

## Key points:

### 1. Food basket composition.

- MC – The food basket composition has been discussed in several forums earlier and there is need build on those deliberations
- WFP – The priority should be placed on meeting the 2100 Kcal as well as the nutritional value of the food items when determining the food basket. WFP provide super cereals to cover the needs of the malnourished children
- The partners agreed on the need to consider the costs of specific food items while making the food basket calculations as some are cheaper than others – e.g. sorghum is cheaper than rice and could vary the cost of the minimum food basket
- USAID/FFP- lean seasons should be considered when calculating the costs of the food basket and necessary adjustments should be done to cover the deficits related to the hunger seasons.
- The need to develop general guideline on the percentage contribution to the Kcal was raised. Consideration such as the IPC levels, HHDD, Cost of Diet and the market assessments findings should be made to determine whether to meet for example 70% or 100% of the 2100 Kcal.
- The partners agreed to use food basket calculator as a common tool.

TAKE AWAY POINT: The team working on harmonization will provide a list of items and food calculator but partners depending on the budget and modality will select from the list factor into the calculator for 2100kcal to cost the basket. This has to be accompanied by robust market monitoring by the partner.

#### **ACTION Points:**

- **Harmonization team to provide the list of items.**
- **Food basket calculator**

### 2. The average HH size vs per capita

- The partners can apply either average household size or per capita when providing rations. The partners agreed to harmonize their average HH size based on the baseline studies, registration data and similar reports.
- Providing rations based on the per capita could naturally lead to inflation of HH size and should be cross checked the with the prevailing HH averages in those areas.
- A household was defined as people eating from the same pot and polygamous HH could be considered as independent households. There was no need to set limit for minimum and maximum HH size in relation to per capita.

#### Key Points

- **Transfer based on Household,**
  - The average household size among partners working in the area for consensus has to be sought. This will avoid creating conflict transfer amounts in the same geographic area and agitation among vulnerable communities.
  - The VAM report provided good information as well on the average household size with has been observed as six members per household in Maiduguri.
- **Per capita transfer,**
  - Always ensure adequate investment in technology to allow transfer based on individuals in the household.
  - There is no need for having a **minimum transfer and maximum** amount as long as standard concise registration protocols are adhered to during registration to have actual number of members per household.
- The food basket calculator attached can be used to determine household transfer and guide on per capita transfer

**ACTION Points:**

- ***Harmonization team will only provide a guiding framework for partners to harmonize regardless of modality.***

**3. Targeting and criteria**

- Whether or not to cover 100% of the HH in a settlement depends on the context but it was agreed in principle that partners will apply targeting over blanket registration. The resources are scarce only those deserving should be considered. 100% coverage in community could be done as long as this covers only those who meet the targeting criteria. The targeting criteria could combine CBT with food security indicators such as FCS, HHDD and rCSI.
- Partners to provide targeting criteria to be used as a guide.

**ACTION Points:**

- ***Harmonization team to consolidate criteria to guide partners.***

**4. Leadership involvement and protection measures**

- Partners to share their approaches and the lessons learned in relation to leadership involvement and beneficiaries' protection with Andrew for compilation and sharing in the subsequent meetings.

**ACTION Points:**

- ***Harmonization team to consolidate protection related issue to guide partners in implementation.***

**NEXT STEPS:**

- **Andrew (SCI) and Malick (WFP);** will take the lead to finalize the guide.
- Malick will share with FSWG in Abuja the outcomes of the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> April.
- Andrew to meet the FSWG in Maiduguri to share outcomes.
- Malick and Andrew to finalize the guide early May to present to FSWG in Abuja and Maiduguri.
- Final guide presented to FSWG end of May for adoption.