

TECHNICAL BRIEF ON UNHCR-WFP JOINT APPEALS PROCESSES



Country examples

The below tables present examples of UNHCR-WFP joint appeals processes to briefly illustrate how some of the key considerations discussed in the [technical brief](#) were addressed in different contexts. Please note that any numbers cited refer to the time period of the specific example, e.g. the number of refugees in country when the targeting or prioritization process was implemented, and appeals were received.

The four countries selected as examples are:

UGANDA

- Approximately **1.5 million** refugees and asylum seekers from South Sudan, the DRC and other countries.
- Prioritization of **WFP's food assistance** in five out of the 13 refugee settlements in the southwestern region from June 2022 to June 2023.

RWANDA

- Approximately **125,000** refugees and asylum seekers from the DRC, Burundi and other countries.
- Targeting of **WFP's food assistance** in five refugee camps since 2021.

NIGER

- Approximately **300,000** refugees and asylum seekers from Nigeria, Mali and other countries, as well as around **360,000** internally displaced people (IDPs).
- Reprioritization of **WFP's food and livelihoods assistance** to refugees, IDPs and host communities located in specific sites across four different regions in 2023¹.

MAURITANIA

- Approximately **91,000** refugees and asylum seekers from Mali in M'bera refugee camp and surrounding host villages.
- Prioritization of **WFP's food assistance**, **UNHCR's livelihoods support** and **government social protection assistance** in M'bera refugee camp and surrounding host villages in 2022.

¹ Excluding refugees and IDPs living among host communities.

TARGETING OR PRIORITIZATION APPROACH	UGANDA	RWANDA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index-based prioritization approach that ranks households by their level of vulnerability considering factors such as the gender and age of household members, the dependency ratio, household members with a disability, a serious medical condition or other specific needs, and the capacity to engage in livelihoods. • A threshold was established to categorize households into two different vulnerability categories using registration data in UNHCR's proGres database. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Categorical targeting approach using eligibility criteria that are either socio-demographic in nature (e.g. dependency ratio, single headed households with children below 5 years, etc.) or cover protection challenges (household members with a disability, chronic illness or other specific needs), while also considering working capacity. • Households were categorized into three different vulnerability categories based on the eligibility criteria and using registration data in proGres.
	NIGER	MAURITANIA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combination of a categorical and a community-based prioritization approach. • Households were categorized into different vulnerability categories by community committees using predefined eligibility criteria that were developed based on the analysis of quantitative data and community feedback. • The eligibility criteria considered socio-demographic aspects (households headed by women or older persons without the presence of other members who are able to engage in livelihoods, and the presence of at least 4 children under the age of 5), protection aspects (household members with a disability or a chronic illness), and if assistance is the most important income source or not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index-based prioritization approach that ranks households by their level of vulnerability considering the five dimensions food access, education, dependency, health and specific needs, and working capacity. • Thresholds were established to categorize households into three different vulnerability categories using census data (collected by the government with support from UNHCR and WFP, and eventually stored in proGres).

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	UGANDA	RWANDA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities were consulted, among other issues, on the types of households that are most vulnerable as well as their preferred channels for receiving key information and providing feedback, complaints and appeals. • There was limited transparency on the eligibility criteria. Only summary information on the criteria was shared with communities, field teams and partners mainly due to fraud concerns but also due to the complexity of the prioritization approach (large number of criteria, and use of weights for certain criteria). • Early and regular joint communication activities were conducted to inform community members about the prioritization process. • Households were informed about their respective vulnerability categorization by SMS and through printed and anonymised eligibility lists that were put up across relevant settlements. Community members could also approach a help/protection desk or call a helpline to inquire about their eligibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities were consulted, among other issues, on the types of households that are most vulnerable, their preferred channels for receiving key information and providing feedback, complaints and appeals as well as a concrete draft list of potential eligibility criteria. • There was full transparency on the eligibility criteria and how these were combined to categorize households. • Regular joint communication activities were conducted to inform community members about the targeting process. • Households were informed about their respective vulnerability categorization by SMS. Community members could also approach a help/protection desk or call a helpline to inquire about their eligibility.
	NIGER	MAURITANIA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities were consulted, among other issues, on the types of households that are most vulnerable, their preferred channels for receiving key information and providing feedback, complaints and appeals as well as a concrete draft list of potential eligibility criteria. • There was full transparency on the eligibility criteria and how these were combined to categorize households. • Community committees led the categorization of households based on the final eligibility criteria (with subsequent verification by WFP, UNHCR and partners). • Early and regular joint communication activities were conducted to inform community members about the prioritization process. • Households were informed about their respective vulnerability categorization by community committees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities were consulted, among other issues, on the types of households that are most vulnerable as well as their preferred channels for receiving key information and providing feedback, complaints and appeals. • There was limited transparency on the eligibility criteria. Only summary information on the criteria was shared with communities due to the complexity of the prioritization approach (large number of criteria, and use of weights for certain criteria) as well as fraud concerns. • Early and regular joint communication activities were conducted to inform community members about the prioritization process. • Households were informed about their respective vulnerability categorization through home visits conducted by a partner organization in close collaboration with outreach volunteers.

SCOPE OF JOINT APPEALS PROCESS	UGANDA	RWANDA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on implementation exclusion errors (updating of household composition and specific needs data in proGres). • Open-ended appeals window, which opened at the same time as the first distributions of prioritized assistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on implementation exclusion errors (updating of household composition and specific needs data in proGres). • Open-ended appeals window, which opened at the same time as the first distributions of targeted assistance.
	NIGER	MAURITANIA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on implementation exclusion errors (household-level reassessments by field teams to reassess compliance with eligibility criteria). • Open-ended appeals window, which opened before the start of distributions of reprioritized assistance. Initial appeals were responded to before changes were made to people's assistance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on implementation exclusion errors (updating of proGres data). • Appeals were received during a three-week window and responded to before the start of distributions of prioritized assistance.

RESOURCING	UGANDA	RWANDA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 50 surge staff were recruited to primarily support case management but also appeals intake and appeals data management during initial implementation.² Laptops were purchased for these surge staff. • Delayed recruitment of a much-needed appeals data management focal point (for data cleaning, further processing and referrals) as well as lack of predictable funding for the surge caseworkers resulted in the appeals process facing major challenges. • 27,039 appeals were received within the first four months of the appeals process, meaning that 23 percent of households that were initially not categorized as most vulnerable decided to appeal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 surge staff were recruited to temporarily support appeals intake and coordinate follow-up by regular caseworkers. The surge staffing was gradually reduced as the number of appeals and related workloads decreased over time. • 1,926 appeals were received within the first six months of the appeals process³, meaning that 16 percent of households that were initially not categorized as most vulnerable decided to appeal, while 71 percent of these appeals were successful. As a result, 11% of households that were initially not categorized as most vulnerable ended up moving to a higher vulnerability category based on the appeals process.
	<p data-bbox="499 651 600 678">NIGER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appeals process was managed by existing WFP, UNHCR and partner staff. Due to the participation of community committees in the categorization of households, only a limited number of appeals were expected, and no surge staff were therefore recruited. 	<p data-bbox="1213 651 1415 678">MAURITANIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing UNHCR, WFP and partner staff managed the appeals process without the recruitment of any surge staff, which Country Offices deemed feasible due to the short appeals window of three weeks and the fact that only a limited number of household visits were carried out as part of appeals follow-up. • 3,435 appeals were received within the three-week appeals window, meaning that 41 percent of households that were initially not categorized as most vulnerable decided to appeal. 60 percent of these appeals were successful. As a result, 25% of households that were initially not categorized as most vulnerable ended up moving to a higher vulnerability category based on the appeals process.

² In the context of Uganda, it was assumed that caseworkers would, on average, be able to process 4-5 appeals per day, meaning 20-25 appeals per week and about 80-100 appeals per month, as long as appellant households could be easily located in the settlements. If an appellant household could not be easily located, coordination would be necessary with community representatives, which would lower the number of appeals that could be processed per day.

³ Note that a limited number of the appeals were likely linked to the fact that errors were made when creating the distribution lists at the beginning of targeting implementation. As a result of these errors, some vulnerable households were wrongly excluded from assistance.

INTAKE AND RESPONSE CHANNELS	UGANDA	RWANDA
	<p>Appeals intake channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFP partner help desks • UNHCR partner protection desks • WFP helpline • Interagency FRRM⁴ helpline (managed by UNHCR) • Protection caseworkers (receiving appeals from highly vulnerable households within the context of ongoing case management processes) <p>Response channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone call (by WFP helpline) • Help and protection desks (follow-up by appellant) • SMS • Protection caseworkers (informing highly vulnerable households within the context of ongoing case management) 	<p>Appeals intake channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint appeal desks (managed by UNHCR) • Local appeal helplines (managed by UNHCR) <p>Response channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint appeal desks (follow-up by appellant)
	NIGER	MAURITANIA
	<p>Appeals intake channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community complaint committees • Partner field staff (including help desks) • WFP helpline <p>Response channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community complaint committees • Partner field staff • Phone call (by WFP focal point at sub-office level) 	<p>Appeals intake channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNHCR registration office in M'bera camp • Mobile teams in host villages <p>Response channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home visits

⁴ Feedback, Referral and Resolution Mechanism

DATA MANAGEMENT, ANALYSIS AND REPORTING	UGANDA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Kobo intake form was used to record appeals. • proGres was used for registration and case management related follow-ups. • The regular analysis of appeals data was led by a joint data analyst (on a UNHCR contract), and Power BI was used for the presentation of key data trends. 	RWANDA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proGres was used to record appeals and facilitate registration and case management related follow-ups. • The regular analysis of and reporting on appeals data through monthly reports and later also Power BI was led by a UNHCR protection focal point.
	NIGER <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field staff recorded appeals in Excel, and this data was subsequently fed into WFP's SugarCRM data system to facilitate further follow-up. WFP helpline operators recorded appeals directly in SugarCRM. • The regular analysis of and reporting on appeals data was led by a WFP data analyst. 	MAURITANIA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeals were recorded using Kobo and subsequently fed into proGres. • Analysis of and reporting on the appeals data was led by the Joint Hub.

KEY STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	UGANDA	RWANDA
	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective to follow up on implementation exclusion errors (updating of relevant registration data) • Open-ended appeals window • Variety of channels used for sharing key messages as well as for receiving and responding to appeals 	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on implementation exclusion errors (updating of relevant registration data) • Open-ended appeals window • Variety of channels used for sharing key messages as well as for receiving appeals • Full transparency on eligibility criteria
	Areas for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on highly vulnerable non-eligible households • For future reprioritization exercises: initiation of appeals process before making changes to people’s assistance • Sustainable resourcing to ensure robust follow-up on appeals, including through household visits where necessary 	Areas for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on vulnerable non-eligible households • For future retargeting exercises: initiation of appeals process before making changes to people’s assistance • Diversification of response channels beyond self-follow-up by appellants at joint appeal desks
	NIGER	MAURITANIA
	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on implementation exclusion errors (verification of community-based selection of eligible households) • Appeals were received and responded to before making changes to people’s assistance • Open-ended appeals window • Variety of channels used for sharing key messages and for receiving and responding to appeals • Full transparency on eligibility criteria 	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on implementation exclusion errors (updating of relevant registration data) • Appeals were received and responded to before starting prioritized assistance distributions • Variety of channels used for sharing key messages and for receiving appeals
	Areas for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on highly vulnerable non-eligible households 	Areas for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on highly vulnerable non-eligible households • Provision of regular opportunities for appeals to be submitted • Sustainable resourcing to ensure robust follow-up on appeals, including through timely household visits where necessary