

## Summary of Round Table Discussion on Support to Vulnerable Households

10 May 2018

Many thanks to the 61 people that took part in the round table discussion on 10 May at Entrance Café, Bakhundole. The event was a preliminary discussion designed to gather information on ongoing and planned efforts from Partner Organisations for support to vulnerable households, and as a first step for establishing a working group on this topic that will work on the formulation of guidance for effective targeting and approaches for support to vulnerable households over the coming weeks.

### Basic Questions on Vulnerable Support

The first part of the round table discussion was focused on sharing of information around four basic questions. The questions, and responses from participants, were as follows:

- 1. What are the vulnerability criteria partners have been using to date? How do these align with the NRA criteria? During current programming, have vulnerable been specifically targeted for support? How?**
  - TPIS-ERP JICA approaching that vulnerable beneficiaries based on the criteria by NRA, through community mobilization program (CMP) and providing the special support by the mobile mason and technical assistance team.
  - Geo-Hazard displaced people
  - Marginalised groups
  - Elderly
  - Landless
  - Children only Households
  - Economically marginalized
  - Low income HHs - extremely poor
  - People with Disabilities
  - Chronically or terminally ill
  - Multi-Vulnerabilities
  - Dalits- Dalit Landless - Dalit Landless with Disabilities - layers of vulnerabilities
  - NRA list is broader and partners need to be more specific with respect to activities around defining vulnerabilities
  - Financially/economically poor households, that may not be covered in the list of specific vulnerability options
  - Coverage of Socially untouchable, economically poor & multi-land ownership cases should be included in Vulnerable group.
  - NRA does not have specific criteria and the list itself needs verification at the local level
  - The NRA list of vulnerable is not specific and detailed and their vulnerable support has to be customized.
  - “Better Brick Nepal”, program about behavioural change in brick industry & implying the modality in other industries like Bonded labour, child labour
  - Multiple vulnerability will increase the degree of vulnerability.
  - Families involved in bonded and child labour
  - Have been following and even have additional criteria

- Through model house
- Additional 50,000 as support

**2. How are partners approaching the use of the NRA lists of vulnerable households, vulnerability criteria, and approach to vulnerable support?**

- Entrepreneurship Development Approach
- Livelihood Integration Approach- Housing with other work
- Advocacy
- Information Dissemination among local elected representatives
- VFP Approach - Vulnerable Focal Point Approach
- Rural Livelihood
- WASH
- HHs integrated with their aspects
- Use Vulnerability HHs, as model house for training
- Not being scattered across too many villages
- Use of available government support
- Discussion, reporting and preparation of proposal: Methodology, Resources, Target setting, Timeline
- High cost of houses
- Implementation
- Coordination, monitoring, and project review

**3. What are the main challenges for partners implementing vulnerable support?**

- Accessibility
- Access to livelihood and income generation activities
- Actual identification of vulnerable HHs
- Skill development for overall livelihood
- Facilitation to link vulnerable group to govt. support
- Need special provision/individual support system
- Technology adaptation (like for blind)- adaptive and accessible tools
- Grant of 300,000+50,000 - not enough
- Inclusive facilities - design & construction -TA alone is not enough for vulnerable support
- No provision for Unconditional Cash support to vulnerable HHs
- Geographical difficulties/accessibility for material transportation
- Additional beneficiaries outside of NRA list - those who are vulnerable
- Need more technical support coverage in unreachable areas
- The beneficiaries list provided by local government structure is politically biased
- Most vulnerable are always excluded from direct support- despite complaint mechanisms being active
- Giving financial access to brick kiln workers
- Difficulty in having common consensus on beneficiary lists- resulting to conflict
- Community led beneficiary selection is the most accepted approach by beneficiaries
- Diversified needs of vulnerable households
- Affordable access to financial subsidy
- Community behaviours towards vulnerable households

- Consistency, adequacy and uniformity of assistance for vulnerable households among different communities
- Sustainability factors
- Caring and counselling of the vulnerable households
- Technical understanding/Knowledge
- Geographically dispersed vulnerable households and challenges around construction management
- Quality assurance
- The tranche will only be sufficient to build a one room home
- The approach should be versatile
- One modality may not fit all, also the process might differ accordingly
- Different vulnerabilities have different needs
- Information Gap (Accessible format for blind)
- Sufficient information dissemination among most affected communities
- Advocacy to local government on information dissemination.
- Vulnerable people displaced by hazard 'lost land' because of their status
- NRA Still in process in survey
- List will be discussed and finalised at the Municipality level
- Coordination with local NRA body
- NRA criteria are not specific or detailed
- Different vulnerable people need different support and its very blanket approach, challenge how approach is customised
- Elderly female headed household, IDP, PWDs, extreme poor
- One of the challenges is there are still vulnerable beneficiaries which is not listed in NRA vulnerable beneficiaries list.
- Very elderly people does not want to reconstruct their houses.
- Social Vulnerability
- Multi ownership / Poor Education status
- To provide a support to the families who are landless but not more than for three generations.
- Senior Citizen 70 + should they get individual houses or care guinea residence.
- Livelihood not considering in all DRR programs.
- Accessible reconstruction still not in practice in individual household though we are forcing to the vulnerable community / individual.
- No Provision for the unconditional cash support to vulnerable household. (Single women headed household, Senior Citizens household)
- Landless issues
- Beneficiary not available at field
- Limited access to banks and technical assistance
- Delay in disbursement of tranches. Families have waited more than 6 months for 2nd and 3rd tranches

**4. What modalities of vulnerable support have been successful to date? Is there anything other than cash, Socio-Technical Assistance (STA), and in-kind support?**

- Identification of vulnerable people from the community
- Discussion between member of local bodies, CBRC, and the community to support
- In kind support to construction worker- Better brick Nepal (Global Fairness Initiative)- has been able to abolish child labour in brick industry & address the issues on acceptance using better bricks free from any sort of labour issues.
- On site supervision - dedicated team
- Social mobilisation
- Material support
- On-site technical support
- Community Driven Approach
- Involvement of Community Committees and Local leaders
- Dedicated team for STA
- Cash for work
- Cash intervention and training
- Materials and technical support to vulnerable
- Constructing full house by organisation
- Inclusive vulnerable capacity assessment
- Vulnerable focal point approach (VFP)
- Social protection
- Should promote catalytic and win-win program
- Integration of livelihood program
- One - Stop Crisis management centres and referral pathways
- Gender responsive public spaces
- Make the construction plan
- Construction support from the mobile mason
- Inspection support and technical assistance from TA team and DLPIU engineer

## Break Out Sessions

The breakout sessions in the second part of the session were focused on taking a more in-depth look at the options for support to vulnerable households in terms of cash support, in-kind support, socio-technical assistance, and market / livelihood initiatives. Each group was asked to list the different modalities / approaches that have been used, identify which are the most impactful of these, and to list the challenges / barriers specific to the type of support they were focused on. The framing questions for each break out group, and the results from the groups are presented below:

- How is **cash** best used to support the vulnerable? What are the different cash modalities being used already, and what has had the most impact? What have you found are the primary factors preventing vulnerable for rebuilding safer homes?

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using Cash for Work/Livelihood</li> <li>• Conditional cash grants</li> <li>• Unconditional cash grants</li> <li>• Timely Grants</li> <li>• Close Monitoring</li> <li>• Cash to suppliers (vendors)</li> <li>• Cash for Voucher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cash is flexible approach. Cash is not enough but it is necessary.</li> <li>• Cash intervention with social mobilization are effective.</li> <li>• On the job training with demo house construction for vulnerable HHs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government to take more responsibility of 18,505 most vulnerable HHs. Government is supporting 90 percent to household reconstruction support and only 10 percent households are supported by NGO in terms of Tranche disbursement and TA. Government has been constructing house for marginalised and vulnerable people in all district through Janata Awas program.</li> <li>• Timing of cash transfer is very challenging in targeting.</li> <li>• 50 thousand top-up is not sufficient as different vulnerability might need different types of support.</li> <li>• Targeting/Selection of vulnerable beneficiaries.</li> </ul>

- How is **in-kind** support best used to support the vulnerable? What are the different in-kind support modalities being used already, and what has had the most impact? What have you found are the primary factors preventing vulnerable for rebuilding safer homes?

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target approach for most vulnerable</li> <li>• Special package for children, lactating mothers, people with disabilities</li> <li>• Modification / design of the house to make accessible for PWD, stationery to children</li> <li>• Access to shelter- making it accessible for the people with disabilities</li> <li>• Construction materials support along with labour</li> <li>• MoU with community - training Supervision</li> <li>• Outsourcing the resources and accessing the local market</li> <li>• Software support through house construction management support and training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to local market</li> <li>• Market assessment</li> <li>• Livelihood support along with reconstruction</li> <li>• Agricultural input</li> <li>• Animal / livestock support for income generation</li> <li>• Micro-finance</li> <li>• One stop crisis management centres and referral pathways</li> <li>• Gender responsive public spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social vulnerability</li> <li>• Multi-ownership, poor economic Status</li> <li>• Senior citizens - 70+ (should be provided individual house or care giving residencies)</li> <li>• Livelihood not included in all DRR programmes</li> <li>• Socially untouchable, ultra poor, multi land ownership case to be involved in vulnerable groups</li> </ul>

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hardware support -promoted materials are available in local market, better transportation, local resource management</li> <li>• Support PWD linking with services</li> <li>• Entrepreneur/business start up support</li> <li>• Linking with financial institution</li> <li>• Social protection</li> <li>• Workers training for brick workers</li> </ul>		

- How is **Socio-Technical Assistance (STA)** best used to support the vulnerable? What are the different STA modalities being used already, and what has had the most impact? What have you found are the primary factors preventing vulnerable for rebuilding safer homes?

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support through the process</li> <li>• Grant Application/Documentation</li> <li>• Drawing Design</li> <li>• Continuous Construction Supervision</li> <li>• Identification of labour and market</li> <li>• Affordable access to grants</li> <li>• Coordination with concerned authorities</li> <li>• Effective communication</li> <li>• Involvement of other community Members (CBRCs)</li> <li>• Cost effective Design option</li> <li>• Salvage Materials</li> <li>• Customised designs</li> <li>• Indigenous materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Door to door assistance</li> <li>• Integration of socio technical assistance with other direct support such as CASH, In kind etc.</li> <li>• Community and HH awareness through community members, CBRC and mobile masons.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance</li> <li>• Access to information</li> <li>• Don't have able family members</li> <li>• Lack of human resources</li> <li>• Different rules/regulations in the municipalities</li> <li>• Access to labour (vulnerable HHs will not be able to pay)</li> <li>• Lack of advocacy about vulnerable groups</li> <li>• First tranche already spent</li> <li>• Migrant labourers working without training.</li> <li>• STA alone is not sufficient and must be integrated with other support.</li> </ul>

- How can **Market and Livelihood support** be used to support the Vulnerable? What are the different market/livelihood modalities being used already and what has the most impact?

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child labour free material production (bricks, cement, steel)</li> <li>• Aggregate - crushers, stone breakers</li> <li>• Allow for safer and cheaper labour</li> <li>• Better working environment</li> <li>• Recommend small scale industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic / livelihood support in addition to STA, in-kind, cash support</li> <li>• Integrating livelihoods with recovery and reconstruction.</li> <li>• Entrepreneur/business start-up support linked with local market</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRA deadline</li> <li>• Can't sell products effectively</li> <li>• Takes time to create entrepreneur</li> <li>• Poor quality construction due to rush of the deadline</li> </ul>

Different Modalities/Approaches Used	Most Impactful	Challenges / Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GoN to enforce guidelines on purifying waste before disposing in different locations including rivers and dumping sites.</li> <li>• Economic / livelihood support in addition to STA, in-kind, cash support</li> <li>• Focus to be given to additional 18 districts as well with this approach</li> <li>• Small scale livelihood support, Home/Kitchen Garden</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High price of materials and labour</li> <li>• Trained women mason to become contractors</li> </ul>

### Working Groups and Next Round Table

The participants agreed that there should be a working group formed with the objective of formulating guidance for effective targeting and approaches for support to vulnerable households. 13 organisations<sup>1</sup> signed up too be part of the working group and nominated an experience programme person to represent them in the group. The first meeting of the working group is taking place on Tuesday, 15 May and the agenda points are reflection on preliminary round table discussion on 10 May, setting objectives and timeline for the working group, defining roles and responsibilities (Lead and Co-lead) of working group members, and AOB. The focal points for the working group within HRRP are Minar Thapa Magar, [minar@hrrpnepal.org](mailto:minar@hrrpnepal.org), and Rupa Pandey, [meal@hrrpnepal.org](mailto:meal@hrrpnepal.org).

It is expected that the next round table discussion on support to vulnerable households will take place in two weeks, and will be focused on reviewing the outputs at that point from the working group.

<sup>1</sup> UNDP, ASF Nepal, Habitat for Humanity Nepal, Build Up Nepal, Humanity and Inclusion Nepal, NSET, CRS Nepal, DFID, CARE Nepal, Swiss Contact, Build Change, Practical Action, and NRA