technical guidelines/standards.

Step 5 <u>If/when cash is proposed</u>, for each of the preferred modalities, compare AVAILABLE transfer mechanisms

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Preferred transfer mechanism
Question to answer	Which mechanisms are the best value for money for each modality?
Actors to be involved	Cash experts
Required inputs and resources	Transfer mechanisms / financial service providers assessment findings
Available tool	b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

Table 12: Comparative table of transfer mechanisms

How to complete the step

The information for this step could be collected through the Transfer Mechanism / Financial Service Providers Assessment. Some preparatory discussions can also take place via email exchange among the cash experts.

Steps:

1) Which modalities were preferred (see output of Step 3)? (This is what goes in column A of b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

2) Table 12)
3) For each modality, which mechanism is feasible/available in the selected locations? (This is what goes in column B of b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

c) Working session output

4) Table 12)
5) To determine pros and cons consider aspects including:
   - How capable would the FSP be to reach the caseload?
   - How experienced are sector members in using the mechanism?
   - How familiar are the target groups with these ways of getting access to money?
   - What protection concerns are associated with these mechanisms?
6) To determine costs for the implementing organisation, consider the following criteria: service provider fees, printing of cards / vouchers, distribution costs (rent of site, security guards, rent or purchase of equipment and support devices, distribution staff and casual labour), training of partners and beneficiaries, staff costs, contracts with implementing partners, insurance costs, all other costs.
7) Populate b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

8) Table 12.

Estimated time required	1 hour
Notes	Definitions: • Modality – refers to the different types of cash based transfer. These can be conditional/ unconditional and restricted/unrestricted. They can also be sector specific or cross sectoral. • Mechanism – refers to different ways of delivering a transfer. E.g. direct physical cash distribution, mobile money, paper voucher, electronic voucher. Notes:

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

	1) The mechanism has to be tailored to the modality but not the objective. 2) Add additional rows as needed.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Table 12: Comparative table of transfer mechanisms

Preferred CT modality	Available CT mechanism	Advantages	Disadvantages	Cost (1 is least expensive – 5 is most expensive)	Comments and recommendation
Modality 1	[write name of Type 1]				
	[write name of Type 2]				
	[write name of Type 3]				
Modality 2	[write name of Type 1]				
	[write name of Type 2]				
	[write name of Type 3]				
Modality 3	[write name of Type 1]				
	[write name of Type 2]				
	[write name of Type 3]				

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Step 6 Comparative analysis of sector response options

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Unweighted ranking of options based on both suitability to objective and operational feasibility
Question to answer	Which response is most suitable and operationally feasible, assuming all criteria have the same weight?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts • Protection experts
Required inputs and resources	Definitions and scores below
Available tool	Table 13: Comparative table of response options (suitability and operational feasibility) Prepare one table per each objective, best if in Excel form, to calculate scores more easily
How to complete the step	1) Decide if the criteria have all the same weight. If not, then establish weights for each criterion. Note that "appropriateness" relates to the relevance of the response option to the objective and it has been assessed in Step 2, whereas the other criteria form part of the broader "operational feasibility". 2) Prepare one table per each objective (**Error! Reference source not found.**). 3) If applicable, use the information on non-cash responses (from Step 2) as possible response options. 4) Use the information on cash responses (disaggregated by cash modalities and mechanisms (from Step 3 and Step 5)) as the possible response options 5) With the assistance of the facilitator, the group will determine what are the pros and cons of each criteria as they apply to each response option, for the relevant objective. 6) Consider whether CTP will create or exacerbate protection risks and benefits for individuals, households and communities, and to what extent new risks could be mitigated by affected communities, humanitarian agencies and duty-bearers (governments) and/or by complementary program activities. Compare risks and benefits of cash, vouchers, in-kind, and no material intervention, e.g. limiting assistance to advocacy or service.
Estimated time required	1.5 hours
Notes	*Scores:* 1 = doesn't meet the criteria at all 2= partly meets the criteria 3 = fully meets the criteria *Definitions:*

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

	• *Programmatic risk* includes substandard quality commodities and services available locally, inflation caused by the programme, reduced earning for local businesses and individuals (creation of oligopoly), misplaced incentives to service provision, creation of unequal access to goods and services, assistance not use for intended purposes (in-kind sold or cash misspent). • *Operational and institutional risks* include diversion of assistance, theft, corruption, fraud, security risks for staff, reputational risks to actors. • *Contextual risk* includes vagaries of climate (floods, droughts), conflicts and displacements, political instability and social unrest, global financial crises, price increases due to global/national inflation. • *Protection risks* for beneficiaries includes security risks, harmful intra-household and community dynamics (e.g. between recipients and no-recipients), undue taxation, theft, exploitation.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

For objective 1 (food security), the two highest-ranking options are food vouchers and MPG, with equal score.

For objective 2 (support to farming), the highest-ranking option is direct distribution of farming inputs.

Table 13: Comparative table of response options (suitability and operational feasibility)

OBJECTIVE 1 Ensure farmers in Jere and Konduga have the means, support and conditions to resume farming production for own consumption and market (micro-production as well as subsistence production)						
CRITERIA	**Considerations**	**Response options**				
		Food distribution	Food voucher	MPG	[write response option]	[write response option]
APPROPRIATENESS (TAKEN FROM QUESTION 1)						
Suitability to objectives and target groups	Positive	• In Konduga, WFP uses in-kind more	• Can enforce the consumption of specific food items,	• Flexibility and possibility to diversify diet	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Is the response option appropriate to achieve the objectives, for all intended groups		than CTP because of market situation • IRC uses also in Konduga • Market disruption is limited because procurement can be local (the great majority; Kanu)	especially if aiming at improving nutritional status • In a context where the food traders need support, the voucher stimulates	• Dignity • More scalable than voucher		
	Negative	• Gathering of large number of people in distribution who can be a target of insurgents • Transportation of heavy loads and security on the road • Food distribution is a risk as such: Security people think that food distribution put them at risk	• Can still agree with the vendor to receive cash instead of spend it in the shop, but they lose value of the transfer. • Retailer keeps some of the value if they do not have change • Less scalable than cash transfer	• Not all cash is used for food • May not be spent to buy nutritious food • More prone to fraud, although it depends to transfer mechanism	NA	NA
	score					
ACCEPTANCE BY LOCAL AND NATIONAL AUTHORITIES						
Acceptance by authorities *Is the response option acceptable for the local and national authorities?*	Positive				NA	NA
	Negative				NA	NA
	score					
MARKETS AND SERVICES						
Suitability to existing service systems (e.g. education, health, public water system, other essential services) *Do the local public services and infrastructure have the capacity to support the proposed response options?*	Positive	• In kind is suitable for Konduga	• In konduga, some areas ypu can do Vouchers	• Jere and MMC are suitable for MPG, market enhancement and wider livelihoods opportunities, • -Systems already in place ie IRC distributing Cash	NA	NA
	Negative	• Markets are not fully functional, safety and security, people have no access to	• Food vouchers can be challenged by blocked/closed markets due to military operations	• Possibility of inflation, corruption in services required by agencies, risks of fraud in the systems.	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

		production land and livelihoods support are not available • Transportation costs are high due to daily tarnsportation of food items as at times security forces don't allow agencies to store food in distribution areas not to attract insurgency/attacks	hence denying access to food by the community	- Protection risks specifically for women and socially vulnerable HHs. • Safety of staff involved in CT		
	score	3	3	1		
Consequences for the service systems *Will the public service system and its infrastructures be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*	Positive	• No • Malnutrition risk will reduce, • Security (could be improved by limiting travels that would expose the community to attacks)	• It will develop the markets functionality since the suppliers will be within the community. • It will improve the local economic performance/livelihood levels	• It will develop the markets functionality since the suppliers will be within the community, • Cash creates many opportunities in different ways ie starting business, enhances supply chain in the systems/communities • It is sustainable solution compared by in kind • It will improve the local economic performance/livelihood levels	NA	NA
	Negative	• It will enhance dependence on assistance by the community	• Could create negative competition against selected traders by those not selected in the community- ganging of traders, • Selected traders might gang up to violet the contract regarding prices/ increase	• Additional pressure by transferring MPG on the existing systems might lead to poor services.	NA	NA

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

	score	3	3	3		
Suitability of market conditions *Do the relevant markets have the capacity to respond positively, timely and at scale to the proposed response option?*	Positive	N/A	• Partially- a lot of interventions like market infrastructure systems have to be rebuilt	• Partially- a lot of interventions like market infrastructure systems have to be rebuilt	NA	NA
	Negative	• No, because the market is not functioning due to security reasons	• Partially- a lot of interventions like market infrastructure systems have to be rebuilt	• Partially- a lot of interventions like market infrastructure systems have to be rebuilt	NA	NA
	score	3	3	3		
Consequences for relevant markets *Will the market actors (or other parts of the system) be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*	Positive	No	No	No	NA	NA
	Negative				NA	NA
	score	3	3	3		
IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES' CAPACITY TO OPERATE AT SCALE AND IN A TIMELY MANNER						
Sector members' familiarity with the modality *What portion of the sector members are familiar with the response option (# of experienced organisations out of total # of members)?*	Positive	Yes	Yes		NA	NA
	Negative			No	NA	NA
	score	3	2	1		
Capacity to go at scale in a short timeframe (caseload size) *Is it possible for the sector partners to go at scale with the response option, in a short timeframe?*	Positive	• Yes, depending on the organizational capacity	• Yes, if you understand the system you can scale up quickly	• Yes, if you the financial the system are functioning well you can scale up quickly	NA	NA
	Negative	• In kind needs a lot of logistical support and cant scale up easily in a short time frame	• Need to orient the traders, a lot of printing which might take time	• Need to orient the stakeholders on the utilization of the funds transferred; funds might be channelled for other uses other than the intended purpose • MPG is not fastest as there is no preparedness	NA	NA
	score	3	3	3		
Geographic coverage	Positive	•	• Jere and MMC Vouchers, is possible	•	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Which of the response option has the widest geographic coverage (in terms of feasibility)?			due to functionality of markets			
	Negative	• Konduga- in kind; due to security reasons	•	• Jere and MMC, need to orient the community into the new system. • Might be challenging to meet the set of objective as it might be used for different issues	NA	NA
	score	2	3	3		
RISKS						
Programmatic (quality standards) and protection risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable programmatic risks, including protection risks for beneficiaries?*	Positive	• In-kind has less protection risks at the HH level	• Vouchers	•	NA	NA
	Negative	• Increases protection risks as communities gather for FD.	•	•	NA	NA
	score					
Operational and institutional risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable operational and institutional risks?*	Positive	•	• Voucher	•	NA	NA
	Negative	•	•	•	NA	NA
	score					
Contextual risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable contextual risks?*	Positive	• No markets in Konduga and in kind is more feasible and has fewer risks	• Jere and MMC, Vouchers can work better due to functionality of markets	• MMC can go on full scale of MPG, partially in Jere due to available financial services.	NA	NA
	Negative				NA	NA
	score	3	3	3		
COSTS						
Costs for the organisation *Which of the response options has lower costs for the organisation?*	Positive	•	•	• MPG is most cost efficient.	NA	NA
	Negative	•	•	•	NA	NA
	score	1	2	3		
Costs for the beneficiaries	Positive	•	•	• MPG will be most convenient	NA	NA
	Negative	•	•	•	NA	NA

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Which of the response options is most convenient for the beneficiaries (in terms of costs incurred to benefit)?	score	1	1	3		
Overall score (maximum = 42)		**25**	**26**	**26**	**0**	**0**

OBJECTIVE 2 Ensure farmers in Jere and Konduga have the means, support and conditions to resume farming production for own consumption and market (micro-production as well as subsistence production)						
CRITERIA	**Considerations**	**Response options**				
		Distribution of farming inputs	Vouchers for farming inputs	MPG	[write response option]	[write response option]
APPROPRIATENESS (TAKEN FROM QUESTION 1)						
Suitability to objectives and target groups *Is the response option appropriate to achieve the objectives, for all intended groups*	Positive	• Konduga, in-kind option is suitable for the selected groups and will meet the objective.	• MMC and Jere, Food Vouchers option is suitable for the selected groups and can meet the objectives.	• MMC Full Scale MPG and in partially in Jere.		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	3	2	2		
ACCEPTANCE BY LOCAL AND NATIONAL AUTHORITIES						
Acceptance by authorities *Is the response option acceptable for the local and national authorities?*	Positive					
	Negative					
	score					
MARKETS AND SERVICES						
Suitability to existing service systems (e.g. education, health, public water system, other essential services) *Do the local public services and infrastructure have the capacity to support the proposed response options?*	Positive	• Yes, Food can be bought in the near by markets within MMC.	• Yes, Traders can be got in the near by markets within Jere and MMC.	• Yes, because markets as well as finical services are accessible in both Jere and MMC.		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	3	3	2		
Consequences for the service systems *Will the public service system and its infrastructures be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*	Positive	• No, Konduga because there is no functional markets and no production.	• No, because we are engaging the local traders.	• No, because people we buy things from the local market boosting market infrastructure.		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	3	3	3		

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Suitability of market conditions *Do the relevant markets have the capacity to respond positively, timely and at scale to the proposed response option?*	Positive	• No, Konduga because there is no functional markets and no production hence food has to be bought from far markets.	• Yes	• Yes		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	1	3	3		
Consequences for relevant markets *Will the market actors (or other parts of the system) be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*	Positive	• No, Konduga because there is no functional markets and no production hence food has to be bought from far markets.	• No	• No		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	3	3	3		
IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES' CAPACITY TO OPERATE AT SCALE AND IN A TIMELY MANNER						
Sector members' familiarity with the modality *What portion of the sector members are familiar with the response option (# of experienced organisations out of total # of members)?*	Positive	•	•	•		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score					
Capacity to go at scale in a short timeframe (caseload size) *Is it possible for the sector partners to go at scale with the response option, in a short timeframe?*	Positive	• Yes, depending on the organizational capacity	• Yes, if you understand the system you can scale up quickly	• Yes, if the financial system are functioning well you can scale up quickly		
	Negative	• In kind needs a lot of logistical support and cant scale up easily in a short time frame	• Need to orient the traders, a lot of printing which might take time	• Need to orient the stakeholders on the utilization of the funds transferred; funds might be channelled for other uses other than the intended purpose. • MPG is not fastest as there is no preparedness		
	score	3	3	1		

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Geographic coverage *Which of the response option has the widest geographic coverage (in terms of feasibility)?*	Positive	• Jere and MMC, in kind for farm inputs is possible, farmers can access their farms safely, markets and production is on going	• Jere and MMC Vouchers, is possible due to functionality of markets as well	• • MMC and selected areas of Jere MPG is possible due to functionality of markets.		
	Negative	• Konduga- in kind; due to security reasons	•	• Jere and MMC, need to orient the community into the new system. • • Might be challenging to meet the set of objective as it might be used for different issues		
	score	3	3	3		
RISKS						
Programmatic (quality standards) and protection risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable programmatic risks, including protection risks for beneficiaries?*	Positive	• In-kind has less protection risks at the HH level • •	•	•		
	Negative	• Increases protection risks as communities gather for FD.	•	•		
	score	3	1	1		
Operational and institutional risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable operational and institutional risks?*	Positive					
	Negative					
	score					
Contextual risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable contextual risks?*	Positive	• No markets in Konduga and in kind is more feasible and has fewer risks	• Jere and MMC, Vouchers can work better due to functionality of markets	• MMC can go on full scale of MPG, partially in Jere due to available financial services.		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score	3	3	3		
COSTS						

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Costs for the organisation *Which of the response options has lower costs for the organisation?*	Positive	•	•	• MPG is most cost efficient.		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score			3		
Costs for the beneficiaries *Which of the response options is most convenient for the beneficiaries (in terms of costs incurred to benefit)?*	Positive	•	•	• MPG will be most convenient		
	Negative	•	•	•		
	score					
Overall score (maximum = 42)		**25**	**24**	**24**	**0**	**0**

d) Lessons from pilot

This group was not supported by the facilitator, who was engaged with another group. As a result, the exercise was not fully understood by the group as it seems from the list of pros and cons, and the fact that many fields have been left blanked and many criteria have not been scored. The guidance has now been revised to make it more accurate; however, definitions of risk typologies may need to be improved, as it seems the group had not understood what they actually were.

For this objective, the "service-related" criteria do not apply and should not have been discussed – they should have been left blank.

Step 7 (optional) Weighted scoring of sector response options

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Weighted ranking of options based on both suitability to objective and operational feasibility
Question to answer	Which response is most suitable and operationally feasible, based on the weighted criteria?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts • Protection experts
Required inputs and resources	The weight of each criterion would have been allocated at the onset of Step 6. Previously filled out **Error! Reference source not found.**.
Available tool	Table 14: Weighted comparison of response options for objective 1 (suitability and operational feasibility) There will be one table per each objective, best if in Excel form, to calculate scores more easily

Funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid

How to complete the step	1. Write the weight of each criteria (see table below) (columns 2 – 5) 2. Copy down the scores for each criteria and each response option from table 7 above (columns 2 – 5) 3. Multiply the weight by the score (columns 6 –8)
Estimated time required	30 minutes
Notes	This step can be skipped if you believe that all criteria are of equal weight.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Table 14: Weighted comparison of response options for objective 1 (suitability and operational feasibility)

OBJECTIVE 1 [write objective]											
CRITERIA	**Weight**	**Scores**					**Weighted scores**				
		[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option	[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option]	[write response option]
APPROPRIATENESS (TAKEN FROM QUESTION 1)											
Suitability to objectives and target groups *Is the response option appropriate to achieve the objectives, for all intended groups*											
ACCEPTANCE BY LOCAL AND NATIONAL AUTHORITIES											
Acceptance by authorities *Is the response option acceptable for the local and national authorities?*											
MARKETS AND SERVICES											

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Suitability to existing service systems (e.g. education, health, public water system, other essential services) *Do the local public services and infrastructure have the capacity to support the proposed response options?*											
Consequences for the service systems *Will the public service system and its infrastructures be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*											
Suitability of market conditions *Do the relevant markets have the capacity to respond positively, timely and at scale to the proposed response option?*											
Consequences for relevant markets *Will the market actors (or other parts of the system) be damaged or supported by the proposed response option?*											
IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES' CAPACITY TO OPERATE AT SCALE AND IN A TIMELY MANNER											
Sector members' familiarity with the modality *What portion of the sector members are familiar with the response option (# of experienced organisations out of total # of members)?*											
Capacity to go at scale in a short timeframe (caseload size) *Is it possible for the sector partners to go at scale with the response option, in a short timeframe?*											
Geographic coverage *Which of the response option has the widest geographic coverage (in terms of feasibility)?*											
RISKS											
Programmatic (quality standards) and protection risks											

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Which response option offers fewer and more manageable programmatic risks, including protection risks for beneficiaries?											
Operational and institutional risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable operational and institutional risks?*											
Contextual risks *Which response option offers fewer and more manageable contextual risks?*											
COSTS											
Costs for the organisation *Which of the response options has lower costs for the organisation?*											
Costs for the beneficiaries *Which of the response options is most convenient for the beneficiaries (in terms of costs incurred to benefit)?*											
Overall score (maximum = 45)											

d) Lessons from pilot

Nothing to report.

Step 8 Final recommendations on sector response options for targeted groups and locations

a) Guidance

Objective / output	Paragraph(s) articulating the sectoral response package for the targeted population group and locations.
Question to answer	What interventions does the sector intend to implement to address the identified humanitarian needs?
Actors to be involved	• Session facilitator • Sector experts • Information management officers • Cash experts

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Required inputs and resources	Outputs of all previous steps
Available tool	0 Template 2
How to complete the step	1. Use the information produced in the previous steps to fill out the empty spaces. The facilitator may assist in carrying out this step.
Estimated time required	30 minutes
Notes	The template may have to be adapted as appropriate.

b) Session participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Email

c) Working session output

Template 1 Sector response options (not cash based)

Over the next [period] the [name of sector] sector will provide assistance to [targeted population group/community] in [location]. [estimated number of individuals] across [number of households] households will benefit from this assistance. This is [percentage] % of total households living in these areas. This assistance will help them to [objective statement]. [targeted population group/community] will have [output of the assistance].

Template 2 Sector response options (cash based)

Over the next [period] the [name of sector] sector will provide assistance to [targeted population group/community] in [location]. [estimated number of individuals] across [number of households] households will benefit from this assistance. This is [percentage] % of total households living in these areas. This assistance will help them to [objective statement]. [targeted population group/community] will receive [type of cash based transfer and frequency] of [amount / quantity] in [number of instalments] instalment(s) or rounds, [on the condition to …, as applicable].

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

This assistance package will be delivered over [timeframe]. Risks will be considered in the following way:

a) _____ (mitigation(s) of programmatic risk(s) including protection risks)
b) _____ (mitigation(s) of operational risk(s))
c) _____ (mitigation(s) of contextual risk(s))
d) _____ (mitigation(s) of institutional risk(s))

The total funding required will be [value of funding].

d) Lessons from pilot

This group did not complete this step.

Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Task Team for Basic-needs Focused Response Option Analysis

(covering Jere, Konduga and MMC)

Background

The Task Team for Response Analysis (hereinafter the Task Team) aims to draw together all the various elements of the ECHO's Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC) funded pilot for the uptake of quality, collaborative Multipurpose Grants (hereinafter MPGs) in Nigeria. This work is led by a Consortium consisting of CaLP, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Mercy Corps, OCHA and Save the Children.

In March 2017, the Consortium began the pilot in Nigeria with the aim of providing technical and strategic support to country-based humanitarian organisations, enabling them to engage in collaborative assessments and decision making. Whilst the Consortium has not been conceived to provide direct assistance to crisis-affected populations, it is intended to have an indirect, positive impact on their lives, by means of influencing humanitarian actors to design better quality and more collaborative MPG programmes. As such, it supports and is line with the commitments made by donors and humanitarian partners as part of the Grand Bargain.

The pilot project provides information and analysis for selected LGAs in Borno State:

- Basic needs of crisis-affected people, through the Basic Needs Assessment (BNA)
- Minimum expenditure basket (MEB)
- Market functionality and related feasibility of CTP, through the Multi-Sector Market Assessment (MSMA)
- Payment mechanisms and financial service providers
- Partners' and government's capacity to implement Cash Transfer Programming (CTP)
- Effectiveness of MPG, based on existing experiences

Ultimately, it is hoped that the Consortium's approach will lead to response analysis that is better structured, and more robust, transparent and people-centred. It will consider cash (in its various forms) and in combination and combined with other modalities (in-kind, cash, services, technical assistance, a combination of these) from the start.

Assessment and decision-making tools, their findings (including the recommendations resulting from the response analysis workshop), and learning on the efficiency and effectiveness of collaborative MPGs will be shared with the country-level members of the Consortium, relevant IASC Clusters/Sectors, Cash Working Groups in country, and Cash Consortia (if any), as well as other key stakeholders in the pilot context. The pilot will help the humanitarian community make more effective and wider use of MPGs, if and when appropriate and feasible.

To do this, the Task team will play a key role in linking the information generated by the Consortium to the response analysis and linking it to the broader and multi-year Humanitarian Response Planning (HRP) process for North-east Nigeria, which will take place between end of August and October 2017.

Objectives and Expected Deliverables

The Task Team will identify possible response options based on needs and feasibility utilising the information collected through the Consortium's assessments, with a focus on the areas targeted by the pilot in Borno state (Jere, Konduga, MMC). Because of this geographic coverage, the Task Team will be based in Maiduguri.

The key deliverables will be:

- Additional analysis of the raw data from the Basic Needs Assessment, by sector
- A note validating the findings of the Basic Needs Assessment which will feed into the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO)
- A note validating the findings of the Consortium's other assessments (MSMA, payment mechanisms assessment, Partners' and government's capacity to implement CTP)
- A note on concrete recommendations to OISWG for priority interventions to be implemented in the short and medium term to address basic needs of specific groups of affected people.[7]

Timeline and Workplan

The Task Team will be established in early September. Initial activities relating to the review of assessment outcomes will be followed by a response analysis workshop at the end of September (exact dates tbc), in order for the Task Team's outputs to feed into the Nigeria HNO Needs Validation and HRP Response Analysis Workshop in at the end of September / early October. Depending on the final dates of those processes, the timeline may need to be adjusted. After reporting to the OISWG the Task team will be disbanded.

When	Action	Location and details	Deliverable	Focal point
28th August – 1st September	One-to-one consultations with sector leads **in Abuja**	Abuja	Buy-in from sector leads at Abuja level	Francesca Battistin (Save the Children)
6th September	Formation of task team at the joint OISWG/CWG meeting	Maiduguri Meeting invite sent by Ibrahima Barry	• TORs of Task Team validated • Task Team composition	Ayo and Ibrahima (OCHA), **Maiduguri**
11th – 15th September	One-on-one working sessions with Sector representatives in Task Team for: (1) validation of the Basic Needs Assessment findings; (2) presentation of key findings from other assessments run by the	Maiduguri **One working session of 3-4 hours** with each sector group	• Assessment findings validated by each sector (discarded the non-plausible ones, added complementary information, confirmed plausible findings) • Sector HH expenditure figures • Profile and size of groups in need • Assistance objectives by group	Nathalie Cissoko (CaLP)

[7] The key strategic, programmatic and technical decisions that would result from this process will include: Priority population groups in each area (HNO); Priority needs of each population group (HNO); Operational Environment/Feasibility; Critical markets to be supported or to operate through Critical **systems of service provision** to be supported or to operate through; Response options / assistance modalities (cash transfers, in-kind, services/technical assistance, combinations); If In-kind: what items; If services provision: what services or technical assistance; If Cash transfers: sector-specific (one or more sectors) or multipurpose; If Cash transfers: what modality; If Cash transfers: what amount; If Cash transfers: what transfer mechanism; Which aid delivery organizations, where, when; Beneficiary targeting approach and mechanism.

	consortium by consortium representative; (3) presentation of other findings by the sector; (4) definition of groups & objectives (**in Maiduguri**)			
18th – 22nd September	Review (reading) of assessments reports by Task Team; additional analysis of BNA raw data	**No meetings**, this is desk review work by the groups	• Additional analysis of BNA raw data • Good grasp of all assessment findings • Questions and observations	Task Team
25th – 28th September	One-on-one working sessions with Sector representatives in Task Team for identification and comparative analysis of response options **in Maiduguri**	Maiduguri **One working session of 3-4 hours** with each sector group	• Response options for each sector objective • Comparative analysis of response options (operational risks, programmatic risks, costs, market feasibility, FSP, etc.)	Francesca Battistin (Save the Children)
29th September	One day workshop with Task Team **in Maiduguri**	**One day workshop** with the Task Team in plenary	• Integrated response plan (any linkages among sectors) • Decision: a state or an LGA-based MPG value? • Composition of MPG and tentative value(s)	Francesca Battistin (Save the Children)

Composition

The Task Team is a sub-group of the Operational Inter-Sector Working Group (OISWG), coordinated by OCHA in Maiduguri and with the technical support of ERC Consortium Members. More specifically, the Task Team will be led by the OISWG Coordinator and the CWG Coordinator, who will also act as co-spokesperson on behalf of the group.

The Task Team will include two-three representatives from each sector of the humanitarian response (the sector lead based in Maiduguri or a sector specialist with decision making power/influence in the sector, and Information Management Officers), as well as cash experts from the Maiduguri Cash Working Group (CWG). The former will validate the priority needs and consider interventions, whereas the latter will provide expert advice on if and how cash can be used to address priority needs.

Membership is voluntary but it will be strongly encouraged as participation will provide active partners and sectors with in-depth information and guidance on how to prioritise multi-modality interventions, in line with the commitments of the Grand Bargain. This will be an advantage to both individual actors and the sectors they represent.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Task Team will

- Contribute suggestions on how best to formulate this workshop based on the task teams' experience between now and then
- Undertake a desk review of the findings of the ERC Consortium's assessments, distilling the most relevant ones
- Conduct additional analysis on the raw data of the BNA
- Make available additional assessment findings to complement those of the ERC Consortium
- Establish and estimate size of the groups in need in the three LGAs; establish assistance objectives for the identified groups

- Identify possible response options based on the established objectives
- Make a final recommendation on response options based on operational feasibility, in a workshop to be organized and facilitated by the Consortium at the end of September

Within the Task Team, the sector representatives and the cash experts will bring their respective expertise.

The Task Team Coordinators will

- form and initiate the Task Team, raising awareness on the Consortium's work and collecting expressions of interest.
- represent the group to the OISWG (when the group report on their response analysis recommendations) and will also likely chair meetings and ensure decisions are made on time and in an effective manner, and that are effectively documented.
- will participate in the wider HNO process and present the BNA and other findings validated by the Task Team during the HNO validation of state-level needs.
- will document the results of all the work undertaken by the Task Team, with the support of the Consortium members.
- will advocate for the Task Team's recommendations to be reflected in the HRP to the extent that is appropriate and possible.

The Consortium members will provide technical support and facilitation of a structured approach to identify response options. Each partner will provide the technical guidance for the data produced by their tool and Save the Children, in its capacity of Consortium lead, will provide additional coordination support in the preparatory phase (by preparing, as necessary, the workshop concept note, the agenda and presentation power points). OCHA will ensure either adequate agenda time has been provided at a regular OISWG, or dedicate a specific meeting to this (depending on how much time is required). Any feedback or follow up from sectors would also be collated by OCHA and supported as required.

Annex 2: Mission Report: Sector groups consultations

Maiduguri – 11-15 September

Purpose of the mission

The ERC consortium led by Save the Children (OCHA, DRC, Mercy Corps, CaLP) is funded by ECHO at global level to develop and pilot tools to enhance MPG preparedness and uptake in 2 countries. Nigeria was selected to be the first pilot country, and tools developed by the consortium's members have been piloted in country since March.

As part of the consortium, CaLP led a mission to Maiduguri to share findings of the assessments done in 3 LGAs in Borno State (Jere, MMC, Konduga) with sectors, to review, enrich and validate those findings and facilitate their inclusion in HNO / HRP process. Sectors met were Protection, WASH, Early Recovery, CCCM/NFI/Shelter, FSL and Education. Assessments shared with sectors, all covering the 3 LGAs mentioned above were:

- Basic Needs Assessment,
- Financial Service Provider Assessment,
- Multi Sector Market Assessment (Charcoal and Core Relief Items, Low Income Rental, Water)
- Organizations' capacity to implement CTP
- Authorities' acceptance

Main conclusions

1) Interpretations of findings

- *Different situation in 3 LGAs:* almost all sectors agree that the situation in Konduga is the worst. Less access to assistance and less government support, and larger proportion of IDPs among the population. Level of expenses is higher and population has specific priority needs (shelter). Jere has a particularly high proportion of people with specific needs (separated minors, pregnant and lactating women, people with physical disability, to be monitored and further analysed) and is also characterized by better access to natural resources / own production (though farming has now almost completely stopped). MMC is more stable and can be targeted for early recovery actions, but costs of services remain high and HHs need support (education).

- *HHs expenses higher in Konduga:* at first, this was surprising for several sectors but all had explanations and interpretations to support it (distance, service availability, type of construction, most severe needs and gaps…). No other assessment is available to confront results.

- *Very high level of expenses declared by populations before the crisis* in comparison with average income.

- *Discrepancy between shelter in need priority and level of expenses dedicated to housing:* May be explained by the amount that is proposed for the simulation (10 000 Na).

- *Distance to markets:* communities are very small but access is not only distance; markets are randomly closed, movement restriction and insecurity. Roads, rains are not a major problem.

2) Further desired analysis

- *Risk of diversion by men;* who should receive the cash? Protection and FS have different interpretations.

- *Analysis by gender*: for preferred assistance, occupied m²/gender and age, and discrimination to service access (WASH)

- *Impact of cash on protection:* children queuing to collect water for free, would this stop with cash?

- *FSP Selection:* look at local systems, how do people living here get paid in Maiduguri?

- *Impact of humanitarian aid on WASH market:* is water trucking destabilizing provision and access to vendors? What impact on prices?

- *Multi Sector Market Assessment:* analyse further dynamics between overcrowded housing and prices, low income rental assessment in Konduga and Jere, and timber market in Jere. Assess, among the 93% declaring having a market within a 2 hour distance, how many is less than 1h distance.

3) Recommendations

- *FSP selection:* look carefully at delivery mechanisms, consider familiarity and financial literacy.

- *Single delivery platform:* FSPs are not ready yet to go at scale, coordination and capacities of cash actors need to be strengthened. Moving bit by bit.

- *Use more local partners to deliver CTP*

- *Cash coordination:* requires further strengthening, still need to mainstream cash in intersector coordination. Need to lead collective discussions with FSPs, to acknowledge their needs for support and to provide technical input. Preparedness.

- *Be careful with quality of services:* Water (transport, collection and storage) and medicines.

- *Safe energy:* do not encourage use of charcoal. Check what development actors can do, expertise from FAO / UNHCR. Work with sub group on safe energy.

- *Build contingency capacities and flexibility:* switching modalities depending on season, market access…

- *Sensitization*, whoever gets the cash, aid is for the HH.

- *Participation of Health / Nutrition and protection sectors:* give comprehensive understanding, in MPG each sector contributes to achieve cross sectoral outcomes (MPG – WASH or FS components contributing to Health / Nutrition outcomes), consider secondary expenses (transport, incentives, gradation…)

- *Target*: MPG should not only target IDPs and build the ground for recovery.

- *M&E:* understand intertwined impact of sector outcomes. M&E for MPG is ideally not a sum of sector indicators but understand the global impact of humanitarian aid on beneficiaries' well-being. (Ex: giving food can increase schooling, NFI have an impact on health etc).

- *Amount:* most of CTP being distributed is already beyond working rate. Start discussions early with authorities. Entry point for advocacy / discussions; incomes from work can be 2 by HH, MPG is 1 transfer per HH.

Detailed notes from the meetings

Protection – 12/09/17 9.00 – 11.30

Participants:

- Josiah Flomo (UNHCR, sector co-lead)
- Anil Mani Acharaya (UNHCR)
- Mohammed Farah (UNICEF)
- Michael Ajwang (UNHCR)

1) **BNA**

Weaknesses

UNHCR is focusing more on returnees but this is not a category assessed in the BNA (to be clarified with the raw data). This category is priority for UNHCR and has very specific needs (shelter for example, that would be a much higher priority than what is assessed in the BNA). Also specific risks (tensions between IDPs occupying abandoned lands/houses and returnees)

Strengths

Findings are very good, provide comprehensive vision of assistance and help tailor assistance in different LGAs and for different types of populations. All cash actors with specific sector objective (shelter, food) have seen in PDM that cash is spread over a large range of needs, but still no real "MPG" in place. Really highlight the need to keep flexibility and to do micro level assessments. For future assessments, need to engage at early stage with protection actors to know what kind of data the sector needs to capture.

Distance with markets (within 2 hour walking) can be preoccupying and need more detailed analysis.

2) **FSP assessment**

Findings are all relevant. Participants will go through the full report and provide more feedback.

Inputs: UNHCR is linking with the Government pilot SP programme (CCTs) in Borno State for future exit strategy.

MoU with 6 organizations (including WFP) are setting up one delivery platform with 1 FSP, but mid-term approach (hopefully 2018). Because of security and difference between areas they are for now using implementing partners for 2016-2017 while building capacities and preparedness to move to 1 single delivery platform. Moving bit by bit = harmonizing procedures, building staff capacities, sensitization of beneficiaries… When at response analysis stage, look carefully at delivery mechanisms, consider familiarity and financial literacy.

3) **Acceptance & capacity assessment**

Findings are in line with UNHCR's experience: Government is giving direct cash in camps, beneficiaries are familiar with cash and banks in urban areas.

Complements:

- Capacities in CTP remain limited.

- Several reports of men taking second wife after receiving cash

- Risk of children not getting the cash or its result (nutrition outcomes for example) = mitigation measure is also how we calculate cash to ensure CTP distributed is covering basic needs to protect sector specific outcomes (if food needs are not covered, higher risk of diversion of CTP for nutrition outcomes)

- Lack of assessment on sharing and redistribution of cash within communities. It's not ones receiving and others non-receiving, it's more complex. Should be taken into consideration when assessing risks and tensions in communities.

Recommendations:

- Use more local partners to deliver CTP

- Protection WG position: unless in case of woman-headed HH, cash should be given to men

- Need preference analysis broken down with gender; very likely that women would prefer in kind, because of time, risk exposure, risk of diversion and HH conflict with husbands because of cash.

- Same for child-headed HH, the group expressed concerns that cash is distributed to those. CTP is not appropriate for this profile. If combined with other modalities, risk that cash is seen as "pocket money" or that handling money would scare off children.

- Cash coordination requires further strengthening + still need to mainstream cash in intersector coordination. There are now active CWGs in Yola and Damaturu

4) **MSMA**

Only final recommendations were shared. More info was shared from UNHCR: their experience is that in newly liberated areas vendors are coming. In IDPs in camps, movements are restricted by military so cannot go to markets as they want, and markets will not mushroom much. But still, it's expected that with cash vendors would come closer to IDPs sites; where there is demand, vendors will go. In Konduga there is less dynamism, but globally vendors have access to escorts to conduct commodities. Scoping and learnings should be done bits by bits.

Humanitarian actors, FSPs, vendors… there is a collective will to go back to the field and provide support anytime possible.

5) **Beyond findings**

Profile & Size of priority groups: Returnees, IDPs, host communities and population in inaccessible areas + populations in newly liberated LGAs in the coming months. The group will get back to the consortium for more info on group size and objectives of assistance.

WASH – 12/09/17 2.00 – 5.00

Participants:

- Souleymane Sow (Unicef, lead of the WASH sector)
- Michael Ajwang (UNHCR)
- Hailu Teka (INGO Forum, technical lead of the CWG)
- Bethal Ukazu (IOM)

1) **BNA:**

Assessment findings are in line with what the sector observes, especially on priority needs & population most affected. Konduga is prioritized by the Wash sector, hot spot for humanitarian needs. Jere is now also being prioritized because of Cholera outbreak, but there are capacities and response in place.

Food and shelter are indeed top priorities, all health structures are overcrowded. Potable water comes after.

Causes for unmet needs; WASH Sector working a lot on discrimination because of prejudice that would be a major obstacle. Very informative to see that assessment said the contrary (though discrimination is higher for access to water than for other sectors). Remark: disaggregated data by gender may give another result.

- Remark on "natural resource". No natural resource in Northern Nigeria gives access to potable water. Either take it out or put it as non-potable water. Rain collection is not a common practice in the region. Even if, it would not be put as potable water as conditions of collection and storage are poor.

- Distribution of cash across needs with a 10 000 Na unrestricted grant: shelter may come lower than needs identified because the amount is too small to cover housing, so not prioritized. Also largely depends on profile of the population.

- It was expected that expenses for potable water would be higher in urban areas (MMC) but not confirmed by assessment, on the contrary. Possible interpretation: more service providers in MMC (public & private actors), which may lower the prices. Higher prices in Konduga would need more analysis.

- Balance of preference between cash (lack of purchasing power being seen as main cause) and inkind = IDPs in camps may prefer to get inkind as water available in sufficient quantity and quality. Part of service provided by Local / national authorities and humanitarian aid is huge, which may explain preference for inkind (but this preference is balanced in the graph). Urban areas may prefer cash, because of good access to vendors. Maybe switching modalities depending on season (see MSMA for findings on seasonality). In host communities, children are sent to queue to collect water (free below 10 L) => concerns for child protection. What would be cash impact on this situation?

Expenses on hygiene / sanitation, hygiene commodities and potable water are well reflecting the needs.

2) **MSMA:**

- Question on capacity to expand: OK on production, boreholes should be able to cope with increased demand. However concerns that needs are not currently fully covered per HH (Sphere Standards). Issue will be on transport capacities and storage.

- Validate the idea that transport and distance are the main factors influencing prices.

- One thing that is missing is water trucking activities from humanitarian actors that must be impacting availability and prices + availability of vendors (who prefer to contract with organizations rather than selling water to HH). Should be assessed.

- Proposed activities: maintenance and trainings are not relevant. There are available skills + wash committee in charge for each borehole. Committees should be made more formal, should be linked with the Ministry to make them accountable.

- Water vendors association exist but no assessment and no formal information. Need a mechanism to connect vendors and customers, there is a huge gap here. Cooperatives could support IDPs reintegration.

- Not only Sphere Standards apply but also the Nigeria Water Act. For infrastructure rehabilitation also skills are available and ongoing initiatives led by development actors (UNDP, WB). Avoid overlapping with dev actors.

- Cash seems appropriate in MMC and Jere, some vendors also in Konduga but service provided by humanitarian agencies & governments seem to be appreciated by populations. Attacks to get food in IDPs camps guarded by military were reported in Konduga. Would need further risk & security analysis for all modalities at LGA level with Oulemas, in Konduga particularly.

- Disagreement about the 9000 Na for water. Calculation is not based on 2011 Sphere Standards. Need to be recalculated considering that HH is getting 140L per day (7 jerry cans), taking an average of 8 persons by HH (not 6 as usual average but 8 to align with BNA and consider specificities of IDPs).

3) Beyond findings

HH expenditure figures: see above. Discussion about standards, not clear if there is a gap.

Profile & Size of priority groups:

In priority order: Konduga (188 117 individuals, should all be considered. Severe needs + cholera and hepatitis epidemics.) Jere (607 063 individuals) and MMC (1 030 217) all 3 LGAs are already prioritized by Unicef and WASH Sector. In the last 2, priority groups will be defined in HNO, but in any case IDPs, all people living in camps (formal & informal), IDPs in host communities, host communities, refugees, population affected by epidemics. Possible additional prevention activities in highly exposed areas. Risks of contamination within camps + poor WASH conditions. Jere and MMC are cholera endemic areas, because of travellers that are more likely to return to those LGAs rather than in Konduga (because of restricted movements in that LGA).

Objectives of assistance:

All 3 sub sectors would be priority (Water, Hygiene, Sanitation). Priority would be quality and continuity of assistance.

Ensure humanitarian imperatives (Sphere standards) are met. Ensure basic needs are covered, no "comfort" interventions (that could happen in Yobe and Adamawa but not in the 3 LGAs mentioned here).

Early Recovery – 13/09/17 9.00 – 12.30

Participants:

- Bernard Lukwiya (Sector coordinator UNDP)
- Emmanuel Ufot (IRC)
- Bethal Ukazu (IOM)
- Hailu Teka (Technical lead of the CWG, INGO Forum)

1) BNA

No much info on livelihoods in the BNA. Very disrupted in MMC.

Findings of the BNA generally capture well the situation. Low severe needs in MMC. Healthcare / Education is indeed an important need, because of destroyed infrastructures, no hospitals etc.

Education profiles are very much in line with assessments they have.

Lack of purchasing is a very big issue in their sector, because of disrupted livelihoods. Debts and major expenses on food are major issues to consider early recovery.

Agreement on how people get what they need. MMC have more accessible and well working markets. In Konduga, SC and IRC are doing CTP. Appeared to be an appropriate modality and very efficient to address needs. In this LGA particularly, there is little support from the Government especially on food.

Production is much lower than 5 years before, cant' go beyond a radius of 1 to 2 km around home so very difficult to crop. In Jere, security, quail birds are causes why all farming activities stopped.

MEB: average amount is overestimated. There will be challenges in aligning with the SSN as the government is giving a 5000 Na grant / HH / month (+ top up of 2000 Na for nutrition). FS basket has managed to go per capita (3500 Na / Per / month). Take into account social / cultural systems, supporting livelihoods; some of the needs they managed to cover prior to the crisis were covered by borrowing within the community, may not be purchased as such. Not because they said a value that they were actually spending that amount of money. Average income is said to be 15000 Na per month, not coherent.

Reminder: MEB is not the transfer amount but also advocacy tool to get as close as possible to covering actual needs.

Why Konduga is so high in comparison to MMC? Level of expenses between all LGAs is questionable.

Possible interpretations:

- MMC has more access to many basic services, which may decrease pressure on prices.

- Can be linked to higher number of HH members in that LGA?

- Shelter commodities and all commodities in Konduga are coming from MMC. So even before the crisis prices were higher in Konduga than MMC (transport, police taxes etc). Houses in Konduga also require typical maintenance.

- Bias: expenses are based on declarations

10 000 Na restricted grant: agreement on interpretation that shelter may be lower than for top basic needs identified as amount provided do not allow to cover housing. Also different findings per group, should be disaggregated.

2) **MSMA**

Core relief items

- What are the rental costs on different markets?

- Could we have %age of male and female vendors on markets?

Different prices and market integration: Monday market is bigger so price are lower and other markets are fed from there, so ok that prices are lower than in other markets. But no consistent for all items: other vendors and markets may provide items to Muna Garaj and Custom markets.

Interpretation of differences in prices and seasonal increases: poor integration, structural factors impacting prices in each market (access, transports, taxes etc).

Vendors' declarations should be taken carefully. Though it is realistic to say that offer should adapt rapidly (no major shortages), it's likely there will be an increase in prices.

Recommendations on support to traders are in line with requests received by the sector. Financial service is important, and market place improvement is a top priority. It's important to improve security on market places, as insecurity is preventing customers to spend time shopping on markets.

Other recommendation: check with FAO is possible to distribute transformed ovens to provide alternatives to the use of charcoal and avoid increased demand. Check what UNHCR is doing in camps.

Low income rental

OK with findings. Because market is saturated and many sub optimal housing units, risk that giving CTP would encourage access to sub optimal rental, but ok to give directly to landlords for those already occupying housing to avoid eviction. Then need to give a tent for those not finding housing to avoid increasing the gap.

Very hard to reach Sphere Standard for shelters. Number of people per shelter is often beyond standards.

3) **FSP assessment**

Hawalas-alike systems not yet regulated in Nigeria; could not this be considered?

Adapted procedures: instead of registering all beneficiaries' SIM Card with biometrics data and pictures, IRC is buying all Sim Cards from mobile phone operator and matches cards with beneficiaries.

Mobile Money operators are not reliable at all, would not recommend to use any of them.

Less optimistic than key findings: expansion of FSPs is very unlikely. There is no business opportunity for them, except if cash coordination improves and actors comes together to negotiate as a group.

4) Beyond findings

HH expenditure figures: CFW was done for returnees based on needs, not aligned on official rate but not creating competition with labour market. Will share info on how it was calculated.

Profile & Size of priority populations:

MMC is for now the priority areas, and host population is the priority group.

Objectives of assistance: Restore social coalition and livelihoods of returnees, provide services for those already in the area, and restore market services.

Livelihood interventions as complement; providing inputs and pre-financing businesses.

Ensure that all humanitarian interventions are linked to a longer term perspective, what will happen in 5 years of time?

CCCM / Shelter / NFI – 13/09/17 2.00 – 4.00 pm

Participants:

- Brice Degla (UNHCR)
- Alex Nwoko (IOM)
- Michael Ajwang (UNHCR)
- Bethal Ukazu (IOM)
- Hailu Teka (Technical lead of the CWG, INGO Forum)

1) BNA

Be careful and consistent with sectors' terminology: "tents" for Emergency shelters? Collective centres = Camps? Formal and informal? What about transitional shelters?

Severity of needs would be probably different if broken down by sectors. Very little has been done in terms of shelter and NFIs, severe needs may be higher or different across LGAs. Period of assessment is also key, lot of this information has changed since May: in the last 3 months, population in Jere and MMC has dropped because people are back to camps closer to their home.

Causes for unmet needs is well reflecting what they observe. Also for how they get what they need, though a few comments:

- Jere: makes sense that natural resources are more used (timber, more natural landscapes in that area)

- MMC: IDPs are more in permanent constructions, so would be expected to have higher number of IDPs purchasing on markets, but proportions are probably impacted by the high number of Emergency Shelters built by humanitarian actors in this area.

- Konduga: Level of support from NGOs is not reflecting what is really happening. Highest number of interventions are in this LGA (and was also the case in May). Proportions may be explained by the total number of IDPs there.

- Konduga is placing shelter / housing as a top need, more than other LGAs + need support to get materials. If they received an Emergency Shelter several months ago beneficiaries may not consider it good and do not declare it

MEB: Konduga is not reflecting reality (same concern than with other sectors). Expect MMC to be higher (but no assessment to confirm it). Interpretations:

- Access to markets can explain higher prices in Konduga

- Distance = the most we get far from MMC the most prices increase. Check relation distance / price

- Labourer can be more expensive; because Konduga is not using much natural resources, maybe they use labourers to build housing.

- Period of needs may also explain = if we'd do this assessment now that people are settled, maybe costs for shelter and shelter commodities would be lower.

Oxfam MEB: categories are not aligned with Shelter / NFI categories. Need more background information on how it was developed.

NFIs are very high in level of expenses, which is normal.

2) **MSMA**

Findings of MSMA are ok.

Would be interesting to analyse further dynamics between overcrowded housing and impact on prices. Assess occupied m²/person & segregation by gender and age and by group profile.

Findings of low income rentals market are very expected. From the sector's assessment, camps especially in Konduga are particularly suffering from congestion. Rental is not a very used option for housing / shelter. What would be more interesting would be to do this assessment in Konduga and Jere and for timber market in Jere.

Government policy is to build emergency shelters now in original places. In 2018 there will be no more emergency shelters.

Market map is OK but.

Paying directly to landlords in not sustainable.

3) **FSP assessment**

Bama, Gana, Damassak; those are ghost cities, absolutely no FSP around. Coordination of humanitarian actors is key for negotiation. Need to acknowledge the need for investment and support to FSP for expansion.

Organizations and assessment are focusing too much on digitalized cash, online payments. There are vendors, big vendors, militaries, civil servants who still work in those areas, those people are getting paid and not coming to MMC to queue at the bank to get their money. We need to observe how local systems are doing. Local actors can deliver cash for partners in areas they can't reach, taking commission. Those options can be limited in terms of scale, but should be considered.

4) Beyond findings

HH expenditures: standard kits value will be shared

Profile & size of priority groups:

Top priority will be IDPs in host communities for which there is less interventions and larger population. IDPs in overcrowded camps (collective centres). Konduga and Jere will be top priority.

Objectives of interventions: Provide adequate shelter (all 3 phases: emergency, temporary and permanent shelters) for HH in host communities. Cash could be useful for rehabilitation.

FSL – 14/09/17 9.00 – 12.00 pm

Participants:

- Moustapha Touré (WFP)
- Fisayo Jassey Jabarr (FAO)
- Edwin Too (FAO)
- Usman Buhari (FAO)
- Lovermore Dumba (ACF)
- Kudomi Damidola (FAO)
- David Kato (ADRA)
- Hailu Keta (Technical lead of the CWG, INGO Forum)

1) BNA

Severe needs are well reflecting reality in terms of priority locations, but IDPs in host family are probably higher than said.

Means of getting what they need: debate over whether the government is actually providing more than declared by populations. No assessment to inform this.

Possible interpretation; at the time of the assessment the government was doing less but is now increasing its contribution.

Distance with markets: 2 hour distance is too much, communities are very small. Would be interesting to see among this 93% how much is less than 1h away from markets to have a better idea of access. Rapid assessment from WFP in Konduga. Access is not only distance, markets are randomly closed and accessible + movement restriction and insecurity preventing beneficiaries to actually access markets. Roads, rains are not the problem.

In Jere, proportion of needs covered by humanitarian aid must be much higher now. Triangulating with the Lean Season response Plan; 62% of needs covered by assistance (for people ranked from 3-5 IPC. Maybe population is not exactly the same, but still cover IDPs + hosts).

Cross check with HEA. Ministry of agriculture could also provide explanations on why level of expenses is different across LGAs.

Level of expenses for Konduga on shelter and shelter commodities is not surprising, because the type of constructions requires a lot of maintenance, often re buying materials to repair their shelters. Construction materials are also more expensive.

Average amount of total expenses is probably over estimated. Preferred assistance: across board cash is largely preferred. Regarding concern raised with protection group on disaggregated data for women, ACF data from PDM show that even when asking preferred assistance separating women and men, all groups will in average largely prefer cash. In MMC in particular. In areas like Monguno is a bit different, prefer inkind because markets are not well functioning.

Few cases should not be generalized. On the contrary to protection WG, the group encourage to give money to women (the Governor of Borno also made that recommendation), keep it flexible. Both groups (FS and protection) should discuss, cash and food have same risks according to the group. Need to do sensitization that money is given for the HH (whether it is given to men or women).

Issue is that not enough assessments are available to measure what is the higher risk (in terms of occurrence, not impact) between diversion (if cash is given to men) and HH tensions (if cash is given to women). Even impact is not obviously higher: risk for women in case of HH tension but risk of abandon/malnutrition etc in case of diversion.

2) **MSMA**

Charcoal is a major concern. There is a WG being set up to work on safe energy (environment and safety).

Regarding scenarios: MPG should not target only IDPs, host communities should be included.

Amount for WASH on MSMA is not correct (see discussions with WASH sector, on Sphere Standards, costs etc). Depends on water quality but in any case it is not accurate.

3) **FSP assessment**

MoU with WFP and other organizations; shared mid-term (not immediate) objectives, working together to get prepared for a single delivery platform. Role of the CWG on preparedness and negotiation with FSPs.

4) **Beyond findings**

Priority groups and size:

IPC 3-5, IDPs in tents & collective centres, especially informal camps + pay attention to host communities. But based on socio economic vulnerability, not on status. Priority location would be Konduga where there are the most severely affected people, total reliance on aid. MMC will come second because it has the largest part of IDPs. Jere the last. Size is determined by Cadre Harmonisé.

HH expenditure figures: food basket, per capita. The value per capita is too low for 1 isolated person with specific needs (elderly for example). Maybe consider a top up for people with specific

needs? Approach per capita is so very much appreciated by large HH but not much by very small HH.

Objectives: Meet their immediate needs and prepare recovery, increase capacities of resilience.

Education – 14/09/17 3.00 – 5.00 pm

Participants:

- Charles Michael Mwagi (Unicef, sector co-lead)
- Richard Baker Sennoga (Unicef)
- Hailu Teka (Technical lead of the CWG, INGO Forum)

There are lots of consumables in education, (uniform is critical for schooling, school materials) currently school kits are coming from Copenhagen.

1) BNA

Konduga; needs are indeed more severe because almost all camps are informal, which explain also why little is provided by the Government.

Source: DTM Round XV, now round XVIII. A bit outdated.

On top needs, other assessments would put education on top 3 or 4 priority needs (higher than the BNA). Interpretation: those other assessments are covering all 3 states (including Yobe and Adamawa where needs are more "live saving" so may influence general ranking of needs. Also, low priority of education commodities and service does not mean that education is not a top priority needs. Education outcomes like increased schooling can be achieved through food sec / health or other sector outcomes. Impact of food on schooling for example is not assessed, MPG could enable this.

2 ACAPS consultants will come in the coming 2 weeks to do an assessment on education system in 3 North East states. Access, quality etc. Findings could be available in October.

Education profile: sector don't have recent assessment or available data but seems to reflect reality.

IDPs are most affected by host families. But host families are also impacted; fees charged by school are higher, HH have to buy everything, classrooms overcrowded = drop out from host families

Situation where some children have not been to school for the last 5 years, some aged 18 yo have never been to school. Reintegration is very hard. Very low investment and support in education. Even since the Oslo Conference where education was in the top 3 priorities with nutrition and health, very little was done since.

Sector would like to do specific assessment for people with disability.

Level of expenses: distance is key to determine costs. Konduga is so unpredictable. MMC demand is higher but offer is also higher. More private institutions that are expensive. At the end, higher gaps in education service. More offer in number but not comparing with population.

2) Beyond findings

Priority group and size: children from 3 to 17 (primary school), IDPs and host communities (so mixed in this context, don't want to discriminate between IDPs and returnees). Right based approach, prevent illiteracy.

HH expenditure figures: would need to do price monitoring / frequency / units but main items would be:

Children	Teacher	Schools
Notebook	Housing or other incentive	Learning desks
Ruler	Incentives for extra lessons	Dark plates
Scissors	Incentive for Double shift	Markers
Maps	Notebook	Chalks
Pencils	Pens	Food
Rubber	Bag	
Geometric set	Umbrella	
Mats	Big ruler	
Sandals		
School uniform		
School Bag		
Text Book		
Sanitary pads for girls		
Soap		
Tooth paste		
Tooth brush		

Objectives of assistance:

Ensure that children complete primary education, give children opportunities in life.

When boys and girls achieve basic education = lower malnutrition, lower child mortality in next generation.