Research Terms of Reference
Accountability to Affected Population (AAP) Assessment
NGA2003
Nigeria

18th February 2020
Version 1

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

Country of intervention	Nigeria					
Type of Emergency	□	Natural disaster	**x**	**Conflict**		
Type of Crisis	□	Sudden onset	□	Slow onset	□	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	*ECHO*					
Project Code	35iAGQ / 35DHZ					
Overall Research Timeframe *(from research design to final outputs / M&E)*	17/02/2020 to 10/04/2020					

Research Timeframe *Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)*	1. Start collect data: 02/03/2020	5. Key findings presentation: -
	2. Data collected: 18/03/2020	6. Outputs sent for validation: 03/04/2020
	3. Data analysed: 25/03/2020	7. Outputs published: 10/04/2020
	4. Data sent for validation: 23/03/2020	

Number of assessments	**x**	**Single assessment (one cycle)**
	□	Multi assessment (more than one cycle) *[Describe here the frequency of the cycle]*

Humanitarian milestones *Specify **what** will the assessment inform and **when** e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;*	**Milestone**		**Deadline**
	x	Donor plan/strategy	10/04/2020
	□	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _
	□	Cluster plan/strategy	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _
	□	NGO platform plan/strategy	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _
	□	Other (Specify):	_ _/_ _/_ _ _ _

Audience Type & Dissemination *Specify **who** will the assessment inform and **how** you will disseminate to inform the audience*	**Audience type**	**Dissemination**
	x Strategic	□ General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to partners and Donors)
	x Programmatic	□ Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting
	x Operational	
	□ [Other, Specify]	□ Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting)
		□ Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre)

				X Donor will disseminate amongst their implementing partners
Detailed dissemination plan required	□	Yes	x	**No**
General Objective	To strengthen the evidence base around affected populations' perceptions of humanitarian assistance and feedback mechanisms, and inform human-centered approaches to humanitarian programming across North-East Nigeria			
Specific Objective(s) (By thematic area aligning with Core Humanitarian Standards)	Building on findings from the 2019 Multi-sector Needs Assessment in North-East Nigeria, this study will: A) Understand affected communities' experiences with humanitarian service delivery, specifically: (1) Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding fairness of humanitarian service delivery and (2) Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors. B) Understand to what extent and in what way affected communities' are able to: (1) Access information about humanitarian response in their area (and what the perceptions are around existing communication channels) and (2) Participate in decisions that affect them. C) Understand to what extent and in what way affected communities are able to access safe and responsive mechanisms to provide feedback about humanitarian service delivery, and what the perceptions are about the relevance and effectiveness of these mechanisms			
Research Questions	To fulfill Specific Objective A: • What is the perception of affected populations regarding the level of fairness in current humanitarian service delivery? • How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors? To fulfill Specific Objective B: • What is the level of awareness among the affected populations about the humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled? • What is the perception of the affected population regarding the communication channels being utilised by humanitarian actors within their community? To fulfill Specific Objective C: • What is the perception of affected populations regarding the feedback mechanisms being used in their communities?How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors?			

Geographic Coverage	Primary data collection will cover selected LGA capitals across Borno state in North-East Nigeria (Bama, Dikwa, Damboa, Gwoza, Mongono and Ngala)						
Secondary data sources	2019 MSNA Data Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan for North-East Nigeria 2018-2020 – Humanitarian Country Team Health Clusters and Accountability to Affected Populations – WHO Nigeria 2018						
Population(s) *Select all that apply*	x	**IDPs in camp**		□	IDPs in informal sites		
	x	**Camp leaders**		x	**IDPs in host communities**		
	x	**Civil society organisations**		□	Refugees in informal sites		
	x	**National NGOs**		□	Refugees [Other, Specify]		
	x	**International NGOs**		□	[Other, Specify]		
Stratification *Select type(s) and enter number of strata*	x	Geographical #:6 Population size per strata is known? □ Yes x No	x	Group #:3 Population size per strata is known? □ Yes x **No**		x	*[Other Specify]* #: Gender Population size per strata is known? □ Yes **x No**
Data collection tool(s)	□	Structured (Quantitative)		x	Semi-structured (Qualitative)		

	Sampling method	**Data collection method**
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1 AAP_International Organisation (INGOs) *Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews*	**x Purposive** □ Snowballing □ [Other, Specify]	□ Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ □ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ x **Focus group discussion** (Target #) 6 (1 per LGA) □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 2 AAP_Civil Society/NNGOs/Community Leaders *Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews ***If more than 2 structured tools please duplicate this row and complete for each tool.*	x **Purposive** □ Snowballing □ [Other, Specify]	□ Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ □ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ x **Focus group discussion** (Target #): 6 (1 per LGA) □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 3 AAP_ Beneficiaries *Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews ***If more than 2 structured tools please duplicate this row and complete for each tool.*	x **Purposive** □ Snowballing □ [Other, Specify]	□ Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ □ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ x **Focus group discussion** (Target #): **12** (2 per LGA- 1 male, one female) □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _

Target level of precision if probability sampling	_ _% level of confidence – N/A			_ _+/- % margin of error– N/A		
Data management platform(s)	x	**REACH**		□	UNHCR	
	□	[Other, Specify]				
Expected ouput type(s)	□	Situation overview #: _ _	x	**Report #: 1**	□	Profile #: _ _
	□	Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: _ _	□	Presentation (Final) #: _ _	□	Factsheet #: _ _
	□	Interactive dashboard #:_	□	Webmap #: _ _	□	Map #: _ _
	□	[Other, Specify] #: _ _				
Access	□	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)				
	x	**Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)¹**				
Visibility *Specify which* **logos** *should be on outputs*	***REACH***					
	Donor: *ECHO*					
	Coordination Framework: *ISWG, AAWG*					
	Partners: *ACTED, CRS, Malteser International, PLAN International, Translators without Borders*					

---

¹ Dissemination will be by ECHO to their implementing partners

2. RATIONALE

The Grand Bargain was an agreement between Humanitarian Donors and Organisations to get "more means into the hands of people in need",[2] with the overall aim of increasing agency of affected populations during crises. The agreement has 61 signatories, (24 states, 11 UN Agencies, 5 inter-governmental organizations and Red Cross/Red Crescent Movements and 21 NGOs)[3] and represented a normative and operational shift toward beneficiary agency. The Grand Bargain outlines a number of core components including, but not limited to, 'Adapt our action based on the feedback received', 'Act based on what we've heard', and 'Receive feedback on how our response is received'.[4] These principles form the basis of the IASC 'Core Commitments on Accountability to Affected People'. These principles include accountability through Leadership/Governance, Transparency, Feedback and Complaints, Participation, as well as the Design and M&E of programmes.[5]

This shift in approach was formalized at the May 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, as signatories endorsed 'Accountability to Affected Populations' as a key framework for ensuring beneficiary agency, continuing the momentum of the "participation revolution" from the Grand Bargain.[6]

With many of the signatories to the participation revolution operating in North East Nigeria, the Humanitarian Country Team released a Community Engagement Strategy in 2018, embedding these key principles and framework into the humanitarian response.[7] The Community Engagement Strategy targeted increased ownership of the humanitarian response from beneficiary communities, increased effectiveness of the response, increasingly reality based perceptions of aid workers and systemic community engagement. These wide strategic objectives were accompanied with recommendations and key components for action by humanitarian actors in the 2018-2020 period. AAP principles are highlighted as key objectives in the 2019-2022 Humanitarian Response Plan for Nigeria under the wider bracket of protection. Objectives included "ensure accountability to affected populations by establishing feedback mechanisms through which they can measure the adequacy of interventions and address any concerns and complaints".[8]

Following the objectives set out in the HRP and Community Engagement Strategy, this study will build on panel discussions undertaken by REACH at the end of the MSNA 2019 cycle.[9] REACH held six panel discussions, with two panel discussions being held in each of the BAY states. These panel discussions were separated into two groups, with INGO and NNGO staff in the first, and civil society organizations (CSOs) and community leaders in the second. The questions touched on themes of aid received, satisfaction of aid delivery, safety of assistance received, language and information preferences, and trust from communities. Respondents of the panel discussions identified face to face interactions with aid workers as the preferred method of feedback due to distrust in other methods, as well a lack of consultation on beneficiary needs before humanitarian programs were implemented.

Building on the findings of the panel discussions and the MSNA 2019, REACH will undertake a qualitative study with a wider scope. The objective of this study is to collect information on the AAP mechanisms being employed by humanitarian actors and the perceptions of these mechanisms within affected populations. Firstly, the study aims to identify key information needs for affected populations, the preferred modality for receiving information and the perceptions of affected populations on the consultation processes, feedback mechanisms and grievance reporting mechanisms of the humanitarian organizations delivering assistance within their communities.

Secondly, the study will provide information regarding AAP mechanisms in North East Nigeria more broadly. To do so, it will collect information on the types mechanisms being employed by humanitarian organizations for consultation and feedback,

---

[2] IASC, About the Grand Bargain
[3] IASC, About the Grand Bargain
[4] CDAC, Global frameworks and commitments on communication and community engagement 2017
[5] Humanitarian Country Team, Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan for North-East Nigeria 2018-2020
[6] IASC, A participation revolution: include people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives
[7] Humanitarian Country Team, Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan for North-East Nigeria 2018-2020
[8] OCHA, Humanitarian Response Strategy Summary 2019-2022 Nigeria
[9] MSNA 2019 Terms of Reference

which of these mechanisms are being utilized by affected populations and how humanitarian actors are using information gained from these processes to shape their programming.

The information collected in this study will be used to strengthen the evidence base around affected populations' perceptions of humanitarian assistance and feedback mechanisms, and inform human-centered approaches to humanitarian programming across North-East Nigeria

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodology Overview

The study adopts a qualitative data collection approach, namely Focus Group Discussions with purposive sampling. In total, 24 focus group discussions will be conducted, with four taking place per selected LGA. REACH staff and other humanitarian staff will assist in mobilising community members, camp leaders and other participants.

Moderators will use a semi-structured topic guide (see Annex 1 for FGD data collection tools). These topic guides have been adapted for each FGD by LGA and by sample group. These guides include specific questions and probes to ensure all relevant information is provided. The FGDs notes are typed and sent to the Field Manager to be stored in a clearly labelled folder. An Assessment Officer will analyse the FGDs to identify trends and themes at the LGA level using Nvivo. The data from the FGDs is indicative of trends only and is not statistically generalizable for populations within the LGA or the North East region.

3.2 Population of interest

The study focuses on interactions between those providing humanitarian assistance (INGOs, NNGOs, Civil Society, Community Leaders) and beneficiaries of this assistance.

Three distinct groups are targeted by the AAP study:

- Employees of INGOs
- Employees/Members of NNGOs, Civil Society, Community Leaders and Camp Leaders
- Beneficiaries

The LGAs selected are Bama, Damboa, Dikwa, Gwoza, Monguno and Ngala. These LGAs have been selected due to the high prevalence of humanitarian activity taking place, as well as their accessibility. Due to the lack of accessibility across the region and within the selected LGAs, these sample will be from those based within LGA capitals only (all LGA capitals share the name of their wider LGA area).

3.3 Primary data collection

The focus group discussions will be stratified by these three groups, allowing information from multiple perspectives to be collected.

The first set of FGDs will take place with beneficiaries directly. For this study, beneficiaries are defined as IDPs, either living in camps or host communities, who have received humanitarian assistance in the past 6 months. These beneficiaries will be identified with the help of community leaders within camps and host communities. This will produce information on beneficiaries' perceptions of programs being run in communities, their awareness and perceptions of complaint/feedback mechanisms, and will also capture lived experiences of incidents involving aid workers in the community, such as incidents of abuse, conflict or miscommunication. These incidents inform and create wider perceptions in communities of humanitarian actors. This group will also measure whether respondents feel consulted before projects take place.

These beneficiary groups will be separated by gender, with two separate FGDs being undertaken in each LGA capital. This aims to create an environment which allows female respondents feel comfortable to share sensitive information related to

gender and minimise response bias. The groups will be composed of both IDPs based in camps and IDPs based in host communities. Note takers and facilitators will be given instructions to pay attention to the differences in answers between the two groups and report key similarities and differences in responses for each question.

The second set of groups will sample employees of civil society groups and national NGOs, as well as community and camp leaders. This group will provide data on communication methods within the communities, further security concerns of beneficiaries regarding aid workers and wider perceptions of humanitarian assistance within the community.

The third set of groups will sample employees of INGOs. These INGO groups will provide further information on communication methods between humanitarian actors and communities, feedback mechanisms and consultation, building on the information gained from the other focus groups and offering new insights.

The selection of these target populations aims to produce information that can be analysed to understand the differences in perceptions between these groups and inform human-centred approaches to humanitarian programming to address them.

4. Roles and responsibilities

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Research design	Assessment Officer	Country coordinator	HQ Research Design and Data (RDD) Unit	ECHO
Supervising data collection	Field Manager	Assessment Officer		ECHO, HQ RDD Unit
Data processing (checking, cleaning)	Database Specialist	Assessment Officer	HQ RDD Unit	ECHO
Data analysis	Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator	HQ RDD Unit	ECHO
Output production	Assessment Officer	Country coordinator	HQ Reporting team	ECHO
Dissemination	Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator	HQ Comms	ECHO
Monitoring & Evaluation	Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator	HQ RDD Unit	
Lessons learned	*Assessment Officer*	*Country Coordinator*		HQ RDD Unit

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*

5. Data Management Plan

A full data management plan is available upon request.

Annex 1: FGD Data Collection Tools

Focus Group Discussion Tool for Bama (Statistics referenced are modified for each LGA, with data taken from the MSNA)

PREPARATIONS

The Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
- ✓ One FGD group of made up of each group who have/can give information on accountability to affected population in the LGA. The groups are **1) INGOs, 2) NNGOS/Civil Society/Community Leaders/Camp Leaders 3) Female IDP beneficiaries who have received assistance in the past 6 months. 4) Male IDP beneficiaries** who have received assistance in the past 6 months.
- ✓ Each group with **6 to 8** participants, as is possible
- ✓ Due to IDPs living in camps and communities being in the same FGD, the note taker will not whether the respondent has identified them as living in a camp or a host community.

Risks to try and avoid (especially likely in a larger groups)
- ✓ Speaking time will be restricted and dominant people will speak most

- ✓ The facilitator will have to play more of a controlling role

- ✓ Some members of the group will become frustrated if they cannot speak

- ✓ Participants will start talking to one other rather than to the group as a whole

- ✓ The group may stop focusing and start talking about something else

What do you need?
- ✓ One facilitator
- ✓ One **note-taker**
- ✓ A common language
- ✓ A **quiet and private** place where the group will not be overheard or interrupted
- ✓ A working **recorder (**only to be used if every member of the group gives consent)
- ✓ **Water and snacks**
- ✓ To sit in a circle and be comfortable

Roles and roll-out
- ✓ The note-taker writes notes
- ✓ The facilitator checks that the written record has captured the main points (continuously)
- ✓ At the end of the session, the facilitator gives a brief summing up of what has been said in case someone has something to add
- ✓ The facilitator and note taker will then debrief the Assessment team to summarise what was discussed. The note taker will then submit their notes to the moderator team.

INSTRUCTIONS TO FACILITATORS

1. **Questions to participants:** the questions below should be read and communicated to the participants. If there are some specific vocabulary which may be unclear, do not hesitate to provide a definition for the purpose of the exercise.
2. **Probing questions**: Probes and clarifying questions are an important part of interviewing and have two main purposes: **1**) to help clarify what an interview respondent has said and **2**) To help get more detailed information on topics of interest. Probes allow the interview respondent to provide more than just a one-sentence answer to the questions to the questions you ask. **Do not read the probes in *italics* to participants**. Use or adapt them if necessary.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE [2 minutes]

Welcome and thank you for volunteering to take part in this focus group discussion. The discussion will be about your experiences and perceptions of humanitarian assistance provided in this LGA.

I work for REACH, a research-focused initiative of the NGOs ACTED and IMPACT. We are conducting an **assessment of Nigerian persons in the Northeast to understand the feedback mechanisms and accountability procedures currently in place in this LGA related to the design and delivery of humanitarian assistance programmes.** We have collected data from households in this LGA as part of our Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment (**MSNA**) **JUNE-JULY 2019** that examined a range of issues, and we have some findings that we want to understand in more depth.

Please note that **this meeting does not have any impact on whether you or your family receives assistance**. This discussion is only meant to better understand the needs of this community in giving feedback and receiving information through its most preferred mechanisms. Please understand that **REACH does not directly deliver aid**. We provide information to organizations that may or may not decide to act.

The **information collected here will be provided to humanitarian actors and related government agencies** so they can understand the intentions of IDPs/Communities like you across the Northeast, and plan more effective humanitarian interventions. The information will only be shared in an anonymised manner. Names, personal details, organisation names and other details will not be shared.

This meeting does not have any direct impact on whether you or your family receives assistance. **There is no benefit to participating and no drawback, your information is only used to help the humanitarian community identify gaps with accountability.**

ANONIMITY, CONFIDENTIALITY AND RIGHT NOT TO PARTICIPATE

I would like to assure you that **the discussion will be anonymous**. We will not share with anyone who participated in this group and who did not. We will only report what you say as a group but will not include names of anyone or the settlements which you came from.

I and the other focus group participants would appreciate it if you would refrain from discussing the comments of other group members outside the focus group. **If there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so**; however please try to answer and be as involved as possible.

The discussion should take about one and half hours.

➔ **Do you consent to participate? (Moderator gets consent from each participant)**
➔ **May I record this session? The audio recording will only be used to make sure our notes are accurate and will not be shared. (Moderator gets consent from each participant).**

GROUND RULES [2 minutes]

1. The most important rule is that only **ONE person speaks at a time.** There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished.
2. There are **no right or wrong answers**.
3. You do not have to speak in any particular order.
4. When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.
5. You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group.
6. Does anyone have any questions? *(Answer questions)*
7. Ok, let's start!

Nigeria | AAP: Focus Group Discussion

Facilitator		**Date**	
Assist/Translator		**Location**	
Start Time		**End time**	
Group Code		**Sex of Group**	

Age	Sex	Name of organisation (if applicable)	Camp or settlements of participant	How long have you been/worked in the LGA?

International Organisations (INGOs):

Engagement question: For how long has your organisation been working in humanitarian assistance programmes in this LGA?

Design of AAP systems:

- What is the preferred way that you and your organisation communicate with the communities you work with? (*Take the responses of each organisation differently)*

  - WHY is this the preferred way?

- What topics do you disseminate information in (security, education, etc.)?

  - What languages do you use to disseminate information?

  - How often?

- The findings from the MSNA 2019 in this LGA show that community leaders and religious leaders are the most trusted for reliable information. Do you work with or engage community or religious leaders?

  - If yes, what is your relationship with these members and is it effective in connecting with communities?

  - Do the leaders you work with cover all languages spoken in the community?

- Do you use the radio and/or cell phone to communicate with the community? What languages do you use?

Language barriers:

- To the best of your knowledge, what are all the languages that are spoken in the communities you work in?

Feedback from the community:

- What are the feedback mechanisms for complaints regarding past and present programmes being run by your organisations use in BAMA LGA?

  - What type of feedback have you received through this mechanism in the past?

  - What is the process with each mechanism?

  - How long does it take to respond with each mechanism?

- In our MSNA 2019 findings, 59% of respondents in BAMA LGA reported that they or their community were not asked about what aid they have received or would like to receive. To what extent do these findings reflect your own experiences in this LGA?

- Has your organisation conducted prior assessments or consultations for the planning and design of a project?

  - If yes, who was part of the assessment or consultation? What gender were they? How old were they? What is their role within the community?

- o What information were you trying to take from these assessments?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings, 10 % of respondents in BAMA LGA reported that they did not feel respected when receiving assistance? How does this observation align with your experiences?

  - o Have you heard about such examples? Can you elaborate?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings, 19% of respondents in BAMA LGA have reported that do not feel safe receiving assistance. What do you think about this observation?

  - o Have you heard about such examples? Can you elaborate?

Please ask the participants if they have further questions or comments they will like to add.

Civil Society/NNGOs/Community Leaders:

Engagement Question: Do you know about and participate in the humanitarian aid programmes ongoing in your community? In what capacity? And what programmes?

Design of AAP systems:

- What are the communication means and engagement methods used by communities in this LGA to discuss their needs and issues regarding humanitarian assistance?

- The MSNA 2019 findings shows that Religious Leaders and community leaders are the most common way to discuss beneficiary needs and issues. Does this align with your experience? What other methods are used?

- How effective are the Information Education Communication (IEC) Materials your communities? Is the language used appropriate? Are they understood by the community?

Language barriers:

- The MSNA 2019 data shows that communities would like to be provided with information on security issues, health, education, etc. meanwhile only 49% of the respondents in BAMA reportedly can read and speak Hausa.

    o What other languages would they prefer if they don't know Hausa?

    o Knowing the barrier to reading and writing, what are some other ways that this information can be disseminated in a more effective way?

Feedback from the community:

- The findings of the MSNA 2019 shows that the top three reported preferences for Bama are: Face to face with the aid worker at home, Face to face with the aid worker in their office, Face to face with someone in the community.

    o Do you think these top three aligned with your experiences?

    o What are more popular feedback mechanisms and why?

- Our previous research shows that 2% and 17 % respondents use the text message and the complaints boxes for feedback. Why do you think people don't use the feedback mechanisms provided (i.e. complaint boxes, text messages)?

    o Can they not write the complaint?

    o Are they provided with paper?

    o Are there clear instructions in all languages?

    o Does anyone come to pick the complaints?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings, 26% of respondents in BAMA LGA reported that they were not satisfied with the assistance received. Why do you think this is the case?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings,28% of respondents in BAMA LGA reported a low level of trust in aid workers. Why do you think this is?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings, 10 % of respondents in BAMA LGA reported that they did not feel respected when receiving assistance? How does this observation align with your experiences?

    o Have you heard about such examples? Can you elaborate?

- In the MSNA 2019 findings, 19% of respondents in BAMA LGA have reported that they do not feel safe receiving assistance. What do you think about this observation?

    o Have you heard about such examples? Can you elaborate?

Please ask the participants if they have further questions or comments they will like to add.

Beneficiaries (Female Focus Group Discussion):

Engagement question: Do you know the NGOs and humanitarian aid programmes in your community? Who are they? And what are they doing?

Design of AAP systems:

- Do you receive the information you would like from NGOs and partners? What additional information would you like to receive?

- Do NGOs use information, education and communication (IEC) materials (banners, leaflets etc.) here in BAMA?

If YES:

- In what languages does your community receive the IEC materials? Is this understood in the community?

- Are these materials easy to understand?

- How do people in the community feel about these materials? Do they like them? Why/Why not?

If NO:

- How do aid organizations or providers share information?

- Do people in your community own cell phones and radios?

- If yes, what kind of information do people in your community access with the cell phone/radio?

- How have you been approached and consulted before an NGO started a project in your camp/ community? If yes, please explain.

- Who was involved?

- What type of information did you provide?

- How was this information acted upon in the project?

Feedback from the community:

- Who do you and people within your community feel the most comfortable making complaints to?

  - Community leaders?

  - NGO workers?

  - Through complaint boxes?

  - Face to face?

- How do you make complaints to these people?

- o Why do you make the complaint to this person?

- o Why do you not use the other options?

- Do you feel safe reporting complaints to NGOs?

  - o Is there a safe space for you to go with more sensitive cases?

- Has there ever been an incident where you or someone you know felt disrespected by an aid worker? Please explain.

- Have you or someone you know made a complaint to an NGO about an incident? If yes:

  - o How long did it take the NGO to respond after the complaint?

  - o Do you/they feel satisfied with the response?

Please ask the participants if they have further questions or comments they would like to add. (Specifically for female FGDs if they have comments and concerns that are gender related)

Beneficiaries (Male Focus Group Discussion):

Engagement question: Do you know the NGOs and humanitarian aid programmes in your community? Who are they? and what are they doing?

Design of AAP systems:

- Do you receive the information you would like from NGOs and partners? What additional information would you like to receive?

- Do NGOs use information, education and communication (IEC) materials (banners, leaflets etc.) here in BAMA?

If YES:

- o In what languages does your community receive the IEC materials? Is this understood in the community?

- o Are these materials easy to understand?

- o How do people in the community feel about these materials? Do they like them? Why/Why not?

If NO:

- o How do aid organizations or providers share information?

- o Do people in your community own cell phones and radios?

- o If yes, what kind of information do people in your community access with the cell phone/radio?

- o How have you been approached and consulted before an NGO started a project in your camp/ community? If yes, please explain.

- o Who was involved?

- o What type of information did you provide?

- o How was this information acted upon in the project?

Feedback from the community:

- Who do you and people within your community feel the most comfortable making complaints to?

- o Community leaders?

- o NGO workers?

- o Through complaint boxes?

- o Face to face?

- How do you make complaints to these people?

- o Why do you make the complaint to this person?

- o Why do you not use the other options?

- Do you feel safe reporting complaints to NGOs?

    - o Is there a safe space for you to go with more sensitive cases?

- Has there ever been an incident where you or someone you know felt disrespected by an aid worker? Please explain.

- Have you or someone you know made a complaint to an NGO about an incident? If yes:

    - o How long did it take the NGO to respond after the complaint?

    - o Do you/they feel satisfied with the response?

Please ask the participants if they have further questions or comments they would like to add.

Thank you.