

Research Methodology Note

From Response to Resilience in Maiduguri

PHASE 3 – Durable Solutions & Social Cohesion Assessment

NGA1902c

Nigeria

November 2020

Version 1



1. Executive Summary

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Country of intervention | Nigeria | | |
| 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 | ECHO | | |
| Project Code | 35DVK | | |
| Overall Research Timeframe (from research design to final outputs / M&E) | October 2020 to February 2021 | | |
| Research Timeframe Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1) | 1. Start collect data: 23/11/2020 | | 5. Preliminary presentation: 15/01/2021 |
| | 2. Data collected: 04/12/2020 | | 6. Outputs sent for validation: 22/01/2021 |
| | 3. Data analysed: 18/12/2020 | | 7. Outputs published: 05/02/2021 |
| | 4. Data sent for validation: 18/12/2020 | | 8. Final presentation: 12/02/2021 |
| Number of assessments | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Single assessment (one cycle) ¹ | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Multi assessment (more than one cycle) [Describe here the frequency of the cycle] | |
| Humanitarian milestones Specify <i>what</i> will the assessment inform and <i>when</i> e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal; | Milestone | | Deadline |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Donor plan/strategy | -- / / -- |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | -- / / -- |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cluster plan/strategy | -- / / -- |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | NGO platform plan/strategy | -- / / -- |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Consortium ² : Assess durable solutions and social cohesion in selected neighbourhoods. | 12/02/2021 |
| | Audience type | | Dissemination |

¹ This methodology note is for Phase 3 of a Multi-cycle research cycle. The research Terms of Reference for this overall research cycle is available upon request.

² The consortium is a collection of International Rescue Committee(IRC), ACTED and IMPACT-Initiatives

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Audience Type & Dissemination <i>Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) <input type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] |
| Detailed dissemination plan required | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| General Objective | The general objective of the assessment is to provide information on the context and conditions for durable solutions in three targeted pilot clusters of neighbourhoods ³ in Maiduguri, as well as an in-depth understanding of the key components of social cohesion so as to inform interventions focusing on durable solutions. | |
| Specific Objective(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand perceived intentions of IDPs to move, particularly needs and risks/vulnerabilities that may influence movements or be exacerbated by choices to return, relocate or settle in place, 2. Assess how conditions in current areas of settlement related to the “sustainability of durable solutions” may affect IDP movement intentions,⁴ 3. Identify the local social dynamics and power structures in terms of stakeholders and affected communities’ relative to IDPs and host communities, 4. Explore conditions in the area in terms of community needs and interrelations and the viability of safe and dignified integration, drawing from the IASC durable solutions framework, and relating to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Household needs and access to services⁵ b. Social cohesion and community tensions c. Governance and security | |
| Research Questions | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the movement intentions of different population groups in the short term (1 month) and longer term (6 months)? What factors have affected these intentions? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. What factors could be affecting these intentions? 1.2. What conditions affect IDP movement intentions related to sustainable durable solutions? 2. What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders in the assessed areas? 3. What are the different populations’ perceptions of conditions in the area regarding conduciveness to durable solutions? | |

³ For this assessment, we shall refer to the selected clusters of neighbourhoods as just Neighbourhoods as they define areas where intervention will be done. The Neighbourhood Clusters are as follows: 1. Cluster ONE (Sulaimanti 1; Sulaimanti 2; Sulaimanti 3; Sulaimanti 4); 2. Cluster TWO (Waziri Musa street; A.B. Hassan Street; Gwange Malut Shuwa street; Gwange Sheik Ibrahim Saleh); and 3. Cluster THREE (Ngirmari Farm Center; Alhaji Tar; Goni Kachalari).

⁴ Sustainability of durable solutions, specifically voluntary return, reintegration or local integration, means that conditions in the arriving areas (areas of origin for returnees or areas of displacement for IDPs) ensure that individuals enjoy socio-economic stability and do not displace again. Those conditions will include sense of safety and security, dignified access to basic and public assistance, access to livelihood and documentation, and reduced risks of aid dependency.

⁵ In terms of Household needs and access to services i.e. basic standards of living, livelihood opportunities, access to adequate shelter and effective mechanisms for restoring HLP, documentation etc. and any demographic differentiation in access; social cohesion and community tensions i.e. prevalence of disputes within and between communities, feeling of safety, security, and freedom of movement, etc.; and governance and security i.e. presence and dynamics of political groups and/or local security actors, access to judicial mechanisms, etc.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| Geographic Coverage | <p>The three target clusters of neighbourhoods pre-selected⁶ during phase 1 in Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria.</p> <p>Three clusters of neighbourhoods were selected during phase one, each cluster is composed of more than one neighbourhood:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster ONE (Sulaimanti 1; Sulaimanti 2; Sulaimanti 3; Sulaimanti 4) Cluster TWO (Waziri Musa street; A.B. Hassan Street; Gwange Malut Shuwa street; Gwange Sheik Ibrahim Saleh) Cluster THREE (Ngirmari Farm Center; Alhaji Tar; Goni Kachalari) | | | | | |
| Secondary data sources | <p>NEMA Nigeria (National Emergency Management Agency), IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA), Reliefweb, EM-DAT (international disasters database), GIZ's Community Development Plans of all wards in Maiduguri</p> | | | | | |
| Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in camp | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in informal sites | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs [Other, Specify] | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in camp | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in informal sites | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees [Other, Specify] | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] | | |
| Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Geographical #: The three selected clusters of neighbourhood selected during phase one within Maiduguri areas (neighbourhoods) Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Group #: (IDPs, Host community) Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" 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 |
| Data collection tool(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Structured (Quantitative) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Semi-structured (Qualitative) | | |
| | Sampling method | | Data collection method | | | |
| Semi-structured data collection tool (s) #1 FGDs Durable Solutions and Social Cohesion - IDPs <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | | <input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #): : 8 per neighbourhood: 2 male IDPs youth (18-24) and 2 male IDP adults (25-59), 2 female IDPs youth and 2 female IDP adults, 24 total <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ | | | |
| Semi-structured data collection tool (s) #2 FGDs Durable Solutions and Social Cohesion – Community leaders (CL) & representatives from | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | | <input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #): 2 per neighbourhood (1 community leaders, 1 CBO), 6 | | | |

⁶ The selection of the three neighbourhoods was completed during phase one in a stakeholders engagement workshop where government ministries, line ministries and local government representatives participated alongside consortium partners. The selection followed Four Criteria that was previously agreed upon by the consortium partners and government representatives. These criteria included Access to critical services, exposure to hazard, IDPs to Host community population ratio and presence of humanitarian workers.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| community-based organisations (CBOs) <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i> | | | <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ | |
| Target level of precision if probability sampling | % level of confidence | | % margin of error | |
| 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 #: 3 (one per neighborhood) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Report #: <input type="checkbox"/> Profile #: _ _ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: 3 (one per neighborhood) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Final) #: 3 (one per neighborhood) <input type="checkbox"/> Factsheet #: _ _ |
| | <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 <i>Specify which logos should be on outputs</i> | Consortium Logo ACTED IRC IMPACT | | | |

2. Rationale

2.1 General Context

Over ten years into the conflict, the humanitarian situation in Northeast Nigeria remains one of the world’s most severe. Out of Borno, Adamawa, and Yobe (BAY) states’ total population of 13 million people, an estimated 7.9 million were in need of humanitarian assistance at the start of 2020. The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) estimates that number may have risen to as high as 10.2 million since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the 2020 Humanitarian Needs Overview, over 60% of Northeast Nigeria’s IDPs currently reside in host communities, making them harder to identify, target, and access than IDPs, and further stretching the already limited resources of these communities. Additionally, high population densities and economic precariousness observed in informal settlements within host communities, particularly in urban areas, are also potential vectors for disease transmission and aggravating factors for secondary impacts. In order to effectively plan an intervention for affected host-communities, humanitarian actors require an area overview to determine how and to what extent durable solutions for returnees and IDPs have or can be achieved, as well as in-depth understanding of the key components of social cohesion so as to inform interventions focusing on durable solutions.

Within this context, the project “From Response to Resilience in Maiduguri” led by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) in a consortium with ACTED and IMPACT seeks to address three interlinked problems: (1) the need for state and local authorities to plan for and manage urban risk, (2) the need to enhance community structures and civil society coordination’s opportunities to engage state and local authorities and hold them to account, and (3) the need to link up Neighbourhood-

grounded and data-driven initiatives which are inclusive of urban displaced communities with community engagement strategies and city-wide capacities for resilience.

Given the scale and prolonged nature of urban displacement patterns in the metropolitan area of Maiduguri, there is an increasing need to understand IDPs' movement intentions and opportunities to benefit from durable solutions either in terms of return or local integration and social cohesion dynamics between host and displaced communities. In response to this need, a durable solutions analysis for IDPs for each selected cluster will be undertaken. The analysis will highlight actionable priorities to progress towards solutions for IDPs, specifically with regards to access to services, and factors that might affect the sustainability of durable solutions, including social cohesion. These findings will be valuable for the consortium partners and local authorities to inform urban planning efforts in understanding of the city's capacity to integrate displaced population groups.

3. Methodology

3.1. Methodology overview

This assessment will be facilitated by IMPACT's AGORA team in Nigeria. The assessment will be carried out in 3 clusters of neighbourhoods selected during Phase 1 of the project. Semi-structured focus group discussions (FGDs) will be conducted in the selected neighbourhoods to assess movement intentions related to durable solutions for IDPs, community needs and interrelations and the viability of safe and dignified integration, and the dynamics impacting social cohesion. FGDs will be conducted with community members who have knowledge about the community, purposively selected from the neighbourhoods. FGDs will also be conducted with community leaders and representatives of community based organizations (CBOs) to further identify dynamics of access and delivery of services and vulnerabilities to hazards across the host communities.

FGD participants will be separated according to gender, age group (young and older people) and community role; in total, 10 FGDs (of 6 to 8 participants each) will be conducted in each clusters of neighborhood. Three slightly different semi-structured tools were used in this assessment: one FGD tool for male/female youths (ages 18 to 24), one FGD tool for male/female adults (ages 25 to 59) and one FGD tool for gatekeepers, elders, religious leaders, local government and CSO representatives.

3.2. Population of interest

The assessment will cover three clusters of neighborhoods that were selected during phase one. The population of interest include the following.

- IDPs living in the target neighborhoods, either within the host community areas or in informal settlements inside these neighborhoods.
- Local authorities, community leaders and representatives of community based organizations (CBOs) and government agencies/ministries

3.3. Secondary data review

- UNHCR Durable solutions assessment, Cameroon, 2015- *This source provided more information on designing durable solutions questions, hence useful for the durable solutions segment of this assessment.*
- AGORA 2020, Understanding the Humanitarian and Service Delivery Related Needs of the Population in Three Vulnerable Neighbourhood in Maiduguri, Nigeria.
- JIPS Durable Solutions Analysis Guide: A tool to measure progress towards Durable Solutions for IDPs – This will inform the design and tools for the assessment.
- IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons – This will inform the design and tools for the assessment.
- GCER Durable Solutions in Practice, September 2017 - This will inform the design and tools for the assessment.
- Journal of Refugee Studies, Social Capital's Role in Humanitarian Crises

- IMPACT Somalia 2019 Social Cohesion Assessment - This will inform the design and tools for the assessment.
- REACH Iraq 2020 Returns and Durable Solutions Assessment - This will inform the design and tools for the assessment.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

Focus group discussions will be conducted in the three selected clusters of neighborhoods listed as Cluster One, Cluster Two and Cluster Three in Table 1 below. Ten FGDs will be conducted in each cluster with participants drawn from the different Neighbourhoods within the cluster, with each FGD comprising of 6 to 8 participants. The breakdown of FGDs by site and demographics is provided below in Table 1. The FGDs with IDP community members will be gender and aged disaggregated: male youths (ages 18 to 24), female youths (ages 18 to 24), male adults (ages 25 to 59), female adults (ages 25 to 59). There will be two additional FGD groupings in each cluster: 1) community leaders i.e. gatekeepers, elders, religious leaders, and local government representatives and 2) CBO representatives. Across the 3 neighbourhoods, there will be 30 FGDs conducted in total.

Table 1: FGD Breakdown

| | Male IDP youths (aged 18 to 24 years) | Female IDP youths (aged 18 to 24 years) | Male IDP adults (aged 25 to 59 years) | Female IDP adults (aged 25 to 59 years) | Community Leaders (CL) | CBO | Total |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Cluster ONE (Sulaimanti 1; Sulaimanti 2; Sulaimanti 3; Sulaimanti 4) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Cluster TWO (Waziri Musa street; A.B. Hassan Street; Gwange Malut Shuwa street; Gwange Sheik Ibrahim Saleh) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Cluster THREE (Ngirmari Farm Center; Alhaji Tar; Goni Kachalari) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 30 |

FGDs will include young people (aged 18-24) and adults (aged 25-59) separately, as it will be useful for comparisons—if any—between young people and adults’ experience and perception of the durable solutions social cohesion in their communities. FGDs will be conducted with gatekeepers, elders (aged 60 years old and more), and religious leaders for the strategic function they hold in Nigerian communities and their first-hand knowledge about community social dynamics. Additionally, CBO representatives will also be interviewed as part of this research to further identify dynamics of access and delivery of services, feasibility of durable solutions, and social cohesion across the communities.

Participants from each of the neighbourhoods within the respective Neighbourhood Cluster FGDs will be selected with the help of community leaders, who will help identify persons in the community who have good knowledge of the neighborhoods. Each FGD will be conducted by 2 IMPACT staff, one leading the discussion and the other recording what is being said. FGD with male participants will be facilitated by male IMPACT staff, while FGDs with female participants will also be facilitated by female IMPACT staff as well. At the end of each FGD, the hand-written debriefs will be shared with the team of typists (2 daily workers), who will transcribe the paper-based forms into soft copies. A two-day training will be held prior to data collection to build capacity on both tools for the data collection.

COVID-19⁷

All necessary protocols will be followed to ensure that IMPACT field staff and FGDs participants are protected from the threat of contracting COVID-19. COVID -19 remains a risk generally in Nigeria, however, there are no movement restrictions of people and goods, and no government restriction to gatherings. Overall, the number of confirmed cases in North East Nigeria remains low (under 100 cases per week), although low testing rates has frequently been cited as a potential cause.

⁷ [IMPACT SoP for Data Collection during COVID-19](#)

However, people are very aware of the risk of COVID-19 and preventive measures and IMPACT staff will continue to maintain all guidelines and protocols against the spread/threat of contacting COVID-19. These include:

- All FGDs will take place outside, with participants sitting at least 2 meters from one another throughout the duration of the discussion.
- Elderly (65+) individuals and individuals with chronic illnesses will be omitted from FGDs when possible.⁸
- No objects will be passed from participants to participant, and direct contact between individuals will be prohibited.
- FGD participants will be reminded of guidelines at the start of each discussion group.
- IMPACT field staff and participants will ensure to sanitize hands frequently within the period FGDs will last which should take at most one hour.
- IMPACT enumerators and field officers will maintain a distance of at least 2 meters from each other throughout the duration of the day's data collection.
- IMPACT staff will be reminded of protocols and procedures each day before beginning data collection.
- FGD participants will not be more than 6-8 participants and for no longer than one hour.

Consent and Participant Protection

Informed consent will be received from all participants before IMPACT staff begin with FGDs. Enumerators will be given a script which includes:

- Who the enumerator is and who they work for
- Why the respondent has been contacted and what the selection process was
- What the purpose and scope of the assessment is and how the information will be used.
- Length of discussion.
- Guarantee of anonymity.
- Guarantee of reversible consent.

3.5. Data Processing & Analysis

Qualitative cleaning and analysis

All qualitative data will result in notes directly taken by enumerators during the interview. Each FGD will have one facilitator and one note taker. The notes will be taken in both English and a local language and will be compared after the FGD. A simple debrief form will be filled out by the facilitation team immediately after the discussion that will then be triangulated with the data in the transcripts. The notes will then be typed in to a digital platform where they will be anonymized and stored. Transcription notes from the FGD taken in a local language will be translated to English during transfer into digital platform.

Notes taken from the FGDs will be typewritten for ease of use at the analysis stage. A saturation grid will be used to code, analyze and compare FGD transcripts. The AO will use thematic coding to analyze qualitative data based on the qualitative data analysis plan.

4 Roles and responsibilities

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

| <i>Task Description</i> | <i>Responsible</i> | <i>Accountable</i> | <i>Consulted</i> | <i>Informed</i> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|

⁸ This potential bias in the qualitative data will be noted in all outputs.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Research design | Assessment Officer (AO) | IMPACT CC | GIS Team, CC, IMPACT HQ, Regional AM | Consortium partner (IRC, ACTED, IMPACT), relevant Clusters, relevant partners |
| Supervising data collection | Senior/Field Officer (S/FO) | AO | Data Officer | CC |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | FO | Data Officer | AO, IMPACT HQ | CFP |
| Data analysis | AO, inputs from regional AM | Data Officer | GC, IMPACT HQ, Regional AM | ACTED, IRC |
| Output production | AO | IMPACT CC | GIS/DO, IMPACT HQ, Regional AM | ACTED, IRC |
| Dissemination | AO | IMPACT CC | Regional AM | IMPACT HQ, ACTED, IRC |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | AO | IMPACT CC | Regional AM | IMPACT HQ, ACTED, IRC |
| Lessons learned | AO | IMPACT CC | Regional AM | IMPACT HQ, ACTED, IRC |

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

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED WITH SEMI-STRUCTURED TOOL(S) – TOOL 1 – IDP FGDs

| Research Questions | Sub-research Question | Questionnaire QUESTION | Probes | Data collection method | Key disaggregations |
|--|-----------------------|---|--------|------------------------|---------------------|
| N/A | Facilitator name | Facilitator Unique ID | N/A | FGD | |
| | Note taker name | Note taker unique ID | N/A | FGD | |
| What are the demographic profiles of participants? | Neighbourhood name | Which neighbourhood do the participants reside in currently? (circle one) | N/A | FGD | |
| | Participants age | Please circle your age range. | N/A | FGD | |
| | Participants gender | Please circle your gender | N/A | FGD | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----|---|
| | Metadata | Please indicate FGD group | N/A | FGD | |
| What are the movement intentions of IDPs in the short term (1 month) and longer term (6 months)? | | Do you and other IDPs like you in this neighbourhood intend to STAY permanently in this location, RESETTLE to other locations or RETURN to areas of origin in the next 1 month? | What about the next 6 months? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the movement intentions of IDPs in the short term (1 month) and longer term (6 months)? | What factors have affected these intentions? | What would be the factors determining your decision to return, stay or relocate? | <i>As regards to Access to services? Service/infrastructure - Cost of living (rents) - Access to jobs - Neighbourhood demographics - Connections/ family ties and general sense of belonging? - Conditions in area of origin? - Etc.?</i> | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | What conditions affect IDP movement intentions related to sustainable durable solutions? | Do you think the ability to integrate into the local neighbourhood is a key consideration for you or other IDPs when deciding to remain in a location or move to another one? If yes, can you elaborate? | What conditions in your opinion are available currently, under which these solutions can be achieved? And if yes, what would make the IDPs want to be integrated? And if yes, what suggestions for better integration? Which assistance would they need for the integration? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | What conditions affect IDP movement intentions related to sustainable durable solutions? | How do you or other IDPs of this neighbourhood have access to information regarding general security, access to basic services, and access to humanitarian services in the neighbourhood? | <i>What type of information would you or other IDPs like to receive? How would you prefer to receive this information?</i> | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----|--|
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | To what extent do you consider yourselves to be members of the neighbourhood you live in? Please explain. | <i>Why do you feel this way? (hint: geography; place where participants were born/grew up, values, social network, ethnicity, engagement in livelihoods, etc.) Has this feeling changed over time? How and why?</i> | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | What is the relationship between host communities and IDPs in this neighbourhood? | Has the relationship always been this way? Or has there been any changes in the last 6months? How about in the last 1 year? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | Are there any tensions? | If so, how do these manifest? If so, what are they based on? How are they resolved? What is the biggest strain on this relationship? What are the factors that can make social relations worse? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | Are there any community or social organizations in your neighbourhood that intend to work towards strengthening intra-community relations, especially between IDPs and host communities? | If so, how successful do you think these initiatives have been in improving community relations according to you? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | In what form, if any, do you currently participate in the life of your neighbourhood? | Economic activity vs voluntary work; political participation, socio-cultural participation, etc. | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | <i>Are there any barriers that people in this neighbourhood have to participating in community affairs?</i> | Are there any barriers specific to demographic groups e.g. women, youth, elderly, etc. | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----|--|
| | | How do you or IDPs in the neighbourhood participate in local governance and decision making processes? | Have you already participated in decision-making in your neighbourhood? Do other IDPs? If not, why? Hints: Elections, participation to town hall meeting, local assemblies and/or other consultation mechanisms etc. | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | How are disputes or conflicts resolved in your neighbourhood? | Who are the people/what are the institutions in charge of dispensing justice/mediation in the neighbourhood? Hints: Gatekeeper, elders, clan leaders, religious leaders, local state government etc. What justice system is enforced in your neighbourhood? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the different populations' perceptions of conditions in the area regarding conduciveness to durable solutions? | | What is the first most important need for IDPs in the neighbourhood? Why is this the first most important need in the neighbourhood? | <i>Do specific groups have different priorities (e.g. men, women, children, elderly, etc.)? What are unique qualities of your neighbourhood that make meeting priority needs easier or harder?</i> | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | Do you think everyone has equal access to basic services i.e. water, sanitation, electricity, waste disposal? | Which groups do you think have less or more access to basic services? Which basic services is equal access especially an issue for? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | What are the available living conditions for you and other IDPs in your neighbourhood? | <i>Type of housing?</i> - Adequacy of current shelter (living space, type of shelter, etc.)? - Occupancy arrangements (rent vs. owned)? - Security of tenure and related documentation? - Risk of eviction | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| | | | <i>Do you fear been forcefully evicted?</i> | | |
| | | Does everyone have equal access to jobs/ livelihood opportunities in this neighbourhood? Why/ why not? | - Which groups have more/ less access? Why? - Types of jobs/ livelihoods most common for IDPs? - Any disruptions in the past six months | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the different populations' perceptions of conditions in the area regarding conducivene ss to durable solutions? | | Does everyone in the neighbourhood have access to a market? | What are the barriers for IDPs in accessing the markets? Any disruptions in the past six months? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ADDRESSED WITH SEMI-STRUCTURED TOOL(S) – TOOL 2 – CL & CBO FGDs

| Research Questions | Sub-research Question | Questionnaire QUESTION | Probes | Data collection method | Key disaggregations |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| N/A | Facilitator name | Facilitator Unique ID | N/A | FGD | |
| | Note taker name | Note taker unique ID | N/A | FGD | |
| What are the demographic profiles of participants? | Neighbourhood name | Which neighbourhood do the participants reside in currently? (circle one) | N/A | FGD | |
| | Participants age | Please circle your age range. | N/A | FGD | |
| | Participants gender | Please cycle your gender | N/A | FGD | |
| What are the demographic profiles of participants? | Metadata | Please indicate FGD group | N/A | FGD | |
| What are the different populations' perceptions of conditions in the area regarding conducivene ss to durable solutions? | | What measures have been taken by you/the neighbourhood/government since IDPs arrived in this neighbourhood, if any? | - Construction of settlements/ land donations - Provision of information regarding general security, access to basic services, and access to humanitarian services in the neighbourhood - Local integration and neighbourhood participation | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| | | What is the first most important need for IDPs in the neighbourhood? Why is this | <i>Do specific groups have different priorities</i> | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age |

Nigeria: From Response to Resilience in Maiduguri, NGA1902c, November 2020

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----|--|
| | | the first most important need in the neighbourhood? | (e.g. men, women, children, elderly, etc.)? What are unique qualities of your neighbourhood that make meeting priority needs easier or harder? | | Participant Gender |
| What are the different populations' perceptions of conditions in the area regarding access to durable solutions? | | Do you think everyone has equal access to basic services i.e. water, sanitation, electricity, waste disposal? | Which groups do you think have less or more access to basic services? Which basic services is equal access especially an issue for? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | What are the available living conditions for IDPs in your neighbourhood? | Type of housing? Adequacy of current shelter (living space, type of shelter, etc.)? Occupancy arrangements (rent vs. owned)? Security of tenure and related documentation? Risk of eviction? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | Does everyone have equal access to jobs/ livelihood opportunities in this neighbourhood? Why/ why not?" | Which groups have more/ less access? Why? Types of jobs/ livelihoods most common for IDPs? Any disruptions in the past six months? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| | | Does everyone in the neighbourhood have access to a market? | What are the barriers for IDPs in accessing the markets? Any disruptions in the past six months? | FDG | Neighbourhood Participant Age Participant Gender |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders? | | What is the relationship between host communities and IDPs in this neighbourhood? | Has the relationship always been this way? Or has there been any changes in the last 6months? How about in the last 1 year? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| | | Are there any tensions? | If so, how do these manifest? If so, what are they based on? How are they resolved? What is the biggest strain on this relationship? What are the factors that can make social relations worse? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|--------------------------------|
| | | Are there any community or social organizations in your neighbourhood that intend to improve neighbourhood relations especially between IDPs and host communities? | If so, how successful do you think these initiatives have been in improving neighbourhood relations according to you? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | How are disputes or conflicts resolved in your neighbourhood? | Who are the people/what are the institutions in charge of dispensing justice/ mediation in the neighbourhood? Hints: Gatekeeper, elders, clan leaders, religious leaders, local state government etc. What justice system is enforced in your neighbourhood? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| What are the movement intentions of IDPs in the short term (1 month) and longer term (6 months)? | What factors could be affecting these intentions? | How positioned is the neighbourhood prepared to manage IDP integration to the neighbourhood in the coming six months? | What conditions in your opinion are available currently, under which these solutions can be achieved? And if yes, what suggestions for better integration? | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| What are the movement intentions of IDPs in the short term (1 month) and longer term (6 months)? | What factors could be affecting these intentions? | According to you, what are the factors that foster local integration (social relationships, work, ability to invest in etc.) over time, and to the opposite, undermine local integration? | Forced evictions, confinement to low-status economic activities etc. | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | In what form, if any, do IDPs currently participate in the life of your neighbourhood? | Economic activity vs voluntary work; political participation, socio-cultural participation, etc. | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |

Nigeria: From Response to Resilience in Maiduguri, NGA1902c, November 2020

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----|--------------------------------|
| | | Are there any barriers that people in this neighbourhood have to participating in neighbourhood affairs? | Are there any barriers specific to demographic groups e.g. women, youth, elderly, etc. | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |
| What are the local social dynamics, power structures and key stakeholders ? | | How do you or IDPs in the neighbourhood participate in local governance and decision making processes? | If not, why? Hints: Elections, participation to town hall meeting, local assemblies and/or other consultation mechanisms etc. | FGD | Neighbourhood Participant Role |