Research Terms of Reference

Lived Experience of Severe and Extreme Food Insecurity
AFG 2307
Afghanistan

April 2023
Version 1

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

Country of intervention	Afghanistan					
Type of Emergency	X	Natural disaster	X	Conflict		
Type of Crisis	X	Sudden onset	□	Slow onset	X	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	WFP					
Project Code	02AZZ					
Overall Research Timeframe	12/12/2023 to 03/05/2024					
Research Timeframe *Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)*	1. Pilot/training: 12/12/2023		5. Data sent for validation: 02/04/2024			
	2. Start collect data: 15/02/2024		6. Outputs sent for validation: 25/04/2024			
	3. Data collected: 01/03/2024		7. Outputs published: 03/05/2024			
	4. Data analysed: 01/04/2024					
Number of assessments	X	Single assessment (one cycle): One phases of the same research cycle				
	□	Multi assessment (more than one cycle)				
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**			
	X	Donor plan/strategy	05/05/2024			
	□	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _			
	X	Cluster plan/strategy	05/05/2024			
	□	NGO platform plan/strategy	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _			
Audience Type & Dissemination *Specify **who** will the assessment inform and **how** you will disseminate to inform the audience*	**Audience type**		**Dissemination**			
	X Strategic X Programmatic X Operational □ [Other, Specify]		X General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to Donor) □ Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting □ Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) X Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) X Dissemination to WFP focial points			

Detailed dissemination plan required	□	Yes	X	No
General Objective	To fill information gaps on food security in Afghanistan, with a focus primarily on severe acute food insecurity, its perceived causes and effects, as well as coping mechanisms. This will inform Real Time Monitoring activities that REACH and WFP are developing together (the quarterly Needs Monitoring Framework, the monthly Shocks Monitoring Index, and the Rapid Food Security Probing tools).			
Specific Objective(s)	I. To understand the contextual characteristics of seasonal and severe acute food insecurity in the selected localities. II. To identify contextualized coping strategies used in periods of seasonal and/or severe acute food insecurity. III. To understand how communities perceive the unfolding of past periods of shock-induced severe acute food insecurity (drivers, evolution, impact).			
Research Questions	1. What are the common food and income sources in the selected locality in a normal year, and how are they affected by seasonality and/or shocks? 2. Which coping strategies are selected according to the severity of the food gaps or income gaps to acquire food in the selected locality? 3. How are relevant markets, health, WASH dimensions simultaneously affected by and contributing to severe food insecurity?			
Geographic Coverage	23 districts across the country which are listed in Table 1 section 3.2.1			
Secondary data sources	REACH: https://www.impact-repository.org/document/reach/15a7c7ff/REACH_AFG_-WoAA-2022_Key-Sectoral-Findings_Factsheet_October-2022.pdf WFP: Afghanistan mVAM Household Food Security Survey | World Food Programme (wfp.org)			
Population(s) *Select all that apply*	□	IDPs in camp	X	IDPs in informal sites
	X	IDPs in host communities	□	IDPs
	□	Refugees in camp	□	Refugees in informal sites
	□	Refugees in host communities	□	Refugees {other,specify}
	X	Non-displaced (hosting)	□	Non-displaced (not hosting)
	□	Returnees	□	[Other, Specify]
Stratification *Select type(s) and enter number of strata*	□	Geographical #: 23 districts across the country Population size per strata is known? x Yes □ No	□	Group 1: Urban and rural Population size per strata is known? x Yes □ No
	□	Group 2: Gender Population size per strata is known? □ Yes x No		
Data collection tool(s)	□	Structured (Quantitative)	X	Semi-structured (Qualitative)
	Sampling method		**Data collection method**	
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1	X Purposive □ Snowballing □ [Other, Specify]		□ Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ □ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ X Focus group discussion (Target #): 30	

					□ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _	
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 2	□ Purposive X Snowballing □ [Other, Specify]				X Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ 11 _ _ □ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ □ Focus group discussion (Target #): □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _	
Data management platform(s)	X	IMPACT			□	WFP
	□	[Other, Specify]				
Expected output type(s)	□	Situation overview #: _ _	□	Report #: _ _	□	Profile #:
	□	Presentation (Preliminary findings) #:	□	Presentation (Final) #: _ _	□	Factsheet#:
	□	Interactive dashboard #:_	□	Webmap #: _ _	□	Map #:
	X	1 x Data saturation grid for sharing anonymised data and analysis	X	1 x Briefing note outlining key findings from the assessment	X	1 x Recommended list of food security monitoring indicators to inform RTM initiatives
	□	Datasets #:	□	Shapefiles #:		
Access	X	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)				
	□	Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)				
Visibility *Specify which **logos** should be on outputs*	REACH **Donor**: WFP					

2. Rationale

2.1. Rationale

Going into the fourth decade since the outbreak of armed conflict in Afghanistan, there are currently an estimated 28.3 million vulnerable people with humanitarian needs in Afghanistan – 13.7 million are in severe and 14.7 million are in extreme needs – due to a variety of causes such as a lack of access to services, an economic crisis, and natural disasters.[1] As of April 2023, approximately 17.2 million Afghans (40 per cent) are experiencing high levels of acute food insecurity, classified as Crisis or Emergency levels (IPC Phase 3 and 4). This includes nearly 3.4 million people (around 8 per cent) experiencing Emergency (IPC Phase 4) levels of food insecurity. Between May and October 2023 a slight seasonal improvement is expected, with the number of people in IPC Phase 3 (Crisis) or above likely decreasing to around 15.3 million, including just under 2.8 million people experiencing Emergency (IPC Phase 4).[2] Nevertheless, 4 million people are acutely malnourished, including 3.2 million children under the age of 5, with a 30-35% wheat deficit expected for 2023 due to drought and an impending locust outbreak in the north, including sustained high food prices, reduced income, unemployment and continued economic decline.[3]

[1] UNOCHA, Afghanistan Humanitarian Needs Overview 2023 (January 2023)
[2] Afghanistan: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for April 2023 and Projection for May - October 2023 | IPC - Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
[3] WFP Afghanistan: Situation Report, 24 May 2023

The worsening economic crisis in Afghanistan, as well as frequent natural disasters, such as drought and flooding, directly affect food security with an impact on all demographics and regions. Yet, there is a dearth of data on past and present instances of severe food insecurity and how this might lead to famine—either in the rare cases of officially-declared famine or those defined by local communities; a lack of understanding thus exists regarding the populations that are most vulnerable to severe food insecurity and how it progresses. In order to improve the understanding of food insecurity in Afghanistan, it is crucial to record the experiences of local communities, as these experiences can provide important qualitative data on trends and localized patterns in order to help monitor food security. This will be accomplished by recording how different communities cope with and characterize the stages of food insecurity, as well as the drivers and pathways of food insecurity. Doing so, REACH aims to better inform early warning systems and needs monitoring across Afghanistan.

3. Methodology

3.1. Methodology overview

For this assessment, REACH will adopt a qualitative methodology. In order to answer the research questions formulated above, the assessment will target 23 districts that are known to have experienced past instances of famine or famine conditions due to protracted conflict, deep economic crisis, drought, flood, high food and fuel prices, insecurity, and natural disasters. The assessment tool involves two question routes to account for the lack of available data and potential lack of clearly defined past instances of severe food insecurity: if members of the community identify periods of severe food insecurity, the first route enquires into their perceived drivers and pathways, their impact on the community, and how the community reacted to these periods. The second route enquires into frequent or chronic experiences of food insecurity for which a community might not identify a specific period or event. The second route thus allows for a more general discussion on the frequency of simultaneous events and their perceived impact.

There are four food security dimensions but this assessment will prioritize two of them: 1) physical *availability* of food and 2) economic, social, and physical *access* to food, as *utilization* of food (i.e., nutrition, preparation, or diversity of diet) would be outside of the scope of the this assessment. The capacity of enumerators and of the tool to account for all food security dimensions, as well as the level of detail required by communities to account for these dimensions in a qualitative assessment is limited. Nevertheless, assessing each dimension of food security will be attempted at the analysis stage if possible.

In each of the 23 selected districts, 1 FGD with men will be held and, where access to female participants is possible in 7 potential districts, we will conduct 1 FGD with women, leading to a minimum of 23 FGDs plus those with confirmed access to female participants. A pilot will be held in three different locations to test the viability of the tool and in the case that significant modifications need to be made, this will be done in consultation with WFP and IMPACT HQ.

The community-based perspectives on past periods of shock and food insecurity obtained through the FGDs will then be complemented by 10 to 20 remote key informant interviews (KIIs) using a semi-structured data collection with a majority of women and sectoral experts to compensate for access constraints to conducting female FGDs. The KIIs will support in triangulating findings from the FGDs on the progression and divers of food insecurity and coping strategies adopted by affected communities, as well as provide sector-specific perspectives on the manifestations and impacts of shocks and food insecurity.

3.1.1 Key Terminology

Food Security: Food security is a concept with four dimensions, all of which must be fulfilled simultaneously in order for a community to be defined as food secure. The dimensions as outlined by the FAO are as follows:

1. Physical *availability* of food: Food availability addresses the 'supply side' of food security and is determined by the level of food production, stock levels and net trade.

2. Economic and physical *access* to food: An adequate supply of food at the national or international level does not in itself guarantee household level food security. Concerns about insufficient food access have resulted in a greater policy focus on incomes, expenditure, markets and prices in achieving food security objectives.

3. Food *utilization*: Utilization is commonly understood as the way the body makes the most of various nutrients in the food. Sufficient energy and nutrient intake by individuals is the result of good care and feeding practices, food preparation, diversity of the diet and intra-household distribution of food. Combined with good biological utilization of food consumed, this determines the nutritional status of individuals

4. *Stability* of the other three dimensions over time: Even if your food intake is adequate today, you are still considered to be food insecure if you have inadequate access to food on a periodic basis, risking a deterioration of your nutritional status. Adverse weather conditions, political instability, or economic factors (unemployment, rising food prices) may have an impact on your food security status.[4]

Hunger: Hunger is one outcome of food insecurity based on a set of indicators that measure food consumption gaps. While lacking a universal definition, one way to measure the severity of a household's hunger is by using a set of questions about the previous 30 days, asking 1) how often there was a shortage of food due to a lack of resources, 2) the frequency at which any household member went to sleep hungry due to a lack of food, and 3) the frequency at which any household member went a whole day and night without eating due to a lack of food.[5] If hunger persists, it can lead to acute malnutrition and eventually Catastrophic/Famine IPC (Phase 5) classification. It is important to note that a Catastrophic/Famine IPC classification can be determined only with high quality quantitative evidence for food consumption/livelihood change, nutrition, and mortality levels.[6]

3.2 Population of interest

3.2.1 Selection of areas of interest for FGDs

The geographic area of analysis retained for the analysis is the district. A sampling frame of 23 districts to assess in priority was compiled, using the following main selection criteria:

i) Districts in which documented shocks have occurred in the past 25 years, with likely impacts on food security, but with little existing data on these periods. These districts will provide diverse contexts of past experiences of severe food insecurity to contextualize the pathways of food insecurity, its impact, and how these communities reacted to and characterize these periods.

ii) Districts whose communities are exposed to multiple and/or seasonal adverse natural conditions and shocks with likely impacts on food security, but might not clearly define a single period of food insecurity or a single shock leading to food insecurity. These communities may experience food security differently from those in the first set of criteria.

The districts to assess were selected through discussions with WFP focal points and REACH's Operations team, as well as a review of available secondary sources, including FEWS NET's livelihood zoning and the latest dataset of REACH's Humanitarian Situation Monitoring. Additionally, attention was paid to achieve a wide geographic spread across the country and to select districts with varying livelihood sources, vulnerability to shocks and socio-demographic characteristic, such as gender, urbanity, region, and age. A greater number of rural districts than urban districts were included in the sampling frame

[4] FAO, 'An Introduction to the Basic Concepts of Food Security', 2008.
[5] USAID, Household Hunger Scale: Indicator Definition and Measurement Scale, 2011.
[6] IPC: Integrated Food Security Phase Classification, IPC Risk of Famine Review – Lessons Learned, 2021.

to account for the disproportionate number of rural communities affected by high levels of food insecurity while also including a number of urban districts for a comparison of differentiated coping strategies used by rural and urban households.

In order to determine settlements in which FGDs will be held in each district of interest, discussions will be held with the REACH Operations team prior to data collection to agree on a definitive list of settlements. This process will attempt to strike a balance between accessibility constraints, settlements known to have experienced particularly severe shocks or high levels of food insecurity, and the necessity to ensure FGD participants present a diverse set of socio-economic characteristics.

Table 1. List of districts of interest

Province	District (strata)	Urba-nity	Livelihood zone	Key activities of livelihood zone	Reason for inclusion
Badakhshan	Kohestan	Rural	17 - Northeastern Highland Agro-Pastoral	Daily farm labor, Livestock keeping, Agriculture, Grain and livestock trading	Districts in this livelihood zone are considered to be at risk of food insecurity in a normal year due to harsh winter conditions and limited market access. 100% of KIs from HSM November 2022 data collection in Kohestan reported that they were affected by economic shock and 87% KIs reported that households in their settlement were affected by flood and heavy rain.
Ghor	Lal Wa Sarjangal	Rural	15 - West-Central Highland Agro-Pastoral	Labor, Agriculture, Livestock keeping	This district lies in a remote zone that is considered at risk of food insecurity in a normal year and is susceptible to harsh winter conditions, which are likely to impact market access, crop growth and livestock. Lal Wa Sarjangal appears to experience the harshest winter conditions in Ghor province, with a mean temperature of -4°C and a mean snow cover of 67%.
Ghor	Dawlat Yar	Rural	15 - West-Central Highland Agro-Pastoral	Labor, Agriculture, Livestock keeping	This district is considered at risk of food insecurity even during a normal year. According to the findings of HSM November 2022, 19% HHs reported to be in severe hunger, and often had no access to food during the last 30 days. 100% KIs reported that their settlements were affected by drought, precipitation, and economic shocks. Additionally, 14% of KIs reported having been affected by insect/locust.
Herat	Adraskan	Rural	14 - Western semi-arid agro-pastoral	Agriculture and agricultural labor, Livestock keeping, Trade	This semi-arid district is located in a zone considered to be at a risk of food insecurity in a bad year and has been reported by a recent GIS analysis to host comparatively large concentrations of nomadic

					pastoralists, who have reportedly been particularly affected by conflict and drought.
Kandahar	Registan	Rural	10 - Southern Semi-Arid Pastoral	Livestock husbandry, Labor, Trade	This district is located in a zone considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year and has reportedly been severely affected by drought in the late 1990's, causing large amounts of affected nomadic herders to leave the region.
Kandahar	Arghandab	Rural	9 - Southern Intensive Irrigated Vegetable and Orchard	Agriculture production and labor, livestock husbandry	This district lies in a zone considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year and subject to erratic climatic behavior. Known as a poppy production zone relying on irrigation from the Arghandab river, its inhabitants' livelihoods have likely been affected by the implementation of past poppy bans.
Khost	Spera	Rural	1 - Eastern Mixed Farming and Forest	Agriculture labor, Forest product sales, Livestock sales, Crop sales	This district lies in a zone where food production possibilities are scarce, and which is considered at a risk of food insecurity when prices increase. In addition, Spera district faces multiple hazards likely to have had an impact on food security, such as flooding (100% of HSM KIs reported their settlement was affected by heavy rain or flooding in the past six months, as of Nov. 2022), and it was among the worst-affected districts by the June 2022 Paktika and Khost earthquake.
Nangarhar	Muhmand Dara	Rural	6 - Eastern Cross-Border Trade and Labor	Labor, Trade, Agriculture production, Livestock husbandry	Districts in this livelihood zone are considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year and their inhabitants largely rely on cross-border trade and labor migration. More specifically, Muhmand Dara district hosts the largest Afghanistan-Pakistan border crossing, which was been subject to frequent closures.
Nuristan	Nurgaram	Rural	2 - Eastern Agro-Pastoral and Forest	Grain Production, Forest product sales, Livestock keeping	This district lies in a zone that is considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year. Its communities rely on livestock, internal and cross-border labor migration and forest products, and their livelihoods can be affected by forest fires, border policy changes and harsh winters hindering

					market access. Additionally, there have been reports of local restrictions on logging and pine nut harvesting, likely to have had an impact on the livelihoods of segments of the population.
Parwan	Sia Ghird (Ghorbund)	Rural	22 - East-Central Vineyard, Cereal and Horticulture 24 - East-Central Mountainous Agro-Pastoral	22 - Cash and food cropping, Labor, Livestock production, Handicraft production and trade 24 - Agriculture & construction labor, Livestock keeping, Handicraft production, Trade	The Sia Ghird/Ghorbund district experienced a man-made food security crisis in the late 1990's, when the impact of a blockage of trade and food assistance was compounded by rising food prices and dwindling stocks.
Parwan	Chaharikar	Rural	24 - East-Central Vineyard, Cereal and Horticulture	Agriculture & construction labor, Livestock keeping, Handicraft production, Trade	This district lies in the Shomali Plain, which is known to have experienced wide-spread man-made destruction of livelihood sources, conflict and population movement in 1997.
Sar-i-Pul	Sayad	Rural	21 - Northern Rainfed Mixed Farming	Agriculture labor, Wheat and barley production, Handicraft production, Livestock husbandry, trade	This district is located in a mixed agricultural livelihood zone which is considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year. The district has been strongly affected by the current drought affecting Afghanistan, with a Standard Precipitation Index of -2.1 for the September 2020 to Sept 2022 period, the lowest among all districts in the country and denoting extremely dry conditions.
Takhar	Rustaq	Rural	18 - Takhar-Badakshan Mixed-Agriculture	Daily farm labor, Agriculture, Livestock keeping, Trade/self-employment	This district was the most affected by the May 1998 earthquake, which caused widespread destruction in a remote area considered chronically at risk of food insecurity.
Badghis	Qala-i-Naw	Urban	20 - Northwest Agro-Pastoral	Agriculture, Livestock husbandry	According to a recent WFP food security assessment, 88% of households in Badghis province display a poor food consumption score, the second-worst across the country. This urban district of Badghis province has experienced recent influxes of internally displaced people fleeing conflict and drought.

Badghis	Muqur	Rural	20 - Northwest Agro-Pastoral	Agriculture, Livestock husbandry	This district is considered to be at risk of food insecurity, 100% of KIs from HSM November 2022 data collection in this district reported that they were affected by economic shock and drought, and 17% KIs reported that their settlements were affected by insect/locust.
Balkh	Khulm	Rural	22 – Northern Intensive Irrigated Agriculture	Cash and Food Cropping, Livestock husbandry and Handi craft trade	Districts in this zone are considered at risk of food insecurity. 100% of KIs from HSM November 2022 data collection in this district reported that they were affected by drought and economic shock, and 14% KIs reported that their settlements were affected by flood/heavy rain.
Bamiyan	Bamiyan	Urban	26 - East-Central Mountainous Agro-Pastoral	Agriculture labor, Agriculture, Livestock husbandry	Bamiyan city lies in a zone considered to be at risk of food insecurity in a normal year. Bamiyan city communities were affected by a siege situation in the late 1990's. Including Bamiyan in the sampling frame alongside Ghorbund district will allow to compare the use of coping strategies between rural and urban areas faced with a shock of a similar nature.
Helmand	Nad-e-Ali	Rural	29 -Helmand Intensive Irrigated Wheat and Cash Crop	Labor, Livestock Husbandry, and Trade,	This district is considered at risk of food insecurity zone during times of conflict. 93% of KIs from HSM November 2022 data collection in this district reported that they were affected by drought/precipitation deficit, 94% reported that they were affected by economic shock, and 7% reported that their settlements were affected by insect/locust.
Herat	Hirat	Urban	13 - Western Intensive Irrigated Agriculture	Agricultural labor, Crop production, Trade	Hirat has reportedly experienced multiple instances of creation of informal settlements and influxes of internally displaced people, including from the nomadic herder community. A 2020 assessment of 5 informal settlements in the district reported that 12,693 households lived in informal settlements, 10,825 of which were protracted IDPs.
Kabul	Kabul	Urban	8 - Kabul and Logar Irrigated	Agriculture production and	Kabul has experienced longstanding arrivals of displaced populations fleeing conflict and informal settlement, most recently in 2021. Additionally, communities

				labor, livestock husbandry	in urban areas of Kabul province appear more subject to food insecurity than their rural counterparts, as a recent WFP food security assessment reported that 43% of Kabul's urban residents displayed a poor food consumption score, vs. 24% of their rural counterparts.
Kandahar	Kandahar	Urban	9 - Southern Intensive Irrigated Vegetable and Orchard	Agriculture production and labor, livestock husbandry	Kandahar has been reported to have experienced numerous instances of informal settlements creations and large influxes of displaced populations, notably from the nomadic herder communities fleeing drought and conflict.
Nangarhar	Jalalabad	Urban	5 - Eastern Intensive Irrigated Agriculture	Labor, Agriculture production, Livestock husbandry	Jalalabad city has experienced high levels of conflicts between various state and non-state armed actors throughout the 1990's and more recently in the 2010's, and has frequently been reported to have experienced flash flooding as well as heavy rain. A recent food security assessment found that urban households in Nangahar were twice as more likely than rural household in the same province to resort to emergency-level livelihood coping strategies.
Faryab	Dawalatabad	Rural	21- Northern Rainfed Mixed Farming	Agriculture labor, Wheat and barely production, Livestock husbandry, Trade	This district is considered at risk of food insecurity in a bad year, which is affected by insufficient or erratic rainfall. 100% of KIs from HSM November 2022 data collection in this district reported that they were affected by drought/precipitation deficit, and economic shock.

3.2.2 Key Informant Interviews

In some selected areas of interest, community perspectives gained through FGDs will be complemented by semi-structured interviews with Kis to provide an expert perspective on shocks and food security. KI selection will focus on majority female sectoral experts with a geographic knowledge covering at least part of their district, rendering them likely to have observed the sectoral manifestations and impacts of past shocks and periods of food security. A non-exhaustive list of prospective KI profiles includes **healthcare workers, nutrition practitioners, food security specialists, teachers, public service providers and merchants.** Imperatively, KIs will have been present in the areas of interest during at least one of the major shocks or periods of food insecurity that were identified through the FGDs.

3.3 Secondary data review

A secondary data review of previous assessments and studies on food security was conducted in order to define a theoretical framework for the assessment, develop data collection tools and define the areas of interest included in the sampling frame. Additional secondary sources will be used to triangulate and contextualize results to both develop the final tools as well as triangulate and contextualize results. An initial list of identified secondary resources is listed in the table below.

Table 2: Secondary Data Resources

Source	Document
Devereux, Stephen (1993)	Goats Before Ploughs: Dilemmas of Household Response Sequencing During Food Shortages
D'Souza, Anna; Jolliffee, Dean (2012)	Rising Food Prices and Coping Strategies: Household-level Evidence from Afghanistan
FEWSNET (2011)	Livelihoods Zoning "plus" Activity in Afghanistan
Howe, Paul (2018)	Famine systems: A new model for understanding the development of Famines
IPC (2022)	IPC Afghanistan Acute Food Insecurity Reports
IPC (2023)	Afghanistan: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for April 2023 and Projection for May - October 2023 | IPC - Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
Maxwell, Daniel, et. al. (2016)	Facing famine: Somali experiences in the famine of 2011
Norhasmah, S., et. al. (2010)	A Qualitative Study on Coping Strategies among Women from Food Insecurity Households in Selangor and Negeri Sembilan.
REACH (2018)	"Now the Forest is Blocked": Shocks and Access to Food
REACH (2022)	Afghanistan: Humanitarian Situation Monitoring
UNOCHA (2022)	Afghanistan: Humanitarian Needs Overview
WFP (2022)	Afghanistan mVAM Household Food Security Survey
WFP (2023)	Livelihood Coping Strategies and their definitions
WFP (2023)	WFP Afghanistan: Situation Report, 24 May 2023
Afghanistan Analysts Network 2013	Thomas Ruttig: How it All Began
Sue Lautze, Neamat Nojumi, Karem Najimi	Qaht-e-Pool "A Cash Famine"

3.4 Primary Data Collection

The primary data collection will consist of both qualitative FGDs and KIIs. As the objective of the assessment is to understand local experiences of extreme food insecurity, REACH will purposely identify FGD participants who are at least 35 years old to provide a broader perspective on how household strategies and livelihoods have evolved and adapted as a result of food insecurity and shocks. REACH will further try to also identify elderly people where possible as FGD participants to collect information on the 1972 famine experienced by Afghanistan. In areas where specific shocks or periods of food insecurity have been identified prior to data collection (for instance the Ghorbund siege in Parwan's Sia Ghird district), REACH will purposely identify FGD participants who were living in the area of interest when those shocks occurred. Due to the lack of

historical data on severe acute food insecurity in Afghanistan, there is no way to identify exactly which districts in the above sampling frame experienced such periods and exactly when, or whether the communities living in these districts will remember these periods. The tool attempts to account for this potentiality. In order to accommodate communities that identify specific periods of food insecurity, on the one hand, as well as communities that do not clearly identify periods of food insecurity or shocks but nevertheless experience chronic or frequent food insecurity, on the other hand, two question routes have been included in the tool. All groups will be asked each question, but skip logic for question 3 is included in the case that a group is unable or unwilling to identify a specific period of severe acute food insecurity.

Thus, in the weeks leading up to data collection, REACH's operations team will leverage its extensive network to identify suitable FGDs participants based on their past experience of food insecurity, involvement in cultivation, livestock rearing and food supply chains. A pilot will be conducted in three distinct locations in order to test the tool. In case any modifications are required, this will be done in consultation with WFP and IMPACT HQ.

A total of 23 FGDs (plus 7 additional potential FGDs with women) will be conducted in person over a period of 12 days. Due to severely limited access limitations to conducting FGDs with women in the proposed districts, REACH will conduct a majority of KIIs with women leaders and experts.

All FGDs will be carried out using a paper-based modality. FGDs are anticipated to take 60 (no more than 90) minutes, and will be conducted using teams of two people each, with one moderator leading the discussion, and one note-taker transcribing. FGDs with female groups will be conducted by female teams (both moderator and notetaker), and FGDs with male groups will be conducted by male teams. Both moderators and notetakers will participate in a two day training prior to data collection. FGDs, with 6-10 participants each, will then be conducted and transcribed in Dari or Pashto. Debrief forms will be filled out on the same day the corresponding FGD was conducted. Field teams will then scan hand-written original-language transcript copies and send both transcripts and debrief forms to the Kabul assessment team on a daily basis (on the same day in which FGDs were conducted). The debrief form will assist in modifying the question route (including whether the participants understood the questions, flagging any missing key points from the discussion), understand group dynamics, and improve set-up of FGDs. The Senior Project Officer will regularly log progress in a progress tracker, and ensure adequate file management, following up with field teams on any missing documents.

The KIIs are planned to take place in a second stage of data collection, to first allow for a review of preliminary findings of the FGDs. This will facilitate the identification of relevant KIs to fill remaining information gaps, i.e., profession, area-based knowledge, etc. Based on specified criteria, the REACH Operations team will use its existing network and snowballing technique to determine a list of KIs.

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

During the FGD data collection, original language transcripts (in Dari/Pashto) are sent daily from the moderators/notetakers to the Senior Project Officer in Kabul. The Senior Project Officer as well as two Senior Project Officers/Translators will do daily quality checks, focusing on missed questions, failure to follow-up on misunderstood questions or off-target answers, and transcript clarity (including handwriting), in order to provide continuous feedback to field teams and follow up on any unclear data that is possible to resolve. Additionally, the debrief forms will be used to review the quality of the FGDs.

Following quality checks in the original language, digital transcripts in English will be produced by a combination of Kabul assessment staff and Senior Project Officers in field locations. On a rolling basis, after transcripts are reviewed and translated, saturation analysis and trend/case study analysis will begin, conducted by the Assessment Officer. This will be completed using a Data Saturation and Analysis Grid to work through the coding of FGDs, with the Assessment Officer reconciling "new" datapoints across FGDs coded at the same time at the end of each day of analysis, to ensure proper data saturation coding. Analysis will be conducted both by location (case study analysis) and at the macro level, bringing together trends across all locations.

Outputs Production

The expected outputs are as follows:

1 x Anonymized transcripts

1 x Data saturation grid for sharing anonymized data and analysis

1 x Briefing note outlining key findings from the assessment

1 x Recommended list of food security monitoring indicators to inform RTM initiatives

4. Roles and responsibilities

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	***Responsible***	***Accountable***	***Consulted***	***Informed***
Research design	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	Deputy Country Coordinator IMPACT HQ	WFP
Supervising data collection	Senior Project Officer	Programme Manager	Assessment Officer	Research Manager
Data processing (checking, cleaning)	Senior Project Officer	Programme Manager	Assessment Officer	Research Manager
Data analysis qualitative	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	IMPACT HQ	Deputy Country Coordinator
Output production	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	IMPACT HQ	WFP Deputy Country Coordinator
Dissemination	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	Country Coordinator	IMPACT HQ
Monitoring & Evaluation	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	Country Coordinator	IMPACT HQ
Lessons learned	Assessment Officer	Research Manager	Deputy Country Coordinator	IMPACT HQ

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) need to be informed when the task is completed*

5. Data Analysis Plan

Following the development of the tool, the data analysis plan will be developed and finalized accordingly.

6. Data Management Plan

Administrative Data	
Research Cycle name	*Lived Experience of Severe and Extreme Food Insecurity*

Project Code	AFG2037			
Donor	*WFP*			
Project partners	*N/A*			
Research Contacts	*Anish Shrestha, Research Manager, anish.shrestha@reach-initiative.org* *Alexander Nachman, Senior Assessment Officer, alexander.nachman@reach-initiative.org*			
Data Management Plan Version	*Date: 01/05/2023*		*Version: 1.0*	
Related Policies	IMPACT Research Cycle Guidelines IMPACT Minimum Standards Checklist for Semi-Structured (Qualitative) Data Processing and Analysis			
Documentation and Metadata				
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data? *Select all that apply*	X	Data analysis plan	□	Data Cleaning Log, including: □ Deletion Log □ Value Change Log
	□	Code book	□	Data Dictionary
	□	Metadata based on HDX Standards	□	[Other, Specify]
Ethics and Legal Compliance				
Which ethical and legal measures will be taken?	X	Consent of participants to participate	□	Consent of participants to share personal information with other agencies
	□	No collection of personally identifiable data will take place	□	Gender, child protection and other protection issues are taken into account
	X	All participants reached age of majority		[Other, Specify]
Who will own the copyright and Intellectual Property Rights for the data that is collected?	*REACH will own the intellectual property rights for the data.*			
Storage and Backup				
Where will data be stored and backed up during the research?	□	IMPACT/REACH Kobo Server	□	Other Kobo Server: *[specify]*
	□	IMPACT Global Physical / Cloud Server	X	Country/Internal Server
	□	On devices held by REACH staff	X	Physical location – hard copy transcripts will exist in the field offices of data collection for a short time, but after digitization and translation is complete, they will be destroyed
	□	[Other, Specify]		
Which data access and security measures have been taken?	X	Password protection on devices/servers	X	Data access is limited to Designated *REACH staff*
	□	Form and data encryption on data collection server	□	Partners signed an MoU if accessing raw data
	□	[Other, Specify]		

Kobo Access Rights (Kobo is not used for this assessment)		
Kobo Access	Person	Account Name
View Form	*N/A*	*N/A*
View and Edit Form	*[Insert name]*	*[Insert account name]*

View Form and Submit Data	*[Insert name]*	*[Insert account name]*
Download Data	*[Insert name]*	*[Insert account name]*

Raw Data Access Rights

Raw Data Access	Reason	Person
Accountable	Accountable	*Alexander Nachman, Assessment Officer*
Access	*Needed for cleaning/translation*	*SPO under recruitment*

Preservation

Where will data be stored for long-term preservation?	X	IMPACT / REACH Global Cloud / Physical Server	□	OCHA HDX
	X	REACH Country Server	□	[Other, Specify]

Data Sharing

Will the data be shared publically?	□	Yes	X	No, only with mandating agency / body
Will all data be shared?	□	Yes	□	No, only anonymized/ cleaned/ consolidated *[delete what does not apply]* data will be shared
	X	No, only DSAG will be archived and final outputs will be shared.		
Where will you share the data?	X	REACH Resource Centre	□	OCHA HDX
	□	Humanitarian Response	□	[Other, Specify]

Data protection risk assessment

Have you completed the Indicators Risk Assessment table below?	X	Yes	□	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]			

Risk indicator	Type of identification risk	Disclosure implications	Benefits	**Class**	**Required mitigation**
Enumerator name	*Identification*	*Loss of Privacy*	*Temporarily useful for follow-up during data review/translation*	*B2*	*To be deleted after translation is completed*
FGD and KI name	*Identification of KI*	*Loss of privacy*	*Follow up for data cleaning*	*B1*	*To be deleted immediately after data cleaning*
FGD and KI phone number	*Direct contact with KI*	*Loss of privacy*	*Follow up for data cleaning*	*B1*	*To be deleted immediately after data cleaning*
FGD and KI interview time	*Indirect identification*	*Loss of privacy*	*Follow up for data cleaning*	*B1*	*To be deleted immediately after data cleaning*

Responsibilities

Data collection	*SPO under recruitment*

Data cleaning	*SPO under recruitment*
Data analysis	*Alexander Nachman, Assessment Officer, alexander.nachman@reach-initiative.org*
Data sharing/uploading	*Alexander Nachman, Assessment Officer, alexander.nachman@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 Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of x product from Resource Center	Country request to HQ	User_log	x Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Relief Web	Country request to HQ		□ Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Country level platforms	Country team		□ Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter	Country request to HQ		x Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly	Country team		□ Yes
		# of visits to x webmap/x dashboard	Country request to HQ		□ 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	x Yes
		# references in single agency documents			
Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs	Country team	Usage_Feedback *and* Usage_Survey template	*The usage survey to be implemented for this research cycle related to all output.*
		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			

	strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products				
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	Country team	Engagement_log	□ Yes
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis			x Yes
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;			x Yes