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# 1. Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country of intervention** | Jordan |
| **Type of Emergency** |  | Natural disaster | x | Conflict |  | Emergency |
| **Type of Crisis** |  | Sudden onset  |  | Slow onset | x | Protracted |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | World Food Organization (WFP) |
| **Project Code** | 13iAFW 0P5 (ACTED code: 13 DFW 88Y) |
| **REACH Pillar** |  | Planning in Emergencies  | x | Displacement | x | Building Community Resilience |
| **Research Timeframe** |  January – June 2018 (six-month duration) |
| **General Objective** | Provide a thorough and complete understanding of the food security and vulnerability situation of registered and unregistered Syrian refugees, vulnerable Jordanian host communities, Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS) and non-Syrian registered refugees including Iraqi, Yemeni, Sudanese and other nationalities. |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | 1. **Identify the current state of food security and vulnerability of Syrian (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households.**
2. **Identify current characteristics of Syrian (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households across Jordan.**
3. **Identify trends in needs and vulnerabilities of Syrian (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households by assessing how the household characteristics correlate with food insecurity.**
4. **For registered Syrian refugees, compare findings with CFSME 2014, 2015 and 2016 to recognize longitudinal changes in (1) food security and vulnerability and (2) the factors that most correlate with food insecurity.**

  |
| **Research Questions** | * **Research Question 1:** What is the current state of food security and vulnerability amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 2:** What are the characteristics of the most food insecure households amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 3:** What are the factors that correlate with food insecurity amongstSyrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 4:** How has the food security and vulnerability status of the Syrian registered refugee population changed from 2016 (CFSME 2016)? Have the factors recognized to be most correlated with food insecurity in in past CFSME (2014, 2015 and 2016) assessments remained the same or have they changed?
 |
| **Research Type** |  | Quantitative |  | Qualitative | x | Mixed methods |
| **Geographic Coverage** | Jordan – nationwide |
| **Target Population(s)** | Syrian registered (in camps and host communities) and unregistered refugees, non-Syrian registered registered refugees, Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS) and vulnerable Jordanians living in host communities in all governorates. |
| **Data Sources** | **Primary Data:*** **Nationwide survey** administered at the case level across a representative sample of registered Syrian refugees, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians in all governorates.
* **Focus group discussions** conducted with registered and unregistered Syrian refugees, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians (segregated by sex, location and population group)
* **Key informant interviews** (where necessary) with unregistered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS, host community members, and NGOs engaging with these groups.
 |
| **Expected Outputs** | * Assessment report (including maps and data visualizations)
* Preliminary findings presentation
* Final findings presentation
* Governorate level factsheets
 |
| **Key Resources** | * REACH technical staff
* REACH operations staff
* ACTED finance and administration staff
* IMPACT technical backstopping staff and resources
* WFP technical staff
 |
| **Humanitarian milestones** |  |
| **Milestone** | **Timeframe** |
|  | Cluster plan/strategy |  |
|  | Inter-cluster plan/strategy  |  |
| x | Donor plan/strategy  |  |
|  | NGO plan/strategy  |  |
|  | Other  |  |
| **Audience** |  |
| **Audience type** | **Specific actors** |
| x | Operational | WFP |
| x | Programmatic | WFP |
| x | Strategic | WFP |
|  | Other |  |
| **Access**  | x |  Public (available on REACH research center and other humanitarian platforms)  |
|  | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) |
|  | Other – TBD by the donor |
| **Visibility** | REACH and WFP logos on all assessment products |
| **Dissemination**  | * Share all relevant products with WFP teams
* Report open to key stakeholders, as agreed with WFP
* Report and presentation of findings shared in key coordination forums as agreed with WFP, such as Zaatari, Azraq, Mafraq and Amman coordination forums.
 |

# 2. Background & rationale

Going into the seventh year since the outbreak of conflict in Syria, there are currently 657,628 Syrian refugees registered in Jordan, of whom 79% (517,626) live in rural and urban host communities and 21% (140,002) in formal refugee camps.[[1]](#footnote-1) The protracted conflict has left refugees in host communities increasingly subject to heightened levels of vulnerability and food insecurity, as they deplete their coping mechanisms and have limited alternative options to meet basic needs. For many vulnerable Syrian refugees, external assistance is the primary, and often sole means to meet basic needs as inflated demand for goods and services has caused a corresponding increase in the cost of daily commodities. In parallel, non-Syrian refugees from Iraq, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia and other countries of origin have been subject to similar levels of vulnerability and food insecurity but are often not the target of humanitarian assistance, which has been increasingly directed towards the Syrian population. A particular case is that of Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS), which face distinct problematics linked to their irregular status and multiple and long-term displacement. To meet basic needs, PRS families rely almost exclusively on assistance from UNRWA, who has mandate responsibility on the population group. As the struggling Jordanian economy has witnessed a rapid growth of population residing in its host communities, there is increasing strain on public services, increased competition for jobs and rising rent and basic-goods prices. These trends have undeniably also affected the food security status of Jordanian hosting communities, in particularly the poorest and most vulnerable. There is important scope to further understand the current food security and vulnerability status of Syrian refugees, non-Syrian refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians.

REACH and WFP have conducted three Comprehensive Food Security Monitoring Exercise (CFSME) assessments in the last 4 years (2014, 2015 and 2016). CFSME 2014 provided the first nation-wide assessment of food security for Syrian refugees living in Jordan. Findings produced by WFP and REACH during the annual CFSME exercises have provided both WFP and the wider humanitarian community with analysis, over time, on how changing levels of assistance have affected food security for Syrian refugees in Jordan. These have been critical towards building a comprehensive understanding of food security in the country and of how changing levels and modalities of WFP assistance have impacted food security. There is recurring need for accurate and up-to-date data to highlight key issues and inform an effective humanitarian response to the fast-changing context of Jordan.

Food security indicators have varied significantly in the three assessments. The 2014 CFSME found that 50% of registered Syrian refugee households living in host communities were food secure. The 2015 assessment saw the percentage of food secure households in host communities decrease to 15%, largely due to reductions in WFP assistance. The latest 2016 CFSME found 28% of Syrian refugee households in host communities as food secure. This improvement was found mainly be due to a stabilisation in food assistance, indicating that refugees are still largely in need of aid. CFSME 2016 also highlighted that economic vulnerability persists among Syrian refugees, with 5% of households having savings and 87% of households being in debt. Furthermore, in 2016, fewer households were sending members to work in socially degrading, exploitative, high risk or illegal temporary jobs than in 2015 (37% in 2015, 26% in 2016). Nonetheless, 60% of households resorted to crisis or emergency coping strategies and 49% reduced essential non-food expenditure in areas such as health and education in order to meet their food needs in 2016. The 2016 CFSME assessment also found that food security in both Zaatari and Azraq camps had improved from 2015. The available data and consequent awareness of the food security status of the Syrian refugee population has been critical to shape programs. Similar understanding, however, does not exist for unregistered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians.

The CFSVA 2018 will also be targeting population groups that were not included in previous CFSME assessments and for which comprehensive information on vulnerability and food security does not exist: non-registered Syrian refugees, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians living in host communities. For these population groups, the CFSVA will serve as a baseline assessment and will provide WFP and the humanitarian community with first and crucial data on vulnerability and food security. Building on past experiences, the CFSVA 2018 will maintain comparability of vulnerability and food security trends with CFSME 2014, 2015 and 2016, while also providing baseline identification of trends in vulnerability and food security levels amongst unregistered Syrian refugees, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians. Overall, this will enable WFP to verify existing targeting criteria, ensure that the most vulnerable are being targeted for assistance and inform the targeting of new population groups in need.

# 3. Research objectives

**Primary objective:** Provide a thorough and complete understanding of the food security and vulnerability situation of registered and unregistered Syrian refugees, vulnerable Jordanian host communities, Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS) and non-Syrian registered refugees including Iraqi, Yemeni, Sudanese and other nationalities.

**Specific objectives:**

1. **Identify the current state of food security and vulnerability of Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households. This will done using:**
	1. Food Security Index
		1. Food consumption score
		2. Livelihood coping strategy index
		3. Food expenditure share
	2. Dietary diversity score
	3. Food consumption coping strategy index
2. **Identify current characteristics of Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households across Jordan, including:**
	1. Household member characteristics
	2. Household economics (expenditure and income, debt and savings)
	3. Coping strategy use
	4. Food consumption, dietary diversity
	5. Access to services (health, education, water, sanitation, etc.)
	6. Living conditions
	7. Access to assets
	8. Participation in food and other assistance projects
	9. Livelihoods and skills
3. **Identify trends in needs and vulnerabilities of Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households by assessing how the household characteristics correlate with food insecurity**
4. **For registered Syrian refugees, compare findings with CFSME 2014, 2015 and 2016 to recognize longitudinal changes in (1) the overall food security and vulnerability status and (2) the factors that most correlate with food insecurity.**

# 4. Research questions

* **Research Question 1:** What is the current state of food security and vulnerability amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 2:** What are the characteristics of the most food insecure households amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 3:** What are the factors that correlate with food insecurity amongstSyrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, PRS and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?
* **Research Question 4:** How has the food security and vulnerability status of the Syrian registered refugee population changed from 2016 (CFSME 2016)? Have the factors recognized to be most correlated with food insecurity in in past CFSME (2014, 2015 and 2016) assessments remained the same or have they changed?

# 5. Methodology

##### 5.1. Methodology Overview

The assessment will be conducted using a mixed-methods approach, combining a nationwide quantitative survey, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and, where deemed useful, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). The project will target five specific population groups that will require tailored sampling and methodological approaches for each component. These are outlined in this section.

##### 5.2. Population of interest

The project will target four specific population groups:

* Registered Syrian refugees living in both camps and host communities
* Non-registered Syrian refugees living in host communities
* Non-Syrian registered refugees, consisting of Iraqi, Yemeni, Sudanese and Other nationalities
* Poor and vulnerable Jordanian host communities
* Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS)

##### 5.3. Primary data collection

###### 5.3.1. Quantitative Component

The quantitative component will be carried out with four of the five populations of interest: registered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and vulnerable Jordanians. Data on unregistered Syrians will only be collected through qualitative methods as there are no total population figures available, there are no comprehensive lists of the population to sample from and there are few ways to specifically identify this group in the field.

For all other groups (registered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, PRS and Jordanians) there are available comprehensive lists from which random sampling will carried out. The sampling strategy for each group is outlined below.

**Registered Syrian refugees**:

Sampling will be implemented by randomly selecting refugee case telephone numbers from the UNHCR Refugee Assistance Information System (RAIS) database. As such, the sampling frame consists of all cases that contain at least one registered refugee.

A minimum total sample of 3,631 cases will be interviewed across all 12 Governorates of Jordan, including in Za’atari Camp and Azraq Camp. Based on (1) the much smaller numbers of registered Syrians residing in certain governorates (can be seen in the table below) and (2) the similar geographical and economic characteristics of the neighbouring governorates, in accord with WFP, these governorates will be grouped together in the stratification:

* Balqa and Madaba
* Jerash and Ajloun
* Karak, Tafilah and Maan

Although Aqaba also hosts a small number of Syrian refugees relative to other governorates, Aqaba will not be grouped with neighbouring governorates due to its distinct geographical and economic characteristics.

As done in previous CFSME assessments, the average number of individuals per case used to deduce the number of cases in each governorate and determine case-level target sample sizes is 3.5. This is the average case size found by UNHCR in the “Living in the shadows” report of 2014 which collected data on 41,976 Syrian refugee households. CFSME 2016 data had a similar average of 3.6 individuals per case.

The sample is designed to allow findings to be generalized at the national level with a 3% margin of error and 99% confidence level, and at the Governorate/Governorate group level with a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level. The final target sample size for the different Governorates/Governorate groups is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Governorate** | **Total Population** | **# of cases (considering 3.5 individuals per case average)** | **Target sample size** |
| Amman | 185,332 | 52,952 | 381 |
| Mafraq | 157,571 | 45,020 | 381 |
| Irbid | 135,329 | 38,665 | 380 |
| Zarqa | 108,439 | 30,983 | 379 |
| Balqa+Madaba | 30,148 | 8,614 | 368 |
| Jarash+Ajloun | 16,601 | 4,743 | 355 |
| Karak+Tafilah+Maan | 17,621 | 5,035 | 357 |
| Aqaba | 3,485 | 996 | 277 |
| Zaatari Camp | 78,908 | 22,545 | 378 |
| Azraq Camp | 53,557 | 15,302 | 375 |
| Total | 786,991 | 224,855 | **3,631** |

As WFP’s programming unit is the household rather than the case, a cluster sampling methodology will then be employed to ensure sampling occurs at the household level while allowing for disaggregation to the case level. Refugee cases randomly selected from the RAIS database will be interviewed, after which all additional cases found to be sharing the same household will be interviewed. Interviews with cases clustered at the household-level will continue until all governorate-level sample targets have been met. If there are unregistered members in the household, an additional interview will be carried out capturing equivalent data for unregistered members.

Cluster sampling at the household level allows indicators to be aggregated from the case- to household level where possible, ensuring case and household comparability with CFSME 2014, 2015 and 2016.

**Non-Syrian registered refugees**:

The non-Syrian registered refugee group encompasses different nationalities and therefore very different socio-economic conditions, drivers of displacement, and other characteristics. Upon consultation with WFP and other organizations engaged with this population, the group will be divided by nationality as follows: (1) Iraqi, (2) Yemeni, (3) Sudanese and (4) Other. These will be used to stratify the sample, rather than the geographic location.

Sampling will be implemented by randomly selecting refugee case telephone numbers from the Refugee Assistance Information System (RAIS) database. As such, the sampling frame consists of all cases that contain at least one registered refugee.

The sampling for this group will be carried out so to gather representative findings at the national level of the overall non-Syrian refugee population with a 4% margin of error and a 99% confidence level, and at the national level for each nationality group with a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nationality** | **Total population** | **# of cases (considering 3.5 individuals per case average)** | **Target sample size** |
| Iraqi | 64,258 | 18,359 | 376 |
| Yemeni | 8,512 | 2,432 | 332 |
| Sudanese | 3,868 | 1,105 | 285 |
| Other | 2,470 | 706 | 249 |
| Total | 79,108 | 22,602 | **1,242** |

Just as with the Syrian refugee sampling, a cluster sampling methodology will be employed to ensure sampling occurs at the household level while allowing for disaggregation to the case level. Refugee cases randomly selected from the RAIS database will be interviewed, after which all additional cases found to be sharing the same household will be interviewed. Interviews with cases clustered at the household-level will continue until all nationality-level sample targets have been met. If there are unregistered members in the household, an additional interview will be carried out capturing equivalent data for unregistered members.

**PRS**

Sampling for the quantitative component of PRS population will take place using UNRWA’s database of registered PRS cases residing in Jordan. The sampling will be stratified using the UNRWA area subdivisions of Jordan: Amman North, Amman South, Irbid and Zarqa.

As UNRWA uses “families” as the unit of sampling, the same unit will be used for analysis. This means the survey will capture information regarding all members registered under the UNRWA family registration.

The sampling will be carried out to generate representative findings at the national-level with 5% error margin and 95% confidence interval, and at the UNRWA area-level with a 10% margin of error and 95% confidence level as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **UNRWA area** | **# of registered families** | **Target sample size** |
| Amman North | 936 | 87 |
| Amman South | 870 | 87 |
| Irbid | 1304 | 90 |
| Zarqa | 1247 | 89 |
| Total | 4357 | **353** |

**Vulnerable Jordanians:**

The sampling of vulnerable Jordanians will be carried out using a list of National Aid Fund (NAF) beneficiaries provided by the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD). This list encompasses vulnerable Jordanian cash-beneficiary households selected by MoSD according to their vulnerability criteria.

The NAF beneficiary lists are at individual level and target a specified number of household members under the listed individual. However, because data will gathered at the household level, the survey will be administered to include all household members, regardless of the number of household members targeted by NAF.

The sampling will be carried out to generate representative findings at the national level with a 2% margin of error and 99% confidence, and at the governorate level with a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Governorate** | **# NAF beneficiary households** | **Target sample size** |
| Amman | 19,083 | 377 |
| Irbid | 22,680 | 378 |
| Mafraq | 8,088 | 367 |
| Zarqa | 13,861 | 374 |
| Balqa | 7,260 | 365 |
| Ajlun | 2,457 | 332 |
| Jerash | 3,449 | 346 |
| Madaba | 3,480 | 346 |
| Karak | 5,390 | 359 |
| Ma'an | 2,847 | 339 |
| Aqaba | 1,842 | 318 |
| Tafilah | 1,364 | 300 |
| Total | 91,801 | **4,201** |

All the samples will be drawn to incorporate 300% more cases than what is needed to reach the target sample size. This is to ensure that randomly selected replacement cases are available in the event of non-responses. The large buffer size was determined based on previous experience in similar assessments requiring call centres, where many numbers were switched off, disconnected, un-answered (after multiple attempts) or no longer owned by the case on the RAIS database. Once randomly selected lists of respondents are created a call center will be implemented for all groups with the following process to ensure an efficient implementation:

***Overview of Call Centre Phase:***

During CFSME 2015 and 2016, REACH conducted a call centre to identify the precise addresses of refugees to be interviewed, however during this process, it was found that many refugee cases had moved since their last registered locations with UNHCR. Therefore, to ensure these households are not excluded from the sample it is critical to conduct a call centre, prior to the start of data collection, to ensure the sample accounts for refugees which have remained sedentary and changed locations.

REACH teams will verify locations of cases/households on a by-district basis. It will follow a similar schedule as data collection—this will be the point where REACH first contacts cases drawn from the UNHCR sample, and the teams will seek informed consent from refugees on participating in the assessment, identify whether there are other cases living in the same household, and the precise location of the case (town/village-level). The data and reference maps will directly assist teams during data collection.

***Implementation of Call Centre Phase:***

* 1. **Create unique ID number for each case (for refugees) or household (for Jordanians) in the sample:** This will comprise nationality code, a Governorate code, a district number, case number. For example, “SYR\_AMM\_1\_001”
	2. **GIS**
		1. Before each call centre session, the GIS team will create a map showing villages and towns within a specific district. It will be used as a reference point for the team to determine the accurate location of a specific UNHCR case.[[2]](#footnote-2)
		2. The same table of location names will be pre-loaded into the ODK questionnaire in order to ensure continuity between the reference map and the questionnaire. This should aide enumerators in finding villages and identifying them in the ODK form.

*Special Cases:* There will be instances where a case either: (a) cannot be located, or (b) is not directly in a village (e.g. Informal Tented Settlements). There will be a skip-logic question in the ODK form to account for these situations. During the day of data collection, the CMs should plan to visit these cases in a logical order with respect to locations of nearby cases.

* + 1. New maps with a table of basic case information should be printed in hard-copy A3 for each Field Coordinator and CM to take to the field. Note that they should also carry an additional sheet that includes context on special cases in order to prepare for visits not within specific towns, in addition to the sampling data set.
	1. **Calling**
		1. Enumerators provided with a list of cases/households including full contact information from the UNHCR RAIS/NAF databases along with unique IDs.
		2. Enumerators will call participants and fill ODK form which will include unique ID to link to RAIS/NAF data.
	2. **GIS-support:** Once the calling is finished, GIS-support will download the ODK data immediately and analyse movement patterns to draw a random sample for each district according to the overall movement trends analysed in the call centre database.
	3. **GIS team** will then load the output table into the map, which will be printed size A3 for each FC/CM and enable teams to plan data collection so that all interviews within geographical proximity are interviewed by the same team or enumerators to increase data collection efficiency.

Due to the sensitive nature of the PRS population group, UNRWA will carry out the initial call center to ensure willingness to participate. This will involve calling randomly selected families in each UNRWA area and confirming availability and location until the target sample size is reached, as done by REACH for other populations. The sample will then be given to REACH who will visit the households and carry out the interview.

**Data collection**

Data collection will be undertaken by an experienced mixed-gender team of REACH enumerators and directly supervised by a Field Officer and Field Manager. All data will be recorded using Open Data Kit (ODK) collect, an Android-based mobile application, to ensure data entry directly during the interview, while also mitigating data entry errors typically found when administering pen-and-paper questionnaires. Enumerators will interview the head of case/household; if unavailable, another household member 18 years or above who is willing to participate will be interviewed instead.

The assessment and field teams will work jointly to develop a daily data cleaning and processing plan, to facilitate continual monitoring of incoming data and ensure a high standard of data quality. Entries will be checked rigorously in Excel, with a thorough data cleaning log cataloguing any irregularities identified and all steps undertaken during data cleaning. A dedicated data entry assistant is anticipated to lead these data cleaning processes.

**Timing of Survey**

To accurately measure the implications of changing levels and modalities of assistance, it is important assistance levels remain constant during data collection and that there is no change in assistance within the time-frames in which questions are asked. REACH and WFP will, therefore, be in close communication about any assistance changes. The data collection will also take place in the same months as previous CFSMEs, to allow comparability and limit any seasonal changes in food consumptions.

###### 5.3.2. Focus Group Discussions

The qualitative component of the assessment will encompass Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). This qualitative component will serve to provide depth and context to the quantitative findings during the analysis phase. It will also allow to recognize important themes that can be incorporated into the quantitative survey to assess prevalence. All FGDs will be segregated by sex in order to respect cultural sensitivities and ensure gender dynamics do not impact the participation of women. Each focus group will be led by a REACH facilitator who will be supported by a scribe. Through daily debriefs with the field team following the completion of FGDs, the assessment team will gauge the depth, quality, and completeness of the information being obtained. If data saturation is not attained once the target number of focus groups are met, additional FGDs will be organised to address remaining gaps in information. To ensure sufficient time to complete extra focus groups, buffer days will be built into the data collection work plan.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Population** | **Strata** | **FGDs** | **Rationale** |
|  | Amman | 2 | One male and one female FGD per governorate and per camp. |
| Irbid | 2 |
| Mafraq | 2 |
| Zarqa | 2 |
| Aqaba | 2 |
| Tafilah | 2 |
| Maan | 2 |
| Balqa | 2 |
| Karak | 2 |
| Jerash | 2 |
| Madaba | 2 |
| Ajlun | 2 |
| Zaatari | 2 |
| Azraq | 2 |
| **Total** | **28** |
| Non-Syrian registered refugees | Iraqi | 8 | Stratify by group rather than by governorate |
| Yemeni | 4 |
| Sudanese | 4 |
| Other | 4 |
| Total | **20** |
| Non-registered Syrians | Amman | 2 | One male and one female FGD per governorate. |
| Irbid | 2 |
| Mafraq | 2 |
| Zarqa | 2 |
| Aqaba | 2 |
| Tafilah | 2 |
| Maan | 2 |
| Balqa | 2 |
| Karak | 2 |
| Jerash | 2 |
| Madaba | 2 |
| Ajlun | 2 |
| **Total** | **24** |
| Host communities | Amman  | 2 | One male and one female FGD per governorate. |
| Irbid  | 2 |
| Mafraq  | 2 |
| Zarqa  | 2 |
| Aqaba  | 2 |
| Tafilah  | 2 |
| Maan  | 2 |
| Balqa  | 2 |
| Karak  | 2 |
| Jerash  | 2 |
| Madaba  | 2 |
| Ajlun  | 2 |
| **Total** | **24** |
| PRS | Amman North | 2 | One male and one female FGD per UNRWA area |
| Amman South | 2 |
| Irbid | 2 |
| Zarqa | 2 |
| **Total** | **8** |
|  | **Total** | **104** |  |

Due to the changing context and the targeting of population groups on which we have limited knowledge and data, the quantitative survey tool will need to be informed and updated to ensure appropriate context and relevancy in the questions asked a set of FGDs and KIIs will be conducted prior to the quantitative data collection. Among other question groups, this will be crucial to have contextualized and updated coping strategy lists for each population group. It is envisaged to conduct the following number of FGD before the commencement of the quantitative component:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Population** | **FGDs** | **Stratification** |
| Registered Syrian refugees | 12 | 1 Male and 1 Female in 6 selected Governorates |
| Vulnerable Jordanians | 12 | 1 Male and 1 Female in 6 selected Governorates |
| Non-Syrian registered refugees | 8 | 1 Male and 1 Female for Iraqi, Yemeni, Sudanese and Other |
| PRS | 8 | 1 Male and 1 Female in the 4 UNRWA areas |

All remaining FGDs will be conducted after the survey data collection has begun. FGDs with non-registered Syrians can be conducted after the start of the quantitative data collection as survey data will not be collected for this group.

Sampling and recruitment of FGD participants:

**Registered Syrian refugees:**

Recruitment of registered Syrian refugees for FGD participants will occur through purposive sampling. Having worked extensively with this group, REACH and its field management staff have long-built relations with CBOs and community leaders that can facilitate in the recruitment of Syrian participants for the FGDs.

**Unregistered Syrian Refugees:**

There is a large gap of verifiable information around this groups and its population numbers. Access to unregistered Syrians is expected to be challenging. Two purposive sampling strategies will initially be used: snowballing through existing contacts into the Syrian community, and reaching out to organizations that might have access to this group like DRC, MercyCorps and ARDD.

**Vulnerable Jordanians:**

Purposive sampling for vulnerable Jordanians will occur through facilitation of CBOs. After consultation with Tickiet Um Ali (TUA), a large food-aid organization that provides food packages to 30,000 food insecure households in Jordan (95% of which are Jordanians), a list of CBOs that work specifically with this group will be provided and used to facilitate recruitment of vulnerable Jordanians to FGDs. While for the quantitative component, “Vulnerable Jordanians” are defined as those benefitting from the NAF, whose criteria was laid out above, for FGD sampling this criteria will be kept slightly looser in order to allow participation of Jordanians considered vulnerable by CBOs and TUA but not necessarily receiving assistance from NAF.

**Non-Syrian registered refugees**:

The purposive sampling and recruitment of non-Syrian registered refugees for FGDs will be carried out mostly, if not entirely, with the facilitation of international and local organizations that work extensively with non-Syrian registered refugees. As REACH does not have wide experience in working within these communities, gaining insight and access through such organizations will be crucial. Those contacted and consulted until present are: the Jesuit Refugee Service, the Mannonite Central Committee, Sawiyan, ARDD and Collateral Repair Project.

**PRS**

The purposive sampling and recruitment of PRS participants to FGDs will be carried out with the support of UNRWA. UNRWA will contact and invite participants to the FGDs in each of the 4 UNRWA areas. UNRWA community centers will be used.

###### 5.3.3. Key Informant Interviews

In addition to the Focus Group Discussions, the data collection will also include Key Informant Interviews. These will be conducted with non-registered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, and host community members. To ascertain main trends and overall levels of food security among these groups, as well as developing an initial frame of information to inform the assessment going forward, key informants within these communities, and those working for NGOs that engage with these groups, will be engaged in Key Informant interviews. The number of KIIs that will be implemented remains flexible and will vary according to the information captured by FGDs and identification of key informants.

##### 5.4. Main indicators and tool design

 **Main indicators**

The quantitative survey will look at the following core indicators of food security, based on previously conducted Comprehensive Food Security Monitoring Exercises:

* Food Security Index

The food security index used in this report is an adaptation of WFP’s Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI) food security index, piloted in CFSME (2014) and used again in CFSME (2015) and CFSME (2016). It is a global measure of food consumption and economic vulnerability, calculated using three indicators covering the short and longer term:

1. The food consumption score (FCS) giving a snapshot of food consumption.

The food consumption score, a global WFP indicator, is a key component of the food security index and measures both the quality and frequency of consumption of different food groups. The food consumption score calculates the consumption of eight food groups weighted by their dietary value, as defined by WFP, during the seven-day recall period preceding the assessment. Households are profiled according to their overall food consumption score and are described as having poor, borderline or acceptable food consumption scores based upon the defined thresholds.

1. Livelihood coping strategies.

To provide a contextualized understanding of the type of coping strategies adopted, WFP/REACH updated the livelihood coping strategy index. The results of the context specific coping strategy index has been integrated throughout the report, however, for the purposes of comparing between 2014, 2015, and 2016 CFSME data, the global livelihood coping strategy index was analysed. This index is a global WFP indicator, comprised of eight coping strategies, which measure longer term household behaviours such as asset depletion, debt and accepting exploitative work households have adopted within a 30 day time period.

1. Food expenditure share, which indicates the extent to which households have remaining expenditure after spending money on food.
* Dietary Diversity Score

The dietary diversity score is based on the consumption of the seven standard food groups. The score ranges from 0 to 7, where the maximum score is 7, and it is calculated by adding the number of food groups of nutritional relevance that have been consumed in the past week. Households with a lower dietary score have a diet which is less varied and of lower nutritional value.

* Coping Strategy Index

The food consumption coping strategy index (reduced CSI) is a global predictor of the onset of food insecurity and measures households’ short-term behaviour when they do not have sufficient access to food. The reduced CSI assesses how many times during a seven-day period households employed five specific coping strategies in response to a shortage of food. Each coping strategy has a standard weight reflecting the severity of the coping strategy used. By multiplying the frequency of usage by the severity of the coping strategy, and overall index score is generated, ranging from zero to 56.

* Demographic and other household indicators: In addition to the core food security indicators, the survey will gather the following core demographic and other household indicators:
	+ Household member characteristics
	+ Household economics (expenditure and income, debt and savings)
	+ Coping strategy use
	+ Food consumption, dietary diversity
	+ Access to services (health, education, water, sanitation, etc.)
	+ Living conditions
	+ Access to assets
	+ Participation in food and other assistance projects
	+ Livelihoods and skills

**Tools**

REACH will undertake design of the survey tool with inputs from WFP’s VAM unit. The survey will be closely based on previous years’ CFSME tools, which were previously also developed by REACH. These tools will be adapted for use with other populations not previously included in the CFSME exercises, such as non-registered Syrians and host communities.

Once the questionnaire has been designed the data collection tool will be developed using Kobo, a mobile application allowing offline data collection. The tool will undergo a rigorous testing process to ensure that it is functioning correctly. This will include thorough testing by the REACH Assessment Officer and Database Officer, as well as piloting in the field.

The training week will include extensive training of enumerators; piloting of sampling and tool; and planning of upcoming field work. Once training is complete, the teams will be engaged in simulation of data collection, to practice identifying participants, according to the sampling methodology, and administering the form. From this process, REACH will identify any additional required training or adjustments to the form. All concerns or issues identified during this exercise will be communicated and addressed with the WFP data analyst, including comments on the tool.

The following tools will be developed:

* **Qualitative tools:**
	+ 5 (registered Syrians, unregistered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, vulnerable Jordanians) x Focus group discussion question route + debriefing form and participant screener.
	+ Key Informant interview question route and debriefing form
* **Quantitative tools:**
	+ 4 (registered Syrians, non-Syrian registered refugees, vulnerable Jordanians) structured, closed-ended questionnaires, including statement of assessment objectives and informed consent.
	+ Call centre tool

All assessment tools will be developed in English and, once finalized, translated into Arabic. Before any data collection begins, the REACH field team will undergo comprehensive training on the assessment methodology and tools, data collection best practices, and relevant protection considerations.

##### 5.5. Data analysis

A final review of data will be undertaken immediately upon completion of data collection, to identify any errors, re-code and translate entries. Preliminary analysis will be undertaken immediately upon completion of cleaning and descriptive statistics will be presented to WFP and other stakeholders for input, to inform and contextualise the final analysis. Final analysis will be undertaken using appropriate software and methods, ensuring appropriate weighting where applicable. The analysis will be undertaken in close collaboration with WFP’s Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping officer.

# 6. Products and dissemination

##### 6.1 Product typology

Table : Type and number of products required

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Product** | **Number of Product(s)** | **Additional information** |
| Report | 1 | Final assessment report detailing quantitative and qualitative findingsTo support the report drafting process, WFP will provide technical inputs to the REACH Assessment team. |
| Factsheet | 13 (Jordanian), 11 (Syrian), 5 (non-Syrian), 5 (PRS) | Naitional and Strata-level findings (different for each population) |
| Presentation | 2 | Preliminary findings and final presentation |
| Maps | TBD | Embedded in report or provided as annexes |
| Dataset | 4 | Cleaned and formatted |
|  |  |  |

##### 6.2 Dissemination plan

* + Share all relevant products with WFP teams
	+ Report open to key stakeholders, as agreed with WFP
	+ Report and presentation of findings shared in key coordination forums as agreed with WFP, such as Zaatari, Azraq, Mafraq and Amman coordination forums.

# 7. Management arrangements and work plan

##### 7.1. Roles and Responsibilities

Table : Description of roles and responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Description** | **Responsible** | **Accountable** | **Consulted** | **Informed** |
| Development of methodology and qualitative tools | REACH Assessment Officer | REACH Assessment Manager,  | Research Design Unit (HQ), WFP | N/A |
| Tracking data entry/ submission | REACH Database Manager, REACH Database officer | REACH Assessment Officer | REACH Assessment Manager | Global Assessment Coordinator |
| Training of CMs for data collection | REACH Senior Field Manager | REACH Assessment Officer | REACH Assessment Manager | WFP |
| Leading and coordinating data collection | REACH Senior Field Manager, REACH Senior IM Officer, FLATS Officer, Assessment Officer, and data collection team | REACH Assessment Officer | REACH Assessment Manager | WFP |
| Data cleaning and analysis | REACH Assessment Officer, GIS Assistance as needed, REACH Database Officer | REACH Assessment Officer | Data Analysis Unit (HQ) | WFP |
| Final output production | REACH Assessment Officer  | REACH Assessment Manager  | Reporting Unit(HQ), WFP |  |

##### 7.2. Resources: HR, Logistic and Financial

ACTED Jordan will provide all HR, logistical, and financial support through the following staff resources:

* REACH-dedicated Finance and Administration Manager
	+ Primary focal point for all HR, administration, and financial needs
* REACH-dedicated Finance and Administration Officer
	+ Primary focal point for all project procurement and recruitment needs
* ACTED FLATS teams in Amman and Mafraq base
	+ HR Officers in Amman and Mafraq will support with the recruitment of data collection teams, as 50% of team will be Amman-based and 50% will be Mafraq-based
	+ Fleet Officer will support with procuring vehicles and drivers from Budget rental, and will lead induction of new drivers
	+ Finance team in Amman will support with all financial reporting and invoicing
* REACH Senior Field Manager and Senior Field Officer
	+ Lead operations and logistics coordination
	+ Liaise with both REACH assessment team and REACH/ACTED operations teams

##### 7.3. Work plan

Due to space limitations, please see Annex 1.

# 8. Risks & Assumptions

Table 5: List of risks and mitigating action

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation Measure** |
| Exclusion bias due to the initial call center phase: cases and households that have changed phone numbers/kept phone off/were not on the network/did not answer calls during the call center priod will be effectively excluded from the sample.  | * Attempt to call numbers multiple times (at different hours and on different days) when number is off/un-answered.
 |
| Participants censor their responses due to sensitivities regarding subject matter, which may result in underreporting of certain indicators | * All interviews will be conducted with informed and consenting participants who are 18 years or above, with enumerators clarifying assessment objectives and stressing confidentiality of responses prior to the interview
* All enumerators will undertake comprehensive training including interview techniques and other soft skills that will establish a firm understanding of the sensitivities of the assessment
* If preliminary analysis suggests potentially censored responses or skewed data, findings will be triangulated with both qualitative data and secondary research to qualify findings
 |
| Conducting household interviews poses a risk to the safety of REACH enumerators during field work | * To ensure the security of all enumerators when conducting interviews in households, all quantitative data collection will be conducted in mixed-sex pairs (as deemed culturally appropriate). Additionally enumerators will carry a charged mobile phone with sufficient credit to provide frequent updates to the Operations and Field Coordinators, as well as for any emergency purposes.
* Operations and Field Coordinators will remain available at all times during data collection to provide support to enumerators and updates to the Assessment Manager/Officer.
 |

# 9. Monitoring and evaluation

Table 6: Monitoring and evaluation targets

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IMPACT Objective** | **External M&E Indicator** | **Internal M&E Indicator** | **Methodology** | **Focal point** | **Tool** | **Research-specific information** |
| **Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products** | Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/productsNumber of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products | # of downloads of baseline report from Resource Center | User monitoring | Country request to HQ | User\_log | Yes |
| # of downloads of baseline report from Relief Web | Country request to HQ | Yes |
| # of page clicks on baseline report from REACH global newsletter | Country request to HQ | Yes |
| # of page clicks on baseline report from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly | Country team | Yes |
| **IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response** | Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products | # references in single agency documents | Reference monitoring | Country team | Reference\_log | Yes |
| **Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products** | Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and deliveryNumber of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products  | Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs | Usage M&E | Country team | Usage\_Feedback *and* Usage\_Survey template | Yes  |
| Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs |
| Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs |
| 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 *(providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.)* | # of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation | Engagement Monitoring | Country team | Engagement\_log | Not applicable |
| # of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis | Yes |
| # of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings; | Yes |

# 10. Documentation plan

Documents to be archived:

* Concept note
* Budget
* Terms of reference
* Final versions of all data collection tools
* FGD debriefs
* KII debriefs
* 3 Cleaned quantitative datasets
* Maps
* Governorate level factsheets
* Final analysis files
* Final Presentation
* Final Report

# 11. Annexes

1. Work plan
2. Data Management Plan
3. Questionnaire(s) / Tool(s)
4. Data Analysis Plan

# Annex 1: Work plan



# Annex 2: Data management plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Administrative Data** |
| Project Name | Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment  |
| Project Code | 13iAFW 0P5 (ACTED code: 13 DFW 88Y) |
| Donor | WFP |
| Project partners | WFP |
| Project Description | A nationwide mixed-methods assessment aiming to assess the food security situation of registered and unregistered Syrian refugees, non-Syrian registered refugees and vulnerable Jordanians. |
| Project Data Contacts | Francesco Teo Ficcarelli, REACH Assessment Officer – francescoteo.ficcarelli@reach-initiative.orgSam Brett, REACH Assessment Manager – samuel.brett@reach-initiative.org  |
| DMP Version | 1.1 |
| Related Policies | None |
| **Data Collection** |
| What data will you collect or create? | Primary quantitative and qualitative data  |
| How will the data be collected or created? | Nationwide survey Focus group discussions Key informant interviews  |
| **Documentation and Metadata** |
| What documentation and metadata will accompany the data? | Metadata:Data Guide will be included as sheet 1 of the data set, which will outline methodology, data collection dates and geographic scope, caveats/limitations, and REACH data focal points. Specific metadata to be included (applicable to quant and/or qual):* Date and time of interview
* Enumerator/interviewer name
* Interviewee name, title, and organisation (KIIs)
* IMEI number of mobile phone
* GPS coordinates of interview location (survey)
* Date and time of FGD
* Facilitator and scribe names
* Location of FGD
* Number of participants

Documentation:A data cleaning log will accompany the quantitative dataset to record all changes made to the raw data during processing and cleaning phases. Further data documentation will include SPSS syntax files with an accompanying guide describing variables that have been constructed, any instances of missing values, and any weighting used in the analysis. For the qualitative FGD data, a consolidated matrix of debrief information will be produced, again with an accompanying guide to describe any coding or categorisation used in the qualitative analysis.  |
| **Ethics and Legal Compliance** |
| How will you manage any ethical issues? | Information collected from participants will be confidential and anonymized: * Participants will be asked for their informed consent prior to the start of the interview (quant) or discussion (qual)
* No personal identifiers such as surname or registration number will be collected as part of the FGDs, and first names will not be used in any outputs.
* Although registration numbers will be collected in the survey, these will be deleted from the final dataset that is shared. They will only be used for cross-checking that interviews have been completed during data collection and in checking for duplicates during cleaning.
 |
| How will you manage copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues? | All materials produced as part of this project are under the ownership of WFP.  |
| **Storage and Backup** |
| How will the data be stored and backed up during the research? | Qualitative data:During data collection, all scribe notes from FGDs and interviewer notes from KIIs will be stored securely in REACH offices. Once digitized, these hard copies will be destroyed. Debrief forms will be stored in three ways:* Locally on the debriefer’s computer
* REACH MENA Dropbox
* REACH Jordan server

Scribe and interviewer notes will be digitized and stored similarly:* Assessment Officer’s computer
* REACH MENA Dropbox
* REACH Jordan server

Quantitative data:During data collection, the REACH database team will extract forms from the KOBO server and export the data via Excel, to be shared with the data entry assistant/team member responsible for daily data checks and cleaning. This individual will store the data in daily files as well as in a master dataset.The daily exported data and master dataset will be stored locally and on the REACH MENA Dropbox. Once data collection is complete and the dataset has been finalized, the Excel file will be stored on cloud-based servers:* REACH Jordan server
* IMPACT global server
 |
| How will you manage access and security? | Both the server and Dropbox are password protected, and Dropbox encrypts all files using 256-bit Advanced Encryption Standard (AES). Physical access to offices in which data is stored is secured, and requires pin-code access to enter.  |
| **Selection and Preservation** |
| Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved? | All digital copies of scribe notes, interviewer notes, debrief forms, and the final quantitative dataset.  |
| What is the long-term preservation plan for the dataset? | Storage on REACH Jordan and IMPACT global servers |
| **Data Sharing** |
| How will you share the data? | WFP will make a final determination on whether assessment outputs and data can be shared. If determined so, REACH will upload the dataset to the REACH Resource Centre, HDX, and will share bilaterally via email by request from partners. |
| Are any restrictions ondata sharing required? | See above. |
| **Responsibilities** |
| Who will be responsible for data management? | REACH Assessment Officer/Manager, Database Manager, and Data Entry Assistant. |
|  |  |

Adapted from:

DCC. (2013). Checklist for a Data Management Plan. v.4.0. Edinburgh: Digital Curation

Centre. Available online: http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/data-management-plans

# Annex 3 : Questionnaire(s) / Tool(s)

The following 7 primary data collection instruments have been developed in collaboration with WFP and inputs from other experts/stakeholders:

1. Survey questionnaires:

 a. Registered Syrian Refugees

 b. Non-Syrian registered Refugees

 c. Vulnerable Jordanians

 d. PRS

2. Focus Group Discussion question routes:

 a. Registered Syrian Refugees

 b. Unregistered Syrian Refugees

 c. Non-Syrian registered Refugees

 d. Vulnerable Jordanians

 e. PRS

Each of these instruments have will be translated into Arabic and approved by the WFP team for data collection. All primary data collection instruments will also be included as annexes in the final report.

# Annex 4: Data Analysis Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Research Question** | **Indicators** | **Question** | **Population of relevance** | **Data collection method** |
| **• Research Question 1: What is the current state of food security and vulnerability amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?** | Food security Index (composed of the following three indicators) |   | All populations | Survey |
| Food consumption score | Over the last 7 days, how many days did your case consume the following foods?(Cereals, White tuber and roots, Vegetables and leaves, Fruits, Meat, Eggs, Fish and other seafood, Pulses nuts and seeds, Milk and dairy products, Oil and fats, Sweets, Spices and condiments) | All populations | Survey |
| Livelihood coping strategy index | In the past 30 days, has your case applied any of the below strategies to meet basic food needs?Spent savingsSell productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheel barrow, bicycle, car, motorbike, livestock)Reduced essential non food expenditures such as education/health Bought food on credit or borrowed money to purchase food from non-relatives/friendsSell household goods (jewelry, phone, furniture, electro domestics, bicycle etc)Changed accommodation location or type in order to reduce rental expenditureMale members of the case accepted socially degrading, exploitative, high risk or illegal temporary jobsFemale members of the case accepted socially degrading, exploitative, high risk or illegal temporary jobsChildren (under the age of 18) in the family worked in order to provide resources for the case. (Ask and take note of whether girls or boys sent to work)Sent adult case members to begSent children case members to beg. (Ask and take note of whether girls or boys sent to beg)Members of the case returned to Syria/Iraq/Yemen/Sudan/Other to provide resources for the case or reduce case expenditure.  | All populations | Survey |
| Food expenditure share | What is the estimated amount spent by the case during the last 30 days for the following items (in JODs) (Food Expenditure, Rent, Utilities, Health related, Education related, Water, Transport, Dept repayment, All other expenses) | All populations | Survey |
| Dietary diversity score | Over the last 7 days, how many days did your case consume the following foods? (Cereals, White tuber and roots, Vegetables and leaves, Fruits, Meat, Eggs, Fish and other seafood, Pulses nuts and seeds, Milk and dairy products, Oil and fats, Sweets, Spices and condiments) | All populations | Survey |
| Food consumption coping strategy index | In the past 30 days, has your case applied any of the below strategies to meet basic food needs? Rely on less preferred and less expensive food (i.e. cheaper lower quality food)Borrow food or relied on help from relative(s) or friend(s), or seeking additional humanitarian assistance Reduce number of meals eaten in a dayLimit portion size at mealtime (different from above: i.e. less food per meal)Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| **• Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of the most food insecure households amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?• Research Question 3: What are the factors that correlate with food insecurity amongst Syrian refugee (registered and non-registered), non-Syrian registered refugee, and vulnerable Jordanian households in Jordan?** | **1.     Household characteristics** |   |   |   |
| Age of HH Head | What is the age of the head of household? | All populations | Survey |
| Sex of HH Head | What is the sex of the head of household? | All populations | Survey |
| Marital status of HH Head | What is the total number of people living in this household? | All populations | Survey |
| Education level of HH Head | What is the total number of people living in this household? | All populations | Survey |
| HH size | What is the total number of people living in this household? | All populations | Survey |
| HHs with members from other nationalities | Are there any non-Syrian registered/Jordanian/Iraqi/Yemeni/Sudanese/Other household members? If yes, how many? From where? | All populations | Survey |
| HHs with unaccompanied or separated minors | Does the total number of household members include any unaccompanied or separated minors? If yes, how many unaccompanied minors? How many separated minors? | All populations | Survey |
| Cases/families within same household | What is the total number of cases living in this household? | All populations | Survey |
| Reasons for living together | Why are you living together as more than one case in the household? | All populations | Survey |
| HHs with non-registered members | How many of your nuclear family members are not registered with UNHCR? | All populations | Survey |
| HHs with heads of case not possessing valid MoI cards | Does the head of case have a valid MOI/service card? (look at place of residence) | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| **2.      Participation in food and other assistance projects** |   | Registered Syrians |   |
| Modality of WFP assistance received | Type of WFP assistance that the case currently benefits from | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| Preference for WFP assistance modalities | Which of these modalities is your preferred type of assistance? | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| Value of WFP assistance received | What is the value in JOD for currently received WFP assistance per person in the case?  | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| Time receiving WFP assistance | For how long has your case been receiving WFP assistance? (in number of months) | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| Other types of assistance received | From which organization are you receiving further assistance? Which type of assistance is it? | All populations | Survey |
| Amount of UNHCR Cash Assistance received | What amount of UNHCR Cash Assistance did you receive over the last 30 days? | Registered Syrians | Survey |
| **3. Health and related** |   | All populations |   |
| HHs with disabled members | Washington Group Questions on Disability to the respondent + Are there any case members that are Chronically ill or have a serious medical conditions (0 = No, 1 = Yes) Are there any case members that are physically or mentally disabled/impaired? (0 = No, 1 = Yes) | All populations | Survey |
| HHs with pregnant women | Are there any pregnant women in your case? (0 = No, 1 = Yes) | All populations | Survey |
| **4.     Access to services (health, education, water, sanitation, etc.)** |   |   |   |
| HHs that were/were not able to access hospitals/clinics when needed. |  If there was a medical need, were you or any of your case members able to access hospitals/clinics in the past six months? | All populations | Survey |
| Which health facilities were accessed | if yes, where? | All populations | Survey |
| Most frequent barriers to accessing health services | if no, please specify the kind of difficulties | All populations | Survey |
| % of school aged children accessing education services | How many of these are accessing education services? | All populations | Survey |
| Most frequent barriers to accessing education services | If children are not accessing education services, what are the reasons? (select all that apply) | All populations | Survey |
| **5.     Household economics (expenditure and income, debt and savings)** |   |   |   |
| Financial support provided by case to other cases/families in HH | Does your case provide financial support (that does not need to be repaid) to another case(s) in the HH? | All populations | Survey |
| Financial support received by case from other cases/families in HH | Is your case receiving financial support (that does not need to be repaid) by another case(s) in the HH? | All populations | Survey |
| Main sources of income | Over the past 30 days, what were the 3 main sources of cash/income (apart from work) to sustain your case? | All populations | Survey |
| Level of indebtedness | If your case has borrowed money/has debts, what is currently your total amount of debt? (this should include not paying the rent etc.) | All populations | Survey |
| Main causes of debt | What was the main reason for you to incur debt? | All populations | Survey |
| Main debt sources | Where/who did you borrow money from? | All populations | Survey |
| Level of savings | How much did you save in the last 3 months?  | All populations | Survey |
| % of expenses spent on food, and other | What is the estimated amount spent by the case during the last 30 days for the following items (in JD): 1. Food Expenditures2. Rent3. Utilities (electricity/gas)4. Health related expenditures (medical, pharmaceutical)5. Education related expenditures 6. Water (network, tanker, bottled, dislodging water, etc.)7. Transport8. Debt repayment9.All other expenditures, please specify\_\_\_ | All populations | Survey |
| Possession of household assets | Does the case have the following items? (in usable condition): Mattresses Beds Winter Clothes Blankets Refrigerator Stove/Kitchen Kitchen Utensils Water heater Table/Chairs Sofa set Heating for house Air conditioning Washing machine TV Computer Motorized vehicle | All populations | Survey |
| **6.     Livelihoods and available skills** |   |   | Survey |
| Number and % of HH members that have worked in the last 30 days | How many of your case members have worked in the last 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| Gender and age of working members | What is the gender of this member? What is the age of this members? | All populations | Survey |
| Most prevalent "types" of work? | Has this member been employed in: | All populations | Survey |
| Most prevalent work sectors | Which sectors was the "work type" in? | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| Income from employment in the last 30 days | What was this member's income from this/these employments in the last 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| % cases/HHs with members having work permits |  Does this member have a work permit?  | All populations | Survey |
| Most prevalent reasons for not having work permits | Why does this member not have a work permit?  | All populations | Survey |
| % cases/HHs having faced exploitation at work, and which form |  Has this member faced any of the following forms of exploitation at work? | All populations | Survey |
| % working members employed in jobs in which had skills or previous experience | Is this work related to the skills and/or past experience of this member? | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| Most prevalent available but un-used skills |  Does this member have skills and/or experience in other professions that he does not practice in Jordan? Which activities does this member have skills and/or experience in?  | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| % case/HH members of working age that have not worked in the last 30 days | How many case members of working age (18-65) have not worked in the last 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| Gender of working age members that are have not worked in the last 30 days | What is the gender of this member? | All populations | Survey |
| Most prevalent reasons for work-aged members not be working | Why did this member not work? | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| Most prevalent available but un-used skills of not working members | Does this member have skills and/or past experience in any of the following sectors (select all that apply) | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| **7.        Living conditions** |   |   |   |
| Type of housing | In which type of shelter do you live? | All populations | Survey |
| Type of occupancy | Which type of occupancy? | All populations | Survey |
| Type of rental agreement | Which type of rental agreement?  | All populations | Survey |
| Possession of rental contract | Do you have a signed rental contract with the landlord? | All populations | Survey |
| Times when could not pay rent | Has your case faced times when it was unable to pay the rent to the landlord? (Yes, No) | All populations | Survey |
| Times faced eviction | How many times has your case been forced to move or evicted in Jordan prior to current location? | All populations | Survey |
| Main reasons for eviction | if by authorities, what was the reason? (text) If by landlord, what was the reason? (Evicted because couldn’t pay rent, For no reason, Other (please specify)) | All populations | Survey |
| Presence of ventilation in shelter | Ventilation is present where case lives (0= No, 1 = Yes), If yes, type of ventilation (list all applicable options) | All populations | Survey |
| Access to electricity | Case has access to Electricity (0 = No, 1 = Yes) | All populations | Survey |
| Sufficient access to water | Did your case have access to sufficient water for drinking, cooking, washing and toilet purposes over the last 30 days? (0=No, 1=Yes) | All populations | Survey |
| Access to drinking water | How many days did you have to drink non-potable water in the past 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| Access to tap/running water | How many days did your case not have running (tap, roof tank) water in the past 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| Main reasons for no access to water | What are the reasons for not having water? | All populations | Survey |
| Most important sources of water (not for drinking) | What are the most important sources of water (not for drinking) in your case over the past 30 days? | All populations | Survey |
| **8. Unmet needs** |   |   |   |
| Main unmet needs | What are the case's 3 main unmet needs at this moment; in order of importance?  | All populations | Survey+FGDs |
| **9. Social Cohesion** |   |   |   |
| Feeling of comfort in interaction with Jordanians | Do you generally feel comfortable in your interactions with Jordanians? | Registered Syrians and non-Syrian registered refugees | Survey+FGDs |
| Presence of tensions or disputes with Jordanians, by reason | Have there been any tensions or disputes between members of your community and Jordanians since your arrival? If yes, what were these tensions or disputes about? | Registered Syrians and non-Syrian registered refugees | Survey+FGDs |

1. UNHCR [Syria Regional Refugee Response Portal](http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=107), accessed on 6 February 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If a case is not located within a specific town, this will be listed in a separate list as a “special case.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)