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MSNA

OBJECTIVES &

METHODOLOGY
Introduction - Narrative

The Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) is a crisis-wide assessment to identify inter-sectoral humanitarian needs which aims to provide a strong evidence base for the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HPR). The first MSNA in Nigeria facilitated by REACH was conducted in 2018.

REACH conducted MSNAs in 10 country missions in 2019. The MSNA fits in the global objective of improving coordination and the provision of solid, evidence-based information. The MSNA is a direct response to the Fifth Objective of the Grand Bargain – calling for the implementation of joint multi-sectoral assessments to improve humanitarian programming.

Targets for 2019:

- Overall improvement of the coordination process
- Focus on timeliness of analysis to be shared with partners and through the inter-sectoral structure
- Become a solid and key source of HNO + HRP update.
The MSNA is a collaborative process from A to Z, including:

- The involvement and buy-in of the sectors, Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG), Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) / Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), key partners in the research design, and integration of the data into the HNO.

- Partner agencies support data collection. In 2018, 95+ local partners participated in 8 MSNAs.

- In some countries, collaborative data analysis, with the support of ACAPS and MapAction.
OBJECTIVES:

Specific objectives: Provide a comprehensive evidence base of multi-sectoral needs, coping capacity and overall well-being among conflict-affected population in the BAY States, including:
o Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) residing either in formal/informal camp settings or within host communities (displaced since the beginning of the conflict in 2009);
o Returnees including returning IDPs (displaced since 2009 but back in their area of origin);
o Non-displaced populations (not displaced since the beginning of the conflict);
o Populations residing in Hard-to-Reach areas (contextual and secondary information from REACH “monitoring of hard-to-reach areas” activity).

Research Question: Overall / Inter-sectoral research question guiding this assessment:
What are the priority multi-sectoral humanitarian needs of the crisis-affected population, and how do these vary between geographical locations, population groups and household profiles?
INDICATORS - Selected with, by and for the sectors

1. Work of prioritization – only those indicators tailored for HNO/HRP analysis chosen;

2. Adjustments from last year: some changes, but many remaining, potentially allowing for some trend analyses this year;

3. Agreement on sectoral analysis with sectors, and on inter-sectoral indicators and analysis process with OCHA IM team and ISWG.
Methodology – Sampling targets and data collection

- Assessment using a **stratified cluster sampling**:
  - The stratum is the Local Government Area (LGA): sample is designed at the LGA level, giving representative data at the LGA level overall – with a 95% confidence level and 10% margin of error;
  - When necessary, a **top-up sample** was conducted in those LGAs where the initial sampling did not render sufficient coverage of the population groups intended to be assessed;
  - Aggregating at the State level, the data will also be representative for each population group.

- Decreased coverage (approx. 7% less coverage in terms of number of LGAs) compared to MSNA 2018, in addition to Abadam and Marte LGAs remaining inaccessible:
  - Guzamala, Kukawa, Nganzai in Borno State – due to security concerns;
  - Geidam in Yobe State – due to security concerns and absence of partners to cover it.

- Training of trainers (ToT) in Maiduguri with all partners, before trickle down trainings in Adamawa and Yobe; Data collection from 17 June to 30 July.

- Results: 59 LGAs covered with 5 implementing partners; 1,010 Key informant interviews; 9,476 Household surveys
02 MSNA ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK
What is the JIAF?

A theoretical and conceptual framework designed for humanitarian needs analysis to inform strategic decision-making across humanitarian crises (for example, HNO).

**Background:**

- Output of the work done by the Joint Inter-Sector Analysis Working Group (JIAG)
- Current version of JIAF builds on:
  - A review of 49 existing analytical frameworks in 2017
  - Three pilot missions in 2018

**Purpose:**

To promote a collaborative approach for inter-sectoral analysis which enables humanitarian actors to arrive at a common understanding of:

1. **What** the priority humanitarian needs are
2. **Where** humanitarian needs are most severe
3. **Which** population groups are most in need of humanitarian assistance.
MSNA meets JIAF: Overview

- Context informed by Secondary data review
- Event/Shock informed by the household vulnerability index in the primary data collection
- Impact on people, systems and services, and access informed by the Impact composite indicator in primary data collection

Informed by MSNA primary data collection, then through the analytical process:
- Living standards corresponds to sectoral composite analysis
- Coping capacity gap gathers relevant questions from several sectors (negative coping strategies when lacking water, fuel, food, etc.)
- Well-being and human rights violations corresponds to such elements as morbidity, mortality, malnutrition, and grave protection concerns. For this preliminary findings presentation, malnutrition and mortality data comes from Nutrition Sector available data.

Combination of the above + intentions/environmental indicators
Objectives of MSNA analytical framework

- Estimate severity of needs
- Compare pop groups
- Compare geo areas
- Compare HH profiles
- Compare sectors / sub-sectors
- Co-occurrence of living standard gaps, vulnerabilities, capacity gap and wellbeing

Inform humanitarian planning & decision-making
### Scoring approach for HH classification: Living Standard Gap Per Sector – FSL example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Thresholds</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Cumulative max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Security / SAFE/ Agriculture</td>
<td>Food Consumption Score (FCS)</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security / SAFE/ Agriculture</td>
<td>Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)</td>
<td>&gt;= 10 (High use)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFE - Do you have sufficient access to firewood/fuel to meet your daily energy needs?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFE - What is your primary means of obtaining firewood of whichever primary fuel source?</td>
<td>Collected directly from outside the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARKET - What barriers does your HH have currently in accessing enough food?</td>
<td>Market-related barrier to accessing food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGRICULTURE - Were you able to access land?</td>
<td>No, did not access any land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGRICULTURE - Were you able to access seeds or agricultural inputs?</td>
<td>Yes, but did not access amount needed</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No/minimal</th>
<th>0-2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2.5-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5-7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>7.5-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the MSNA analysis, the “Living Standard Gap” corresponds to the sectoral analysis (excluding nutrition which is a “well-being” pillar component). For each sector, a composite indicator was designed and agreed upon with the sectors. After adding up scores for each indicators, HHs are then classified following a sectoral needs severity scale from “No/minimal” severity of needs, to “Extreme” severity of needs.
MSNA PRELIMINARY FINDINGS
Relatively more HHs are considered vulnerable in Borno State compared to other States.

Returnee and IDP HHs are more vulnerable than non-displaced HHs in the 3 States.

LGA level:
- Highest proportion of vulnerable HHs in Borno: Kala-Balge (39%), Gwoza/Mobbar (33%), Gubio (30%)
- Highest proportion of vulnerable HHs in Adamawa: Michika (20%), Madagali (19%), Yola North (15%)
- Highest proportion of vulnerable HHs in Yobe: Bade (20%), Bursari (17%), Machina (16%)
Food Consumption Score

- Overall, Borno HHs had the highest % of HHs with a poor food consumption score, mostly in conflict-affected areas.
- Looking at population groups, IDP HHs were most likely to have a low FCS across the States, but particularly in Borno. In Borno State, both IDP and returnee HHs had an average FCS in the borderline category (average FCS of 33 for IDP HHs and 34 for returnee HHs across the State)
- LGAs with highest % of HHs with poor food consumption were Dikwa (45%), Monguno (44%), Gwoza (37%) and one LGA in Adamawa, Madagali (34%). In Dikwa LGA, poor and borderline FCS account for 82% of HHs combined
- At least 40% of HHs in 11 Borno State LGAs and 7 Adamawa LGAs were affected by both poor and borderline FCS combined.
- Yobe State had fewer HHs with a poor food consumption score as compared to the other States. However, the highest % of HHs suffering from poor FCS were in Busari (17%) and Bade (15%) LGAs.
- Top 5 LGAs where HHs displayed the highest proportion of “poor” FCS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>FCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dikwa</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguno</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwoza</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagali</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bama</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduced Coping Strategy Index

- Across all states, HHs were using a “high amount” (> 10 aggregated score) of negative coping strategies but particularly in Borno State, where at least 60% of HHs did so in 8 different LGAs.

- A high proportion of HHs in Borno State LGAs that demonstrated a high use of negative coping strategies were in areas that could be characterised as having less access to services and partner presence such as Mafa (70%), Mobbar (69%), Gubio (67%), and Magumeri (65%).

- Adamawa had HHs in three LGAs reporting over 60% in the “high” category including Mubi South (69%), Madagali (63%) and Maiha (61%).

- Although only one LGA in Yobe, Machina, demonstrated 60% of its HHs in the high category, LGAs across the state are still high with the lowest LGA being Tarmua 39%

- Only three LGAs in all three States had 40% or over HHs in the “low” use category, including Yola North (53%), Yola South (42%) and Ngala (40%).

- Across all LGAs, the most commonly reported negative coping strategy for lack of food was to seek less preferred food sources (average of 3 days in a week, with higher average for IDP HHs compared to other population groups across the 3 States), followed reducing the number of meals in a day (highest average of doing so in Gwoza, Jere, Madagali LGAs).
Market – Access and Barriers to Markets

- Overall, HHs in LGAs in Borno state reported less access to markets and HHs in Adamawa reported the most access to markets.

- In Borno, a majority of HHs in 11 LGAs reported no access to markets. The LGAs with the highest % included Hawul (62%), Bayo (63%) and Bama (63%).

- **Discussion**: Although this year the question was centred around the “physical” access to a market, this question of “access” might still be misunderstood by some participants.

- Overall, across all states, the most commonly reported barrier to accessing food was that food was too expensive. This was particularly true in Adamawa State LGAs with up to 80% HHs in Numan reporting this as a barrier.

- LGAs with highest % of HH who reported expensive food as a barrier: Numan (80%), Jere (79%), Guyuk (79%) and Lamurde (78%).

- Conflict-affected areas did not really report expensive food as a barrier but had other barriers such as a market being too far, transport being expensive, no food at the market and (perceived) presence of explosive hazards.
  - Example of Gowza LGA HHs: 11% reported the market was too far, 11% that there was movement restriction as a barrier to accessing food, 11% reported the perceived presence of explosive hazards.

- 66% of HHs in Kala-Balge LGA the absence of food distribution as a barrier to accessing food, suggesting an over-reliance on aid.
Food Assistance Modality Preference

- Overall across the 3 States, the preferred modality for food assistance was a mix of cash and in-kind assistance. This was overwhelmingly true across Adamawa and Yobe States, with more fluctuations across Borno State LGAs.

- In Borno State, IDP HHs reported in relatively similar proportions wanting either a mix of cash and in-kind assistance, or only in-kind assistance – therefore, it seems that looking at LGAs on a case-by-case basis might be more relevant.

Top 5 LGAs in Borno where HHs preferred in-kind assistance:

- Konduga: 56%
- Biu: 55%
- Bayo: 54%
- Hawul: 54%
- Maiduguri: 52%

Top 5 LGAs in Borno where HHs preferred mix of cash-in-kind assistance:

- Ngala: 73%
- Kala-Balge: 71%
- Askira-Uba: 58%
- Chibok: 53%
- Dikwa: 53%
SAFE – Access and Practices

- Overall, HHs in Borno reported in higher proportions that they did not have enough fuel to meet their daily needs. This was followed to a slightly lesser extent by Adamawa HHs, while Yobe HHs did not seem to be affected by fuel shortage for daily consumption.

- Top 3 LGAs where HHs reported not enough fuel for daily use:

  - Gwoza: 67%
  - Bama: 62%
  - Monguno: 47%

- Overwhelmingly, HHs across States and population groups reported that they were using firewood as the main source of fuel for daily use. Only around MMC area (for MMC, Jere, Gubio and Konduga LGAs) higher proportions of HHs reported using charcoal.

- In Kala-Balge, a majority of HHs reported using agricultural waste.

- Across most LGAs, the most commonly reported means of obtaining the main source of fuel was to purchase it from a local seller. The second most commonly reported means was to collect the fuel source (mostly firewood) within the community of residence/displacement.

- However, higher proportions of HHs in Adamawa, Yobe, and Southern Borno LGAs reported that they collected their main fuel source outside the community of residence/displacement. This is mostly due to fewer movement restrictions, however can come with heightened protection risks.

- In Kala-Balge, a majority of HHs reported collecting firewood outside the community, highlighting some concerns due to security concerns in the vicinity.
SAFE (cont.) – Protection risks

- Overall, a majority of HHs across all LGAs covered reported that someone in the HH was making trips to collect firewood – with the notable exception of Dikwa (48% only), Gwoza (38%), Damboa (35%), Maiduguri LGAs (25%).

- Overwhelmingly, adult men were reported to make those trips to collect firewood. Second to them were adult women.

- For IDP HHs, a lesser proportion of adult men were collecting firewood compared to other population groups. This could be due to more displaced HHs being female-headed or missing adult male members due to displacement or security incidents.

- Higher proportions of HHs in Adamawa and Yobe (compared to Borno State) reported that adolescent boys and girls could also make trips to collect firewood, which could represent heightened child protection concerns.

- The most commonly reported protection risk associated with collecting firewood was physical violence. Highest % were reported in Borno State especially – affecting more IDP and returnee HHs, closely followed by Adamawa State.

- Top 5 LGAs overall with HHs reporting physical violence during firewood collection:
  - In Ngala, Gwoza, Dikwa, Bama, and some other Adamawa LGAs, high proportions of HHs also reported risk of abductions.
  - Out of those making trips to collect firewood in Damboa LGA, 49% of HHs reported risks associated with explosives hazards.
AGRICULTURE – Income, access to land and inputs

- High proportions of HHs in garrison town LGAs of Borno reported not having any income: Dikwa (54%), Kala-Balge (40%), Bama (36%), Ngala (29%), Gwoza (28%), Monguno (26%), Mobbar (20%). Otherwise, across most LGAs the most commonly reported income source was agriculture, followed (in much lower proportions) by small business or trade.

- Out of those HHs that have an income related to agriculture, livestock, fishery, etc.; HHs across LGAs overwhelmingly reported needing to access land primarily for crop cultivation (fluctuating between 60% and 100% of HHs across LGAs in the 3 States).

- In Adamawa and Yobe States, a majority of HHs across LGAs reported that they had accessed the amount of land they needed. In Borno State, the proportion was similar across most LGAs between “accessed amount of land needed” and “accessed land but not enough” – IDP HHs were more affected by land access issues. Additionally, higher proportions in some garrison towns mentioned they did not access land at all.

- Notable data on barriers to accessing land:
  - A majority of HHs reported no barriers to accessing land, except in Madagali, Bama, Gwoza, Jere, Monguno LGAs (fewer than 15% HHs)
  - Most widely reported barrier to accessing land across all LGAs: charges to access land too high / not enough resources;
  - High proportions of HHs reporting as a barrier that the land is “unsafe”: most Borno LGAs, Northern Adamawa LGAs, West Adamawa LGA (linking to herders/farmers conflict – Girei, Guyuk, Lamurde, Numan)
  - 40% of HHs in Gwoza LGA, 26% in Madagali, 26% in Mafa, 25% in Bama, and to a lesser extent HHs in Askira-Uba, Jere and Konduga LGAs reported that explosive hazards were a barrier to accessing land.

- A majority of HHs with agricultural-related income accessed some agricultural inputs but not enough in Adamawa and Borno States, while in Yobe State higher proportions of HHs reported accessing sufficient inputs. The main barrier reported to accessing agricultural inputs was high prices, while in Borno State garrison town, more HHs reported that those were not available in markets.
**Discussion**: FSL composite indicator under-reporting in Borno because of agriculture sub-component condition?

- IDP HHs across States were the most negatively affected population group in terms of food security and livelihoods; Returnee HHs were also among the most affected in Borno State.
- More Borno LGAs showed a high proportion of HHs with MSNI severity scores of 3-4. The following all demonstrated that more than 20% of HHs had a severity score of 3-4: Askira-Uba, Bama, Biu, Chibok, Damboa, Dikwa, Gubio, Gwoza, Jere, Kaga, Magumeri, Mobbar, Monguno
- Highest proportions of HHs affected in Adamawa State were in Madagali, Michika, Toungo and Fufore LGAs.
Next Steps - Timeline

- **Early August**
  - Data cleaning
  - Data analysis
  - Work on MSNA/JIAF indicators to support OCHA and sectors

- **End August**
  - Presentation of preliminary findings
  - Publication of dataset
  - H2R Analysis

- **September**
  - Joint Analysis Workshops
  - State level HNO meetings
  - Factsheets production

- **October**
  - AAP-focused memo
  - Feeding MSNA analysis into resource mobilization

- **November**
  - Final report production
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