

Research Terms of Reference

Humanitarian Situation Monitoring of high needs and hard to reach areas

CAR1902

Central African Republic

01.03.2020

Version 2

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Country of intervention | Central African Republic | | | | | |
| Type of Emergency | <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural disaster | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Conflict | | |
| Type of Crisis | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sudden onset | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slow onset | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Protracted |
| Mandating Body/ Agency | Assessment Working Group | | | | | |
| Project Code | 26iALM / 26DXI | | | | | |
| Overall Research Timeframe (from research design to final outputs / M&E) | 01/05/2019 to 31/04/2021 | | | | | |
| Research Timeframe¹ Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1) | 1. Start collect data: 01/03/2020 | | 5. Preliminary presentation: __/__/__ | | | |
| | 2. Data collected: 31/03/2020 | | 6. Outputs sent for validation: __/__/__ | | | |
| | 3. Data analysed: 13/05/2020 | | 7. Outputs published: __/__/__ | | | |
| | 4. Data sent for validation: 13/05/2020 | | 8. Final presentation: __/__/__ | | | |
| Number of assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> | Single assessment (one cycle) | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Monthly 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 | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Donor plan/strategy | On a monthly basis | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | On a monthly basis | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cluster plan/strategy | On a monthly basis | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | NGO platform plan/strategy | __/__/__ | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (Specify): | __/__/__ | | | |
| Audience Type & Dissemination Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience | Audience type | | Dissemination | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter/NFI, Health, Nutrition, WASH, Protection, Logistics) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | | | | | |

¹ The timeframe refers to the data collection of March 2020 only.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | X Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | |
| Detailed dissemination plan required | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | X No |
| General Objective | <i>To inform humanitarian actors on needs, displacement dynamics and services access in high needs and/or hard-to-reach areas in Central African Republic</i> | | |
| Specific Objective(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To identify humanitarian needs and vulnerabilities, both sectoral and cross-sectoral of populations living in high needs and/or hard-to-reach² areas of Central African Republic; 2. To provide up-to-date information on displacement dynamics and service provisions / access in high needs and/or hard-to-reach areas. 3. Compare needs and vulnerabilities over time | | |
| Research Questions | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the needs and vulnerabilities of populations in high needs and/or hard-to-reach areas with regards to Food Security, Livelihoods, Health, Nutrition, Shelter/NFI, WASH, Education and Protection 2. How do these needs and vulnerabilities evolve over time? 3. To which services and type of humanitarian assistance, the populations in high needs and/or hard-to-reach areas have access ? 4. What are the main access constraints ? 5. What are the main movements of populations in high needs and/or hard-to-reach areas? | | |
| Geographic Coverage | <i>Localities situated along roads / axis in High needs and / or hard-to-reach areas defined as areas responding to one, or more, of the following criteria:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas that are difficult to access for security reasons 2. Areas that are difficult to access for logistical reasons 3. Areas for which information on the humanitarian situation are outdated or incomplete 4. Areas with highest severity of needs | | |
| Secondary data sources | <i>OCHA, IOM Displacement Tracking Matric (DTM), Rapid Response Mechanism(RRM), MSNA / JMMI and other situations reports Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM) monthly price monitoring Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) updates Cluster and partner-led assessments</i> | | |
| Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i> | X | IDPs in camp | X IDPs in informal sites |
| | X | IDPs in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> IDPs [Other, Specify] |
| | X | Refugees in camp | X Refugees in informal sites |
| | X | Refugees in host communities | X Refugees [Other, Specify] |
| | X | Host communities | X Other, specify : Returnees and repatriated |
| Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i> | X | Geographical #: Hard-to-reach areas identified in 3 macro areas: 1. North East | <input type="checkbox"/> Group #: _ _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> [Other Specify] #: _ _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

² Areas with non-regular access due to poor infrastructures, active conflict, humanitarian access restrictions, out-dated information or a combination of these.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | 2. Southeast 3. Northwest In each macro area: 1. Quantitative data at axis level 2. Qualitative data at Admin 3 level Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | | | | |
| Data collection tool(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Structured (Quantitative) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Semi-structured (Qualitative) | | |
| | Sampling method | | Data collection method | | | |
| Structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified cluster sampling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Snowball sampling | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #): <i>max. 5 per locality / target minimum according to the number of localities situated along the identified roads / axis :</i> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> From 1 to 6 localities: 50% <input type="checkbox"/> From 7 to 10 localities: 33% <input type="checkbox"/> From 11 to 20 localities: 20% <input type="checkbox"/> 21 localities and more: 10% </div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group discussion (Target #): <i>min. 1 FGD per admin 3 per month</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Household interview (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Direct observations (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #): _____ | | | |
| Target level of precision if probability sampling | N/A | | N/A | | | |
| Data management platform(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IMPACT | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNHCR | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] | | | | |
| Expected output type(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Situation overview #: 05 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Report #: __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Profile #: __ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Final) #: __ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Factsheet #: 03 monthly factsheets (1 factsheet per macro-area) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interactive dashboard #: __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Webmap #: __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Map #: __ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] #: __ | | | | |
| Access | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms) | | | | |

| | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) |
| Visibility | | REACH Initiative, OFDA, CHF, IMAWG |

2. Rationale

The crisis in Central African Republic has entered its 6th year. Since late 2012 – early 2013, the conflict, driven by diverse motives between armed groups, the *Mission Intégrée des Nations Unies pour la Stabilisation de la Centrafrique* (MINUSCA) and the *Force Armées de Centrafrique* (FACA) in several parts of the country, has created acute humanitarian information gaps. Indeed, access is continuously impeded in many areas due to security and logistics challenges. This has resulted in both non-systematic and non-comprehensive data collection efforts. As a consequence, humanitarian planning and implementation has been mostly driven by available information rather than by a comprehensive understanding of the humanitarian situation and its subsequent priorities. It has become urgent to ensure a closer monitoring of the humanitarian situation in areas where access is limited and/or when information is out-dated.

To monitor humanitarian needs and displacement of population living in these areas, REACH is conducting data collection mostly remotely as access is largely impeded in targeted areas. As such, data is collected at the locality level, through a network of key informants. First pilot was deployed in Bangassou town, Mbomou prefecture, and in Bambari, Ouaka prefecture from May 2019, and has now expanded to other high needs and / or hard-to-reach area based such as North-east of the country (Vakaga, Haute-Kotto), and North-west of the country (Ouham, Ouham-Pendé).

The AoK approach, as described in its South-Sudan version, “provides regular, reliable indicative tracking of humanitarian needs over time, to support the prioritization and identification of hot-spot areas witnessing a deterioration of humanitarian needs”. Collected data and subsequent analysis will be shared with existing humanitarian coordination mechanisms and structures for triangulation and feedbacks purposes in order to ensure that results effectively inform the humanitarian response planning. Indeed, a wide consensus in CAR is that response is implemented based on areas where we have information, rather than where needs are / may be. Sharing data and analysis aim at informing response planning and supporting decision making process based on identified needs and vulnerabilities across the country.

A first round of data collection has been completed during the months of November 2019, December 2019 and January 2020. The related factsheets (monthly) and “Situation Overview” (quarterly) have been published, and contributed to inform the humanitarian response planning for 2020. Following the first round of data collection, REACH will continue the monthly data collection starting from the month of March 2020. Compared to the first round, in order to obtain results at a more accurate and detailed geographical level, as well as a level that is more relevant to humanitarian programming, the methodology will be reviewed (as explained in the paragraph below), in order to focus the analysis and reporting at two different levels: macro-area level (North East; Southeast; Northwest) and axis level. Collected data and subsequent analysis will be shared with existing humanitarian coordination mechanisms and structures for triangulation and feedbacks purposes in order to ensure that results effectively inform the humanitarian response planning.

3. Methodology

3.1. Methodology overview

This recurring research cycle aims at informing on multi-sectoral needs in hard-to-reach areas (on a regular basis), defined as areas with non-regular access due to poor infrastructures, active conflict, humanitarian access restrictions, out-dated information or a combination of these.

Quantitative data will be collected in both direct and remote data collections using a structured locality level questionnaire. Each month, enumerators will gather information on humanitarian needs and vulnerabilities regarding the localities situated in a buffer of 20 km (10 + 10) along the targeted roads / axis. The total number of localities located within each buffer has been identified before data collection. In most of the cases REACH officers and/or enumerators will not visit directly the

localities to be assessed, but data will be collected through Key Informants (KI) interviews with people deemed to have the required knowledge (i.e. good information about a locality of interest over the last 30 days) in accessible areas. KIs in this category are expected to be i) IDPs/returnees arrived within the past 30 days ii) itinerants (traders, NGO officials), and/or iii) individuals who have regular phone/satellite/radio communication with individuals living in the locality.

In order to provide a more in-depth understanding of the movements of the population, the access to services and the service access constraints by sector (FSL, Health, WASH, Shelter/NFI), as well as to complement/verify data collected through the KI interviews, the monthly data collection cycle also entails Focus Group Discussions (FGD). FGDs are conducted by Field Coordinators and/or Assessment Officers, assisted by 1 enumerator for taking the notes. During these FGDs a semi-structured tool is used in order to collect the needed information. This tool is used to look at wider commune-level, with participants purposively selected through the previously identified KIs. At least 1 FGD per month should be conducted for each commune, with participants representing (reporting about) at least 5% of the total of targeted localities for the commune.

REACH officers and/or enumerators could however visit some targeted localities, if accessible by car or motorbike, in case that these localities host places of concentration / transit particularly relevant for the surrounding localities, such as markets, health services, bus stations, IDPs site etc. In such cases, quantitative data will be produced through KI interviews with local stakeholders of the visited locality (representatives of health and/or education services, local organisations etc.), by using the same questionnaire as for the standard KI interviews.

Quantitative data regarding the surrounding localities will be as well collected.

In order to ensure a minimum level of representativeness, some minimum thresholds of localities to be assessed on each road/axis have been established as follows:

- Roads on which there are 1 to 6 localities: 50% of localities to be assessed;
- Roads on which there are 7 to 10 localities: 33% of localities to be assessed;
- Roads on which there are 11 to 20 localities: 20% of localities to be assessed;
- Roads on which there are 21 localities and more: 10% of localities to be assessed.

Findings concerning the roads / axis for which the above thresholds will not be reached, are not included in published REACH products.

Quantitative data will then be aggregated in order to provide findings at axis level and/or at macro-area level. Data will be displayed on factsheets informing on humanitarian needs and vulnerabilities per sector, and reporting data by percentage of assessed localities situated on each road/axis, or by percentage of assessed localities situated in the macro-area. These factsheets will be published each month, while Situation Overview reports will be published every three months and will focus on trends analysis.

3.2 Population of interest

Data will be collected at the lowest unit possible, i.e. at the locality level derived from the OCHA localities dataset. A locality is either a village or, regarding an urban area, a neighbourhood. The level of coverage will be declared for each product when results are presented, in terms of proportion of localities assessed compared to the total number of known localities situated along each targeted axis.

During the data collection, a part from some questions regarding the presence and movement of populations in the locality (KI) and within the commune (FGD), no stratification by group of population is implemented, given the aim of the survey is to assess the overall population living in the locality and the commune.

3.3 Secondary data review

Secondary data is used to support the identification of areas with limited or irregular access and/or with outdated information, design of tools and triangulation of data / results.

- **Identifying areas:** through continued discussions with humanitarian partners (OCHA, NGOs, clusters) and reviews of existing analysis (HNO, IPC, RRM reports, MSNA findings and other ad-hoc analysis), high needs and / or hard-to-reach areas have been identified, and will be updated on a regularly basis.
- **Designing tools:** tools are reviewed according to the feedbacks from the first round of data collection (November 2019 – January 2020); partners' feedbacks, in order to make sure data produced closely informs humanitarian planning.
- **Triangulation:** Data produced will be triangulated with other sources (through discussion with partners and existing analysis) to confirm findings during analysis and report drafting stages.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

After the first round of data collection (November 2019 – January 2020), changes were needed for getting more detailed information at geographical level (previously reported at national and admin3 level). Following the discussions entailed with the humanitarian partners, and considering the humanitarian programming take into consideration the level of accessibility and interrelationships within the roads/axis, data will be now collected and analyzed for providing indicative information about the humanitarian situation on the following roads/axis:

| Macro-area | Axis | Location |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| North East | Birao - Kidjidi | Birao |
| North East | Oulou - Tiringoulou | Ouandja |
| North East | Ouadda - Ouanda-Djalle | Ouadda |
| North East | Ouadda - Ouhi | Ouadda |
| North East | Ouadda - Sam Ouandja | Ouadda |
| North East | Ouadda - Gbalikape | Ouadda |
| North East | Sam Ouandja - Ouadda Djalle | Sam Ouandja |
| North East | Sam Ouandja - Kaouadja | Sam Ouandja |
| North East | Army - Tissy 4 | Birao |
| North East | Bani - Kaouadja | Yalinga |
| North East | Bani - Ouadda | Yalinga |
| North East | Bani - Yalinga | Yalinga |
| North East | Yalinga-Bria | Yalinga |
| North East | Bria - Ira-Banda | Bria |
| North East | Ippy - Ndjoubissi | Ippy |
| North East | Ippy - Atongo-Bakari | Ippy |
| North East | Atongo-Bakari_Ira-Banda | Ippy |
| North East | Birao - Gnalida (Am-Dafock) | Birao |

| | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| North East | Birao-Belakoutou | Birao |
| North East | Birao - Madja | Birao |
| North East | Birao - Ouanda-Djalle | Birao |
| North East | Kidjidji - Aifa | Ouandja |
| North East | Aifa - Ouandja | Ouandja |
| Southeast | Bambouti - Obo | Bambouti |
| Southeast | Ndenguio - Bali-Fondo | Bakouma |
| Southeast | Fode - Bali-Fondo | Bakouma |
| Southeast | Niakari - M bapia | Bangassou |
| Southeast | Niakari - Banabongo | Bangassou |
| Southeast | Ouazzoua - Ziangba (via Bobo) | Ouango |
| Southeast | Ouango - Ngombe | Ouango |
| Southeast | Gambo - Ngandou | Gambo |
| Southeast | Ngandou - Guilo | Gambo |
| Southeast | Ngandou - Popongo | Gambo |
| Southeast | Obo - Djema | Obo |
| Southeast | Ngandou - Ouazzoua | Gambo |
| Southeast | Ngouakouzou - Bangba-Balingou | Gambo |
| Southeast | Satema - Tenguia | Satema |
| Southeast | Satema - Guilo | Satema |
| Southeast | Guilo - Kembe | Satema |
| Southeast | Guilo - Gambo (via Lakoundji) | Satema |
| Southeast | Guilo - Limassa | Satema |
| Southeast | Dimbi - Mboutou | Kembe |
| Southeast | Bouhou 1 - Oye 2 | Kembe |
| Southeast | Obo - Mboki | Obo |
| Southeast | Liwa - Ngale croisement | Mobaye |
| Southeast | Ngale croisement - Kete-bangui | Zangba |
| Southeast | Ndawa - Ngonda | Zangba |
| Southeast | Ndawa - Kete bangui | Zangba |
| Southeast | Wele - Ligba | Zangba |
| Southeast | Ndawa - Demanda | Zangba |
| Southeast | Alindao - Mbo-Poulobou (via tagbale) | Mingala |
| Southeast | Mboki - Zemio | Zemio |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| Southeast | Alindao - Kabou 1 (axe Seliba) | Mingala |
| Southeast | Mbo-Poulobou - Mingala | Mingala |
| Southeast | Kabou 1 - Bana-Dobe | Mingala |
| Southeast | Kabou 1 - Niada (via Dalakera 2) | Mingala |
| Southeast | Mingala - Niada | Mingala |
| Southeast | Mingala - Ligui | Mingala |
| Southeast | Foulata - Kogba 1 | Zangba |
| Southeast | Zemio - Djema | Zemio |
| Southeast | Dembia - Zemio | Zemio |
| Southeast | Djema - Dembia | Djema |
| Southeast | Bakouma - Ngui 1 | Bakouma |
| Southeast | Bakouma - Ndenguïro | Bakouma |
| Northwest | Bohong - Tolle | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Nzakoundou_Herbo | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Begouladje 2 - Benamkor | Paoua |
| Northwest | Benamkor - Bah-Bessar | Paoua |
| Northwest | Bah-Bessar - Betoko 1 | Paoua |
| Northwest | Betoko 1 - Begouladje 2 | Paoua |
| Northwest | Benah 2 - Begouladje 2 (via Bedoua 1) | Paoua |
| Northwest | Bendou-Moundou - Bedaya | Paoua |
| Northwest | Dito - Bedogo 1 (via Bedogo 2) | Paoua |
| Northwest | Beboura 3 - Bembere | Paoua |
| Northwest | Koui-Bomango (via Mbitanga et Dock) | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Beboura 3 - Boria | Paoua |
| Northwest | Boria - Markounda | Markounda |
| Northwest | Markounda - Bodjomo | Markounda |
| Northwest | Bodjomo - Bele | Markounda |
| Northwest | Markounda - Maissolo (Batangafo) | Markounda |
| Northwest | Bodjomo - Groupement Kouki | Markounda |
| Northwest | Bodjomo - Boguila 1 | Markounda |
| Northwest | Koui-Bomango (via Jean-Basse et Sangoldoro) | Bocaranga |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Northwest | Bomango - Groupement Yelewa (Bouar) | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Bogang 2 - Bogoui | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Bogoui - Kounang | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Usine Ndim - Nzakoundou (via Kollo) | Bocaranga |
| Northwest | Usine Ndim - Nzakoundou | Bocaranga |

The roads / axis listed in the above table could be slightly reviewed during the data collection according to the feedback from REACH field officer and/or humanitarian partners.

Quantitative data collection

○ Data collection tools

Quantitative data is collected in the above-mentioned field locations through a structured multi-sector survey tool that captures locality-level information on displacement, food security and livelihoods (FSL), WASH, Shelter/NFI, Nutrition, Protection, Education and Health. This tool can be used in both direct and remote data collections.

Starting from March 2020, the data will be collected through a slightly revised version of the tool, based on the feedback / lessons learnt from the first round of data collection (November 2019 – January 2020). Feedbacks received from partners following the dissemination of the results will be constantly evaluated and eventually incorporated to ensure a collaboratively designed tool.

Data will be uploaded to the REACH CAR Kobo server at the end of each collection day (should there be an available internet network).

Data is collected by enumerators supervised by a field officer, who will ensure in collaboration with the assessment officer the cleaning process and briefing with enumerators to address inconsistencies in data collection and constantly monitor the geographical coverage based on collected data. The aim of the assessment is to cover as many localities as possible, hence to focus resources accordingly, a cap on KI interviews has been set at a maximum of 5 per locality for each data collection round.

○ Sampling

Data collection will be conducted using a combination of purposive and snowball sampling to identify key informants who have knowledge of a remote-locality will be interviewed. KIs in this category will be identified amongst i) IDPs/returnees arrived within the past 30 days, refugees, ii) itinerants (traders, NGO officials), and/or iii) individuals who have regular phone/satellite/radio communication with individuals living in the locality. KIs can also be selected through snowball sampling; via KIs that have been interviewed, who are able to put the data collection team in touch with additional KIs.

REACH officers and/or enumerators could however visit some targeted localities, if accessible by car or motorbike, in case that these localities host places of concentration / transit particularly relevant for the surrounding localities, such as markets, health services, bus stations, IDPs site etc. In such cases, quantitative data will be produced through the conduction of KI interviews with local stakeholders of the visited locality (representatives of health and/or education services, local organisations etc.), by using the same questionnaire as for the standard KI interviews.

The selection criteria for a KI, applicable to any KI type, is that s/he has knowledge of a remote locality from within the last month to ensure that gathered information is up-to-date (no later than 30 days). KIs report on the locality level. A minimum

of one KI per locality is required, and teams will seek to avoid more than 5 KIs per locality in order to maintain focus on covering as many localities as possible (as opposed to KIs).

Qualitative data collection

○ Data collection tools

In order to provide a more in-depth understanding of the movements of the population, the access to services and the service access constraints by sector (FSL, Health, WASH, Shelter/NFI), as well as to complement/verify data collected through the KI interviews, the monthly data collection cycle also entails Focus Group Discussions (FGD). FGDs are conducted by Field Coordinators and/or Assessment Officers, assisted by 1 enumerator for taking the notes.

During these FGDs a semi-structured tool is used in order to collect the needed information. This tool is used to look at wider Admin 3 (commune)-level, with participants purposively selected through the previously identified KIs.

○ Sampling

At least 1 FGD per month should be conducted for each commune, with participants identified within the previously interviewed KIs, and representing (reporting about) at least 5% of the total of targeted localities for the commune. Information collected through the FGDs will be filled into a matrix and sent to the Assessment officer on a monthly basis.

Data collection during COVID-19

Given the risk of spreading of the covid-19, starting from March 2020 some preventive measures will be put in place to safeguard the teams and the visited communities, according to the principle of “do no harm”. In this regard, specific operational procedures will be implemented when carrying out field surveys (before, during and after the data collection), based on social distances and the strengthening of hygiene rules. In particular, the teams will be instructed in order to reduce the duration of the interviews with the KIs; to reduce the number of participants and the duration of the FGD; to always maintain social distances during the implementation of all activities; to optimize the movements to field locations and reduce those that are not strictly necessary.

3.5. Data Processing & Analysis

Data quality and cleaning

Every day, at the end of the collection, the surveys are uploaded on the REACH/IMPACT Kobo server and downloaded as one dataset. This dataset will be cleaned by the database assistant or the Assessment Officer, in line with IMPACT standard procedures. Cleaning include logging deleted entries and value changes, whilst the raw dataset is also stored.

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

- Weekly spot checks by field officer of enumerators conducting interviews
- Daily data check of collected quantitative data by field officers, who identify outliers, abnormalities and logical inconsistencies and give regular feedback to enumerators through monthly and ad-hoc trainings, during spot checks as well as the daily morning brief. Data points which can't be resolved through discussions with enumerators are deleted and where entire records (surveys) are deemed unreliable, the entire record is deleted from the dataset.
- Weekly data cleaning by Assessment Officer, who review data cleaning conducted by Field Officers and provide additional feedback to the data collection teams in the form of re-training.

After all data is cleaned, the raw and cleaned dataset, along with the data cleaning log, will be saved and stored in a clearly labelled folder (see data management plan).

Aggregation of KI responses to locality level

Given more than one quantitative survey may be collected on a given locality, data from key informants reporting on the same locality is aggregated to the locality level using a R script which employs the following logic to calculate locality-level responses.

All questions will be analyzed according to the % of assessed localities responding for each answer. In the event that the number of KI interviews from a given locality conflict, the most frequent response will be used as the answer for that locality. In the event that the answers conflict, and there is not a majority answer, then the results will be aggregated also considering the typology of KI, in order to prioritize the answers reported by KIs whom “visited” directly the locality during the last 30 days (individuals living in the locality, newly arrived IDPs/refugees or itinerants) instead of those referred by KI through remote (even if regular) communications with the locality.

After that, in the event that the answer still conflict, then the answer “Aucun consensus” will be given instead. “Aucun consensus” will be included as an option in the total responses for the aggregated data.

Note: For certain questions, noted in the Data Analysis Plan, some responses will super-cede others, and either the modal response or “Aucun consensus” will not be used as normal. This is to ensure that one KI’s lack of knowledge about specific issues, for instance, protection concerns, do not cancel out the information that other KIs might know. The specific questions and the particular method of their analysis will be detailed in the section 5. For example, if there are three KIs, and one notes that there are unaccompanied children in the locality, but two say that there are not, the answer will be coded as “Yes” even though more KIs reported “No” because not all KIs might be aware of unaccompanied children within the locality.

In order to ensure a minimum level of representativeness, findings for roads where less than pre-established thresholds of localities situated along the axis have been assessed, will not be included in published REACH products. The minimum thresholds have been established as follows:

- From 1 to 6 localities: 50%
- From 7 to 10 localities: 33%
- From 11 to 20 localities: 20%
- 21 localities and more: 10%

Data Analysis

For quantitative data gathered, analysis will be conducted using R and Excel. Following the aggregation of the data (made through a R-script), it will then be fed into an excel tool, which will be used as a tool to easily analyze indicators at different levels (macro-area, prefecture (Admin 1), sous-préfecture (Admin 2), commune (Admin 3) or road / axis).

Because there is no way to ensure that localities are selected at random, strong representative claims cannot be made regarding the findings of the data. The following criteria have been established to maximize representativeness as far as possible:

- All data is to be reported as “assessed localities” in order to ensure that no broader claims regarding representativeness are made;
- The area (either the macro-area, the préfecture, the sous-préfecture, the commune or the road / axis) must be clearly defined so as not to misrepresent the findings.

Qualitative data

The results of FGDs will be filled into a matrix and sent par mail to the Assessment officer in charge for supervising all data. During the analysis, these results will be used to verify and complement the data collected through the KI interviews, as well as to identify trends to be included in the Situation Overview reports.

4. Roles and responsibilities

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

| Task Description | Responsible | Accountable | Consulted | Informed |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Research design | Assessment Officer | Assessment Officer / CFP | HQ | |
| Supervising data collection | FO | AO | AO /CFP | |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | FO/AO | AO | AO / CFP + GIS | |
| Data analysis | AO | AO/CFP | GIS, HQ | |
| Output production | AO | AO/CFP | GIS, HQ | |
| Dissemination | AO | AO | CFP | HQ |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | AO | AO/CFP | HQ | |
| Lessons learned | AO | AO | CFP, 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) who need to be informed when the task is completed

NB: Only one person can be Accountable; the only scenario when the same person is listed twice for a task is when the same person is both Responsible and Accountable.

5.Data Analysis Plan

The Data Analysis Plan is available at the following [link](#).

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

- Please complete the M&E Plan column in the table and use the corresponding Tools in the Monitoring & Evaluation matrix to implement the plan during the research cycle.

| IMPACT Objective | External M&E Indicator | Internal M&E Indicator | Focal point | Tool | Will indicator be tracked? |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products | Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products | # of downloads of x product from Resource Center | Country request to HQ | User_log | X Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Relief Web | Country request to HQ | | X Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Country level platforms | Country team | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products | # of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter | Country request to HQ | | X Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly | Country team | | X Yes |
| | | # of visits to x webmap/x dashboard | Country request to HQ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response | Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products | # references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies) | Country team | Reference_log | HNO, HRP, light-mid-year HNO, Cluster strategy if any |
| | | # 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 | Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs | Country team | Usage_Feedback and Usage_Survey template | Usage surveys |
| | | Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs | | | Usage surveys |
| | | Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | |
| | | Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff | | | |
| | | Perceived quality of outputs/programs | | | |
| | Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products | Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | Usage surveys |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|----------------|-------|
| 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 | X Yes |
| | | # of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis | | | X Yes |
| | | # of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings; | | | X Yes |