

Research Terms of Reference

Accountability to Affected Population (AAP) – Community perceptions tracking

Research Cycle ID SSD1905

South Sudan

January 2019

Version 1

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

Country of intervention	South Sudan		
Type of Emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural disaster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conflict
Type of Crisis	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sudden onset	<input type="checkbox"/> Slow onset <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	DFID Department for International Development		
Project Code	32iAIE		
Overall Research Timeframe (from research design to final outputs / M&E)	01/02/2019 to 28/02/2020		
Research Timeframe Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)	1. Start collect data: 01/05/2019		5. Preliminary presentation: 15/06/2019
	2. Data collected: 31/05/2019		6. Outputs sent for validation: 15/06/2019
	3. Data analysed: 05/06/2019		7. Outputs published: 20/06/2019
	4. Data sent for validation: 05/06/2019		8. Final presentation: 30/06/2019
Number of assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	Single assessment (one cycle)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Multi assessment (more than one cycle) 4 cycles (one baseline with data collection May 2019 followed by an assessment once every three months, with the exception of the second tracking, which will be done after two months : July 2019, October 2019 and January 2020)	
Humanitarian milestones Specify what will the assessment inform and when e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;	Milestone		Deadline
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Donor plan/strategy	29/02/2020
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	--/ /----
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cluster plan/strategy	--/ /----
	<input type="checkbox"/>	NGO platform plan/strategy	--/ /----
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Specify):	--/ /----
Audience Type & Dissemination Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience	Audience type		Dissemination
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting)

		X Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]	
Detailed dissemination plan required	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
General Objective	<i>To strengthen accountability of humanitarian actors to affected populations in South Sudan by providing an evidence base on affected populations' perception of humanitarian assistance</i>		
Specific Objective(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess awareness of humanitarian service delivery among affected populations 2. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding the relevance of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models 3. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding fairness of humanitarian service delivery 4. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors 5. Quarterly monitoring of these perceptions to understand how these perceptions change over time over a year period. 		
Research Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the level of awareness among the affected populations about the humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled? 2. What is the perception of affected populations on types of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models? 3. What is the perception of affected populations regarding the level of fairness in current humanitarian service delivery? 4. How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors 5. How do perceptions of humanitarian assistance change over time (quarterly basis) over a year period? 		
Geographic Coverage	<i>South Sudan, all 10 States</i>		
Secondary data sources	<p>Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (CDAC) Network. Global Frameworks and Commitments on Communication and Community Engagement, 2018.</p> <p>Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance. Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability. 2014.</p> <p>Emergency Capacity Building Project, Impact Measurement and Accountability in Emergencies, 2007</p> <p>Humanitarian Outcomes, Evaluation of WFP Polices on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts, May 2018.</p>		
Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in camp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IDPs in informal sites
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in host communities	<input type="checkbox"/> IDPs [Other, Specify]
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in camp	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees in informal sites
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in host communities	<input type="checkbox"/> Refugees [Other, Specify]
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Host communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] Returnees
Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geographical: hard-to-reach settlements across ten (former) states	<input type="checkbox"/> Group #: _ _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
			<input type="checkbox"/> [Other Specify] #: _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

		Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Threshold for reporting at county-level: at least 5% of settlements in a given county must have been assessed.		
Data collection tool(s)	X	Structured (Quantitative)	X	Semi-structured (Qualitative)
	Sampling method		Data collection method	
Structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i>	X Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		X Key informant interview (Target #): 1300 X 4¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Group discussion (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Household interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Direct observations (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i>	X Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #): 30 X Focus group discussion (Target #): 15 Individual interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Data management platform(s)	X	IMPACT	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNHCR
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]		
Expected output type(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Situation overview #: __	X	Report #: 01
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Final) #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Interactive dashboard #: _	<input type="checkbox"/>	Webmap #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify] #: __		
Access	X	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)		
Visibility <i>Specify which logos should be on outputs</i>	DFID, REACH			

¹ 1300 per round for four rounds: 1 baseline and 3 follow-up monitoring rounds

2. Rationale

2.1. Rationale

As highlighted in May 2016 at the World Humanitarian Summit, Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)² is a key theme, with a dedicated commitment of a ‘participation revolution’ included in the Grand Bargain to ensure that people receiving aid are included in the decision-making processes that affect their lives. The Grand Bargain outlines a number of core components of ‘participation’ and urges humanitarian actors to adhere to principles such as ‘Adapt our action based on the feedback received’, ‘Act based on what we’ve heard’, ‘Receive feedback on how our response is received’. In reflection of this commitment, the [2018 South Sudan HRP](#) put AAP as a central strategy element.

However, in South Sudan, as of October 2018 there has been no comprehensive attempt to capture perceptions of humanitarian service delivery amongst the communities served, which inhibits the extent to which humanitarian responders can adjust and tailor their programming to a more community-centred approach. REACH, Internews and the CDAC network went some way to begin looking into this topic in early 2017 - first research exists on the appropriate channels of communication and dissemination of information to crisis-affected communities in South Sudan through [REACH’s Media Landscape Guide](#) that was developed together with the CDAC network in August 2017. Building on this research and lessons from similar initiatives in [Nepal](#) and [Somalia](#), and in close collaboration with the Community Engagement Working Group (CEWG), REACH will undertake an indicative mixed methods baseline study of perceptions of humanitarian service delivery and access to relevant information. The aim of this research is to inform the humanitarian response on community perceptions of service delivery to enable a more community-centered and responsive approach. The study will draw on REACH’s extensive field presence in South Sudan, using its 15 field sites and sites accessed through the monthly Area of Knowledge data collection.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

The data collection for this research project will rely heavily on REACH’s existing **Area of Knowledge** data collection structure, for which complete Terms of Reference can be accessed [here](#). Data collection will be conducted in **two stages**, the first being entirely quantitative and the second entirely qualitative. The qualitative data collection component will be structured to be interactive and to involve feeding back preliminary results from the quantitative data analysis back to the communities in order to gather their feedback on REACH’s findings.

Quantitative data collection through the AAP module will be piloted during the April 2019 monthly Area of Knowledge data collection cycle and will serve as a baseline. The exercise will be repeated 3 times – once every three months, hence in July 2019, October 2019 and January 2020, providing the ability to track changes or fluctuations in perceptions over an entire year.

The first round of qualitative data collection will take place in REACH field bases in June and will be made up of Focus Group Discussions where participants will be asked questions that will provide more context and nuance to the answers provided in Area of Knowledge quantitative data. In the spirit of CwC, the FGDs will include a second component where the Assessment Officer (AO) will feedback the preliminary results and analysis of the quantitative data collection to the participants and ask them for feedback on this analysis: whether they agree / disagree / etc. This step will serve to ensure active participation of the communities beyond data collection itself, with an opportunity to shape and orient the analysis of the data collected. Alongside the FGDs with communities, the REACH Assessment team will be interviewing aid actors in Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) during each field visits. These KIIs will be selected purposively – they will be Project Managers

² Defined by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee as “Accountability to affected populations is an active commitment to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organisations seek to assist.”

(PMs) who have a specific insight into operational constraints in the context of South Sudan, and challenges / best practices in terms of mainstreaming Accountability to Affected Populations in the project cycles.

As the theme of the research (Accountability to Affected Populations) is relevant to all humanitarian partners operating in South Sudan, the design of the tools will be conducted through an inclusive participatory process in order to build early buy-in for the outputs among key partners. Meetings will be held with key members of CCEWG in Juba as well as with the WASH and shelter/NFI clusters who have a AAP sub-group, and with M&E offices of key agencies in order to ensure a broad consensus surrounding the indicators to be tracked through this research. Following the first round of quantitative data collection, preliminary findings will be presented at the CCEWG as well to the communities via interactive FGDs, and as such, questions may be lightly edited ahead of subsequent data collection exercises in case the community / end users of the products feel like questions should be added / modified to better capture answers.

3.2 Population of interest

In recognition of the urgent need for data from non-formal camp settings to improve the understanding of the humanitarian context in South Sudan, this research will focus on – while not being restricted to IDP and host community populations in hard-to-reach or inaccessible areas in Greater Upper Nile, Greater Equatoria and Greater Bahr el Ghazal. For the purpose of this assessment, hard-to-reach areas are defined as those areas of the country that are not regularly accessible either due to poor infrastructure, active conflict or humanitarian access restrictions, or a combination of these.

Data is collected at the lowest possible administrative unit – individual settlements – as derived from the OCHA settlement dataset (in which a settlement represents a village or neighbourhood in a defined urban area), to ensure that the area for which KIs are providing information corresponds directly to their actual area of knowledge, thereby mitigating unfounded deductions. Moreover, reporting and collection of data at the settlement level is driven by the absence of a common operational dataset on payam and bomas (higher administrative levels). The level of coverage (proportion of settlements assessed in a given county/state) will be declared for each product when results are presented. County-level reporting in which less than 5% of settlements have been assessed will be not be included in published REACH products to ensure a minimum threshold for data collection coverage. While coverage of settlements varies from one month to the other, REACH has a system in place to ensure coverage consistency at the payam level (more details below).

3.3 Secondary data review .

REACH will conduct a thorough desk review of existing AAP norms and declarations of intention by global clusters, country-based clusters, individual UN Agencies, INGO and NNGOs operating in South Sudan. Existing assessments of AAP in South Sudan and in other countries will also be reviewed to ensure a comprehensive overview of AAP in different operational contexts and assess existing attempts at evaluating perceptions of humanitarian service delivery.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

Stage 1: For the purpose of producing the initial AAP Quantitative baseline, quantitative data will be collected across 15 field locations (Table 1) in May 2019 through a structured multi-sector survey tool that captures settlement-level information on displacement, FSL, WASH, Shelter, Nutrition, Protection, Education, and Health (REACH's Area of Knowledge tool) and can be used in both direct as well as remote data collection. A Module on AAP will be added in the AoK monthly tool, and will be incorporated into the tool on the first month of every quarter starting in May 2019. The tool is available in Dinka, Nuer, Arabic as well as English, with data collected on mobile phones through the Open Data Kit application (Kobo Toolbox).

At the end of each data collection day, the forms are uploaded to the Kobo server, after which the datasets are merged, cleaned and uploaded to the REACH/IMPACT server on a daily basis. Data is collected by enumerators who are supervised by Field Coordinators who in turn are managed by Assessment Officers. Before the start of data collection each morning, enumerators are briefed by Field Coordinators based on the data cleaning process of the previous day (described in the next section) to ensure appropriate coverage, debrief on any potential data collection errors and achieve the highest quality in data collection.

Table 1: Overview data collection sites

Geographical region	(Former) State	Data collection base location
Greater Equatorias	Eastern Equatoria	Kapoeta Town
	Central Equatoria	Juba – remote phone calling
	Western Equatoria	Yambio Town
Maridi Town		
Greater Upper Nile	Unity	Nyal Town
		Bentiu PoC
		Jamjang Town
	Jonglei	Akobo Town
		Bor PoC + Bor Town
	Upper Nile ⁵	Akobo Town
Malakal PoC		
Greater Bahr el Ghazals	Western Bahr el Ghazal	Wau PoC + IDP Collective Sites
	Northern Bahr el Ghazal	Aweil Town
	Warrap	Wau PoC – remote phone calling
	Lakes	Mingkaman Spontaneous Settlement

The rationale underpinning the AoK sampling methodology rests the level of humanitarian access to a geographic area and the level of access to the population of interest within a geographic area, which is driven by to what extent the displacement context is – a. Dynamic (high levels of population movement) or b. Stable (low levels of population movement) Appropriate data collection methods will depend on both access and population movements, with sampling being purposive, direct when access is greater and, purposive but remote, as access decreases. Where sufficient access is unavailable for a given geographic area, remote data collection methodologies can be employed to ensure that information can be collected on a population of concern to meet the identified research questions.

Given the dynamic and fast-moving nature of the South Sudan crisis, nearly all data collection, falls within the “no access” and “restricted access” parameters, which means in practice the two following purposive sampling methods will be employed:

- Direct KI interviews: Key informants who have knowledge (defined as direct contact with persons living in the settlement in the last month) of a remote-settlement will be interviewed. KIs in this category are expected to be i) newly arrived IDPs, ii) itinerants (traders, NGO officials), and/or iii) individuals who have regular phone/satellite/radio communication with individuals living in the settlement.

- Remote KI interviews through phone calling: REACH will directly interview KIs living in settlements (understood as camp or non-camp settlements) of interest, through phone calling from Juba.

KIs are selected through snowball sampling, with each KI recommending additional respondents at the conclusion of each interview. As data collection continues on a monthly basis, it is anticipated that the number of KIs per settlement will increase over time, therefore improving the reliability of data over time.

The selection criteria for a KI, applicable to any KI type, is that s/he has knowledge of a remote settlement from within the last month to ensure that gathered information is up-to-date. These KIs are typically recently displaced persons, traders, or persons who have travelled from hard to reach area to access the market. KIs report on the settlement level. A minimum of one KII per settlement is required, and teams will seek to avoid more than 5 KIIs per settlement in order to avoid inefficiencies.

Stage 2: Qualitative data collection tools on AAP will be used to triangulate information collected as part of the quantitative baseline exercise (the initial quantitative data collection exercise, in May 2019), as well as to explore certain themes in more detail. FGDs will be conducted by Field Coordinators and/or Assessment Officers in each bases with affected populations who have received humanitarian assistance, with FGDs typically separated by gender of participants. Additionally, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) will be conducted with aid workers who have experience in AAP operationalization in order to identify practical obstacles faced on the ground, with the goal of identifying what additional resources practitioners feel like they would need in order to enhance their organization's accountability. This KII will also gather their perspective on examples of best practices.

For FGDs, a purposive sampling approach will also be employed. Field coordinators will seek out people with knowledge of the county in question. Using this tool information can be collected at both the settlement as well as county (or sub-county) level. In the majority of cases this tool is used to look at wider county-level AAP issues, with participants purposively selected according to their origin in a specific county, ensuring that key population centres from a county are represented in the FGD. Depending on the county of interest, participants are either new arrivals, traders or host community members. The tool will be shared with AAP partners for review.

For the KIIs with aid workers, the targeting participants will be seasoned aid workers based in the field who have been involved in AAP related work, especially project managers who have had to operationalize AAP component of a project, or else field staff who work on M&E or Post-Distribution Monitoring.

Stage 3 the second stage of data collection will replicate the same methodology as the first stage in order to provide an update to the quantitative baseline that will have been produced during the first Stage (trends monitoring). Data collection will therefore consist of remote KI interviews in REACH's 15 field bases through a structured multi-sector survey tool to which an AAP module will be incorporated. REACH will track changes in key AAP indicators after every quarter follow the initial data collection until four data collection cycles have been completed.

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

Data quality and cleaning of quantitative data: Every day, at the end of data collection, the surveys are uploaded on the REACH/IMPACT Kobo-server and downloaded in .xls format as one dataset for a specific site. This dataset is cleaned during the evening, logging deleted entries and value changes, whilst the raw dataset is also stored. Assessment Officers oversee Field Coordinators, who are in turn responsible for data quality assurance and the supervision of field teams.

The following protocols are in place to ensure the quality of data collected:

- Weekly spot checks of enumerators conducting interviews
- Daily data cleaning by Field Coordinators, who identify outliers, abnormalities and logical inconsistencies and give regular feedback to enumerators through monthly and ad-hoc trainings, during spot checks as well as the daily

morning brief. Data points which can't be resolved through discussions with enumerators are deleted and when records (surveys) have more than three mistakes, the entire record is deleted from the dataset.

- Weekly data cleaning by Assessment Officers, who review data cleaning conducted by Field Coordinators and provide additional feedback to the data collection teams in the form of re-training.

- Data aggregation and cleaning is conducted by GIS/Data Management Officers in Juba at the end of each data collection exercises, who provide feedback on outliers and common mistakes, which inform the design of the next debriefs and enumerator trainings for the next monthly data collection exercise. After all datasets are cleaned, the raw and cleaned dataset, along with the data cleaning log, will be saved and stored in a clearly labelled folder (see data management plan)

For the qualitative data, all FGD transcripts will be written up and stored in a clearly labelled folder or server.

Quantitative data aggregation: Given more than one quantitative survey may be collected on a given settlement, data from key informants reporting on the same settlement is aggregated to the settlement level using a R script which employs the following logic to calculate settlement-level responses. For more details on data aggregation, see the [complete Terms of Reference for Area of Knowledge](#).

Data validity and trends analysis over time (Quantitative data)

In order to achieve the trends analysis component of this project on key AAP indicators, coverage must be comparable from month to month so that similar settlements are analysed. Although REACH largely assess different settlements every month, there is a system in place to ensure that the data is comparable at the payam level. Since payams are the unit of service provision within an area, this is the unit that will be used for determining the degree of similarity in a county over time.

To determine the degree of similarity over time, the unique number of payams throughout the comparison period will be used as a baseline. This value will be multiplied by the number of months being compared to represent the maximum number of payams that can be assessed. The achieved score will take the sum of the number of payams covered each month. For a payam to qualify for this analysis, at least one settlement must have been assessed from it across the months that are being analysed.

For a county to qualify for trend analysis, it must obtain a score of 70% or greater over the time period.

$$\text{Consistency Coverage} = \frac{\text{All Assessed Payams score (over a period of time)}}{\text{Total possible assessed Payams score(over a period of time)}}$$

4. Roles and responsibilities

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Research design	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	DFID, CEWG
Supervising data collection	Assessment Officer	Assessment Officer	GIS Officer	Assessment Manager, IMPACT
Data processing (checking, cleaning)	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager, GIS	GIS Officer, IMPACT HQ	Assessment Manager
Data analysis	Assessment Officer	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	GIS Officer
Output production	Assessment Officer	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	GIS Officer, DFID
Dissemination	Assessment Officer, Assessment Manager	Assessment Manager	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	DFID
Monitoring & Evaluation	Communications Manager	Communications Manager	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	DFID
Lessons learned	Assessment Officer	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager, IMPACT HQ	DFID

Responsible: the person(s) who executes the task

Accountable: the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone

Consulted: the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented

Informed: the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed

5. Data Analysis Plan

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED WITH SEMI-STRUCTURED TOOL(S)

FGD WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Research questions	SUBQ #	Sub-question	Questionnaire QUESTION	Probes	Data collection method	Key disaggregations (Group types)
1. How much are affected communities aware of humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled?	1.1	Are people receiving enough information about humanitarian assistance to which they are entitled?	Do people in your area usually feel like they are receiving enough information about the assistance that is available to them?	What are challenges? What information are people lacking? Probe for challenges specific to women & disabled persons	KI interview	Gender Disability Age
	1.2	What are the most effective communication channels to spread relevant information about available assistance?	What are the communication strategy that are the most effective at spreading information about available humanitarian assistance in your area?	Loudspeakers, poster campaigns, door to door messaging, loudspeaker, radio messaging campaign, town hall meetings... Probe for people with hearing or visual disabilities, age groups, gender....	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
2. What is the perception of affected populations on relevance types of interventions and beneficiary targeting models	2.1	Do most people feel consulted enough by humanitarian actors at all stages of the project?	Do most people in your area feel like they are being consulted enough by humanitarian actors at all stages of the project (before, during, after)?	Women? Disabled people? Young people? Elderly?	KI interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.2	How do most people prefer to be consulted?	Do you have examples of instances where the community felt consulted enough?	Before project? During? After? Do you have examples of instances where the community did not feel consulted enough?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age

	2.3	Do most people feel like their views are properly incorporated in the design of projects once they have been consulted?	Do most people in your area feel like their views are usually being considered and incorporated in the design of projects once they have been consulted?	If not, why? Do you have specific examples? If yes, how? Do you have specific examples?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.4	Do most people feel like the assistance they receive makes them more self-reliant and autonomous?	Do most people in your area usually feel like the assistance they receive makes them more self-reliant and autonomous?	If yes, how? If not, what are examples of typical obstacles that prevent becoming more autonomous?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.5	Are most people satisfied with the assistance that is being delivered? If not, what are the main reasons for dissatisfaction with humanitarian assistance in your area?	Are most people satisfied with the assistance that is being delivered? If not, what are the main reasons for dissatisfaction with humanitarian assistance in your area?	Does not target the right beneficiaries? Insufficient? Not what is most needed? Unsustainable? Most of the community is not aware that the services exist? Most of the community is not aware how to access the services?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
3. How do affected populations perceive the level of fairness in current humanitarian service delivery	3.1	Has humanitarian service delivery ever fuelled tensions within the community due to perception that the distribution was not fairly targeted?	Has there ever been tensions that developed in your community because some people had received assistance and others had not? Why were people angry about the assistance that had been distributed in the community?	If so, what were examples?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	3.2	Do the “vulnerabilities” identified by humanitarian actors for the purpose of targeting and prioritization correspond to how the community perceives vulnerabilities?	Which are the criteria used by humanitarian actors to determine if a person is vulnerable? Do you feel like the way humanitarian actors identifies “vulnerability” corresponds to who the community considers to be most vulnerable?	Are there individuals / groups that are not usually considered to be vulnerable for the purpose of targeting by humanitarian actors that most of the community considers to be vulnerable? Are there individuals / groups that are considered to be vulnerable by humanitarian actors for the purpose of targeting	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age

				that most of the community does not perceive to be vulnerable? Probe for age groups, gender, displacement status, disability, pre-existing conditions (illness), etc.		
4. How do affected populations feel respected through current models of humanitarian service delivery	4.1	Have members of the community ever felt disrespected by aid workers?	Have members of the community ever felt disrespected by aid workers in your area recently?	If yes, what happened? How often do people feel disrespected? What are examples of actions by humanitarian organizations / workers that make people feel disrespected? Are certain groups more likely to feel disrespected than others?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	4.2	Do most people feel like they usually know how to submit complaint about the modalities of service delivery?	Do most people feel like they usually know how to submit complaint about the modalities of service delivery in your area?	Are there complaint mechanisms that the community feels effective / not effective? Probe for complaint box, help desk, giving direct feedback to an aid worker, accountability hotline, interactive radio shows Are specific groups more able to access complaint mechanisms than others?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age

KII WITH HUMANITARIAN ACTORS (PROGRAMME MANAGER)

Research questions	SUBQ #	Sub-question	Questionnaire QUESTION	Probes	Data collection method	Key disaggregations (Group types)
1. How much are affected communities aware of humanitarian service	1.1	What are the different approaches that humanitarian actors rely on to communicate with communities in order to create awareness about	Does your project have a communication with communities' component in order to create awareness about	If so, through which channel is the communication carried out? What type of information is being communicated?	KI interview	Gender Disability Age

delivery to which they are entitled?		the assistance provided?	the assistance provided among community members?	How does your project collect feedback from community members? How does the project respond to feedback from community members?		
	1.2	What are the most effective communication channels to spread relevant information about available assistance?	What are the communication strategy that you find to be the most effective at spreading information about available humanitarian assistance in your area?	Loudspeakers, poster campaigns, door to door messaging, loudspeaker, radio messaging campaign, town hall meetings... Probe for people with hearing or visual disabilities, age groups, gender....	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
2. What is the perception of affected populations on relevance types of interventions and beneficiary targetting models	2.1	What are the different approaches that humanitarian actors rely on to ensure that communities' perspective is at the center of the project design and implementation?	Does your project involve mechanisms to consult affected populations at any stage of the project cycle? If so, which ones?	Women? Disabled people? Young people? Elderly?	KI interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.2	How do humanitarian actors prefer to carry out consultations?	In your experience, what are the mechanisms that yield the most active participation / interesting results?	Before project? During? After?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.3	How do humanitarian actors evaluate their own ability to adapt programming based on the input provided by communities?	Do you find that it is easy to adapt programming to reflect the feedback of the communities?	If yes, how? Do you have specific examples? If there are obstacles that make it difficult, what are these obstacles? For ex: short term funding, donor requirements	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
	2.4	How do humanitarian actors target beneficiaries?	How does your project target beneficiaries, and are there particular measures put in place to ensure that assistance is delivered to the most vulnerable individuals?	How is vulnerability defined by your programme for targeting purposes?	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age

	2.5	How do humanitarian actors evaluate their own performance in terms of helping affected populations become more self-reliant	In what way do you think your project is helping affected populations to become more self-reliant		KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
3. How do affected populations perceive the level of fairness in current humanitarian service delivery	3.1	Do the “vulnerabilities” identified by humanitarian actors for the purpose of targeting and prioritization correspond to how the community perceives vulnerabilities?	<p>Which are the criteria used by your organization to determine if a person is vulnerable for the purpose of beneficiary targeting?</p> <p>Do you feel like the way humanitarian actors identify “vulnerability” corresponds to who the community considers to be most vulnerable?</p>	<p>Are there individuals / groups that are not usually considered to be vulnerable for the purpose of targeting by humanitarian actors that you would consider to be vulnerable?</p> <p>Have you witnessed situations where the targeting of beneficiaries caused tensions / conflict between community leaders and aid workers or within the community itself? What was the cause of these tensions?</p> <p>Probe for age groups, gender, displacement status, disability, pre-existing conditions (illness), etc.</p>	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
4. How do affected populations feel respected through current models of humanitarian service delivery	4.1	How do humanitarian actors perceive the performance of the sector in terms of the level of respect shown to affected populations during service/aid delivery.	<p>Do you feel like humanitarian service delivery is always respectful of community members?</p> <p>Do you feel like mechanisms to ensure accountability to affected populations have become more or less effective in recent years?</p>	<p>What are examples of actions by humanitarian organizations / workers that you think make people feel disrespected?</p> <p>Do you think that humanitarian actors are more likely to disrespect / discriminate certain groups in particular? If so, which ones?</p>	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age

4.2	How do humanitarian actors perceive the performance of the sector in terms of collecting complaints from affected populations and following up on complaints?	How responsive is your organization at following up on complaints voiced by beneficiaries through any mechanisms about a situation where they felt disrespected by an aid actor involved in service delivery?	What channels does your project provide for beneficiaries and community members to file serious complaints about cases of abuse? What additional resources, if any, do you feel like you would need to be able to address these cases optimally? Probe for complaint box, help desk, giving direct feedback to an aid worker, accountability hotline, interactive radio shows	KI Interview	Gender Disability Age
4.3.	How do humanitarian actors perceive the performance of the sector in terms of increasing accountability to affected populations in general.	Do you feel like mechanisms to ensure accountability to affected populations have become more effective in recent years?	If not, why? If so, how? Is there anything else that you would ideally like to do to enhance your project's accountability to affected populations but that you don't feel like you currently have access to the resources for?		

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED WITH STRUCTURED TOOL(S)

Research questions	IN #	Data collection method	Indicator / Variable	Questionnaire Question	Questionnaire Responses	Data collection level
How much are affected communities aware of humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled	A.1.1.	KI Interview	Aap_awareness	Do people in (info_settlement) feel like they are receiving enough information about the assistance that is available to them?	Yes / No	Settlement
2. What is the perception of affected populations on types of interventions and beneficiary targeting models	B.1.1	KI Interview	aap_consult	Do people in (settlement) feel like their opinion is considered enough in the design of humanitarian activities?	Yes / No	Settlement
	B.1.2	KI Interview	aap_satisfaction	If people in (settlement) have received assistance in the last 6 months, were most people satisfied with that assistance?	Yes / No	Settlement

	B.1.3	KI Interview	aap_reasons_satisfaction	What are the reported reasons for dissatisfaction with aid received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not target the right beneficiaries Insufficient Not what is most needed Unsustainable Most of the community is not aware that the services exist Most of the community is not aware how to access the services 	Settlement
	B.1.4	KI Interview	aap_autonomy	Do most people in {info_settlement} feel like the assistance they receive makes them more self-reliant and autonomous?	Yes / No	Settlement
3. How do affected populations perceive the level of fairness in current humanitarian service delivery	C.1.1	KI Interview	aap_violence	Do you know of any time that delivery of humanitarian assistance to (settlement) has caused violence or tension in the community?	Yes / No	Settlement
	C.1.2	KI Interview	aap_vulnerability	Is humanitarian assistance provided in {info_settlement} evenly accessible to the most vulnerable members of society?	Yes / No	Settlement
4. How do affected populations feel respected through current models of humanitarian service delivery	D.1.1.	KI Interview	aap_respect	Do most people in {info_settlement} feel respected by humanitarian actors?	Yes / No	Settlement

6. Data Management Plan

Administrative Data			
Research Cycle name	AAP Community Perceptions Tracking		
Project Code	32iAIE		
Donor	DFID		
Project partners	CEWG		
Research Contacts	Margot Fortin, margot.fortin@reach-initiative.org		
Data Management Plan Version	Date: 09/01/2019	Version: 01	
Related Policies			
Documentation and Metadata			
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data? <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data analysis plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Cleaning Log, including: <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion Log <input type="checkbox"/> Value Change Log
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Code book	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Dictionary
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Metadata based on HDX Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Log of completed FGDs and KIIs with link to the storage location of the write ups.
Ethics and Legal Compliance			
Which ethical and legal measures will be taken?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consent of participants to participate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consent of participants to share personal information with other agencies
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No collection of personally identifiable data will take place	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender, child protection and other protection issues are taken into account
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All participants reached age of majority	[Other, Specify]
Who will own the copyright and Intellectual Property Rights for the data that is collected?	IMPACT, DFID		
Storage and Backup			
Where will data be stored and backed up during the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT/REACH Kobo Server	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Kobo Server: <i>[specify]</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT Global Physical / Cloud Server	<input type="checkbox"/> Country/Internal Server
	<input type="checkbox"/>	On devices held by REACH staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical location <i>[specify]</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]	
Which data access and security measures have been taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Password protection on devices/servers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data access is limited to REACH senior staff
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Form and data encryption on data collection server	<input type="checkbox"/> Partners signed an MoU if accessing raw data
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]	
Preservation			
Where will data be stored for long-term	<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT / REACH Global Cloud / Physical Server	<input type="checkbox"/> OCHA HDX

preservation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REACH Country Server	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]
Data Sharing				
Will the data be shared publically?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No, only with mandating agency / body
Will all data be shared?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No, only anonymized/ cleaned/ consolidated data will be shared
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No, [Other, Specify]		
Data protection risk assessment				
Have you completed the Indicators Risk Assessment table below?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No, no information that potentially allows identification of individuals is to be collected.
	[Please complete the first 4 columns in the Indicators Risk Assessment table below]			
Responsibilities				
Data collection	Margot Fortin, Senior Assessment Officer, margot.fortin@reach-initiative.org			
Data cleaning	Margot Fortin, Senior Assessment Officer, margot.fortin@reach-initiative.org			
Data analysis	Margot Fortin, Senior Assessment Officer, margot.fortin@reach-initiative.org			
Data sharing/uploading	Margot Fortin, Senior Assessment Officer, margot.fortin@reach-initiative.org			

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

IMPACT Objective	External M&E Indicator	Internal M&E Indicator	Focal point	Tool	Will indicator be tracked?
Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products	Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of x product from Resource Center	Country request to HQ	User_log	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Relief Web	Country request to HQ		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Country level platforms	Country team		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
	Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products	# of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter	Country request to HQ		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly	Country team		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of visits to x webmap/x dashboard	Country request to HQ		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response	Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products	# references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies)	Country team	Reference_log	<i>CEWG Strategy Documents</i> <i>South Sudan HNO 2020</i> <i>South Sudan HRP 2020</i> <i>Cluster strategies</i>
		# references in single agency documents			<i>UN Agencies, INGOs and NNGOs strategic planning documents.</i>
Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs	Country team	Usage_Feedback and Usage_Survey template	<i>Survey Monkey to be conducted following dissemination with cluster coordinators, key UN Agencies and INGOs, Humanitarian coordination bodies.</i>
		Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs			
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			
	Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff			
		Perceived quality of outputs/programs			
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			

Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle	Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs (<i>providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.</i>)	# of organisations providing resources (i.e. staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation	Country team	Engagement_log	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

Annex 1 : Area of Knowledge Quantitative Survey (Intro, AAP section and metadata only)

Topic	Sector	Data collection method	Q #	Indicator / Variable	Question	Choices	Data collection level	No-Consensus Weighting ³
Population characteristics	KI demographics	Quantitative KI interview	B.1	Gender of KI	What is the gender of the interviewee?	Male, Female	Individual level	N/A
			B.2	Age of KI	What is your age?	Continuous, 15 < x <126	Individual level	N/A
			B.3	Displacement status (categorical, IDP, refugee, returnee, host community)	What is your current displacement status?	IDP, refugee, returnee, host community	Individual level	N/A
	Area of knowledge	Quantitative KI interview	D.1	KI area of knowledge, state (categorical)	What is the location in?	List of states	Individual level	N/A
			D.2	KI area of knowledge, county (categorical)	What county is the location in?	List of counties	Individual level	N/A
			D.3 / D.4	KI area of knowledge, settlement (categorical)	What settlement is the location in? If other, please specify	List of settlements; other	Individual level	N/A
			D.5	KI type of contact	In the last month, how did you get knowledge about [info settlement]?	Remote contact, direct contact	Individual-level	N/A
			D.6	KI type of contact	In the last month, what did you use to make contact with someone living in [info settlement]?	mobile phone, satellite phone, computer internet, mobile phone app, HR or VHF radio, other, don't know	Individual-level	N/A
			D.7	KI time of last information received from settlement	into confirm, you have either visited [info settlement]? IN THE LAST MONTH, or talked remotely with someone living in [info settlement] IN THE LAST MONTH?	Within the last month, more than a month	Individual-level	N/A
			Demographics	Quantitative KI interview	F1.1	% of (de)populated settlements	In the last month, were ANY members of the local [ORIGINAL] community still living in [info settlement]?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer
	F1.2	% of settlements per proportion of remaining population			In the last month, what proportion of the ORIGINAL population remains in [info settlement]?	less than half, half, more than half, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
	F2.1	% of settlements with IDPs			In the last month, were ANY IDPs living in [info settlement]?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	Yes > all other responses
	F2.2	% of settlements per given proportion of IDP population			In the last month, what proportion of the population were IDPs in [info settlement]?	less than half, half, more than half, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
	F2.3	% of settlements per IDP date of most recent arrival			When did the MOST RECENT IDPs arrive in [info settlement]?	Last 3 months, 3 to 6 months, 6 to 12 months, More than 1 year, don't know	Settlement-level	Most recent response > other responses.
	F2.4	% of settlements with IDPs			Do you know where the MOST RECENT	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal

³ In the event of a No-consensus with conflicting answers, all responses are weighted more heavily than, “I don't know or I don't want to answer.”

					IDPs came from in [info settlement]?			(modal weighting)
			F2.5	% of settlements per main state of present IDP's displacement	What state are the IDPs mainly from since the beginning of the crisis?	List of states	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
			F2.6	% of settlements per main county of present IDP's displacement	What county are the IDPs mainly from?	List of counties	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
			F3.1	% of settlements with returned (formerly displaced) community population	Have ANY local community returned to [info settlement] after being displaced in another area since the beginning of the crisis?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	Yes > other responses
			F3.2	% of settlements per month of returnee arrival	When did the MOST RECENT returnees arrive in [info settlement]?	Last 3 months, 3 to 6 months, 6 to 12 months, More than 1 year, don't know	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
Sector Indicators	Accountability to Affected Pop	Quantitative KI interview	G.1	% of settlements that received humanitarian assistance in past 6 months	Has any humanitarian assistance (distribution or service delivery) taken place in {info_settlement} in the past 6 months?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	Most recent response > other responses.
			G.2	% of settlements that receive sufficient information about assistance available	Do people in (info_settlement) feel like they have received enough information about the assistance that was available to them over the past 6 months?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are equal (modal weighting)
			G.3	% of settlements where people feel consulted enough	Do people in (settlement) feel like their opinion is considered enough in the design of humanitarian activities?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are equal (modal weighting)
			G.4	% of settlements where most people were satisfied with assistance	If people in (settlement) have received assistance in the last 6 months, were most people satisfied with that assistance?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
			G.5	% of settlements per reason for dissatisfaction with assistance	What are the main reasons for dissatisfaction with aid received over the last 6 months for most people in (info_settlement)?...	Select multiple- Does not target the right beneficiaries, Insufficient, Not what is most needed, Unsustainable, Most of the community is not aware that the services exist, Most of the community is not aware how to access the services	Settlement-level	
			G.6	% of settlements where most people feel like assistance	Do most people in {info_settlement} feel like the assistance	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal

				received enhances their self-reliance	they receive makes them more self-reliant and autonomous?			(modal weighting)
			G.7	% of settlements reporting incidents of violence as a result of assistance delivery	7. Do you know of any time that delivery of humanitarian assistance to (settlement) has caused violence or tension in the community?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	Yes > All other responses
			G.8	% of settlement reporting assistance is adequately available to most vulnerable	8. Is humanitarian assistance provided in {info_settlement} adequately accessible to the most vulnerable members of society?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
			G.9	% of settlements where most people felt respected by humanitarian actors over past six months	Do most people in {info_settlement} feel respected by humanitarian actors?	Yes, no, I don't know or don't want to answer	Settlement-level	All responses are Equal (modal weighting)
<i>Meta-Data</i>	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	NA	Data Collection Date	NA	Automatic	N/A	N/A
	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	A.2	Enumerator ID	Enumerator ID number	1-30	N/A	N/A
	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	NA	Start and end time of survey	NA	Automatic	N/A	N/A
	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	A.1	Location of interview – base	Please specify your (enumerator) base	Akobo, Aweil, Bentiu, Bor Pock, Bor Town, Juba, Capote, Maban, Malakal, Mingkaman, Moyo, Nyal, Pariang, Rank, Ton, Wau, Yam bio	N/A	N/A
	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	A.3	How enumerator is assessing settlement	How are you (enumerator) assessing the settlement?	Remote, Remotely, Directly, Phone call		N/A
	<i>Meta-Data</i>	N/A	Q.1	GPS coordinates of data collection site	Please take the GPS coordinates of your location	Geoponic	N/A	N/A

Annex 2 : Area of Knowledge Accountability to Affected Populations FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTION ROUTE

Moderator Name:

Assistant Moderator Name:

Focus Group Name/Code:

Started at

Completed at

Name	Area of knowledge	How do they know about area ? (Recently left, HH member visited, Regular contact etc.)	State of origin	Age	Sex
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

INTRODUCTION

A. Facilitator's welcome, introduction and instructions to participants [5 minutes]

- Welcome and thank you for volunteering to take part in this discussion. You have been asked to participate as your point of view is important. I appreciate your time.
- This discussion is designed to understand the overall welfare situation in your community and factors and risks affecting this welfare amongst communities like yours across South Sudan.
- Participation to this discussion is entirely voluntary, and anyone who does not desire to participate can leave. It is not mandatory to answer all the questions.
- **Anonymity:** I would like to assure you that the discussion will be anonymous. We would appreciate it if you would refrain from discussing the comments of other group members outside of this session. If there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so; however please try to answer and be as involved as possible.
- The discussion will take no more than 1 hour.

B. Ground rules [2 minutes]

- The most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- You do not have to speak in any particular order.
- When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.
- You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group.
- Does anyone have any questions? (*answers*)
- With this in mind, may I tape the discussion to facilitate its recollection? (*if yes, switch on the recorder*)
- OK, let's begin.

QUESTION ROUTE (60minutes)

Stage 1: AWARENESS OF HUMANITARIAN SERVICE DELIVERY [10 minutes]

1.1 [Engagement Question] Do people in your area usually feel like they are receiving enough information about the assistance that is available to them?

➤ **[Probing Questions]**

- a. If not, what are challenges that prevent people from receiving enough information?
- b. Are there some individuals / groups in your area that have access to less information about available humanitarian assistance? For example women? Persons who have a disability?
- c. If not, what are challenges that prevent people from receiving enough information?
- d. How do people like to receive information the most?
- e. What type of information do people like to receive the most?

1.2. What are the means of communication that are the most effective at spreading information, and why? Which ones are the least effective?

➤ **[Probing Questions]**

- f. Are there means of communication that are less effective for different groups of people, such as persons with disabilities, different age groups or different genders?

[On a flipchart, note the means of communication that people like / dislike / non applicable in one column and add a third column to write down the main reason why people enjoy when humanitarian actors communicate with them through that channel.]

Note to facilitator: *If the participants are struggling to answer, probe for loudspeakers, poster campaigns, door to door messaging, loudspeaker, radio messaging campaign, town hall meetings...*

EXAMPLE:

Loudspeaker	N/A	No organization uses the loudspeaker in our area
Radio messaging	Like	We trust the radio station
Town hall meetings	Dislike	Only the big men speak...
...

Stage 2: RELEVANCE OF HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS [10 minutes]

2.1 Do most people in your area feel like they are being consulted enough by humanitarian actors at all stages of the project?

➤ **[Probing Questions]**

- a. Do people feel like they are being consulted at every stage of the project? (During project design, during service delivery, to provide feedback once the project is over...)
- b. Do women have access to the same opportunities to express their views on the projects than the men? If not, what are specific obstacles that prevent women from being heard equally?
- c. Do persons with disabilities have access to the same opportunities to express their views on the projects than able-bodied persons? If not, what are specific obstacles that prevent persons with disabilities from being heard equally?

2.2. How do people prefer to be consulted by humanitarian actors?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- a. Before project is designed? During service delivery? After the project is over?
- b. Do you have examples of instances where the community did not feel consulted enough?

2.3. Do most people in your area feel like their views are usually being considered and incorporated in the design of projects once they have been consulted?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- a. If not, why? Do you have specific examples?
- b. If yes, why? Do you have specific examples?

2.4. Do most people in your area usually feel like the assistance they receive makes them more self-reliant and autonomous?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- c. If yes, how? Do you have example of good practice (cases where assistance helped the members of the community becoming less reliant on assistance)?
- d. If not, what are examples of typical obstacles that prevent becoming more autonomous?

2.5. Are most people satisfied with humanitarian assistance in your area? If not, what are the main reasons for dissatisfaction with humanitarian assistance in your area?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- a. Does not target the right beneficiaries? Insufficient? Not what is most needed? Unsustainable? Most of the community is not aware that the services exist? Most of the community is not aware how to access the services?

Stage 3: FAIRNESS OF HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS [10 minutes]

3.1. Has there ever been tensions that developed in your community because some people had received assistance and others had not? Why were people angry about the assistance that had been distributed in the community?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- a. If yes, do you have examples?

3.2. How do you think that humanitarian actors select beneficiaries in your area? If based on vulnerabilities, what vulnerabilities do they prioritize for service delivery? Do you feel like the way humanitarian actors identifies “vulnerability” corresponds to who the community considers to be most vulnerable?

➤ [Probing Questions]

- a. Are there individuals / groups that are not usually considered to be vulnerable for the purpose of targeting by humanitarian actors that most of the community considers to be vulnerable?

- b. Are there individuals / groups that are considered to be vulnerable by humanitarian actors for the purpose of targeting that most of the community does not perceive to be vulnerable?

4. Have members of the community ever felt disrespected by aid workers in your area recently?

➤ **[Probing Questions]**

- a. If yes, what happened?
- b. If yes, how often do people feel disrespected? How much?
- c. What are examples of actions by humanitarian organizations / workers that make people feel disrespected?
- d. Are certain groups more likely to feel disrespected than others?

4. Do most people feel like they usually know how to submit complaint about the modalities of service delivery in your area?

➤ **[Probing Questions]**

- a. What are the complaint mechanisms that the community feels to be effective?
- b. What are complaint mechanisms that the community feels to be ineffective?
- c. Are specific groups more able to access complaint mechanisms than others?

Note to facilitator: *If the participants are struggling to answer, probe for complaint boxes, help desk, giving direct feedback to an aid worker, accountability hotline, interactive radio shows...*

CONCLUSION [5 MINUTES]

- Thank you for participating. This has been a very successful discussion. We hope you found it interesting
- Your opinions will be a valuable asset to the study
- I would like to remind you that any comments featuring in this report will be anonymous.
- Before you leave, please ensure you have completed the personal details.

Key Informant Interview Tool for Project Managers

- This tool serves to gather the perspective of humanitarian actors themselves, via aid worker key informants (KIs) on the ground
- Target KIs, aid workers who have been involved in AAP related work, especially project managers who have had to operationalize AAP component of a project, or else field staff who work on M&E or Post-Distribution Monitoring....

1. What experience have you had so far with operationalizing Accountability to Affected Populations as part of your programming, and in which geographic areas / thematic sector?

Note to the facilitator: *Explain to the KI that we are looking more specifically at initiatives to improve awareness of assistance among the communities, ensure that interventions are relevant to the needs of the community, that service delivery is fair, and to ensure that affected populations are feeling respected by the interventions?*

2. Does your project have a communication with communities' component in order to create awareness about the assistance provided among community members?

- If so, through which channel is the communication carried out?
- What type of information is being communicated?
- How does your project collect feedback from community members?
- How does the project respond to feedback from community members?
- What are the channels of communications that you perceive to be the most effective to convey information to the communities and to receive feedback from them?

3. Does your project involve mechanisms to consult affected populations at any stage of the project cycle? If so, which ones?

- What are the mechanisms used to consult during the inception phase?
- What are the mechanisms used to consult during the course of the project?
- What are the mechanisms used to consult following the end of the project?
- Do you find that it is easy to adapt programming to reflect the feedback of the communities? If there are obstacles that make it difficult, what are these obstacles?

4. How does your project target beneficiaries, and are there particular measures put in place to ensure that assistance is delivered to the most vulnerable individuals?

- How is vulnerability defined by your programme for targeting purposes?
- In consultations with communities, do you find that individuals that are particularly vulnerable (for example single mothers, isolated elderly persons, disabled persons) are able to voice their opinion?
- Do you find that vulnerability criteria used to select beneficiaries in many programmes are adequate? Have you faced instances where the standard vulnerability criteria used did not align with the community's own definition of who is vulnerable in their community?
- Have you witnessed situations where the targeting of beneficiaries caused tensions / conflict between community leaders and aid workers or within the community itself? What was the cause of these tensions?

5. In what way do you think your project is helping affected populations to become more self-reliant?

6. What channels does your project provide for beneficiaries and community members to file serious complaints about cases of abuse?

- How would your organization go about investigating these cases and providing feedback / reparation to the affected community members? (disrespect by a humanitarian worker, sexual abuse, corruption)
- What additional resources, if any, do you feel like you would need to be able to address these cases optimally?

7. Do you feel like mechanisms to ensure accountability to affected populations have become more effective in recent years?

- If not, why?
- If so, how?

8. Is there anything else that you would ideally like to do to enhance your project's accountability to affected populations but that you don't feel like you currently have access to the resources for?