

CSSF Syria
Independent Monitoring Project
Syrian Civil Defense (White Helmets)
Concept note

1. Introduction and Project Background

Under the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) of Her Majesty’s Government (HMG) of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland (UK), funding is provided to the Implementing Partner (IP) Mayday Rescue to support the Syrian Civil Defense (SCD), also known as the “White Helmets”. Mayday is responsible for supporting SCD in the provision of essential services Mayday’s support broadly consists of operational support in the form of stipends and operational funds provision as well as provision of and support to training in Syria; organisational capacity building; and efforts towards reputation management and preservation. SCD is responsible for the oversight, management and delivery of its own operations on the ground, broadly categorised as urban search and rescue (USAR) and non-SAR essential services.

1.1. SCD activities

SCD is a community-driven response to the Syrian conflict, commonly known for its widely reported civilian rescue operations after aerial bombardments. However, its activities vary and also include non-search and rescue operations, e.g. road maintenance, firefighting. SCD activities inside Syria cover opposition-held areas in Aleppo, Hama, Idlib and Latakia. In each governorate, there is a SCD Directorate office responsible for managing its respective sectors (Table 1). In addition to overseeing sector offices,¹ directorate offices are responsible for managing specialised teams (e.g. powder and foam factory, vehicles maintenance centres). SCD sector offices manage SAR centres² and women points. In Syria, SCD has:

- 4 directorate offices
- 14 sector management offices
- 4 powder and foam factories³
- 2 vehicles maintenance centres
- 77 SAR/non-SAR centres;
- 31 women points⁴
- 4 training centres.⁵

Table 1: SCD directorates and sectors

Directorate	Sector
Aleppo	Western Aleppo sector
	Eastern Aleppo sector
	Northern Aleppo sector
	Southern Aleppo sector
	Azaz sector
Hama	Western Hama sector
	Northern Hama sector
	Northern Elghab sector
Idlib	Western Idlib sector
	Ariha sector
	Eastern Idlib sector
	Ma'arrat An Nu'man sector
	Jisr-Ash-Shugur sector
	Khan Shaykun sector
	Harim sector
Latakia	-

¹ With the exception of Latakia where there are no sector offices. All SCD centres are managed by the Latakia directorate office.

² SAR centres also perform non-SAR operations.

³ Factories are used for packaging powder and foam into fire extinguishers for firefighting.

⁴ Women’s points provide medical services and conduct community engagement activities.

⁵ Training centres are managed by the general management office (not directorate or sector office).

When an airstrike occurs, SCD rescue teams arrive at bomb sites to search for and rescue civilians. SAR operations are mainly in urban areas, where airstrikes most frequently occur. Target areas could include civilian homes, main roads, hospitals, SCD centres, market, schools etc. SCD records its SAR operations in an “Incidents Reports” database daily for Mayday Rescue. This database records each attack’s approximate time, target location, weapon used, suspected perpetrator and number of casualties.

Non-SAR operations carried out by the civil defense include:

- early warning (Sentry);
- evacuation;
- management of shelters;
- medical services;
- fire-fighting;
- detection and marking of danger areas;
- decontamination and similar protective measures;
- provision of emergency accommodation and supplies;
- emergency assistance in the restoration and maintenance of order in distressed areas;
- emergency repair of indispensable public utilities;
- emergency disposal of the dead;
- assistance in the preservation of objects essential for survival;
- complementary activities needed to carry out any of the tasks mentioned above.

SCD records its non-SAR operations daily on a database (shared with Mayday). For non-SAR activities, the database includes the sector, location, date, time and type of service provided.

1.2. Mayday’s third party monitoring of SCD activities

RMTeam, an independent company, is commissioned by Mayday Rescue to conduct third-party monitoring (TPM) of its programme outputs through conducting visits to SCD teams. RMTeam’s monitoring tools are developed by Mayday Rescue, and field data collection activities are conducted by RMTeam.⁶ RMTeam is anticipated to begin implementing its new TPM plan in December 2018. The new TPM plan adopts a more robust approach in monitoring SCD’s activities (e.g. stipend verification, operational funds), designed to better address contextual and security challenges faced in the previous TPM approach.⁷ As SCD activities are not Mayday’s direct programme outputs, there are no independent monitoring activities conducted by Mayday on SCD’s USAR operations and non-SAR operations e.g. fire-fighting, ambulance service.⁸

In Mayday’s new plan, each monitoring cycle (twice until March 2019) is expected to require:

- Interviews: one day per non-SAR office; and three days per SAR centre.⁹
- Inventory: one day per USAR sector warehouse or center warehouse.

1.2.1. Interviews

⁶ RMTeam is a research partner with an on-the-ground network that implements Mayday’s approach to monitoring SCD. The monitoring approach as well as the research tools are therefore entirely designed by Mayday ADMEL’s department to map against its logframe indicators. 5 of 21 Mayday indicators use data sourced from RMTeam, as well as other informational needs such as stipend and operational funds verification.

⁷ In the previous TPM approach implemented by RMTeam, field visits consisted of interviews with centre managers and volunteers (at SAR and women’s points only) in which (i) all 130+ centres/points were covered every quarter; (ii) one third of the total number of centres was visited every month; and (iii) all volunteers (7-10) and centre manager present in the centre at the time of the visit (on shift) were interviewed (as opposed to reaching all volunteers in the new TPM approach). In the past, certain questions in the visits were tied to indicators in the logframe that required quarterly reporting. Therefore, quarterly visits to all centres were required. The associated cost meant that the RMTeam could not conduct monthly visits to reach all volunteers.

⁸ SCD’s SAR and non-SAR activities are also verifiable in open source media and confirmed in Mayday’s annual survey.

⁹ In SAR centres, each volunteer is on a rotating 24 hour shift. As there are three groups of volunteers per SAR centre, it would require visits over three monitoring days per SAR centre in order cover all volunteers.

In the new TPM plan, all types of SCD staff and volunteers would be interviewed during monitoring visits. Teams monitored would include (i) the Directorate offices; (ii) Sector offices; (iii) Specialised teams, e.g. powder and foam factory, vehicle maintenance, dealing with unexploded ordnance (UXO), chemical; (iv) SAR centres and (v) women's points.

There are 17 monitoring tools, with one tool per type of volunteer/staff (see columns in Table 2). Different areas are assessed in each tool depending on the type of volunteer/function of the staff. Most interview questions are repeated across different tools, as there are areas that need to be assessed across multiple types of staff/volunteers.

Monitoring tools for SAR will also be used for volunteers and managers working in specialised teams (vehicle maintenance and foam factories).

Table 2: Types of actors and areas monitored through Mayday monitoring tools

	SAR		Women's Point		Sector							Directorate					
	Volunteer	Manager	Volunteer	Leader	Admin Officer	HR Officer	Finance Officer	Logistics Officer	Media Officer	Technician	Leader	Admin Officer	HR Officer	Finance Officer	Logistics Officer	Media Officer	Technician
Management	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Human resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Complaint mechanism	✓		✓	✓													
Operational capacity	✓																
Stipend disbursement about volunteers		✓		✓			✓							✓			
Stipend disbursement (personnel)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Financial matters		✓		✓			✓				✓			✓			
Operational funds		✓		✓			✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
Working with Syrian Civil Defense (SCD)			✓	✓													
Capacity assessment		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hero Fund	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Online training portal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

As opposed to the past where all interviews were anonymous and SCD staff/volunteers did not have SCD-issued ID numbers, RMTTeam's field researchers will request to see the volunteers' unique ID (SCD-issued ID card) during interviews in the new approach.¹⁰ S/he would take note of the card and employment numbers. For security reasons, this guarantees that no names will be circulated between RMTTeam's field teams and headquarters and between RMTTeam and Mayday. Once the data is submitted, Mayday would crosscheck answers with its database of unique IDs and corresponding biodata to ensure there are no duplications or missing volunteers without justification.

1.2.2. Inventory

RMTTeam's field researchers will go to a given location and run an inventory of all equipment and vehicles therein (including taking photos of vehicles).¹¹ The inventory results will be compared to:

- i. Mayday's (and Chemonics' past if possible) procurement and finance records,¹²
- ii. SCD inventory list.

The aim of the inventory exercise is to assess SCD's capacity in keeping accurate and up-to-date records of their inventories, and for Mayday's and donors' assurance.

¹⁰ In the past, volunteers did not have WH-issued IDs. As recording names and national ID numbers was too risky, interviews were anonymous. This had the advantage of allowing greater freedom of expression without fear of retribution for questions relating to quality of management in the centres.

¹¹ If a vehicle or piece of equipment is being used in an operation during the inventory visit, the field researcher would flag it in report and compared with SCD's operational reporting for that day/centre.

¹² Most donors (UK, Denmark, the Netherlands, Canada, Germany, New Zealand) provide support to SCD through Mayday, whereas the US provide support through the US contractor Chemonics. Source: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2018), Review of the monitoring systems of three projects in Syria: AJACS, White Helmets and NLA.

2. Overview of Third Party Monitoring Exercise

Under CSSF's Independent Monitoring Programme, IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is to conduct a third party monitoring (TPM) exercise to evaluate the accuracy and reliability of Mayday's third-party monitoring approach, community perceptions in the value of SCD's activities and assess possible risks involved in SCD activities.

2.1. Research questions

The overall research questions seek to:

- (i) Evaluate effectiveness in the design of **Mayday's monitoring approach/tools** in verifying SCD activities; and the reliability and accuracy of its findings.
- (ii) Verify that SCD's reported **urban SAR** and **non-SAR operations** happened in practice.¹³
- (iii) Understand **public perceptions** regarding the relevance and value of SCD's activities.
- (iv) Identify potential **risks** (i.e. informal payments, physical/emotional abuse and financial exploitation) associated with SCD's activities.

Table 3: RQs and sub RQs

<p>RQ1. To what extent is Mayday's third-party monitoring approach effective in verifying SCD activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What potential delivery issues is Mayday's TPM approach designed to assess? • To what extent does Mayday's TPM tools and approach pass a face validity assessment? • What are the gaps and issues faced in the field when implementing Mayday's TPM approach? • Assuming the verification approach is considered valid, to what extent do IMPACT's TPM findings and Mayday's TPM findings align?
<p>RQ2. To what extent did SCD's claimed (i) urban SAR and (ii) non-SAR operations happen in practice (using IMPACT's field verification approach)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of the SAR operations assessed, what is the percentage of (i) SAR operations and (ii) non-SAR operations verified to have happened in practice (using IMPACT's verification approach)?¹⁴
<p>RQ3. What services do civilians receive from SCD? What are their perceptions on the value of these services?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of SCD operations have community members received or witnessed in the past three months? • What is the perceived value of SCD's operations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To what extent are SCD's operations aligned with priority local needs in civil defense? ○ To what extent do communities feel SCD contribute to community resilience? (i.e. able to receive and use SCD's protection advice; benefit from SCD activities to prevent, mitigate, prepare, respond to, evacuate and/or recover from military attacks). ○ Who, if anyone, in the assessed communities would undertake these tasks if SCD was not present? • To what extent are SCD operations seen as equitable? Are vulnerable groups (e.g. women, elderly, IDPs, persons with disabilities) served effectively?
<p>RQ4. What are the risks associated with SCD's activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does SCD pay taxes or make informal payments (e.g. to armed groups) for the receipt of equipment or for undertaking activities?¹⁵

¹³ Mayday and RMTeam do not currently carry out monitoring activities to verify SCD's claimed SAR and non-SAR operations.

¹⁴ IMPACT will assess all SAR and non-SAR incidents in assessed locations within one month prior to the start of data collection.

¹⁵ According to the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs report, SCD (like many other organisations) use the *Hawala* networks to transfer money into Syria. The report suggested that there is a lack of clarity on who receives payments and taxes along the way or how the money is used. It suggested that "transactions cannot be viewed in isolation, but are part of a wider system. The risk of diversion of funds by armed groups exists; the existing system does not provide insight into who receives payments and taxes along the way or how the money is used. In addition, by using the wider system, organisations may indirectly facilitate harmful or illicit trade."

- To what extent have SCD volunteers, centre managers or community members witnessed or heard of SCD volunteers/affiliates engaging in physical or emotional violence or abuse, or financial exploitation? Who would they tell, if anyone?

2.2. Data Collection

A mixed methods approach will be used, including desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs) and individual structured surveys. For field data collection, three locations will be covered. The same locations will be used to cover all research questions, with the exception of RQ2 where more locations might be covered depending on the number and type of SCD operations during the one month prior to the start of data collection.

Table 4: RQs and Tools

	RQ1	RQ2	RQ3	RQ4
Desk review of Mayday's TPM monitoring tools	✓			
KIIs with Mayday staff	✓			
KIIs with SCD staff and volunteers (Mayday's TPM tools)	✓			✓
Inventory (Mayday's TPM tools)	✓			
KIIs with beneficiary/witnesses of SAR and non-SAR operations		✓		
Direct observation		✓		
Individual perception survey			✓	✓

The methodological approach per research question is outlined below.

RQ1. To what extent is Mayday's third-party monitoring approach effective in verifying SCD activities?

RQ1.1. What potential delivery issues is Mayday's TPM approach designed to assess?

- IMPACT will conduct 1-2 KIIs with Mayday (e.g. programme manager, field staff) to identify the type of delivery issues Mayday and SCD have faced before. IMPACT will match these delivery issues with indicators used to track potential delivery issues covered in Mayday's TPM tools.

RQ1.2. To what extent do Mayday's TPM tools and approach pass a face validity assessment?

- IMPACT will conduct a desk review of Mayday's TPM tools to compare, at face value, whether tools cover intended monitoring indicators and whether there are any indicators missing in Mayday's existing TPM tools. Mayday's intended objectives of adopting a TPM approach will be identified through:
 - A KII with Mayday's senior M&E staff
 - Review of 5 of the 21 indicators relevant in Mayday's logframe, and any other relevant documents shared by Mayday.

RQ1.3. What are the gaps and issues faced in the field when implementing Mayday's TPM approach?

In order to identify any potential field issues, IMPACT will strictly follow the same monitoring approach as RMTTeam in select locations, including the use of the same data collection protocol and tools. IMPACT will monitor separate locations to RMTTeam to avoid overlaps.¹⁶ As the purpose is to evaluate the robustness/effectiveness of Mayday's TPM tools (rather than RMTTeam's ability to conduct TPM), IMPACT will not shadow RMTTeam's monitoring activities.

¹⁶ If IMPACT finds any gaps to Mayday's monitoring tools during the face-validity test (RQ 1.2), the Assessment Officer will report these gaps in the final report. IMPACT will *not* make any adjustments to Mayday's tools based on the face-validity test for its monitoring visits.

- Prior to conducting monitoring visits, IMPACT will familiarise itself with Mayday's TPM monitoring tools and procedures. IMPACT's Field Manager will provide training to IMPACT enumerators, including instructions on using RMTTeam tools as well as ways to identify and record challenges faced in the field.¹⁷
- RMTTeam and IMPACT database staff will coordinate to set up mobile data collection tools for data entry. IMPACT will upload and store data in an independent data collection platform (separate to RMTTeam).
- Using random sampling, IMPACT will select locations to conduct monitoring visits using Mayday's monitoring approach and tools (adopted by RMTTeam).¹⁸ At least one directorate, one sector, one women's point and one SAR centre will be covered in three governorates (Idleb, Hama and Latakia).¹⁹
- For each monitoring visit:
 - IMPACT enumerators will identify and record issues faced during field implementation.
 - IMPACT Field Manager will conduct debriefs with all IMPACT enumerators after each monitoring day, and identifies any additional field issues faced by enumerators.
- IMPACT Assessment Officer will analyse data collected to:
 - Identify gaps in data not collected and/or questions in tools that were irrelevant or misinterpreted.
 - Identify additional findings, if any, brought up by key informants not covered by questions in the tools that might be useful to cover in the future.

RQ1.4. Assuming the verification approach is considered valid, to what extent are do IMPACT's TPM findings and RMTTeam's TPM findings align?

- IMPACT will report all its raw monitoring findings to Mayday precisely as RMTTeam does, using the same format RMTTeam uses.
- IMPACT will present a headline summary of all monitoring data in its report to HMG.
- Mayday will prepare a reporting template for RMTTeam and IMPACT to report findings. The same template will be used to facilitate HMG's comparison of findings.
- HMG will compare reported findings to identify any notable divergence if present, and HMG will discuss with IMPACT and Mayday if required.

RQ2: To what extent did SCD's claimed (i) urban SAR and (ii) non-SAR operations happen in practice (using IMPACT's field verification approach)?

Verification will be conducted on **all** SAR and non-SAR operations that occurred over the **past one month prior to data collection**, within the three assessed locations.²⁰

- Depending on the number of operations that occurred in the selected locations in the past one month prior to data collection, IMPACT will adjust its methodology (by covering more locations) in order to verify a sufficient number of operations. IMPACT will verify +/- 10% of the reported average number of operations per team per month.²¹

As SAR and non-SAR operations are currently recorded to a city/community level, IMPACT will only be able to verify activities when specific identifiable locations (e.g. nearby landmark, building name) are mentioned under the "Description" column of its database (if available). See Annex 1 for verification standards and protocol.

Verifying urban SAR operations

¹⁷ IMPACT's Field Manager will observe RMTTeam's training for RMTTeam enumerators in order to learn about field instructions and details on monitoring tools provided to enumerators.

¹⁸ RMTTeam will cover the remaining locations in this monitoring cycle.

¹⁹ In Latakia, only the directorate, one women's point and one SAR centre will be covered given there are no sectors.

²⁰ These will be the same locations as the ones covered in RQ1.

²¹ According to Mayday's logframe reports, the average number of operations per team are 53 USAR operations (including 2 search and rescue efforts, 20 ambulance activities, 3 firefighting operations), 29 operations for non-USAR services and 109 women's point activities.

IMPACT enumerators will follow the locations provided in the “Incident Reports” database to visit the site where SAR operations were reported. IMPACT will use purposive sampling to conduct at least three KIIs from different households that had received/witnessed SCD’s SAR operations.

The KIIs will verify that (i) there was an attack, (ii) approximate response time for SCD to arrive at the site after the attack, (iii) type of services provided by SCD after arriving at the site, and (iv) any complaints or concerns of SCD’s SAR operation. It will not assess other aspects regarding the quality of SCD’s SAR operations.

Verifying non-SAR operations

The majority of SCD’s time and resource is dedicated to non-SAR operations and civil defense services HMG is interested in conducting verification on SCD’s non-SAR operations to improve its understanding of these activities.

IMPACT will conduct verification activities using direct observation and testimonies (KIIs), depending on the nature of the non-SAR operation. As mentioned, IMPACT will only be able to verify activities where specific locations of the operation is recorded.

Type of non-SAR operations	Verification approach
Ambulance service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review of ambulance’s driving log to and from hospitals/clinics (if available) • Testimonies with witnesses/beneficiaries of ambulance service
Fire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct observation to verify visible remains of a fire in claimed location • Testimonies with witnesses near the claimed location of fire incident
Burying bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review of burial records (if available) • Testimonies with neighbours/families of deceased
Car accident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct observation (e.g. wrecked car) • Testimonies with witnesses/victims of car accident
Evacuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testimonies with evacuated persons
Service-related work (e.g. road maintenance, public awareness campaigns)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct observation (e.g. road repaired) • Testimonies (e.g. participants/witness of public awareness campaigns)

Questions will verify whether operations happened, and also include 1-2 questions on the perceived quality of service received. KIIs will also be given the opportunity to report any complaints (including awareness of any physical or emotional abuse, financial exploitation, etc.)²²

RQ3: What services do civilians receive from WH? What is their perception of the value of these services?

IMPACT will build upon previous public perception surveys conducted by Mayday Rescue with contribution from RMTeam and Hala Systems.²³ For efficiency and comparability purposes,²⁴ relevant survey questions will be adopted from the survey conducted by Mayday in March 2018. Additional questions will be added to cover thematic areas not assessed in previous surveys (e.g. whether vulnerable groups are served effectively).

²² Complaints will be presented in IMPACT’s findings report to HMG. Any urgent complaints will be shared with HMG and Mayday for follow up.

²³ The SCD public perceptions survey was conducted over five waves in January 2015, October 2015, March 2016, March 2017 and March 2018. In waves I and II, the study was conducted in Aleppo, Idlib and Daraa. The study expanded to Homs, Damascus Countryside and Hama in waves III and IV, and to Quneitra in wave V. The most recent survey was Wave V, conducted in March 2018. Hala Systems is the IP for Sentry’s early warning system.

²⁴ Unless requested by HMG, IMPACT will not compare findings with SCD’s previous survey findings as it is not within the scope of the RQ. However, the raw dataset can be made available should the IP and/or HMG wish to make comparisons in the future.

The public perception survey will be an individual (rather than household) structured quantitative survey. The public perception survey will cover **three** communities (same locations used for RQ1 and RQ2). A total of 385 surveys will be collected.

- Survey (385) findings will have a **95%** confidence level and **5%** margin of error, assuming an infinite population. Findings will be representative of the population of the three assessed locations only, and not to the sub-districts or governorates.
 - If population data of selected communities is available, IMPACT will weigh aggregated findings based on the population size of each community.
- If disaggregated by community (i.e. 129 surveys per community), survey findings will have a 95% confidence level and 8.6% margin of error, assuming an infinite population.

Due to security reasons, randomised geographic information system (GIS) sampling will not be possible. IMPACT will adopt a **'random walk'** sampling approach in the selection of households (e.g. every two streets, every fifth house, covering all urban areas). Prior to data collection, the IMPACT field team will draw grids on maps of the selected communities. Enumerators will then visit households in regular intervals within each grid.

To ensure approximately half of the respondents are female, both male and female enumerators will be used to conduct data collection. The first person (above 18 years old) who answers the door will be interviewed. If this person is of a different gender, the enumerator will ask to speak to someone else in the household with the right gender. If they refuse or are unavailable, enumerators will move onto the next household. Community boundaries will be agreed upon in collaboration with Mayday and/or SCD.

RQ4. What are the risks associated with SCD's activities?

Questions on risks, including questions on taxes and informal payment, will be included at the end of the KIIs with SCD staff/volunteers and public perception survey conducted by IMPACT.

2.3. Data analysis

KII forms will be translated and analysed per research question and sub-indicator. The dataset will be analysed against each research question and indicator. Pre-set codes for qualitative data will be created based on the established sub-questions/indicators. Emerging codes and trends in the data will also be identified. Quantitative data will be analysed using Excel or SPSS.

3. Preliminary work plan and timeframe

It is anticipated that data collection will take place starting early December, depending on the time needed to finalise the TPM research design. IMPACT will start with data collection on RQ1 as RMTeam tools are already finalised/ translated by RMTeam (and also if Mayday is required to have a complete dataset of all locations at an earlier date for internal reporting or other purposes).

After data collection, sufficient time is needed for IMPACT to conduct data translation, analysis, write up and report validation.

Table 5: Preliminary timeframe²⁵

Activity	Responsible	Deadline
Draft Concept Note submitted to HMG and IP	IMPACT	Nov 12 th , 2018
Revised Concept Note submitted to HMG and IP	IMPACT	Nov 19 th , 2018
Draft Indicator Matrix and Tools submitted to HMG and IP	IMPACT	Nov 19 th , 2018
Revised Indicator Matrix and Tools submitted to HMG and IP	IMPACT	Nov 22 nd , 2018
Assessment Tools translated	IMPACT	Nov 6 th , 2018
Enumerator training completed	IMPACT, IP	Dec 9 th , 2018

²⁵ The timeline is subject to change depending on when the TPM's concept note and tools are finalised.

Piloting completed	IMPACT	Throughout as data collection are in phases
Data collection completed	IMPACT	Jan 14 th , 2018
Output Report shared with HMG	IMPACT ²⁶	Feb 15 th , 2018

4. Annexes

Annex 1

SCD TPM: USAR / non-USAR Verification Standards and Protocol

1. IMPACT Field Manager, Team Leader and enumerators screen database of USAR and non-USAR operations provided by Mayday to identify incidents that have specific locations recorded (i.e. feasible to verify). For example, this could be:
 - a. Operations with names of specific hospital/schools/buildings recorded;
 - b. Small towns where there are only one or two schools/hospitals/roads.
2. IMPACT Field Manager shares the list of selected operations (that are feasibly to verify) with IMPACT enumerators.
3. IMPACT enumerators go through each operation on the list to conduct verification activity.
 - Enumerator will visit the location indicated from the description in the database provided by Mayday. If location is unclear, IMPACT enumerator will ask relevant people that might be able to provide information on a more specific location.
 - Where useful, enumerators conduct preliminary phone calls to collect additional information.
 - Once at the location, IMPACT enumerator will look for people that could verify that the SCD operation took place. Enumerators should look for people that are regularly at the location (e.g. regular hospital staff for ambulance verification, shopkeeper nearby for road maintenance verification, residents for firefighting verification) who are more likely to have witnessed the SCD operation.
 - **In order for an operation to be considered 'verified'**, enumerators should collect testimonies from *at least 3 beneficiary/witness* (from different households).
 - For each beneficiary/witness that was present during the SCD operation, IMPACT enumerator will fill in the **KOBO form** (*questions in indicator matrix*).
 - If the enumerator is unable to find 3 KIs, record reasons on why (e.g. no one was around, others did not know it happened) under "Enumerator comments" in the KOBO form.
 - **In order for an operation to be considered 'not verified':**
 - Enumerators need to speak to *at least 5 people that was at the location on the specified date of the SCD operation*. This should be people that are regularly at the location (e.g. shopkeeper nearby).
 - If the enumerator cannot find 5 people that was in the location at the specified date, s/he should note down why (e.g. no one was around).
 - If nobody can verify the SCD operation, the enumerator will fill in the "**Documentation form for operations that are not verified**" (see below).

Documentation form for non-verifiable operations

*This form should only be filled in if the recorded SCD operation cannot be verified. For any operation that was verified by at least 1 witness/beneficiary, please fill in the **KOBO form** instead. There should be 1 form per operation (that cannot be verified).*

Date:
Governorate:
District:
Sub-district:

²⁶ All reports need to be reviewed and validated by IMPACT HQ which would require at least 10 working days.

Specific location:
Enumerator code:
IMPACT incident/service code:

Challenges in finding the location of SCD's operation

1. Did you find the location of the SCD operation? (Yes/No)

2. Please describe in detail how you obtained the location and the challenges you faced in finding it.
 - E.g. Where did you get the location/address from? Who did you ask? (e.g. IMPACT list, Local Council, SCD staff, hospital staff, pedestrian, shopkeeper)
 - What challenges did you face in getting to the location? (e.g. location is far, reported hospital does not exist, people gave me contradicting information/directions)

Challenges in finding people to verify

3. Number of people asked (note: should be at least 5 people that claim to be at the location on the specified date) :

4. List the people (e.g. Head of clinic, nurse, street pedestrian) you asked to get information about the incident or the operation provided from SCD:

5. What did they say? Why did they not know about this specific SCD operation provided? (e.g. no records, they didn't notice any road maintenance work done, not aware of SCD presence in the area)

6. If you spoke to less than 5 people, please list all challenges in finding people to talk to (e.g. nobody is around the location, people didn't want to answer).

In your opinion, why was it difficult to verify this incident/service?

