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Introduction

This inception note is the first deliverable of the study of the inclusion of pastoral populations in the Single National Register (SNR). It recalls the understanding of the mandate given by the sponsor, presents the process analysis protocol and the associated interview tools, but also the protocol for analysing and sampling the degree of inclusion of pastoral households.

# **UNDERSTANDING OF THE MANDATE AS PRESENTED IN THE TENDER**

## 1.1 Background and justification

Social protection covers a range of actions to address the socio-economic vulnerability of populations. There are two mechanisms that make up most social protection systems: contributory social insurance, which is financed by contributions, and non-contributory social assistance to support the most disadvantaged. Protection integrates several instruments including endogenous solidarity mechanisms and serves to prevent, manage and overcome difficult situations for populations (Grain de sel, N°79, 2020).

In sub-Saharan Africa, social protection systems have been built since colonisation and have gradually expanded at very different rates from one state to another (Dupuis and Fagnani, 2018)[[1]](#footnote-1). In Senegal, public social protection policy took a turn from 2012, following the political changeover. This new turning point is marked by the creation of a General Delegation for Social Protection whose mission is to take into account the requirements of increasingly diversified and complex social protection needs. Several programmes were launched, in particular a mechanism for universal health coverage and a national programme of family security grants in 2013. This dynamic cannot be disconnected from the growing interest, over the last two decades, of donors, international organisations, NGOs, etc. in promoting social safety net programmes. Thus, the budgets allocated by the States are increasing, and programmes are being initiated that are intended to complement national social protection policies. This does not fail to raise questions about the links between social protection systems and these diverse and disconnected social safety net initiatives and the possible generalisation of targeting registers; but these questions are not the subject of this study. However, all the promoters are based on the need for social protection to be a citizen's right and to be inclusive.

The General Delegation for Social Protection and National Solidarity (DGPSN), a dedicated structure, has the central mission of correcting cleavages and disparities by combining "the contributory" and "the non-contributory", "the formal" and "the non-formal", the central and the local level of the social protection system (National Social Protection Strategy document, 2016). The Single National Register (RNU) is a central tool of this institution and, the World Bank is the main supporter of the state in the implementation of this targeting instrument. The RNU is a dynamic database obtained through a process of identification and selection of households in poverty. Its main objective is to promote the efficiency and coordination of social services through a single mechanism for identifying and targeting the various populations eligible for these services (Ndiaye, Diop and Sarr, 2019). There are many targeting methods, all of which, in the context of social safety nets, aim to identify the relevant beneficiary profiles to receive social assistance. Targeting remains an issue in the context of development programmes. The methods and doctrines are analysed by many specialists (Escot, 2018, De Sardan, 2019) [[2]](#footnote-2)who draw attention to the cautions to be considered regarding the categories constituted.

Senegal's Single National Register adopts a poverty-based approach and aims to include all poor households regardless of their social group, source of income or geographical area. This approach has, in theory, the merit of being non-discriminatory. However, it remains complex to include mobile communities such as pastoralists because of the specificity of their economy and their mode of resource exploitation. Several studies on pastoral societies underline their invisibility with regard to public policies in general. In the field of social protection and the rapid deployment of social safety net programmes, the difficulty of their inclusion is increasingly apparent. Moreover, few studies have analysed the conditions for the inclusion of these mobile herders in social protection systems. This study aims to address this issue in the context of Senegal and the UNRD.

## 1.2 Objective of the study

***The objective of the study is to analyse the current process of building the Single National Register in Senegal and to measure its effective degree of inclusiveness in*** relation to vulnerable pastoral populations.

More specifically, this expertise aims to :

1. ***evaluate the process of UNR and the inclusion of pastoralists;***
2. ***to analyse and compare by sampling the current coverage of the social register with regard to the situation of pastoral populations in defined locations;***
3. ***to make recommendations to decision-makers and partners in the process initiated by the Government of Senegal to extend the RNU to the poorest and most vulnerable pastoral populations.***

This understanding of the mission will help answer these key questions in the end:

Q1. Does the targeting process (community identification, socio-economic survey) identify poor pastoralist households in the same way as other poor households? For a given area, does the RNU correctly reflect the proportion of poor pastoral households?

* Comparison of the % exclusion errors in the pastoral population with the % exclusion errors (based on LMP) in the non-pastoral population.
* Comparison of PMT score between RNU and non-RNU pastoralists.

Q2. What are the characteristics of pastoral households in the RNU? Do these characteristics meet the indicators of pastoral vulnerability?

* Comparison of socio-demo variables between RNU and non-RNU pastoralists.
* Comparison of the vulnerability score between RNU and non-RNU pastoralists.
* Critical analysis of the variables of the single sheet and reasonable proposal of adaptation for a future iteration of the RNU.

Q3. What are the potential biases that may lead to a lack of consideration of pastoral households in the process?

* Process evaluation (community identification, socio-economic survey).

## 1.3 Expected deliverables

Beyond the exchanges that will be organised with the main technical and financial partners of the implementation of the RNU, the animation, the elaboration of tools and approaches, as well as the animation of field activities, the products expected at the end of this expertise, must correspond to the five (5) following deliverables:

Deliverable 1: An inception report presenting the mapping of RNU households and the sampling and data collection protocol;

Deliverable 2 Interview guides, for focus group and field interviews, household survey questionnaire and planning of field activities;

Deliverable 3: The analysis report of the UNR process and its implementation.

Deliverable 4: The analysis report on the degree of inclusion of vulnerable pastoral populations (already delivered to the technical committee);

Deliverable 5: A final report of the study, with operational recommendations, validated by the technical committee (+ PowerPoint presentation).

Deliverables 1 and 2 are the subject of this document.

In relation to Deliverable 1, it was agreed to map the households already targeted by the RNU in the areas of concentration of mobile herders chosen for the study, which are the departments of Linguère, Dagana and Ranérou. Given the impossibility of accessing the geographical coordinates of households, we do not need to carry out the first spatial analysis, which would have provided an initial answer to the question of the representation of pastoral areas in the RNU. Nevertheless, an initial analysis of the RNU database was carried out.

# **Initial findings on vulnerable pastoralist households in the RNU database**

As stated, the area of concentration of pastoralists is the Ferlo. A preliminary analysis based on an extraction of data from the departments of Linguère, Ranérou and Dagana allows us to make some observations.

* ***Household incomes in these livestock areas are mainly from agricultural and off-farm activities***

Overall, in the four communes, the main sources of income are respectively non-agricultural and agricultural activities, except in the commune of Tesse kré where livestock farming comes second. This suggests that the targets surveyed in the RNU do not have livestock as their main activity. However, by definition, a pastoral household is one that derives most of its income from livestock activity.

* ***In livestock-raising communes, households without animals are over-represented***:

The average number of animals (cattle and small ruminants) is too low to consider households in the communes considered as pastoral.Indeed, whatever its level of poverty, a pastoral household must own animals. Several, if not all, of the typologies on the vulnerability of transhumant herders show numbers between 0 and 20 with holdings of more than 10 cattle. The endogenous categories of livestock endowment levels in pastoral areas consider those with fewer than 20 cattle and 50 small ruminants to be poor livestock keepers (smallholders).

There are several dimensions in the table. I suggest splitting it in two:

Table 1: Proportion of households with animals, by commune (N =)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Municipalities | Proportion |
| TESSEKERE |  |
| THIEL |  |
| MBANE |  |
| VELINGARA |  |

Table 2: Average number of types of animals per household, by commune

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of animal | TESSEKERE (n= 195) | THIEL (n=396) | MBANE (n=1303) | VELINGARA (n=851) |
| BOVINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| CAPRINS | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| OVINS | 5 | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| POULTRY | 7 | 9 | 7 | 4 |



Source:

These initial findings support the hypothesis that the inclusion of pastoral households in the RNU could be improved. Analysis of the targeting process and analysis of the degree of inclusion and exclusion by survey will provide more in-depth answers.

# **PROCESS ANALYSIS PROTOCOL**

The process analysis aims to characterise the conditions for inclusion of pastoral households in the RNU. This involves analysing the community targeting process, targeting methods, data collection tools, appeal/complaint mechanisms, etc. The team has started to interact with the RNU management and already has a first understanding of the framework of the system that is being put in place. It was decided to 1) set up a steering committee, 2) develop interview tools, 3) pre-identify the actors to be interviewed.

## 3.1 Setting up a technical steering committee

A first scoping meeting was held with the management of the RNU. It allowed for the discussion of the methodology proposed by ISRA-BAME and to exchange on the process. The operational mechanism of the DGPSN was presented by the RNU management. We agreed on the composition of the steering committee, which should be***made up of a member of the DGPSN, MEPA, ANSD, CSE, the World Bank, a member of the breeders' organisations and the research team (ISRA-BAME and PPZS).*** The RNU management will take the necessary steps to notify the institutions concerned in order to designate their representatives. The committee will hold its first meeting in xxxx to share the inception report once it is accepted by the study sponsor.

## 3.2 Dimensions addressed in the tools for analysing the process

The targeting process was carried out in two (2) stages: community-based targeting and the socio-economic survey. eBased on the analysis of targeting methods combining these two approaches[[3]](#footnote-3), the individual interview guides and focus groups address the following dimensions

With the state actors, designers of the RNU, the questions will be oriented on :

* Governance of the design (choice of targeting methods):Who are the actors in the design and what is the technical contribution of each? Are the targeting methods adapted to the particularities of the contexts (here taking into account the pastoral context)? Adaptation to local criteria (understood as criteria that characterise local poverty and vulnerability)? Assess how the degree of complexity of each method is envisaged, anticipated and managed during formulation?
* Governance of implementation: What are the procedures for mobilising and/or recruiting the staff used (selection and monitoring committee) for targeting? What are the procedures for technical and ethical training of staff? What are the monitoring procedures? Is the method consistent with the constraints ofthe local environment? What are the decision-making spaces/places in the different targeting processes? Who is involved? Who is not? Are all identified sites/villages effectively targeted and surveyed? Are there any neighbourhoods / hamlets within the villages that are omitted?
* Governance of community involvement (especially pastoral): How are communities involved in the targeting process? What is the role of elites in the targeting process? To what extent is the community approach and the involvement of community leaders and authorities effective? What place is given to women and potentially marginalised groups (social castes, specific ethnic groups, etc.) in the targeting process?

With relevant local stakeholders and resource persons, questions will be directed to these dimensions (idem, Escot, 2018):

* Community perception of social protection: How do the target populations view Senegal's social protection programmes? How are these programmes perceived in terms of equity and justice? In this context, how is the issue of targeting perceived by different social groups (elites, non-poor, poor, men, women, etc.)?
* Understanding of targeting: Are the methods known/understood? Access (in information, in understanding) to this type of consideration, which part of the population? What about others? Identify what differentiates the two targeting methods from the communities' point of view. Do communities understand their objectives? What are the perceived advantages and disadvantages? To what extent is the community-based approach and the involvement of community leaders and authorities accepted by the communities?
* Exclusion-inclusion redress mechanisms: What are the risks of capture by the elites? Are there proven risks of self-exclusion? If so, what are they linked to (stigmatisation, social structure, dependency relationships,...)? How do communities address exclusion/inclusion errors? Do communities know about complaint mechanisms? If so, do they use them?
* Recommendations for improvement: What alternative targeting criteria? What should be the composition of the selection and monitoring committees? Who should represent transhumant herders? How can the constraints of mobility be overcome?

## 3.3 The target actors for the interviews and focus groups :

The pre-identified actors are

* The General Delegation for Social Protection and National Solidarity (DGPSN) at the Ministry of Community Development, Social and Territorial Equitý,
* the Directorate of the Single National Register,
* The National Agency for Statistics and Demography (ANSD),
* local authorities (prefects, sub-prefects, governors and mayors) in the study areas,
* RNU social operators,
* the Ecological MonitoringCentre
* community relays,
* Village committees ;
* sub-samples of beneficiaries in the targeted communes;
* local organisations (women's groups, breeders' associations, etc.).

During the course of these interviews, other relevant actors may emerge, and they will be included in the interview protocol as far as possible.

# **THE SURVEY AND SAMPLING PROTOCOL**

## 4.1 Specificities of pastoral vulnerability justifying the adaptation of the socio-economic analysis

Vulnerability of Sahelian pastoralists is commonly defined as the exposure, sensitivity and reactivity of populations to a highly constrained environment. Pastoralists live and operate in an environment subject to risks and shocks of various forms (Wane et al., 2010). Climatic variability plays a central role in having a direct impact on the dynamics of natural resources, pushing herders to cope with spatio-temporal variations. International aid, in the event of a crisis, and targeted research, in a structural way, are regularly called upon on this subject (Ancey et al., 2009).

Climate change is also a factor that exacerbates economic, social, cultural and political disruptions (national and international food and feed price volatility, diseases, political instability, social transformations, etc.). Pastoralists are also confronted with lack of infrastructure and market uncertainties, which severely affect their livelihoods. They adapt their activities to these conditions by using mobility and diversification strategies to improve production and secure their livelihoods (Alary et al., 2015).

Multiple knowledge gaps limit the ability of policies to address the main constraints affecting the livestock and pastoralism sectors in Sahelian livestock countries.

Sometimes pastoralists engage in raising livestock species with short life cycles, which provide quick gains to escape poverty (Alary et al., 2015). In other contexts, they favour large ruminants that represent a long-term investment (Wane et al., 2010).

It should be noted that in a risky context, holding animals beyond a non-optimal marketing period corresponds to a form of contingency rationality (Wane et al, 2020). Imperfect and incomplete information on markets encourages pastoralists to adopt a cautious position, adapted to the circumstances and therefore contingent on their socio-economic environment (Wane, 2005; Wane et al., 2010). This explains why pastoralists are not in favour of 'regular destocking of animals' even if technical services encourage them to do so.

Thus, extensive systems cannot be measured solely in terms of endowments, as they are continuously evolving and adapting to an increasingly uncertain biophysical environment and a monetised world (Chambers, 1989; Van Dijk, 1997; Bovin, 2000; Ancey et al., 2009). This suggests that pastoral vulnerability should be analysed through several categories of indicators.

## 4.2 Different categories of pastoral vulnerability indicators

Indicators of pastoral vulnerability are divided into two categories, namely indicators related to covariant risks that affect all individuals in the same population and indicators related to idiosyncratic risks that do not affect all individuals in the same population. However, indicators specific to the socio-economic characteristics of the household are divided into two groups, namely endowment indicators and capacity or strategy indicators (Sen, 1981).

### 4.2.1 Vulnerability indicators related to covariant risks

* Covariant risks related to foreseeable natural phenomena

The use of these indicators in this study is considered less appropriate because this type of indicator is not intrinsic to pastoral households, but also impacts on all households in a given area. For information, the following are the related indicators.

Table 3: Vulnerability indicators related to covariant risks induced by foreseeable natural phenomena

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Themes | Indicators |
| Vegetation | Quantity and quality of late rainy season biomass |
| Climatic situation | Spatial and temporal evolution of climatic variables (rainfall, temperature, wind etc.) |
| Hydrological situation | Potential flow - groundwater and watercourses |
| Health situation (human and animal) | Number of disease outbreaks; vaccination rate |
| Livestock movements (transhumance) | Area attractiveness and emissivity indices (average number of herds entering the area and number of herds leaving the area) |

* Covariant risks related to unpredictable shocks

These unpredictable covariant risks refer to extreme events that negatively impact households and can occur at any time. For example, bushfires, out-of-season rains, borehole failure, and so on, fall into this category of risk. These risks are important in the context of pastoralist livestock and may be relevant to considerin the analysis of the survey data.

Table 4: Vulnerability indicators related to covariant risks induced by unpredictable shocks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Themes | Indicators |
| Bushfires | Number of bushfires per year |
| Drilling failure | Number of drilling failures per year |
| Out-of-season rains | Number of out-of-season rains per year |

### 4.2.2 Vulnerability indicators related to idiosyncratic risks

* Endowment indicators

Endowment indicators refer to variables intrinsic to households. These variables are accumulable and quantifiable, so they can change over time, both up and down. Information for calculating these indicators will be collected through the field survey of pastoralist households.

**Table 5: Staffing indicators related to idiosyncratic risks**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Themes** | **Endowment indicators** |
| Demographic data | Size, composition and structure of the herd (to be used in the calculation of the viability threshold by the UBT method) |
| Household size, composition and structure (to be used in the calculation of the viability threshold by the UBT method) |
| Household income | Pastoral households derive their income from five main sources: (i) agricultural activities (cereals and vegetables); (ii) livestock products; (iii) services to other activities and sectors; (iv) current transfers received; and (v) production for own use or self-consumption (ILO, 2003 cited by Wane et al., 2020). |
| Household facilities and access to basic social services | Equipment index by type of housing / Access to and use of basic social services (boreholes, markets, veterinary posts, vaccination parks, abattoirs, etc.) |
| Share capital | Levelof education; social networks of mutual support and solidarity; level of social inclusion or exclusion. |
| Agricultural base | Area owned and/or farmed; production equipment, agricultural production; level of diversification of crops. |
| Household resources | Average duration of self-consumption per year (cereals and milk); % of farmers with other activities; Animal and crop production (quantity, distribution, etc.) |

* Capacity / strategy indicators (entitlement)

Capacity or strategy indicators refer to the different coping strategies of pastoral households to deal with different circumstances in order to maintain their level of well-being. These strategies may change from one production system to another, but also from one context to another. The data to calculate these indicators will be collected through the field survey of pastoral households.

Table 6: Capacity indicators related to idiosyncratic risks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Themes | Enabling indicators (entitlement) |
| Livestock/grain markets | Terms of trade trend (cereals/livestock)  Households' level of market expectations |
| Changes in strategy | Feeding; watering; animal health; change in species composition of the herd; method of supplementation; use of wage labour; extent of monetisation; local diversification or migration / Fodder crops (types, area sown, quantity produced, destination of the product) / Feed storage capacity |
| External resources | Livestock loans; mutual aid; capture of external resources... |
| Livestock theft | Number of livestock thefts; strategies to curb livestock theft |
| Predators | Forms/types of predators; number of predator attacks; strategies to control predators. |
| Road accidents | Number of road accidents; strategies to avoid or limit accidents. |

After the presentation of all these indicators, it would be good to specify which ones will be taken into account in the study because some of them are difficult to measure.

### 4.2.3 Calculation of MTP (Multidimensional Livelihoods Test) scores

To our knowledge, there are five commonly used targeting methods:resource testing, geographic targeting, community targeting, self-targeting andthe Proxy Means Test (PMTThe resource testing method is very cumbersome as it requires income verification and the targeting methods are subject to criticism as they are done by designation. The proxy-means-test (PMT) method is based on national household surveys. Since household income in developing countries is often difficult and costly to measure accurately, this method relies on household assets and other explanatory variables to estimate household welfare. Moreoveruse ofsuch a methodto estimatethe welfare or probabilityofpastoral households being poorparticularly usefulinformaland/orself-productioneconomicactivitiesfor a high proportion of their income.This method relies on proxy variables. These variables can be indicators of pastoral vulnerability such as the viability threshold of the herd measured from the size of the household, the composition and structure of the household, human capital characteristics (such as the level and type of education of the head of the household, the schooling of children), the type of household housing, durable goods and productive assets (such as land or animals). The method is based on econometric regressions.

A regression is performed to find the variables that best explain the household's standard of living or welfare. Then the MTP uses the set of variables that best explainthe household's standard of living. Each explanatory variable is assigned a weight based on its estimated impact on living standards. Using the agreed weights, a score is calculated for each household. Households whose score is below the cut-off point are considered vulnerable.

However, a first problem in implementing a targeting programme is determining the right target. Indeed, there may be individuals or households that are wrongly excluded or included when they should not be. In order to address this possibility in the context of this UNRD, we will :

* First, apply the PMT method to the pastoral and non-pastoral population respectively and calculate the exclusion or inclusion error percentages in the said populations;
* Insecond phasesample households in the identified pastoral areas;
* Thirdly, calculate the LMP score of pastoral households on the basis of the sample survey we will carry out, using the pastoral vulnerability indicators mentioned above as explanatory variables in the regression.

In this second case, in order to select pastoral households, we first chose an area where mobile herders are concentrated, which is known for its diversity of locations and herding systems. This zone concerns the communes of *Vélingara* in Ranérou, *Tessekeré Forage* and *Thiel* in Linguère, and *Mbane* in Dagana, where the majority of pastoralists are concentrated. Next, we defined a variable that is strongly correlated with vulnerability for targeting pastoral households. This variable can then be household expenditure, taking into account the specificities of pastoral household expenses. This seems to be the most effective targeting method, as it allows vulnerable pastoral households to be reached directly and minimises inclusion or exclusion errors.

*In this study, we use the LMP score formula used in the LEAP framework[[4]](#footnote-4)and which has been used in several developing countries. Thuswelfare is approximated by annual per capita household consumption.* The variables used are the usual poverty criteria, indicators of vulnerability specific to pastoral households (covariant risks, idiosyncratic risks) and the adoption of coping strategies.

In this study, standard of living is approximated by annual consumption expenditure per head of a pastoral household. *The MTP assigns a 'score' to all households, based on information collected from households on all the indicators used in the calculation:*

*where S is the score, the indicator e and the weight of the indicator in the formula. The weights of the indicators are derived from the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimation of the logarithm of per capita consumption over the set of indicators selected in this study. The LMP allows for the selection of variables:*

* + *correlated with the standard of living of pastoral households,*
  + *easily measurable or observable,*
  + *difficult for households and individuals to handle.*

*The OLS method is generally used to predict well-being mainly due to convenience and ease of interpretation.*

*where is the standard of living indicator (in this case per capita consumption), is a set of characteristic household indicators correlated with the standard of living.*

*The weight of each indicator is its coefficient in the regression . The total score for each household is calculated as the constant, plus the weight of each indicator. The score reflects the predicted expenditure or welfare: the lower the score, the poorer the household. The scores are then used to identify vulnerable pastoralist households.*

### 4.2.4 Presentation of the questionnaire modules

The questionnaire used for the RNU targeting by the ANSD has been adapted to take into account the specificities of pastoral vulnerability. It is thus composed of the same revised modules and two additional modules on household income and expenditure. The questionnaire has not yet been finalised and will be adapted following the process analysis.

The preliminary questionnaire consists of the following modules:

As an indication, here are some modifications made to the ANSD's basic questionnaire

1. Location: addition ofgeographical coordinates of households

3. Housing and living conditions: we have adapted by eliminating some questions related to housing characteristics and added distances to basic social services and water and drinking facilities

4. Durable assets: addition ofwater conservation equipment

5. Household income: new module income from livestock (animal sales, milk sales, etc.), agricultural income (production sold, etc.), transfers received, income from other activities (marabout, trade, wage-earning, etc.)

6. Household expenditure: consumption expenditure, animal health expenditure, education, market anticipation (cereals)...

7. Food security: adding time for self-consumption of milk, cereals

## 4.2.5 Sampling method

#### 4.2.5.1 Study area

The study area, known as Ferlo, straddles several administrative regions of Senegal, including Louga, Saint-Louis and Matam. It is an area of concentration of mobile livestock breeders and is also known for its diversity of locations and livestock production systems. This area includes the three departments of Linguère, Ranérou and part of Dagana (Ferlo Nord), which are home to the majority of pastoralists who increasingly combine livestock with rain-fed agriculture (cereals and groundnuts), and one or two communes in the Lac de Guiers area (Ngnit, Keur Momar Sarr, Niassanté), where livestock systems coexist with irrigated farming. This zone covers an area of about 70,000 km2 and has 94,673 households practising livestock, i.e. 28% of households at national level (RGPHAE, 2013).

#### 4.2.5.2 Survey frame

In this study two sampling frames are used:

The RNU database: in this database, pastoral households will be drawn to make an initial analysis of their vulnerability profile;

The ANSD database of pastoral areas: this is used to target true pastoral areas to calculate the proportion of vulnerable pastoral households.

#### 4.2.5.3 Sample size calculation

The sample size (in terms of number of pastoral households) is set according to the formula for estimating a proportion.

The sample size formula for estimating a proportion is as follows:

Using a correction factor for small populations, equation (1) becomes :

Where:

N is the total number of pastoral households, equal to 6999 (the number of pastoral households in the communes of Velingara in Ranérou, Tess ekré and Thieul in Linguère and Mbane in Dagana, RGPH 2013, ANSD);

);

p is the proportion of vulnerable pastoral households. To ensure that the sample is representative, we set p=0.5 ;

e is the margin of error or accuracy level set at 5%.

is equal to 2.326 for α fixed with a threshold of 98% (two-tailed test);

Replacing the different values we obtain :

This represents 7.18% of the number of pastoral households in the four communes.

#### 4.2.5.4 Survey design

The method of drawing will be in two stages:

The first stage consists of drawing villages with unequal probabilities proportional to their size with a discount. i.

#### In the second stage, households are drawn with equal probability and without discount from the villages selected in the first stage. 4.2.5.5 The survey mechanism

The survey system will consist of interviewers and supervisors. For the selected sample, a team of 20 interviewers will be mobilised at a rate of two questionnaires per day. The preparation of the survey will require four days of training for the interviewers. A statistician will be mobilised to implement the questionnaire in the tablets, monitor the surveys, clean the database and process the data.

Congratulations on this well written document. There is a lot of useful information. Below are some general suggestions:

* Increase the line spacing of the text a little as it is difficult to read in this format.
* Better highlighting of title levels by spacing them out (I started by capitalizing title 1)

#### 4.2.5.6 Drawn sample

**Table7: Distribution of the sample by municipality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Regions | Departments | Municipalities | Number of households to be surveyed |
| MATAM | RANEROU | VELINGARA | 146 |
| LOUGA | LINGUERE | THIEL | 96 |
| SAINT-LOUIS | DAGANA | MBANE | 183 |
| LOUGA | LINGUERE | TESSEKRE DRILLING | 80 |
| Total |  |  | 505 |

# Timeline for further activities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tasks** | **Deadlines** | **Responsible for** |
| Start-up report | | |
| Delivery of the start-up report | 29May | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Feedback on the start-up report | 31 May-04 June | World Bank |
| Validation meeting ofthe inception report | 07 June | World Bank,ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Sharing the inception report, after validation, with the other members of the technical committee | 08 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Analysis of theUNRprocessand its:**Interviews and focus groups** | | |
| Interviews with RNU teamsat central and decentralised levels:  *the Directorate General for Social Protection and National Solidarity (DGPSN),Directorate of the Single National Register, the National Agency for Statistics and Demography (ANSD), local authorities (prefects, sub-prefects, governors and mayors) of the study areas,Ecological Monitoring Centre* | 10-11 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Focus groups with the population and key actors:*social operators, community relays, village committees, beneficiaries in the targeted communes* | 13-22 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Analysis of the degree of inclusionvulnerable pastoral populations:**Survey** | | |
| Finalisation and implementation of the questionnaire in the tablets (ODK) | 31 May - 10 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Testing of the questionnaires on the tablet by the researchers | 12 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Recruitment of interviewers | 07-09 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Training of interviewers and field testing of questionnaires with interviewers | 24-26 June | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Survey period | 28 June-12 July | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Clearance and data cleansing | 14-16 July | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Report writing | | |
| Editorial retreat | 26-31 July | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Finalisation of thefirstdrafts:(1) analysis of the RNU process and (2)degree of inclusionvulnerable pastoral populations | 02 August | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Feedback onthefirstdraftsand validation | 03-06 August | World BankandISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Workshop to share and validatethefirstdraftswith the World Bankand the other members of the technical committee | 09 August | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
| Drafting of the Final Report | 10-12 August | ISRA-BAME and PPZS |
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The annexes attached to this inception report are as follows:

Annex 1: Individual and group interview guides ;

Annexes 2: Household questionnaire ;

Appendix 3: List of sampled villages.
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