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# Executive Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country of intervention** | *Ukraine* | | | | | | | |
| **Type of Emergency** | □ | Natural hazard | x | Conflict | | | □ | Other *(specify)* | |
| **Type of Crisis** | □ | Sudden onset | □ | Slow onset | | | x | Protracted | |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | BHA | | | | | | | |
| **IMPACT Project Code** | 64BAO | | | | | | | |
| **Overall Research Timeframe** *(from research design to final outputs / M&E)* | 16/09/2024 to 24/01/2025 | | | | | | | |
| **Research Timeframe**  *Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)* | 1. Pilot/ training: 25/11/2024 | | | | 6. Preliminary presentation: N/a | | | |
| 2. Start collect data: 26/11/2024 | | | | 7. Outputs sent for validation: 13/01/2025 | | | |
| 3. Data collected: 13/12/2024 | | | | 8. Outputs published: 24/01/2025 | | | |
| 4. Data analysed: 20/12/2024 | | | | 9. Final presentation: 24/01/2025 | | | |
| 5. Data sent for validation: 23/12/2024 | | | |
| **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 (can be tentative)** | | | |
| x | Donor plan/strategy | | | 10/01/2025 | | | |
| x | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | | | 10/01/2025 | | | |
| x | Cluster plan/strategy | | | 10/01/2025 | | | |
| □ | NGO platform plan/strategy | | | \_ \_/\_ \_/\_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| □ | Other (Specify): | | | \_ \_/\_ \_/\_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Audience Type & Dissemination** | **Audience type** | | | | **Dissemination** | | | |
| x Strategic  x Programmatic  □ Operational  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | xGeneral Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors)  x Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and CCCM) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting  x Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting)  x Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre)  x Follow-up workshop with local stakeholders | | | |
| **Stakeholder mapping** *Has a detailed stakeholder mapping been conducted during research design to identify all actors that could* ***contribute*** *to and/or* ***benefit******from*** *the research?* | x | Yes (along with national consultations) | | | □ | No | | |
| **General Objective** | To inform humanitarian and transitional policy discussions by exploring how and to what extent ongoing protection, CCCM and shelter-related needs of conflict-affected people in selected hromadas of Western Ukraine are being met at the local level, in the context of the scale-down of humanitarian assistance. | | | | | | | |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | 1. To assess key outstanding humanitarian needs, particularly protection, CCCM and shelter-related, faced by conflict-affected communities in selected hromadas in Western Ukraine. 2. To map out at the hromada level, what humanitarian protection, CCCM and shelter interventions are or have been scaled down, and the capacities of local CSOs and authorities to respond to remaining needs. 3. To identify the main risks and barriers, as well as good practices and opportunities regarding humanitarian phase-down and transition to other, longer-term, forms of assistance (primarily government-provided services). 4. To contribute to the development of benchmarking for determining when conditions are sufficiently stable, in terms of needs and response capacity, to shift towards other forms of assistance. | | | | | | | |
| **Research Questions** | 1. To what extent are the needs of conflict-affected population, related to protection, CCCM and shelter, being met by sources of support other than humanitarian, in areas where humanitarian assistance is being or has already been scaled down?    1. Where needs are being met, what has facilitated this process, and how sustainable is it?    2. Which actors are involved, and to what extent are they coordinating effectively? 2. What, if any, are the outstanding needs related to protection, CCCM and shelter, of conflict-affected population in areas where humanitarian assistance is being or has already been scaled down?    1. Where needs are not being met, what are the barriers preventing this from happening? 3. To what extent is the shift away from humanitarian support taking place as a coordinated, systematic transition at the local level?    1. What good practices exist where such a transition is taking place?    2. What are the possible consequences where it is not? 4. To what extent do dynamics around transition at local level align with the assumptions and expectations of different stakeholders at the national level?    1. What are crisis-affected populations’ perceptions and expectations of this process? 5. What opportunities exist for humanitarian and non-humanitarian stakeholders to strengthen the coherence and effectiveness of their efforts to meet affected populations’ acute needs in the context of a scaling-down of humanitarian resources in future? | | | | | | | |
|  | This assessment will take an area-based case study approach, aimed at providing a snapshot of key dynamics in the context of limited time and resources. Thus, its proposed geographic scope is two hromadas in Western Ukraine (see selection criteria in Section 3.2): Volodymyrska (Volynska oblast) and Chortkivska (Ternopilska oblast). | | | | | | | |
| **Secondary data sources** | See section 3.3. | | | | | | | |
| **Population(s)** | x | IDPs in camp | | | □ | IDPs in informal sites | | |
| *Select all that apply* | x | IDPs in host communities | | | □ | IDPs [Other, Specify] | | |
|  | □ | Refugees in camp | | | □ | Refugees in informal sites | | |
|  | □ | Refugees in host communities | | | □ | Refugees [Other, Specify] | | |
|  | x | Host communities | | | □ | [Other, Specify] | | |
| **Stratification**  *Select type(s) and enter number of strata* | x | Geographical #: 2 (hromada)  Population size per strata is known? x Yes □ No | x | Vulnerability type #: 5  Population size per strata is known?  □ Yes x No | | | □ | *[Other Specify]* #: \_ \_  Population size per strata is known?  □ Yes □ No |
| **Data collection tool(s)** | □ | Structured (Quantitative) | | | **x** | Semi-structured (Qualitative) | | |
|  | **Sampling method** | | | | **Data collection method** | | | |
| **Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1** | x Purposive  x Snowballing  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | x Key informant interview (Target #): 48  □ Individual interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Focus group discussion (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ [Other, Specify](Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 2** | x Purposive  x Snowballing  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | □ Key informant interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Individual interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  x Focus group discussion (Target #):8  □ [Other, Specify] (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ | | | |
| **Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 3** | x Purposive  x Snowballing  □ [Other, Specify] | | | | □ Key informant interview (Target #):\_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Individual interview (Target #): \_ \_ \_ \_ \_  □ Focus group discussion (Target #): \_ \_ \_ \_ \_  x Household Interviews (Target #): 6-10 | | | |
| **Disaggregation by gender and age**  *Are you planning to conduct sex/age disaggregated analysis?* | Gender | | | | Age | | | |
| □ | Yes | | | □ | Yes | | |
| x | No | | | x | No | | |
| **Data management platform(s)** | x | IMPACT | | | □ | UNHCR | | |
|  | □ | [Other, Specify] | | | | | | |
| **Expected ouput type(s)** | x | Situation overview #: 1 | □ | Report #: \_ \_ | | | □ | Profile #: \_ \_ |
| □ | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: \_ \_ | x | Presentation (Final) #: 1 | | | □ | Factsheet #: \_ \_ |
| □ | Interactive dashboard #:\_ | □ | Webmap #: \_ \_ | | | □ | Map #: \_ \_ |
|  | □ | [Other, Specify] #: \_ \_ | | | | | | |
| **Access** | x | Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms) | | | | | | |
| □ | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) | | | | | | |
| **Visibility** *Specify which* ***logos*** *should be on outputs* | ***REACH*** | | | | | | | |
| ***Donor:*** *BHA* | | | | | | | |
| ***Coordination Framework:*** *N/a* | | | | | | | |
| ***Partners:*** *N/a* | | | | | | | |

# Rationale

* 1. Background

As the needs of conflict-affected populations in Western and Central Ukraine become more protracted in nature, the 2024 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan (HNRP) has shifted its focus to providing life-saving assistance in the South and Eastern regions of the country and areas along the Russian border, the so-called “crescent”[[1]](#footnote-2). Consequently, humanitarian actors have begun to scale down aid programmes in the West and Centre. At the same time, initial discussions around transitions out of humanitarian assistance have emphasised the importance of coordinating this process responsibly, ensuring that non-humanitarian systems and resources are in place to meet ongoing, often complex needs, rather than shutting off assistance when the money runs out.

Conflict-affected populations in Western and Central areas still face chronic, often complex challenges that threaten both their short-term wellbeing, their longer-term resilience, and the country’s wider prospects for sustainable recovery. Over 4 million Ukrainians remain displaced, including many within the Western oblasts, with more expected to flee due to ongoing evacuations near the frontline and border areas[[2]](#footnote-3). Other challenges include economic issues, such as the rising cost of living. According to MSNA 2024, 47% of households in the Centre and 24% in the West struggled to cover their basic needs[[3]](#footnote-4). Although the unemployment rate is projected to decline to 14% in 2024, it will still remain above pre-February 2022 levels, leading many households to continue relying on social protection transfers[[4]](#footnote-5). War has also caused significant damage to vital infrastructure, including the energy grid, affecting electricity availability, which in turn impacts both the economy and living conditions. Additionally, healthcare and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) needs are increasing, driven by war-related injuries and psychosocial issues among both the civilian population and veterans[[5]](#footnote-6). In education, while schools near the frontline operate online, those in the West largely provide in-person teaching (86% children attended school in person)[[6]](#footnote-7). These schools must be prepared to accommodate either returning Ukrainians from abroad or further waves of internally displaced persons (IDPs).

Addressing these issues has overwhelmed local governments, NGOs, and service providers, who are often operating beyond their capacity—which itself has often been heavily impacted by the conflict—while available humanitarian aid is scaling down. For example, by mid-2023 the estimated number of available social workers had halved since the beginning of the war, which is severely inadequate to meet the rising needs[[7]](#footnote-8). Additionally, according to UNDP, Ukraine's total recovery and reconstruction needs are estimated at US$486 billion[[8]](#footnote-9). At the same time, the United Nations notes a lack of reliable data regarding population in need of social support[[9]](#footnote-10).

* 1. Intended impact

While there have not been many studies conducted to evaluate the transition from reliance on humanitarian aid to other, long-term forms of assistance (primarily government-provided services) in Ukraine, it is crucial to deepen the understanding of this process to better inform policy, address challenges and guide future actions in this area. At present, the coordination architecture for durable solutions and the nexus in Ukraine is under review following the arrival of a new United Nations Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC), and the stagnation and failure of previous pilot approaches.[[10]](#footnote-11) At the same time, the question of if and how clusters should support managed, “responsible” transitions away from humanitarian assistance in areas deprioritized in the 2025 HNRP remains fiercely debated within national-level coordination spaces. Part of this conversation has focused on developing an approach to “benchmarking” when local needs and capacities are ready to “graduate” away from humanitarian assistance, but as of yet this is largely theoretical and has yet to be accompanied by a clear conceptual framework or measurement approach. There is thus a window for a piece of rapid research to ensure that these ongoing debates are properly grounded in evidence, by providing a tangible snapshot of how the operational realities of transition are currently playing out at field level.

This assessment has a dual focus. Firstly, it aims to determine the extent to which the protection, CCCM, and shelter needs of the conflict-affected population are being met through sources other than humanitarian aid. Secondly, it evaluates the transition itself, examining whether it is:

* Systematic: Based on a structured and methodical approach to change, ensuring that all components are aligned and integrated for a seamless and effective shift.
* Coordinated: Entrenched within a process in which various actors or elements work together in a well-organised and synchronised manner.
* Sustainable: Seeking changes and solutions that ensure long-term viability.

# 3. Methodology

* 1. Methodology overview

This assessment will rely on a qualitative approach, including:

1. **Secondary data review** (October-January): Analysis of secondary data sources (e.g., reports of international organisations, government reports, programs, plans; government datasets) for initial context understanding and further triangulation of REACH-collected data.
2. **Stakeholder mapping** (November): The main humanitarian and non-humanitarian stakeholders responsible for addressing populations’ key needs will be mapped within each of the two hromadas. Mapping will allow for a better understanding of the local structures and feed into selection of key informants for qualitative primary data collection.
3. **Preliminary consultations with national stakeholders** (November): Consultations with the representatives of central government, national humanitarian clusters, development actors and civil society will be held at the initial stage of assessment, to explore the context and relevant governance structures. Understanding of the transition process, along with the expectations and concerns expressed by central-level stakeholders, will inform the research design and later be analysed and compared with the transition experiences described by local stakeholders.
4. **Qualitative primary data collection (hromada level)** (November-December):
   * Key Informant Interviews: KIIs are a qualitative research method in which detailed, individual in-depth interviews are conducted with individuals who have specialised knowledge of the topic, e.g., representatives of a specific sector or institution. KIIs will be conducted with stakeholders working within Protection, Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) and Shelter clusters. Informants will include local actors, including representatives of the local government, local NGOs, local CSOs, INGOs, UN agencies and coordination structures operating locally, allowing to gain an understanding of the transition process and responsibility structure, along with barriers, opportunities and risks involved.
   * Focus Group Discussions: FGDs are a qualitative research method used to gather insights and opinions from a small group of participants through structured or semi-structured dialogue. FGDs with members of vulnerable population groups currently or previously receiving humanitarian assistance will be conducted to explore the unaddressed needs of the IDP and non-displaced conflict-affected population and gain perspectives of direct beneficiaries of the early recovery transition process.
   * Household Interviews: HHIs are a qualitative research method in which detailed, individual in-depth interviews are conducted, asking questions at the household level (about the situation of the household). HHIs with persons with disability and/or chronic illness currently or previously receiving humanitarian assistance will be conducted instead of FGDs with this group to explore their unaddressed needs and gain perspectives of direct beneficiaries of the early recovery transition process.
5. **Follow-up workshop with local stakeholders** (potential, January or later): Following analysis of findings, a participatory workshop could be held with local and/or national stakeholders to validate findings, identify areas for further exploration and develop initial recommendations.

Key Definitions:

**Oblast** is the highest administrative unit in Ukraine below the national level.

**Rayon** is thesecond level of administrative unit in Ukraine, a part of an oblast.

**Hromada** is abasic administrative unit in Ukraine, a part of a rayon.

**Humanitarian needs** are the essential needs of individuals and communities affected by crises, such as armed conflicts, or other emergencies. These needs encompass basic necessities, including shelter and protection.

3.2 Population of interest

Geographical area assessed

This assessment will take an area-based case study approach, aimed at providing a snapshot of key dynamics in the context of limited time and resources. Its proposed geographic scope is two hromadas in Western Ukraine: Volodymyrska (Volynska oblast) and Chortkivska (Ternopilska oblast). The exact locations have been chosen based on discussions with humanitarian and development stakeholders. Preliminary selection criteria included:

* Urban hromadas, due to their larger populations and broader provision of basic services.
* Hromadas located outside oblast centres, to exclude oblasts’ capitals that may have stronger financial resources and are more likely to be included in central planning.
* Hromadas which experienced or which are likely to experience IDP influx.
* A scaling down of humanitarian presence, including 1 hromada that has largely transitioned to the early recovery stage and 1 that is going through that process.
* Recommendations by the clusters, ensuring coverage of several clusters across the two hromadas, to inform a larger variety of stakeholders.

Population assessed

Population of interest are vulnerable conflict-affected populations, currently or formerly included in humanitarian caseloads, who require social assistance. The assessment will also include the perspective of local humanitarian and governmental service providers and policymakers working within the within the Protection, CCCM and Shelter sectors.

The Protection, CCCM, and Shelter sectors have been chosen because their activities are primarily linked to times of crisis; in regular circumstances, the need for their services (particularly CCCM and Shelter) is lower, resulting in a greater reliance on humanitarian actors during emergencies rather than established national stakeholder networks. Additionally, over the past year, international actors in these sectors have been scaling down their operations in Western Ukraine, providing an opportunity to assess the transition process.

Unit of measurement

Outstanding needs of the local population will be assessed via FGDs and Household Interviews at the household level. Challenges in the transition process of local stakeholders will be assessed at the hromada level, by sector.

* 1. Secondary data review

The main documents for secondary data review can be found below (see Table 1). Additional documents might be used throughout the assessment depending on research needs and availability new publications.

**Table 1. Secondary sources**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Secondary source** | **Purpose of the source** | **Link** |
| Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2024 | * Contextual understanding of the latest planning and targeting for humanitarian aid * Key definitions | <https://reliefweb.int/report/ukraine/ukraine-humanitarian-needs-and-response-plan-2024-december-2023-enuk> |
| Ukraine Recovery and Reconstruction Needs Assessment 2024, UNDP | * Understanding of recovery efforts in Ukraine | <https://www.undp.org/ukraine/publications/updated-ukraine-recovery-and-reconstruction-needs-assessment> |
| Ukraine Common Country Analysis 2023, UN | * Contextual understanding * Identification of vulnerable groups | [https://ukraine.un.org/sites/default/files/2023-12/CCA](https://ukraine.un.org/sites/default/files/2023-12/CCA%20Ukraine%202023_final_November%202023.pdf?afd_azwaf_tok=eyJhbGciOiJSUzI1NiJ9.eyJhdWQiOiJ1a3JhaW5lLnVuLm9yZyIsImV4cCI6MTcyOTUyMjA2NywiaWF0IjoxNzI5NTIxNzY3LCJpc3MiOiJ0aWVyMS1kNTk1ZjQ1ZDYteDVicXEiLCJzdWIiOiI0Ni4zMC4xNjUuODYiLCJkYXRhIjp7InR5cGUiOiJpc3N1ZWQiLCJyZWYiOiIyMDI0MTAyMVQxNDQyNDdaLXIxZDU5NWY0NWQ2eDVicXFnN2U3ejluNzljMDAwMDAwMDRzZzAwMDAwMDAyNjB5OSIsImIiOiJka3NrLTNnOUFnclZnZFNGZFA5SzJ2VFhGOEFjeTJPeG91dDVTMmZDNUVFIiwiaCI6IkpXcWZ3VFZrMjR1TVRLZldXMmdfVTloUGRvRVI2N3dfTnBVSkItNDdwdVUifX0.R-tlVnnU9ER8uV-7ywyTGgojEqmwO34Q35KG4NqvR-CFiSJCxw2pDU7dJlyoNpXC5ugu8WTihJnNkMjVdYcZw6mnfWE1EXPDh9dGWtDhhtdR__sBGfcsWTeNyIH4DeP3wE3KDJWdR31n_9iWlv71eR2uS_IosvYacq9qSewt2TwY0bvVJQTI9HnKhSxtF3gZTpCGZ0uq2Ht_eg3IMHeWvufPJMeJX4Jp2-ucBgMtyOKV-EZmirWUFLs_z5oiNNTmCCiRQQh-g_2Mf596ZN8JoCHXt1TjVfzD3FV6YFqH02f_w6zNB4RUIOfGGuUfx48qSyCSvCz4KPFyBCD0RTGB1A.WF3obl2IDtqgvMFRqVdYkD5s) |
| MSNA 2024, IMPACT | * Information on vulnerable groups and outstanding needs | <https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/893b7468/REACH_UKR_Frequency-Tables-Oblast_MSNA_August24_General-Population.xlsx> |
| IDP Profiling in Urban Areas, 2024, IMPACT | * Information on vulnerable groups and outstanding needs | <https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/a5be0846/REACH_IDP-Profiling_Situation-Overview_Chervonohradska.pdf> |
| IDP Collective Site Monitoring maps, IMPACT | * Mapping active/closing collective sites | <https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/2a03cf3a/REACH-Ukraine-IDP-Collective-Site-Monitoring-Map-Active-Sites-August-2024.pdf> |
| Ukraine - Durable Solutions For People Living in Collective Sites: Outlook and Way Forward, 2024, IMPACT | * Information on vulnerable groups and outstanding needs * Understanding of the expectations and recommendations for early recovery regarding IDPs | <https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/7d73ed0f/UKR_DS_CCCM_report.pdf> |
| Documents of the National Council for the Recovery of Ukraine from the War 2022, Government of Ukraine | * Understanding of the national authorities’ plans and expectations for early recovery | <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/en/national-council-recovery-ukraine-war/working-groups> |
| United Nations in Ukraine Transitional Framework September 2022-December 2024, UN | * Understanding of the UN-Ukraine plans and expectations for early recovery | <https://ukraine.un.org/sites/default/files/2024-04/UNUkraine_2022_2024_TransitionalFramework_Updated_EN.pdf> |
| A study of recovery initiatives in Ukraine, Ednannia, 2023 | * Contextual understanding of early recovery efforts in Ukraine * Feeding into the Data Analysis Plan | <https://ednannia.ua/images/A_study_of_recovery_initiatives_in_Ukraine.pdf> |

* 1. Primary Data Collection

Secondary Data Review and consultations with national stakeholders will begin before the start of the primary data collection to feed into the research design. Consultations with national-level stakeholders helped identify suitable locations for the assessment and deepened the assessment team’s understanding of the transition process from a national or central-level perspective, which has guided the development of additional questions for the Key Informant Interviews.

Primary data collection will include three components: Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with representatives of vulnerable conflict-affected populations, currently or formerly included in humanitarian caseloads, who require social assistance. Household Interviews (HHIs) with persons with disability and/or chronic illness currently or formerly included in humanitarian caseloads, who require social assistance. Semi-structured (qualitative) Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with local humanitarian and governmental service providers and policymakers working within the Protection, CCCM and Shelter sectors (see Table 2). FGDs, HHIs and KIIs will be conducted simultaneously as the findings from each component will complement one another without influencing each other’s design.

**Table 2. Data collection components**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Collection Component** | **Respondents** | **Target Number of Interviews** | **Main areas of focus** |
| Key Informant Interviews | Stakeholders working in the Protection, CCCM and Shelter sectors in given locations, including representatives of:   * International organisations * International NGOs | 3-6 KIIs total per hromada | * To what extent are outstanding needs of the population being met by non-humanitarian sources of support? * Where needs are being met, what has facilitated this process, and how sustainable is it? * Where needs are not being met, what are the barriers preventing this from happening? * Which actors are involved, and to what extent are they coordinating effectively? * To what extent is the shift away from humanitarian support taking place as a managed, systematic transition? * What good practices exist where such a transition is taking place? * What are the possible consequences where it is not? * To what extent do dynamics around transition at local level align with the assumptions and expectations of different stakeholders at the national level?   What opportunities exist for humanitarian and non-humanitarian stakeholders to strengthen the coherence and effectiveness of their efforts to meet affected populations’ acute needs in the context of a scaling-down of humanitarian resources in future? |
| Key Informant Interviews | Stakeholders working in the Protection, CCCM and Shelter sectors, including representatives of:   * Local authorities * Public service providers * Local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) * Local Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) | 8-13 KIIs total per hromada | * To what extent are outstanding needs of the population being met by non-humanitarian sources of support? * Where needs are being met, what has facilitated this process, and how sustainable is it? * Where needs are not being met, what are the barriers preventing this from happening? * Which actors are involved, and to what extent are they coordinating effectively? * To what extent is the shift away from humanitarian support taking place as a managed, systematic transition? * What good practices exist where such a transition is taking place? * What are the possible consequences where it is not? * To what extent do dynamics around transition at local level align with the assumptions and expectations of different stakeholders at the national level? * What opportunities exist for humanitarian and non-humanitarian stakeholders to strengthen the coherence and effectiveness of their efforts to meet affected populations’ acute needs in the context of a scaling-down of humanitarian resources in future? |
| Focus Group Discussions | Vulnerable groups of local population:   * IDPs in collective sites * IDPs outside of collective sites * Single caregivers (members of HHs with children) * Elderly persons (65+ y.o.) with special needs | 4 FGDs total (1 per each vulnerable group) per hromada (each FGD involving 5-10 persons) | * To what extent is the shift away from humanitarian support taking place as a managed, systematic transition? * What, if any, are the outstanding needs related to protection, CCCM and Shelter, of population in areas where humanitarian assistance is being or has already been scaled down? * To what extent are these needs being met by other sources of support? * Where needs are being met, what has facilitated this process, and how sustainable is it? * Where needs are not being met, what are the barriers preventing this from happening? * What are crisis-affected populations’ perceptions and expectations of the transition process? |
| Household Interviews | Persons with disability and/or chronic illness | 3-5 per hromada | * What, if any, are the outstanding needs related to protection, CCCM and Shelter, of population in areas where humanitarian assistance is being or has already been scaled down? * To what extent are these needs being met by other sources of support? * Where needs are being met, what has facilitated this process, and how sustainable is it? * Where needs are not being met, what are the barriers preventing this from happening? * What are crisis-affected populations’ perceptions and expectations of the transition process? |

All primary data will be collected by the IMPACT Localisation Team, supported by the Field Team, in November 2024. Data collection will include a pilot phase, after which the results will be discussed, and the Assessment Team will review the debrief forms to make improvements to the tool if needed.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) will be conducted in person, while Household Interviews (HHIs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) will be conducted either face-to-face or by phone, depending on logistical capacity and the security situation. Members of households with persons with vulnerabilities enlisted in Table 3 will be invited to participate in FGDs and HHIs – ideally, the data collection team will attempt to involve persons with given vulnerabilities directly, but if not possible, other members of their households can participate instead. Household Interviews will serve as a replacement to FGDs with persons with disability and/or chronic illness to ensure that people with limited mobility or special needs can participate. KIIs will rely on questionnaires adjusted to international and local stakeholders (although all will be interviewed at the local level.

In total, 22-38 KIIs, 8 FGDs and 6-10 HHIs are envisioned, all disaggregated by location (see Table 3). The FGDs and HHIs will enable to include perspectives of the main vulnerable groups in each hromada by providing information on their needs. KIIs will involve the main stakeholders participating in the transition process. The number of KIIs remains flexible, as stakeholder mapping is ongoing in parallel to data collection preparations. The final number of KIIs will depend on the number of stakeholders involved in the transition process and addressing needs of the population within each hromada. KIIs will be additionally disaggregated during analysis by type of actor, while FGDs will be further disaggregated by type of vulnerability. Sampling will be purposive, with snowball sampling employed to achieve the target number of respondents, with the respondents for FGDs and HHIs reached, i.a., by contacting local NGOs that provide aid to the relevant vulnerable population groups. However, snowball sampling for FGDs will be conducted in a manner that ensures participants who are acquittances are not placed in the same group.

Table 3. Detailed sampling

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **KIIs** | | | |
| Category | Examples of respondents: Representatives of... | Chortkivska Hromada | Volodymyrska Hromada |
| INGOs | Protection WG  CCCM WG  Shelter WG | 3-6 | 3-6 |
| Local authorities | Bureau of the Head of hromada  Social services department  Administrative Services Centre (TSNAP)  Department of housing/communal economy  Services for Children | 3-5 | 3-5 |
| Public service providers and advisory bodies | Shelter (collective sites)  IDP councils | 2-3 | 2-3 |
| Local NGOs/CBOs | NGOs/CBOs providing IDP-oriented services  NGOs/CBOs providing social services (incl. legal, material aid)  NGOs/CBOs providing aid to persons with disability or chronic illness  NGOs/CBOs providing child protection services  NGOs/CBOs providing aid related to GBV | 3-5 | 3-5 |
|  | Total: | 22-38 | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FGDs** | | | |
| Vulnerability | | Chortkivska Hromada | Volodymyrska Hromada |
| IDP | Members of IDP HHs outside of collective sites | 1 | 1 |
| Members of IDP HHs in collective sites | 1 | 1 |
| Host | Members of HHs with children, incl. single caregivers | 1 | 1 |
| Members of HHs with elderly members (65+ y.o.) with special needs | 1 | 1 |
|  | Total: | 8 | |
|  |  |  |  |
| **HHIs** | | | |
| Vulnerability | | Chortkivska Hromada | Volodymyrska Hromada |
| Host | Members of HHs with persons with a disability/chronic illness | 3-5 | 3-5 |
|  | Total: | 6-10 | |
|  |  |  |  |

* 1. Data Processing & Analysis

Secondary data will be collected and reviewed by the Assessment Team (Assessment Officer and Senior Assessment Officer). Any new relevant reports, factsheets, briefings and other information, will be added to the stock of secondary data and will be used to triangulate the results of the data collection.

Data collection will be conducted by the Assessment Officers and supported by the Field Officers and enumerators, all supervised by the Assessment Team Leader in coordination with the Field Operations Manager. Prior to collecting data Assessment, Field Officers and enumerators will receive a training on qualitative data collection, as well as the specific tools used in this assessment. A pilot data collection of the qualitative components will follow the training. The data collection tools may be adjusted based on the insights from the pilot.

Qualitative data collection will be audio-recorded (dependent on respondents’ consent), and the interviewers (Assessment and Field Officers, enumerators) will take notes during data collection. Enumerators and Field Officers will transcribe these notes, using recordings to consolidate them, as soon as possible after the discussions. The transcripts will be translated automatically, with translation verified and edited by the Assessment Officers.

The coding system will be exported as a data saturation grid built via MAXQDA to highlight the key themes, areas of consensus, and areas of disagreement, with the possibility of disaggregating findings by location. A summary of findings will be written and included in the data saturation grid. Qualitative data analysis will be performed according to the Data Analysis Plan (see section 6). All data cleaning and analysis will be reviewed by the IMPACT HQ Research Department.

* 1. **Limitations**
* A qualitative approach will not provide representative data on humanitarian and early recovery efforts’ beneficiaries, however, it will enable to explore the transition process and remaining unmet needs in depth.
* It needs to be noted that this assessment will serve as a case study, providing insights on the transition process in selected locations, rather than findings generalisable at country level.
* It might be challenging to select a hromada that is entering the early recovery process and one that has made progress in it, as situation may vary per sector. Simultaneously, given the time constraints, providing a comprehensive overview of the entire humanitarian and recovery landscape in a given hromada may not be feasible. Therefore, the focus has been narrowed to three specific sectors to set clear boundaries for the assessment.
* It would be challenging for representatives of vulnerable population groups to distinguish whether they receive humanitarian or early recovery support. Therefore, FGDs and HHIs will focus on broader service provision and unmet needs.
* Because recruiting respondents for FGDs and HHIs will be conducted with the help of local NGOs, the sample will at least partially include those who have already contacted or are aware of certain NGOs providing aid to vulnerable population groups. It will be more difficult to reach those who did not attempt to access NGO services, therefore this group, potentially with a wider array of unmet needs, may be underrepresented in the sample.
* Persons with certain types of disability or chronic illness, such as those with hearing loss or undergoing complex medical treatment will be more difficult to reach and be included in the sample.
* Key Informant Interviews will allow to evaluate the transition process and locally provided services. However, answers might be biased, as respondents might be inclined to present their organisations and institutions in a favourable light, or on the contrary – present the situation as more dire than in reality in a hope for attracting more funding.

# Key ethical considerations and related risks

The proposed research design meets / does not meet the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***The proposed research design…*** | ***Yes/ No*** | ***Details if no (including mitigation)*** |
| … Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to **avoid unnecessary duplication** of data collection efforts? | Yes |  |
| … **Respects respondents, their rights and dignity** (*specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants’ time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided*)? | Yes |  |
| … Does not **expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes |  |
| … Does not **expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes |  |
| … Does not involve **collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising** for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)? | Yes |  |
| … Does not involve **data collection with minors** i.e. anyone less than 18 years old? | Yes |  |
| … Does not involve **data collection with other vulnerable groups** e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.? | No | Focus Group Discussions will involve participants with vulnerabilities related to IDP status, older age, being a single caregiver to children. Logistical organisation of FGDs will be conducted to account for needs of these populations and adapt the logistics (time and duration of FGDs, location). Participants of FGDs will not be asked sensitive questions about their own experience and no personally identifiable information will be collected.  Persons with disability and/or chronic illness will be interviewed separately, via Household Interviews, to account for their needs and adapt the logistics (choice of place of interview, possibility to interview by phone, etc.). |
| … Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of **personally identifiable information**? | Yes |  |

# Roles and responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Description** | **Responsible** | **Accountable** | **Consulted** | **Informed** |
| Research design | *Assessment Officer, Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager* | *HQ Research Department* | *Protection, Shelter, CCCM, WASH clusters* |
| Data collection | *Assessment Officers, Field Officers* | *Assessment Team Leader* | *Senior Assessment Officer, Research Manager* | *Protection, Shelter, CCCM clusters* |
| Supervising data collection | *Assessment Team Leader, Field Operations Manager* | *Assessment Team Leader* | *Senior Assessment Officer, Research Manager, HQ Research Department* | *N/a* |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | *Assessment Officer* | *Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager, HQ Research Department* | *N/a* |
| Data analysis | *Assessment Officer, Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager* | *HQ Research Department* | *Protection, Shelter, CCCM clusters* |
| Output production | *Assessment Officer, Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager* | *HQ Research Department* | *Protection, Shelter, CCCM, WASH clusters* |
| Dissemination | *Assessment Officer, Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager* | *HQ Communication Department* | *Protection, Shelter, CCCM, WASH clusters* |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | *Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager* | *HQ Research Department (MEAL Unit)* | *N/a* |
| Lessons learned | *Assessment Officer, Senior Assessment Officer* | *Senior Assessment Officer* | *Research Manager, Field Team, HQ Research Department* | *N/a* |

***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*

# Data Analysis Plan

***The Data Analysis Plan can be found here:***

[***https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/31db8d92/UKR\_DAP\_Transition-Assessment\_November-2024.xlsx***](https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/31db8d92/UKR_DAP_Transition-Assessment_November-2024.xlsx)
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