

Interagency Cash Risk Assessment
led by UNICEF on behalf of the sub national Gedaref CWG.
Tigray Refugee response
Feb 2021.

Report compiled with thanks from:

Data collection: UNICEF, NCA, UNHCR

Daily debrief: UNICEF, NCA, ZOA

Workshop: UNICEF, NCA, ZOA, WFP

Data provision (previous assessments): WFP, ZOA, WFP.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	5
1. APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT	5
1.1 SECONDARY DATA REVIEW REFLECTIONS AND DATA CONSIDERATIONS	6
2. METHODOLOGY	6
3. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	6
3.1 NEEDS	7
3.2 SAFETY AND DIGNITY	8
3.3 ACCESS TO MARKETS AND SERVICES	9
3.4 PREFERRED MODALITY AND ASSOCIATED RISKS	10
3.5 SOCIAL RELATIONS	11
3.6 DATA PROTECTION AND PRIVACY/IDENTIFICATION METHODS.....	11
3.7 C4D/AAP.....	12
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	13
3. ANNEX ONE DATA COLLECTION TOOL	15
4. ANNEX TWO DETAILED METHODOLOGY.....	22

Executive summary

Since the crisis in the Tigray region of Ethiopia in November 2020 over 60,000 people have sought refuge in neighbouring Sudan and were mostly accommodated in camps re-established in Gedaref State. Cash has been utilised as a response modality and is being considered further by several agencies. This report, led by UNICEF on behalf of the sub-national Cash Working Group (CGW) in Gedaref, is the product of a ten-day inter agency initiative assessing the risks that any new or continued cash-based initiative would need to consider before and during implementation. The main focus has been on GBV/PSEA risks; the tools used were reflective of this as are the recommendations. Over 100 people were consulted over two days by a multi sectoral, inter agency team of ten UN and INGO staff. This report has been generated within a week of the assessment ending in order to quickly inform any programme design and implementation to ensure risks are taken into account.

Main findings include:

- Key protection risks in the camp do not appear to be aggravated or introduced by the cash assistance. Cash assistance is not the cause of the GBV/PSEA risks, presence of alcohol, or minor increase in petty theft reported in the camps. Cash assistance does not appear to exacerbate intra-household relations, and the presence of cash within households may decrease risks of domestic violence.
- In-camp market spaces are accessible and safe to access for most. Specific groups (elderly, PwD) may not be able to access goods and services as easily as others and may require additional support. Travel to and from the market carries a perception of risk for some women. Travel out of the camps is usually prohibited and brings language barriers.
- It is highly unlikely that the one-off cash assistance NRC distributed in Um Rukuba has caused any localised inflation; the country-wide inflation situation is already volatile and well documented in this regard and a refugee influx will attract opportunistic traders seeking higher than usual prices with or without a one-off cash injection.
- Cash assistance, if designed well, can mitigate some of the risks such as reports of commercial and survival sex, increasing tensions in households that may lead to GBV risks because of a lack of cash to buy basic items and access services.

Main recommendations:

- To organisations providing or considering multipurpose cash interventions
 - Cash (in envelopes) should be utilised as the medium of delivery, as preferred by all focus group participants and KIs. It can be used to meet refugees' priority needs and appears to not exacerbate and can often reduce protection risks.
 - Any engagement should account for both the Host community and refugee population which require equitable programming to ensure continued good relations as well as reaching people in need.
 - While cash itself is not inherently risky, any cash-based intervention should be designed and implemented with an assessment of gender dynamics, the potential risks of GBV, and the associated protection benefits which can lead to unintended consequences.
- To the refugee response or camp-based coordination fora:
 - Identify activities or initiatives that improve Persons with Specific Needs (especially elderly people and people with disabilities) access to in-camp markets and also (permitted) out-of-camp services

- Context specific and multiple communication channels should be used to inform and communicate with communities to counter rumours, ensure widespread dissemination and facilitate better accountability to affected populations
- Ensure adequate security in and around camps to reduce theft and the risk of violence including Gender based and sexual exploitation and abuse.
- To cash coordination working groups, at national and sub-national level:
 - Review the transfer value calculations, especially the MEB for Gedaref, which may need to take into account the high inflation situation of the country, but also protection issues (eg: transport costs). Also review the transfer value calculation with regard to number of household members.
 - In the next phase of assistance, explore ways that ongoing cash and voucher assistance can be utilised or coordinated to assist in survivor-centered GBV services
 - A coherent cash strategy needs to be established and agreed by the CWG (with donor involvement in the national CWG); the impact of Foreign Exchange discrepancies and hyper-inflation are issues that require donor attention and agreement on how to move forward. Partners are competing on Value for Money in lieu of clear donor guidance on what is or is not acceptable; response coherence and coordination amongst implementing actors is required to reduce and mitigate existing refugee stress caused by unclear targeting criteria and lack of cash.
- To the Sudanese authorities:
 - Review arrangements affecting the freedom of movement of refugees, so they can benefit from and benefit broader markets and services
 - Review refugee access to employment and livelihoods to reduce unsustainable humanitarian cash burden and reinforce sustainable local economies and market systems
 - Prioritise making official identification papers available to all refugees and host communities, with particular reference to naturalised Ethiopian refugees (from previous influxes) living now as host communities.

INTRODUCTION

Flowing from the Tigray crisis in Ethiopia from November 2020, a refugee emergency began developing in eastern Sudan, with the first hundred refugees registered on 9 November 2020 with the majority entering at Hamdayet and Lugdi border points, and temporarily residing in place there, with host communities, or in the transit centre at Village 8. By 13 November, the Sudanese government had reopened a refugee site at Um Rakuba, used during previous influxes from twenty years ago and this has reached capacity with 20,572 residents. Further assessment and deliberations yielded access to land at the Tenetba site with space for up to 50,000 people but currently accommodating around 14,551 with relocations ongoing from Hamdayet where 22,768 reside. As of 14 February, 661,209 Ethiopian refugees have entered into Sudan.

Sudan was already amid a political transition, multiple protracted and new humanitarian emergencies, and severe economic challenges. It is important that the interagency response to the refugee emergency strengthens the local economy as much as possible in this period. The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) conducted a market and cash feasibility assessment and launched a blanket Multi-Purpose Cash disbursement in Um Rakuba camp, with other humanitarian partners expressing interest to follow suit. A Gedaref-level Cash Working Group (CWG) has been established, co- led by UNHCR and NRC.

During a mission by the UNICEF Middle East & North Africa (MENA) region Emergency Team to Gedaref in December 2020, several specific concerns were raised within the wider inter-agency response, in regard to possible cash responses. First, corruption around the provision of humanitarian assistance appeared to be rife. Second, there were increasing reports of women and girls being sexually abused and exploited. Third, there were also reports of excessive alcohol consumption driving increases in GBV. These issues were indeed found to be present during the risk assessment however as the report explains, there is no correlation between these and the presence of a Humanitarian Cash Transfer programme and there is a high chance they would be mitigated by the introduction of cash modalities.

The sub national cash working group recognised the gap in understanding and requested UNICEF to lead on a cash risk assessment. The inter-agency assessment took place over a 4-day mission to Gedaref (with a week prior in preparation remotely) from 5 to 9 of February 2021. The data collection team was composed of UNICEF (10 members covering all sectors), Norwegian Church Aid (GBV focal point), UNHCR (gender focal point), with the participation of NRC, ZOA and WFP (information provision, participation in daily debriefs, half day workshop).

This report is the findings from the inter-agency assessment which was led by UNICEF. It starts with the methodology, presents the findings and analysis and ends with recommendations. The purpose of the report is to guide agencies in the design and implementation of risk sensitive cash assistance in Gedaref. It also makes recommendations that can be used at the national CWG level and the tools and methods developed for this assessment can be rolled out and used in other responses in Sudan that consider and use cash assistance.

1. Approach to the assessment

In the setup of the mission the team sought to refine the scope and focus with a short assessment of the information available and how it could best be used. This has been done with the following activities:

- Initial briefings with UNICEF focal points (Social Policy and Emergency teams), Representative, Gedaref Response Coordinator. Included interviews with UNICEF programme sections (Child Protection, Education, GBV, WASH, Health & Nutrition, Communication for Development);

- Interviews with UN and other partners and Ministry of Social development and Labour, including attendance at National and Sub National CWG meetings
- Desk research on context and available assessment reports
- Development of tools with a specific focus on GBV/PSEA risks and methodology for an inter-agency assessment focused on qualitative data.

1.1 Secondary data review reflections and data considerations

From the inception period, three points became clear:

1. Cash is feasible (markets in both refugee and host communities are functioning and cash is widely used); this assessment is not about cash feasibility or wider protection risks.
2. The main risks listed in previous assessments did not seem to be specifically associated or correlated to cash (GBV/PSEA). The assessment would therefore focus on mitigation strategies to ensure that any cash assistance does not cause or exacerbate risks (hence the section on communication and AAP). The assessment will also validate the preliminary findings and ensure that all possible risks associated with cash (theft, extortion, unsafe delivery) are explored.
3. Many assessments are taking place and can cause assessment fatigue with the affected populations; the assessment was targeted and where possible, information from IPs/NGOs and community leaders collected and validated to ease the burden on affected people.

Risk was assessed based on the draft UNICEF GBV HCT guidelines mapped against the Enhanced Response Capacity Cash and Risk Assessment guidelines (2016, UNHCR et al). The data collection tool is attached as Annex one.

2. Methodology

Within the overall design, the assessment method employed a mixed method approach, collecting and analysing a combination of (primarily) qualitative and (available) quantitative data that was compiled within data workbooks to provide a unified framework for triangulation across different data sources and camp sites. The approach lent itself to a joint agency assessment and partners were involved in the design of the interview guide, data collection (including providing existing assessment data), the daily debriefs, the half day workshop for joint analysis and recommendation generation. Partners also reviewed the draft report.

The detailed methodology is presented in Annex two. The assessment took place over a period of 4 days with two days of field interviews which covered over 100 people in a mix of focus group discussions and key informant interviews covering both the host and camp communities in Tenetba and Um Rukuba. Given the fluctuating numbers of refugees at Hamdayet and plans to move people to the camps, the interagency team decided not to assess the transit points (as of the week of 4th Feb, Village 8 was reported to be 'emptying' out).

3. Findings and Analysis

This section lays out the findings from the assessment. The qualitative tool asked questions on the following broad categories (adapted from the ERC cash and protection toolkit 2016):

- Needs
- Safety and Dignity
- Access to markets and services
- Preferred modality and any associated risks
- Social relations
- Data protection and privacy/identification
- Communications for development (C4D), AAP

Each sub section first states the finding from the four groups (Tenetba camp, Um Rukuba Camp, Tenetba host community, Um Rukuba host community), summarizing where possible. It then provides a short summary analysis.

3.1 Needs

Findings: Both camps have listed health (cash to buy medicine), food (as rations are not enough or distributed 'unequally'), education and livelihoods (cash to buy goods and services and they are 'bored') as priority needs. Malnutrition in Um Rukuba camp is listed as a higher priority and nutrition for mothers an issue was highlighted in Tenetba camp. WASH needs are also listed as an issue in both camps, specifically latrines overflowing and women do not feel safe using them at night as they are not segregated (not a cash specific issue but listed here for information).

In Um Rukuba camp, the at-risk groups, the elderly and people with disabilities were specifically named as requiring support to receive tents in a timely manner upon arrival. The NRC Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) preliminary results from Um Rukuba confirm the needs listed above. NRC distributed the full value of the national Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) for all households in the camp that should have covered all their basic needs. Whilst highly appreciated, 66 percent of people reported also that the amount that was distributed (12,000 SDG/HH) was insufficient to cover their basic needs, and the PDM recorded that their average expected expenditure is around 26,000 SDG/HH, and that they had fully spent the transferred amount within ten days. This is mainly due to the high inflation rate the country is facing, affecting the prices of all needed commodities and services in the nearby marketplaces and nationally. There is also a local price affect caused simply by the establishment of the camps and opportunistic trading, however this has occurred in both Um Rakuba and Tenetba, indicating this is independent of a cash distribution. Although 86% of funds were spent on food and non-food items, other funds were spent on other items such as healthcare, debt repayment, communications, and fuels. 81% of households report being able to buy vegetables and culturally specific bread, i.e. a more diverse food basket.

Host communities have listed education (beyond primary), electricity and health (referrals for pregnant women and other services beyond PHCs) as the main needs. Loss of livelihoods for the youth as their agricultural land has been 'donated' to the refugee camp in Tenetba was also highlighted as an area of concern. Other issues heard were on infrastructure related aspects (roads, latrines, water supply). Safety is a concern for women as there are snakes in the area and 'bad roads' exacerbate this (Tenetba).

Summary analysis: Priority needs are those that can be met by cash such as food, fuel, communications and health (medicines). Other needs for NFIs (clothes, other items) can be as well. The NRC PDM confirms this as well as the ZOA household assessments carried out in both camp and host communities in both areas.

For refugees: Current protection risks are not connected to cash but there is an urgent need to ensure safety for women especially at latrines and referral pathways and information for GBV. The risks noted are similar in both camps and only one has had a distribution of cash assistance which underscores the point on the cash assistance not being the cause of risk.

Any cash programme would require CLEAR targeting and selection criteria communicated to communities. This information would need to include; why certain households are treated differently, i.e. why they are given a disbursement (or extra cash) when others are not as there is a level of need common to all in the camp which could be alleviated with blanket distributions; clear disbursement/distribution scheduling so that people know when their next allocation is due; and overall maintain clear expectations for what will be disbursed. Care must be taken to prevent knowledge of targeting criteria leading to gaming of the system, which could also put children further at risk, i.e. malnourished children deliberately kept underweight to “earn” more cash; or create tension through dishonest manipulation of circumstances leaving those who “play by the rules” worse off. However, these issues are not unique to Cash distribution, rather are related to poor targeting in general. The assessment heard several examples across both camps of in-kind assistance being distributed amid misunderstood criteria and processes resulting in confusion when expectations are unmet and resentment when people receive less than others for unknown reasons. This is a clear source of tension and anxiety within settlements with a refugees confirming a link to violence occurring around distribution times and theft of NFIs. Mitigation measures for CASH distribution could include independent referral for those in need, i.e. MUAC cases are referred to a child protection social worker for assessment and registration within a cash programme. Strong community governance structures and AAP systems can inform programmes of any mis-targeting, either those who have missed out, or those that are taking advantages.

People are eager to work and make their own money (to buy the aforementioned items as a priority). Livelihoods is also important to keep youth engaged in 'productive' activities and not in anti-social behaviour. Cash for Work programmes are therefore encouraged.

For host community: Development approaches to longer term issues and programming are needed along with immediate programming to maintain social cohesion between host and refugee communities and allay any social tensions that may exist or arise in the future.

3.2 Safety and dignity

Findings: For refugees safety was not listed as a major concern (as it relates to cash assistance). There are some reports of petty theft of things left unattended in tents (phones, blankets) or from (tea) shops. Women stated that they feel unsafe at times at night when men from the host communities enter camps to consume alcohol. Safety issues (not related to cash) were also reported at the latrines. Additionally, there are tensions because of distributions that are seen as unfair as the targeting is not clear. One or two cases of high tensions that led to stabbing were mentioned in both the men and women focus group discussion in Um Rukuba. It is worth noting that there are cases of commercial survival sex that could be mitigated with cash assistance. This was reported by the Key Informants in both camps; there are no real case management and referral pathways on this aspect that are clearly laid out. Key Informants suggested that programming to address this is developed and to explore how cash assistance can be used to mitigate/facilitate ways out of this coping strategy.

Findings from the ongoing NRC PDMs have found that one female respondent said she was harassed by other refugees while waiting to receive assistance and one refugee indicated that his cash assistance was stolen from him. However, 96% of the respondents felt safe traveling with the cash assistance (to their 'home', and to the market) while 98% of the interviewees reported that the cash assistance did not cause any intra-household or inter-household conflicts.

The host community in Tenetba did not report any safety concerns (including women) however, females walk together in groups to proactively mitigate any risks to their safety. In the Um Rukuba host community there were reports of theft taking place (before the refugees arrived) but it was also made clear that some of the thefts are because of the refugee influx in the area. Inflation was reported but this not related to the NRC cash distribution but rather the increased demand for goods and the 'regular' situation across the country (Um Rukuba camp and host communities).

Summary analysis:

For refugees the main risks are theft of items left unattended. No risks associated with cash specifically have been noted. Careful design and implementation will be required to not exacerbate the risks of petty theft and frustrations on how targeting and distributions have occurred so far. There are rumours and some tensions/feelings that things could escalate between the host and refugee communities if theft in host communities continues (not serious as yet but needs to be monitored)

There is a perception of risks to safety from women that needs to be addressed in general. Alcohol consumption takes place and women stated they feel unsafe after men have been drinking. However, this was reported in both camps and only one has had a cash distribution, so this is not a cash assistance related issue but one that needs to be addressed for women's safety in general. Governance structures and security measures need to address this and furthermore, a way for people to leave their tents and not worry about petty theft needs to be taken into consideration. How communities make collective decisions, organise and represent themselves needs to be clearly understood and where possible strengthened in a way that ensures the most vulnerable members are considered. Differences, tensions and inequalities need to be analysed and understood so that program design and implementation can reduce risks and create safer programming.

Of critical importance is the issue of survival sex; programming needs to facilitate a way out of this high risk situation and cash distribution could be one way to provide safer options.

Host community: As above for theft (can cause tensions in the future). No major risks to safety and dignity have been noted or further risks around GBV or PSEA as they relate to cash.

3.3 Access to markets and services

Findings: For both refugee camps, the markets were reported as largely safe and accessible. The markets in Um Rukuba are closer and this includes the thriving markets inside the camps that provide both goods (food, NFI), and services (barbers, tailors etc). It was reported as harder for people with disabilities (PWD) to access the outside markets. There is some price discrimination also reported for transport (refugees pay a higher price than Sudanese). Refugee communities in Um Rukuba are restricted to Um Rukuba village (travel one way is 100 SDG) and need special permission to travel any further (can pay a bribe for this between 1000-4000 SDG depending on negotiation skills). For Tenetba camp, language came up as a barrier in accessing goods and services. Also, the elderly can get left out and don't

have the support needed. There are no real established markets within the camp (one at the entrance) only some very small tea shops and stalls in stark contrast to Um Rukuba camp. In both camps there are donkey carts, mostly driven by young boys, providing internal transportation from the distribution sites.

For the host communities, markets were reported to be safe and accessible to most but not all. In Tenetba, women do not like using some forms of transport (pick-up trucks) as they may be sitting too close to men and fear harassment in this case. Mostly the men go shopping. For services, specifically health, the Tenetba host community use the camp services (MSF Clinic) despite the "fear of contagion" (communities have been advised by COR to not enter the camps as refugees may carry diseases). The one pharmacy in the area has also moved into the camp so this is what everyone uses.

In Um Rukuba, host community women travel in groups to ensure their own safety but have not reported any issues in traveling to markets. Health services are far and they do not have access to camp health services as the community does in Tenetba.

Summary analysis: Markets are safe and accessible for many with some specific concerns for the elderly, PWD and transport for women and how they can access markets or services outside the camp especially if the distance is far as in Tenetba camp. The cost of transport to the market can be prohibitive to some, particularly in Tenetba, and the language barrier an issue. There is a further specific risk for travel for Um Rukuba refugees (in camp and host) as they are not allowed to travel beyond the confines of the area to access larger markets and services further afield. The goods and services they require however, are either available for sale in the camp or available in the host community markets, albeit at a mark-up. Women travel in groups for safety as a proactive protection measure and this indicates there is a 'feeling' or perception of risks that need to be taken into account for programming.

3.4 Preferred modality and associated risks

Findings: In both camps, people have stated that 'cash in envelopes' is the preferred modality. In Tenetba they asked for clear distribution methods and to the household directly as they are tired of waiting in lines. Additional advice was to be clear on the selection criteria. The women's discussion mentioned that a "household" may be formed by several young men or women who have banded together to meet the relocation requirements but they are individuals with separate spending patterns and needs and therefore should be counted as such so that there is no tension. For Um Rukuba camp, it was noted that the NRC distributed cash assistance equally per "household" so a family of 4 was given same as one of 10, and participants stated that this needs to be targeted better; per person and suggested more distribution facilities to reduce wait times. "The targeting needs to be fair and everyone should receive" (blanket assistance). It was suggested this can be done through community leaders (however, some said as these are not elected, they are not trusted). The NRC PDMs confirm many of the points above and preliminary findings (from 197 interviews) suggest that 83 per cent of beneficiaries did not face difficulties during the multipurpose cash intervention and the 17 per cent who did mostly related to the waiting time at the scheduled cash distributions. Refugee feedback requested better organization of the distribution process, suggesting more sites to reduce walking distance and improve wait times.

Host communities also prefer 'cash in envelopes' as banking facilities are far and many do not have bank accounts or familiarity with financial instruments (the older generation does but the youth do not).

Summary analysis: Cash in hand is the preferred method across the board. There are suggestions on clearer targeting criteria as this may cause tensions and in both the host communities there is a call for

blanket coverage as 'all are in need'. More distribution points to reduce waiting, a higher amount of money and ensuring that it's based on equitable household size, are all recommendations from the camps. Access to banks is nonexistent for the most part for many.

3.5 Social relations

Findings: For the newly arrived refugees in both camps, there are no reported tensions and both men and women have said they make share decisions on spending as women are used to earning money as well (this was the case with the NRC cash assistance in Um Rukuba). Women FGDs in both camps however did mention that the lack of earning (livelihoods) for men could become an issue as men are feeling pressure to provide and they cannot (feeling emasculated) so there is some mounting tensions around this. As mentioned in other sections, if targeting is explained properly and the distributions feel fair, there are no issues (this has not been the case so far with in-kind distributions).

For the host communities consulted, they did not report receiving cash assistance before but have been part of other social assistance programmes (in Tenetba for Zakat and in Ramadhan). It is well understood that it is the '*miskeen*' (vulnerable) who receive this. This decision on targeting is made by community committees (the 8 villages surrounding Tenetba) and sent to the central government on who is eligible. In both host communities the men make the decisions in the house on cash but it is done in consultation with women who have the responsibility on the expenditures. The women ensure that every member of the Household is taken into account for spending.

Summary analysis:

Refugees For the newly arrived Tigray refugees there are no issues within a household with gender dynamics around cash; they are used to both earning and making joint decisions on household expenditures. There is a concern on the lack of money in a household (and hence the ask for livelihood activities) as it is causing tension amongst men and this could trigger GBV issues as women are able to earn from small-scale, gender defined microbusinesses (selling tea etc.).

Host: in all host communities (including refugee host), men are the decision makers and consult with women on household expenditures. This would need a bit more exploration as it's not fully clear if all members of the household are treated equally in terms of expenditures.

3.6 Data protection and privacy/identification methods

Findings: For both camps, the UNHCR Ration paper is the only form of ID that a household has. This is one 'ID' per HH and only for adults. In Tenetba, there is a new 'red' card from Sudanese Red Crescent but is not being evenly distributed and not everyone has one. There is a wait to get ID cards (in lieu of the sheet of paper) from UNHCR. Responses were mixed on Ethiopian identification, making it unclear how common it was for refugees to possess some kind (ID cards, birth certificates etc.) as some did, some did not.

For the host communities many but not all have a national number although it is not common as its not regularly used but it is available upon request. If parents are without ID then their children won't get an ID. Not all children have birth certificates either as this is a process that requires a national ID, and travel

with the sheikh/community head for verification and a cost in terms of time and money. In Um Rukuba, as mentioned above, there is an ethnically Tigraini, host community settled from the refugee influx twenty years ago. **They lack any form of identification** which they stated is a huge problem as they are at risk of and fear being detained if they venture beyond the locality since refugees in camp are not permitted to move without documentation and they may be confused for them by authorities and arrested.

Summary analysis:

Refugees: People have the UNHCR ration paper and no other form of national ID. An issue in both camps for children is birth registration and "households" of single men and women that have come together in order to move to the camp under one ID paper.

Host: In both locations, Sudanese have a national ID and birth certificates but obtaining these can be an issue and expensive as one has to travel to Gedaref and have witnesses etc. The major issue is for refugee hosts who do not have any form of identification and are 'stateless'. There is a way for them to convert their refugee status into a migrant ID but this remains an unknown requiring further follow-up.

3.7 C4D/AAP

The answers on this question are not summarised as they were specific to each area and are shared below to allow for the varied suggestions received from the participants.

Tenetba Camp: Men stated that megaphones can be used but it's better through leaders and community outreach, and some stated they prefer to write reports for feedback. Others suggested to use social workers rather than community leaders because leaders don't always convey information.

Women preferred to use community leaders and many said that megaphones cause anxiety as they think they are missing a food distribution. Language can be an issue and the suggestions were to be sensitive around this. The in-camp governance structure is defined, each block has a leader, elected by the community. This has been reflected by the females focus groups. The community leaders are trusted, and their voices are heard. It was recommended to have more female presence.

The Key Informants suggested communications should be handled through community mechanisms and that radio would be a good mechanism to set up.

In Um Rukuba camp it was reported that not many people have mobile phones so megaphones were listed as an ok mechanism and it was suggested to use volunteers and community groups.

Women stated that the phones are not reliable as many do not have them (left them back in Tigray and the network is weak) so they prefer community volunteers to inform each household.

There are conflicting opinions relating to the governance structure. It was stated that the community leaders have been appointed by COR and the community. However, during the focus group it was reflected that, the community do not trust the community leaders, and that they haven't elected them.

In the Tenetba host community it was reported that men have mobiles, and that women don't, connectivity is poor for mobiles. Additionally, literacy rates are low. The Sheikh, announcements and mobilising youth for messaging were listed as good ways to get out information and communicate.

For the Um Rukuba host community, they stated that they don't trust 'influencers' such as community groups as they are biased, and that literacy is an issue. Phones are often lost, sold etc. and there are no real representatives, and therefore household visits are good. There is no electricity so therefore no TV. Megaphones and community service leaders and volunteers are also viable.

Summary analysis: Communication preferences were not uniform across neither camps no host communities and was the question raising the most divergence with each place and even groups from the same place giving different answers per their situation. There is no one size fits all and it is dependent on community structures, literacy, power dynamics, capacities and access to technology and preferences. Reliance on a single information channel to deliver critical messaging would be foolhardy and multiple avenues that are tailor made will need to be designed and implemented (for all programmes, not just cash). Further in-depth assessments will need to be conducted to understand the governance structure in the two camps, and whether it will manufacture false legitimacy and power for certain individuals, contrary to the interests of the community, such as in other contexts, where the community “leaders” have exploited resources and caused protection risks.

4. Recommendations

This section looks at the key recommendations that were jointly discussed in the workshop at the end of the assessment. They include, where possible, who the recommendation is geared towards and provides, where possible, the how to implement the recommendation. The first section looks at GBV/PSEA specific recommendations, followed by cash recommendations. An additional section on programme related risks is also included although this is out of scope for the assessment. Cash is not a programme by itself but used as part of a programme and many of the risks noted are related to how programmes are being designed and implemented.

GBV/PSEA specific recommendation:

1. Preventing and responding to GBV and protection must be a priority from the outset for all actors in humanitarian operations. While cash itself is not risky, designing and implementing a cash-based intervention (CBI) without assessing gender dynamics, the potential risks of GBV associated with the introduction of cash, and the associated protection benefits can lead to unintended consequences. Cash practitioners can effectively mainstream GBV and protection considerations within CBIs. Likewise, GBV practitioners can effectively use cash as a tool to enhance the protection of crisis- and conflict-affected populations, thereby mitigating their risks of recurrent violence, promoting their recovery, and building their resilience. The following guidance and tools can be utilised by all cash actors:

- **Resources for Mainstreaming Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Considerations in Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) and Utilizing CVA in GBV Prevention and Response:** <https://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/research-resources/mainstreaming-gender-based-violence-considerations-cash-voucher-assistance/>
- **Cash & Voucher Assistance and Gender- Based Violence Compendium: Practical Guidance for Humanitarian Practitioners:** <https://gbvguidelines.org/wp/wp->

- **Protection and CVA CALP Resource Page:** <https://www.calpnetwork.org/fr/themes/sector-specific-cva/protection-and-cash-and-voucher-assistance/>
2. **Transactional Sex in the Camp:** Women and girls are engaged in transactional sex or survival sex within the camp which exemplifies their vulnerable conditions. Humanitarian actors need a better understanding of the needs of women and girls, and assess if there is a correlation between access to assistance and coping mechanism i.e. transactional sex, early marriage and etc. Survival sex within this context is poorly understood. Health and GBV actors need to work together to mitigate and reduce the risk of further violence and HIV. More preventive initiatives to increase availability and access to information about safe sex, condoms and case management services is vital for this population.

Cash (risk) specific recommendations:

1. Ensure the MEB includes values for protection, GBV and PSEA related needs given the context of this response and good practice. This includes:
 - medical costs (the health service is not enough and many noted they needed cash to meet their health related needs, i.e. the purchase of prescription medication)
 - hygiene items for health and dignity (and to ensure COVID 19 preventative messaging can be acted on and masks, soap etc can be bought)
 - Female hygiene products (MHM)
 - transport costs to access markets for goods and services in a safe manner
 - fuel/energy costs (women travel to collect firewood in some cases which has safety risks but also can cause tension with the host communities).
 - Communication (phone credit)
 - Milling costs (if the food basket continues to distribute sorghum that requires milling).
2. Along with the MEB, for those agencies who will consider one off assistance, the following items should be taken into consideration:
 - Clothing (seasonal)
 - cooking items (dishes)
 - education (stationary)
 - capital for livelihoods (micro businesses)
 - specialty items for special needs groups such as PWD, pregnant mothers, elderly, GBV survivors, and those engaged in transactional sex.
3. Clear cash strategy for the Gedaref response. Sub National CWG members with support from National CWG and with involvement of donors interested in funding cash. This is required as all stakeholders (recipients, agencies, donors) are all interested in increasing cash assistance and different programming modalities can limit the potential impact.

Recommendations for all programming

1. Humanitarian agencies should seek to avoid inadvertently contributing to tensions between groups of displaced populations and host communities. The following guidance enables humanitarian actors working under pressure and time constraints to enhance conflict sensitivity in their projects.
 - *Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building*: <http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/publications/conflict-sensitive-approaches-development-humanitarian-assistance-and-peacebuilding-res>
 - *DFID Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity - Methodological challenges and practical solutions*: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304611/Mon-eval-conflict-sensitivity-challenges-practical-solutions.pdf
 - *Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding in UNICEF - Technical Note, June 2012*: <http://www.unicefinemergencies.com/downloads/eresource/docs/conflict%20sensitivity/UNICEF%20Technical%20Note%20on%20Conflict%20Sensitivity%20and%20Peacebuilding%5B1%5D.pdf>
 - *TRAINING MATERIALS/TOOLKITS: Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding*: <https://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/publications/148-conflict->
2. Training of camp management on humanitarian principles; this is to ensure that targeting and selection is done in an equitable manner with a clear understanding of vulnerabilities. This includes:
 - Ensuring targeting and selection criteria are clearly communicated and published in multiple languages at different areas in the camp.
3. All working groups, including CWGs, work with the Communicating with Communities working group to ensure that messaging and ways in which to communicate are context and group specific.
 - Consider a help desk that can triage information (including referrals) to the different programming available in the camps.
4. All programming should have a percentage on assisting both refugee and host communities. There are examples in the region and noted good practice that both communities should be assisted for equity and to decrease any social tensions (see recommendation one in this section)
5. It is critical to establish a clear referral pathway and dissemination information and engage the community around the availability and utility of life-saving services including GBV case management, Health and Child Protection. Humanitarian actor should engage in joint coordination and mapping of response services, joint referral pathways, and clear criteria for offering specialized support to community members.
 - Reference: https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/19-200_Minimun_Standards_Report_ENGLISH-Nov.FINAL_.pdf
6. IDs/registration should be per person (including children) to ensure all have access to assistance and are 'counted' appropriately.
7. A clear timeline, next steps and a discussion on the recommendations should be agreed by the CWG and sub national CWG to ensure practical and realistic steps are taken to address this report.

3. Annex One Data Collection Tool

Introduction

YOU MUST READ THIS AND GET CONSENT. We do this so that people know why we are collection information and what we are doing with their data, that they feel safe and comfortable to provide their data and are doing this openly. Informed consent is critical.

Thank the person for agreeing to participate in the interview and making time available.

- Hello. I am [insert name] and I will be facilitating. [Insert name] will be taking notes. We represent [insert service provider]. [Insert service provider] is a humanitarian organization working in [insert location] to provide services to communities affected by conflict and crisis.
- Today [insert service provider] is facilitating a discussion and want your help to understand how cash programming can be as safe as possible for [insert sub-population]. This is primarily discussion about cash assistance and we are unable to provide you any guarantees if in the future it will be provided to the population.
- We will be talking about violence and risks that [insert sub-population] in [insert location] could face. Agencies working in the area want to make sure risks for [insert sub-population] are prevented and reduced. This focus discussion group will take 1.5 hours.
- If you feel uncomfortable, please feel free to leave anytime and if you require support about any topics discussed today please speak to us privately after the meeting.
- All of you are important in this discussion and all your voices are of equal value here. We encourage everyone to share their views. Do you all agree that everyone is important, and all voices are of equal value here? Continue when everyone agrees.
- Do all of you agree to keep others' participation and answers confidential? Continue when everyone agrees.
- We will take notes, but we will not write down names. Your participation and your comments are confidential. It is important that you feel safe and free to talk.
- This interview will last approximately an hour (KI), 90 minutes (FGD).
- Questions?
- Do we have your permission to begin? (make sure everyone consents before you begin).

Note for interviewer: You do not have to ask EVERY question in detail. Use your judgement on where you can get better information in the categories to dig deeper into some of the issues.

VERY IMPORTANT: for each question pls consider: women and girl-headed households, boy-headed household, adolescent girls, elderly, other at-risk individuals.

SUPER VERY IMPORTANT: READ THE PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION as this is the core of what we are trying to find out. It's semi structured so you can make it your own style of question AS LONG AS YOU GET THE INFORMATION LISTED IN THE PURPOSE

General question

Question 0	Can you please tell us a bit about yourself? Prompts: How many family members, and whom, how they meet their needs and any changes in the household situation over the past few months or expected in the future?
Purpose	Ice breaker question but also to get a sense of family composition (any children (girls, boys), people with disabilities, elders, people with health conditions etc, pregnant/lactating women), AND use this time to validate and confirm any needs without asking about them directly. DO NOT GET STUCK IN THIS QUESTION and keep moving forward (politely)
Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any particular vulnerabilities in the family (to dig into these groups later in the questions) • Food, education, WASH (needs) • Using cash, getting in kind assistance, selling in kind assistance, borrowing, debt

Safety and Dignity

Question 1	<p>We would like to ask you about your safety and how you have been able to ensure you and your family feel safe.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there are reports of theft or looting in the area? How do you keep your valuables safe? Does extortion happen? • If receiving assistance, do you have to pay in any way for this or asked anything in return to receive it? (Look for GBV/PSEA) • What are relations like between men and women? For girls? Is it different between the communities and the camps? What looks or feels different to you?
Purpose	Purpose is to find out, as possible, if there is any criminality in the area (theft, looting, extortion for cash) AND any GBV/PSEA and CP risks.
Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender dynamics within camps, host community, and between camps/host community • Power dynamics within camps, host community, between camps/host community, humanitarian workers including volunteers • GBV (including SEA) and CP risks

Data protection and privacy

Question 2	<p>What IDs do community members have? Which types? Are there concerns about sharing IDs or documents with humanitarian actors as part of service provision?</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there differences between women, girls, men, and boys? (ask for each question)
Purpose	The purpose of the question is to ensure that any registration is not excluding people who may not have IDs that are accepted—this affects children, women, other marginalised groups.
Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNHCR number, Sudanese ID, Ethiopian ID • Certificates (birth, marriage registration) • Community members just know each other or 'vouch' for each other and via community committees • None

Access and Markets

Question 3	<p>How do communities access markets, goods, and services? For Um Rukuba only: Have you noticed a big difference in price since the cash distribution? (for this just note yes or no and ask how much the difference is by percentage of price increase)</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do they travel there?
------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where there any problems or obstacles on the road to the market (e.g. checkpoints, routes that are unsafe, etc)? • Is there regular public transport (excluding private taxis) to the market from the surrounding area? If yes, which types • Is this transport affordable / accessible for all people, if no who? Why? • Are there certain times of the year the market become more difficult to access? If yes, Why? Which households/individuals are most affected? • Does the market have regular working days? If yes, which days are the market open? • Do people who cant go to the market have to pay others to shop for them ? Who is most likely to require this support?
Purpose	The purpose of this question is to understand how people are accessing markets and any risks associated with this that may need to be considered in the programme design phase and monitored over time.
Indicator(s)	NA
Question 4. MARKET SAFETY	<p>How safe is the market(s)? How safe is it getting to shops/traders, banks, any services and transport? Can women, girls and boys safely go to market(s) / shops/ banks/ mobile agents, services (health etc), and if so during which seasons, days and hours? Can be combined with question below.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any problems or obstacles within the market that could restrict access or movement? • Are there any security concerns related to the market place or site of service itself? If yes, what? • Are women and girls of all ages safe in the market and would they be safe to visit at all hours? • Are men and boys of all ages safe in the market and would they be safe to visit at all hours? • Are there any other groups who are not safe accessing the market or services? Is yes who and why? • Have there been reports about/do you think there is discrimination at the market or at any services? • Are there any social issues/stigma/discrimination in the given context that might prevent the entire population from accessing this market/service center (for example, social division due to poverty, GBV survivors)?
Purpose	The purpose of this question is to understand any risks associated with going to and using the markets and services that may need to be considered in the programme design phase and monitored over time.
Indicator(s)	NA

Market risks

Question 5	How safe is it going home from accessing markets, goods, and services ? Considerations for women and girl-headed households, boy-headed household, adolescent girls, elderly,
------------	--

	<p>other at-risk individuals. Can be combined with question above as it lays the ground work for this.</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think clients/customers are safe returning from the market with goods or cash? If yes, who might be unsafe? Why? • Transportation from market
Purpose	The purpose of this question is to understand any risks associated with going home AFTER using the markets and services that may need to be considered in the programme design phase and monitored over time.
Indicator(s)	NA

Preference

Question 6	<p>Has the community had cash distributions before? Wo had access and was it safe?</p> <p>What would be the preferred way to safely receive cash? How often is best to receive the transfer? Considerations for women and girl-headed households, boy-headed household, adolescent girls, elderly, other at-risk individuals</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How this differ across the community? • How would this affect decision making? • How would this affect safety?
Purpose	This purpose of this question is to understand how people prefer to receive cash and how it is safe and what are the different considerations by area, and grouping that need to be taken into account.
Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cash in envelope • Cash Cards • Vouchers • In kind is better for all or some things • Delivery to the house/via proxy/community mechanisms or distributions

Social relations- HH dynamics

Question 7	When money comes into your house (from job or assistance), how has it caused changes in household dynamics or relations? Considerations for women and girl-headed households, boy-headed household, adolescent girls, elderly, other at-risk individuals
Purpose	This purpose of this question is to ensure there is a do no harm approach to any cash assistance with a household—that it does not cause more problems and might even have a positive affect on the dynamics.

Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible positive changes in gender and family dynamics • Possible negative changes in gender and family dynamics • Control over resources
--------------	--

Social relations- HH dynamics

Question 8	<p>How do families in this community make decisions about cash?</p> <p>Prompts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who decides how to spend HH cash? • Do decisions on expenditures vary by the type of expenditure (ex. food versus housing materials, or education)? • Are there safety concerns that affect these decisions? • Do HHs consider everyone's needs when making spending decisions or are some persons more likely to benefit less from the expenditure decisions? • Can women decide how to use cash on their own? What about female-headed households (do they need to consult with other male relatives)? • Are the male, female or other members of the household responsible for certain types of purchases?
Purpose	This purpose of this question is to ensure there is a do no harm approach to any cash assistance with a household such as domestic violence or any exclusion (for women or children)
Indicator(s)	NA

Social relations- Community dynamics

Question 9	<p>How have/will cash distributions to targeted households impact community relationships (e.g. gender dynamics, risks of violence, etc)?</p> <p>Prompts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the community between those receiving cash and those not • Between refugee and host community • Social, ethnic or religious affiliation
Purpose	This purpose of this question is to understand any change in relationships that may have occurred (or can occur) because of cash.
Indicator(s)	NA

GRM/C4D/AAP

Question 10	<p>What is the best way to communicate about the program including distributions and disbursements? What is the best way for community members to communicate feedback, concerns or complaints?</p> <p>Considerations for language, literacy, access to mobile phone</p>
-------------	--

Purpose	This purpose of this question is to help design a C4D and AAP strategy around cash to mitigate for risks and ensure all ways of communication are considered and catered for.
Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone (sms) • Community members/leaders • Community meetings • Social workers/NGOs • Announcements • Radio • Other

Interview closure

- Is there anything we haven't discussed which you feel would be relevant?
- Thank you for your time. As mentioned previously, your participation does not automatically include you in any future programming but we are grateful for your time as it helps agencies make decisions on how best to provide assistance in a dignified and safe manner for all affected people.

4. Annex Two Detailed Methodology

Methodology

On behalf of the sub national cash working work in Gedaref and collaboratively with UNHCR, NRC, Norwegian Church Aid (NCA), and ZOA, UNICEF conducted a **Cash Risk assessment** to understand the key issues in distribution and programming of cash, priority needs, gender and social dynamics, and communication methods. The qualitative research including semi-structured questions key informant interviews and focus group discussions along with observations. The sample size was in different locations including host communities (including refugee living in host communities) and refugee camp sites (Tenetba and Um Rakuba). The interviews were conducted in Tigray, Arabic and English.

The focus group discussion included different genders and those with disabilities and ethnicity with an average of 15-20 participants per focus group discussion. The key informant interviews involved various personnel working in the field such as nutrition officers (SMoH/ALIGHT), health officers (SMoH/MSF-Holland), social workers (State Council of Child welfare), Government managers (Commissions of Refugees) and host community leaders. The focus groups (FGD) were conducted in **Tenetba** (6th February 2021). It included 2 FGD (young mothers 14 - 19 years old), (young and old males 17- 65 year old) and 2 FGD in the Host Community (young females 14 - 19 years old), (young and old males 17 – 65 year old). UNICEF coordinated the selection criteria of all focus groups supported by the Commission of Refugee (COR), ALIGHT and Community leaders in the Host Community. For the in camp female FGD, ALIGHT considered young lactating mothers within all geographical blocks in the camp and variation ethnic groups represented. For the in camp male FGD, the COR camp manager selected 7 young males (17-25 years old) and 3 old males (above 30) within all blocks in the camp and included males with disabilities. For both Host Community FGDs (female and male) the Community leader within the Host Community selected the two groups based on different ethnicity and social dynamics.

In **Um Rakuba** (7th February 2021), the focus group discussion included gender disaggregated groups and those with disabilities with an average of 15-20 participants per focus group. The key informant interviews involved various personnel working in the field such as nutrition officers (SMoH), health officers (SMoH), social workers (SCCW), Government managers (COR) and host community leaders. The focus group discussion included 2 FGD (young lactating mothers 14 - 19 years old), (young and old males 17-65). In addition to 3 FGDs in the Host Community village of Um Rakuba (young females 14 - 19 years old), (young males & old males 17- 65) and host communities refugee group (young females and males). Throughout the selection process, the SMoH focal point at Um Rakuba, assigned community volunteers to visit the households and inform the participants from Zone 1-3. In the host community, the COR protection manager with the service committee organized all focus groups, and notified the community in participants who fit the brief of: young mothers (14-19 years old); 7 young males (17-25); and 3 old males (above 30) willing to attend and lastly for the Host Community Refugee FGD (mixed young males and females).

Literature review

The team reviewed and built on the following available documents:

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) conducted a market assessment based on understanding the Tenetba market to establish a cash distribution center within Um Rakuba.

A PDM was also shared from the ongoing assessment (Feb 2021) on the cash distributions from Um Rukuba.

ZOA shared assessment data which included questions on cash and it covers both camp and host communities in Um Rukuba and Tenetba. Information from Jan 2021.

UNICEF conducted a host community multi sectoral needs assessment (MSNA) in Hamdeyat, Um Rakuba, Village 8 and Tenetba to identify area of needs (primarily) in WASH, Education, Child Protection and Health and Nutrition in regards to the Ethiopian Tigray refugee crisis in Sudan. The assessment including structured questions under focus group discussions with host community's member (both female and male).

In addition to this, data was compiled from the report of the Regional Emergency Advisor mission in Dec 2020.

UNHCR Situation Update Report outlines the relocated/new arrivals and mapping of the refugee population and all the services being provided among all the partners on the ground within all four sites.

UNFPA released a Situation Update Report (Jan 27th 2021) outlining their overall integrated response on sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and gender based violence (GBV) interventions for refugees (primarily women and girls) in all camp sites.

WFP shared the executive summary of the food market assessment for Um Rukuba carried out in Nov 2020.