

JOINT EMERGENCY OPERATION (JEOP)

JOINT EMERGENCY OPERATION (JEOP)

LEARNING FROM RECENT PDM - TIGRAY SCALE-UP

AUGUST 05, 2021



BACKGROUND

Typically, JEOP receives feedback from project participants through established systems;

- Quarterly qualitative post distribution monitoring (PDM), and Annual Results Survey (ARS)
- Accountability mechanisms (community help desks, suggestion box, phone, staff)
- Risk and compliance monitoring system

The scale-up of the emergency in Tigray called JEOP to adapt the approach to include a rolling household survey. A PDM for Round 6&7 was rolled out covering 1,535 households and 35% woredas of REST operational areas;

- Phase 1: February 18 - March 1, Mekele town, 398 households interviewed in seven urban sub-cities
- Phase 2: March 18 – 21, Shire town, 307 households interviewed in three urban IDP camps
- Phase 3 May 11-19, 830 households interviewed in nine Woredas in four Zones

PDM was conducted by JEOP M&E staff with hired enumerators

Limitation: sampling was purposive, access issues prevented going deep into rural villages

KEY FINDINGS

Respondent profile

- **Marital status** – the number of singles was unusually high in urban areas 6% (11% Mekele, 6% Shire), the last ARS had not exceeded 2%, and rural surveyed woredas remained at 3%.
- **Age** - the mean age of the head of the household was 40.5 with variations between locations (37.7 in Mekele, 41.6 in Shire, 41.5 other woredas). This was skewed to young population as compared to the last ARS (44.6).
- **Family size** – average actual family size was 4.9, average targeted family size was 4.1. Overall, 61% of respondents perceived full family targeting (79% Mekele, 80% Shire, 45% other woredas).

KEY FINDINGS

Mobility

- **Length of stay in current location** - 31% of respondents had lived in their current location for less than six months *i.e recently displaced* (39% Mekele, 100% Shire, 2% other woredas)
- **Trends of mobility** – 79% of respondents observed population movement during the last six months (56% more people coming and 23% more people going out)
- **Perceived factors triggering movements** - 52% noted seeking protection (safety/security); 41% referred to food and shelter and 7% noted social ties.

KEY FINDINGS

Livelihoods

- **Humanitarian engagement** - 88% of respondents had never received food assistance pre-current crisis (92% Mekele, 99% Shire, 82% other woredas)
- **Typical food access** – most respondents relied on local markets to purchase food (67%), followed by own production 28%.
- **Means of livelihood** - the main sources of income respondents noted were agriculture (32%), casual labour (26%), business (16%) and crafts (15%).
- **Income** – the average annual income pre-crisis was 74,500 ETB with significant variation between locations (97,500 ETB in Shire, 62,100 ETB in Mekele, 30,400 ETB in other woredas)

KEY FINDINGS

Access to Final Distribution Points (FDPs)

- **Distance** – 71% of respondents travelled for less than 30 minutes to reach FDPs. Respondents in some woredas travel longer to access food (e.g. Tsirae Wembeta & Endmekon). A breakdown by clustered location of respondents travelling under 30 minutes by food was as follows; 96% Mekele, 98% Shire, 49% other woredas.
- **Transport of commodities** – 85% travelled on foot to reach the FDP and 59% paid for transport to/from FDPs
 - Average spent on transport was ~50 ETB
 - While the distance travelled was short in Mekele and Shire, the cost of transport was high as transport services had not fully resumed operation.

KEY FINDINGS

Information about assistance

- **Entitlement** - 95% of respondents knew key details about their entitlement (type, amount per person). Information predominantly came from friends or neighbors, project staff and government leaders.
- **Quantity received** - 92% of respondents confirmed amount received correspond with the announced entitlement
- **Timing** - 79% were notified in advance the date, time, and place of distribution (14% notified 3 days in advance) and 81% confirmed the schedule respected.

KEY FINDINGS

Utilization

- **Duration** - 41% of respondents reported that food assistance support their family for 3-4 weeks, whereas 31% reported that rations could last over four weeks and 27% reported that it last less than 3 weeks.
- **Sale** - was high, 21% of respondents reported voluntary sale of commodities (26% in Mekele, 43% in Shire, 10% in the other woredas).
- **Reasons for sale** – the highest proportion of respondents noted desire to buy other food items (34%); followed cash needed for non-food items (29%), or cash needed for supplementary food items (27%).
- **Sharing** - 12% of respondents reported voluntarily sharing with non-family members.

KEY FINDINGS

Safety and security

- **Access** - 5% of reported challenges accessing FDPs, mainly related to security.
- **Safety** - 11% of respondents experienced security concerns during distribution related to crowding (60%) or theft (37%). Furthermore, 7% reported feeling in danger or unsafe due to food assistance. Sources of fear were theft (48%) and community tension (38%).
- **Dignity** - 82% of respondents felt that they were treated respectfully by distribution staff. Furthermore, 61% saw priority accorded to vulnerable persons during distribution.
- **Coercion**- 7 respondents (0.5%) were asked by local leaders do something against their will to be registered for food assistance (5 asked to pay money, 1 asked to work without pay, 1 threatened to be denied food if refused to attend meeting)

KEY FINDINGS

Satisfaction

- **Assistance Received** - 79% of respondents were satisfied with the food assistance received. For those dissatisfied, reasons were; ration size and lack of money for grinding.
- **Distribution Process** – 68% of respondents were satisfied with the distribution processes. For those dissatisfied long wait times (48%), overcrowding (26%) and absence of facilities at distribution sites (20%) were top reasons.
- **General feedback** - Among long list of wider causes of concern, targeting, request for extending the assistance to people not reached, ration size, delay of assistance and distribution management are the top issues.

DATA BASED DECISION MAKING

Capacity building

- Two rounds training held for local GoE stakeholders leading the targeting process
- PSEA and Do Not Harm (DNH) training for frontline staff (June)

Reinforced field monitoring

- Increased staffing – MEAL, Risk and Compliance, Early Warning
- CRS compliance risk monitoring staff in Tigray increased from 5 to 30+ with decentralized field monitoring (two hubs in Adigrat and Mekele)
- Provision for additional MEAL, accountability safeguarding and protection staff (CRS) and Woreda based MEAL staff at implementing partner level

Scale up of quantitative PDM

- Continue PDM expanding across all JEOP operational areas with plans to engage third party PDM support
- Rolled out end user survey via exit interviews

Scale up of quantitative PDM

- Result communicated to donor (USAID)
- Data reflection sessions with implementing partners

Safe Stay Thank You



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



JOINT EMERGENCY OPERATION (JEOP)

