Research Terms of Reference

Baseline Study for USAID CITIES (Cities Implementing Transparent, Innovative and Effective Solutions) Project, Jordan

December 5, 2017
Version 1

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Summary

Country of intervention	*Jordan*					
Type of Emergency		Natural disaster	**X**	Conflict		Emergency
Type of Crisis		Sudden onset		Slow onset	**X**	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	*USAID CITIES/ Chemonics International*					
Project Code	*13 DEP*					
REACH Pillar		Planning in Emergencies		Displacement	**X**	Building Community Resilience
Research Timeframe	November 2017- February 2018					
General Objective	Inform evidence-based design and implementation of USAID CITIES interventions by providing comprehensive data on the effectiveness of municipal governance in targetted municipalities					
Specific Objective(s)	(1) Provide a detailed understanding of current municipal capacities and effectiveness to deliver key services (2) Provide a thorough understanding of community perceptions of municipal effectiveness and responsiveness (3) Provide a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms through which municipalities communicate with constituents and seek to redress any grievances they have (4) Provide a comprehensive understanding of the position of Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) groups[1] within the community with regards to their engagement with the municipality, barriers faced in such engagement, and their level of participation in planning and decision-making processes for municipal service delivery					
Research Questions	(1) What are the current municipal capacities to effectively deliver key services and to respond to the needs of the community? Which key factors determine these capacities? (2) To what extent do community members perceive municipal governments to be effective? What factors determine perceptions of effectiveness? (3) To what extent are community members satisfied with municipal service delivery? What factors determine satisfaction with municipal service delivery? (4) To what extent do community members perceive municipalites to be responsive to community needs? What factors determine perceptions of responsiveness?					

---

[1] For the purpose of this baseline study, GESI groups refer to women, youth, refugees and people with disabilities

	(5)	To what extent do community members in targetted municipalities perceive municipalities to be able to solve problems identified by the community within the mandate of the municipality? What factors determine community members' perceptions in this regard?				
	(6)	What are the key channels of communication being used by community members to provide input and feedback to the municipality/ by the municipality to solicit input and feedback from the community? To what extent are these perceived to be effective and why? What barriers are faced specifically by GESI groups in this regard?				

Research Type		Quantitative		Qualitative	X	Mixed methods
Geographic Coverage	33 municipalities across the country					
Target Population(s)	People living within the 33 municipalities being targetted by USAID CITIES, with a specific focus on women, youth, refugees and people with disabilities					
Data Sources	**Secondary Data:** Existing literature (academic works, grey literature, research produced by other NGOs/ UN agencies, past REACH research) on municipal laws/ policies and management of municipal public services in Jordan **Primary Data:** Key Informant Interviews (70), Focus Group Discussions (132), Community Members' Perception Survey[2] (4,158)					
Expected Outputs	Inception report, quantitative and qualitative research instruments, capacity building trainings, preliminary findings summary, fully cleaned datasets, report on the administration of data collection instruments , baseline study report, final presentation					
Key Resources	Human resources (core in-country team, enumerator roster), cars and drivers, laptops with required analysis software, smartphones					

Humanitarian milestones	*Donor plan/ strategy*			
	Milestone		**Timeframe**	
		Cluster plan/strategy		
		Inter-cluster plan/strategy		
	X	Donor plan/strategy		
		NGO plan/strategy		

Audience	*Operational, Programmatic and Strategic*			
	Audience type		**Specific actors**	
	X	Operational	*CITIES project team, CITIES implementing partners (including municipalities and local development unit)*	
	X	Programmatic	*CITIES project team, CITIES implementing partners (including municipalities and local development unit)*	
	X	Strategic	*USAID Jordan mission*	
		Other		

Access	X	Public (available on REACH online resource center and other humanitarian platforms)[3]	
		Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)	

---

[2] Primarily at the individual (community members' perceptions) level with a few household-level indicators. Please refer to survey questionnaire for full list of indicators.
[3] Subject to approval/ confirmation from Chemonics and USAID Jordan

	Other	
Visibility	*USAID, Chemonics, REACH*	
Dissemination	*To be finalised upon discussion with USAID CITIES team*	

2. Background & Rationale

The August 2015 passage of the Decentralization Law and the Municipalities Law demonstrated the Kingdom of Jordan's increased focus on integrating municipalities into the governance framework to increase democratic accountability and improve conditions in Jordanian communities. This integration of municipalities and decentralization of power and authorities is also seen as an opportunity to help local institutions assist disadvantaged Jordanians and help them cope with the influx of Syrian refugees. While the policy reforms have given municipalities significant authorities, successful implementation of these laws will require sustained attention and support. Building upon prior United States Government (USG) and other donor investments, as well as Government of Jordan's (GoJ) own reforms, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has identified support to municipal governance and decentralization as an urgent need. Indeed, Jordanian citizens — and other semi-permanent residents, including Syrian refugees — are in need of access to basic services, economic opportunities, security and belonging, and inclusion by their government.

It is against the backdrop of these social and economic strains and continued regional instability that USAID initiated the Cities Implementing Transparent, Innovative, and Effective Solutions (CITIES) programme. Working through an integrated approach, CITIES will implement innovative and sustainable solutions to improve service delivery; increase sustainability of municipal and decentralized government operations; enhance citizen-government engagement; and foster community cohesion.

Within this context, REACH will be conducting a baseline study to measure the current effectiveness of municipal governance in the 33 municipalities selected for USAID CITIES intervention. CITIES has identified indicators which will be used to measure the changes that result from project interventions. A baseline study is considered an integral part of CITIES approach for guiding and informing evidence-based programming for project implementation as well as tracking progress and results, as per performance indicators identified by CITIES under the four Sub Purposes within the project's Results Framework.

3. Research Objectives

The overall goal of the baseline study is to provide comprehensive baseline data for CITIES project outcome frameworks, especially in relation to current effectiveness of municipal governance in targetted municipalities, so as to inform evidence-based programming for project implementation and provide robust baseline data to track project progress and results. To meet this goal, the baseline study seeks to address the following research objectives:

- To provide a comprehensive understanding of current municipal capacities and effectiveness to deliver key services
- To provide a comprehensive understanding of community perceptions of municipal effectiveness and responsiveness
- To provide a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms through which municipalities communicate with constituents and seek to redress any grievances they have
- To provide a comprehensive understanding of the position of GESI groups within their community, with regards to their engagement with the municipality, barriers faced in such engagement, and their level of participation in planning and decision-making processes for municipal service delivery

4. Research Questions

The research questions for this baseline study are designed around the performance indicators identified by USAID CITIES to help measure existing municipal capacities and community perceptions of these capacities in relation to the key results areas/ sub-purposes of the project (as outlined in the project Results Framework):

(1) What are the current municipal capacities to effectively deliver key services and to respond to the needs of the community? Which key factors determine these capacities?

(2) To what extent do community members perceive municipal governments to be effective? What factors determine perceptions of municipal effectiveness?

(3) To what extent are community members satisfied with municipal service delivery? What factors determine satisfaction with municipal service delivery?

(4) To what extent do community members perceive municipalites to be responsive to community needs? What factors determine perceptions of municipal responsiveness?

(5) To what extent do community members in targetted municipalities perceive municipalities to be able to solve problems identified by the community within the mandate of the municipality? What factors determine community members' perceptions in this regard?

(6) What are the key channels of communication being used by community members to provide input and feedback to the municipality/ by the municipality to solicit input and feedback from the community? To what extent are these perceived to be effective and why? What barriers are faced specifically by GESI groups in this regard?

5. Methodology

5.1. Methodology overview

The baseline study will employ a mixed methods approach to ensure comprehensive and robust quantitative and qualitative data is gathered in order not only to provide baseline data for the project's outcome framework, but also provide a comprehensive background document on current municipality practices, communications channels and mechanisms, and community perceptions of municipal responsiveness and effectiveness.

In order to meet these objectives, the methodology will consist of the following elements:

1.   Literature review

2.   Quantitative community members' perception survey

3.   Focus group discussions (FGDs)

4.   Key informant interviews (KI interviews)

The literature review will inform and contextualize the data collection, providing triangulation and additional data on current municipality and local governance processes. This will be followed by quantitative data collection at the individual level (community members' perceptions)[4] which will provide core data for the principal indicators and outcome framework of the project. Focus group discussions will be used to understand in more detail the perceptions of community members, as well as their main concerns with regards to municipal services, and the main mechanisms through which they communicate directly with municipalities. Key informant interviews with municipality staff will be conducted to understand in detail the mechanisms used by municipalities for service provision, mechanisms for communicating with constituents, and dispute redress mechanisms as well as to understand the impact potential of the newly implemented decentralisation law. Focus group discussions and Key informant interviews will also be used to understand in more detail the perceptions of specific demographic groups within the community, namely women, youth, refugees and people with disabilities.

---

[4] Primarily at the individual level with some household-level indicators. Please refer to survey questionnaire for full list of indicators.

Overall, in addition to providing qualitative information for these specific demographic groups, findings from both FGDs and KI interviews can also be used to contextualise and explain in more depth quantitative findings from the survey,

5.2. Population of interest

The population of interest for this baseline study are the people living within the 33 municipalities being targeted by USAID CITIES, with a specific focus on women, youth, refugees and people with disabilities within these municipalities.

5.3. Secondary data review

The secondary data review will look at existing literature relating to municipal policies and management of municipal public services in Jordan, particularly with reference to the ways in which municipalities have sought to cope with and mitigate the impact of the arrival of many Syrian refugees in recent years. Literature will include academic works, grey literature, research produced by other NGOs, UN agencies and research facilities, as well as REACH's own past research on municipalities in Jordan. REACH has undertaken numerous projects requiring in-depth studies of municipality management structures and practices and as such has accrued a considerable body of material in this area.

The literature review will seek to build a thorough understanding of the structures of management and response to public needs in place in municipalities, as well as identifying existing sources of data that can be used to triangulate any data collected in the course of the baseline. This will improve the design of data collection tools for both quantitative and qualitative aspects, as well as ensure that the REACH assessment team has a thorough understanding of the context of municipal management in Jordan. The literature review will be presented as a stand-alone section of the final report and will also feed into the methodology.

5.4. Quantitative Data Collection

The core of the assessment will consist of a randomized quantitative perception survey. The survey will collect data on the four primary indicators of the project:

- Percent of respondents (community members) who perceive municipal governments to be effective.
- Percent of respondents who perceive municipal entities to be responsive.
- Percent of respondents who perceive municipality entities to be responsive to local community needs in services and development initiatives.
- Percent of community members in targeted municipalities who perceive their municipalities can solve problems identified by the community within the mandate of the municipality.

All of these indicators will be disaggregated by sex, age, disability, and nationality to support the GESI component of the CITIES project.[5] In addition, the survey also includes questions related to four of the key indicators from the project's GESI component which will be asked only if respondents meet this criteria (i.e. loops of questions that will be asked if the respondent is youth/ female/ refugee/ person with disability).[6]

All tools used will be handed over to the CITIES team upon completion of the baseline to ensure that they can be used again as needed in future. REACH will also deliver three training sessions (one per region) for CITIES field staff and Local Development Unit (LDU) staff

---

[5] REACH uses the Washington Group of questions to identify disability amongst survey respondents.
[6] Please refer to survey questionnaire for these GESI-specific questions.

to familiarize them with the baseline tools and approach, and overall research ethics, so that baseline tools and methods can be used again by these staff for follow-up assessments during the course of the project.

Further details on the quantitative data collection including sampling and survey administration are provided below.

Sampling Framework

A sample of 126 respondents, stratified by gender, will be randomly selected in each municipality for the quantitative survey. The sample purposefully does not include stratification by nationality (i.e. separate sub-samples for Jordanian and Syrian) as it will be randomly drawn from the population. Therefore, it is assumed that the sample will be statistically representative of the populations living in each municipality. This sample size has been selected for the following reasons:

- Given the large number of individual sampling units for which data is required (municipalities) a larger sample size than this would require significantly more resources.

- Given the minimum population required to qualify for category C status as a municipality in Jordan is 5,000, this sample gives a confidence level and error margin of 95% and 8.6% respectively in the smallest municipality, which is within acceptable bounds for a study of this type.

- The anticipated effect sizes of the intervention according to the outcome framework provided are around 10% over the three years of the project. Given this anticipated effect size, a sample of 126 allows for a statistical power of 0.8 roughly for almost all indicators, an acceptable figure for a study of this type which will ensure a low chance of incorrectly identifying that no impact is found when in fact there has been an impact. For outcome indicators with an anticipated effect size of 7% the statistical power of the sample falls to 0.7.[7]

- Given the small size of the male/ female strata at the municipality level (63 each), the findings will not be representative for these two strata at the municipality level. However, this sampling framework will provide results generalizable to the male and female population across all 33 municipalities with a 98% level of confidence and 2% margin of error.

Table 1: Survey Sample Size, by location and level of stratification

Governorate	Municipality	Sample	Males	Females
Ajloun	Greater Ajloun	126	63	63
Ammman	Sahab	126	63	63
Aqaba	Houd Al Dissa	126	63	63
	Wadi Araba	126	63	63
Balqa	Greater Salt	126	63	63
	New Deir Alla	126	63	63
	New Ma'adi	126	63	63
Irbid	Greater Irbid	126	63	63
	New Ramtha	126	63	63
	Sahel Horan	126	63	63
	Shurahbil Ibn Hasana	126	63	63
Jerash	Greater Jerash	126	63	63
Karak	Greater Karak	126	63	63
	Southern Aghwar	126	63	63

---

[7] The calculations have been made using the following statistical power calculator: http://clincalc.com/stats/samplesize.aspx

Ma'an	Al Jafr	126	63	63
	Greater Ma'an	126	63	63
	New Husainiyah	126	63	63
Madaba	Greater Madaba	126	63	63
Mafraq	Al Khalidiyah	126	63	63
	Greater Mafraq	126	63	63
	New Balama	126	63	63
	New Deir Al Kahf	126	63	63
	New Ruwaished	126	63	63
	New Umm El-Jimal	126	63	63
	Prince Hussein Bin Abdullah	126	63	63
	Sabha and Dafiana	126	63	63
	Salhiah & Nayfeh	126	63	63
	Sarhan	126	63	63
	Za'atari and Manshea	126	63	63
Tafileh	Greater Tafileh	126	63	63
Zarqa	Al Dhulail	126	63	63
	Al-Hallabat	126	63	63
	Greater Zarqa	126	63	63
Total Sample		**4,158**	**2,079**	**2,079**

Sampling Approach

To identify survey respondents, the survey will use a random sampling approach developed by REACH and implemented for several research projects in Jordan in the past. This approach will employ randomized GIS sampling which takes satellite imagery of the municipality targeted, overlaid with a grid of hexagons. This is then overlaid with population-density data drawn from a number of sources (light intensity data, Department of Statistics population data, and water network customer data) to provide each hexagon with a weight. A sample is then drawn randomly with a higher likelihood of sampling locations being drawn from those hexagons with higher population density. Data collectors then go to each GPS point and conduct an interview with the closest household to the point. Where this household is empty, unresponsive, or refuses to participate in the survey, REACH data collectors will move to the next house but one until a respondent can be identified. In order to ensure gender representation, locations will be classified as either male or female according to the sampling framework above. In each classification, data collectors will seek respondents of that gender. If there is more than one adult within the household of that specific gender, the data collectors will provide an introduction to the assessment and then ask household members who they think among themselves would be best able to provide information given the nature of the assessment.

Survey Administration

The survey will be administered using Kobo (a mobile application for data collection) form developed by REACH's in-house Database Unit. Data collected during the course of the survey will be stored directly on REACH's secure internal server.

A number of checks will be put in place to ensure the quality and accuracy of data collected. These will include:

- A thorough testing process for the data collection tool in line with REACH's standard operating procedures for tool development and testing. This involves multiple layers of testing to ensure that the tool functions fully.

- A pilot phase in the field during which the tool is thoroughly checked and tested prior to final use.
- Daily checks of data collected to ensure that it is comprehensive and does not contain any mistakes.
- Daily debriefs with data collection team to ensure that any problems encountered during data collection are identified and resolved.
- Regular spot checks on the field during data collection to ensure data collectors are properly administering survey questionnaire.
- A final, thorough, data cleaning process which will include verification of any potentially inaccurate data and re-visits to the field if necessary. A log of data cleaning will be kept to ensure that all steps in the process can be replicated.

Data will be managed following REACH's internal data management Standard Operating Procedures. Data is anonymized to maximize data protection. Data will be stored on REACH's secure servers and not shared unless express permission given by the donor. Only anonymized data will be shared externally.

5.5. Qualitative Data Collection

In addition to quantitative data collection, the baseline study will also include a qualitative data collection component to generate more in-depth understanding of community dynamics, provide direct data for qualitative indicators, and triangulate and explain quantitative findings. Qualitative data collection is also intended to generate data specifically to understand the position of GESI groups- women, youth, refugees, and people with disability (PWDs) - within each municipality. Two key methods will be used for qualitative data collection: focus group discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant (KI) interviews.

Focus Group Discussions

As part of the qualitative data collection, a total of 132 FGDs will be conducted for the entire study. The sample groups to be targetted through the FGDs include members of the local community, specifically women, youth, and refugees. The exact breakdown of these FGDs per sample group and municipality is outlined in the table below.

Table 2: Number of FGDs to be conducted, by sample group

	FGD Sample Group			
	Women from the local community	Youth (Male)	Youth (Female)	Refugees[8]
No. of FGDs per municipality	1	1	1	1
Total no. of FGDs	33	33	33	33
	132			

The FGDs will focus on the following aspects:

- Gather qualitative data to triangulate, explain, and expand upon the quantitative data gathered.
- Explore in more detail challenges facing community members and perceived gaps in municipal service provision.
- Explore community members' perceptions of municipal effectiveness and responsiveness, as well as perceived effectiveness of existing channels of communication to engage with the municipality.

---

[8] Although the initial plan agreed upon with CITIES is to conduct FGDs with refugees in mixed male-female groups, REACH will need to account for a certain degree of flexibility for this specific sample group. Given the cultural context, conducting constructive FGDs where both men and women are equally participating might prove to be difficult, even though REACH will be deploying a team of one male and one female enumerator to co-facilitate these discussions. If it is found to be particularly challenging during the pilot, REACH will discuss again with CITIES the need to change the selection criteria for this sample group, potentially by alternating between male and female refugee FGDs for every other municipality, or by grouping municipalities based on shared characteristics and conducting equal number of male and female refugee FGDs for each group of municipalities. Please refer to Risk and Mitigation Measures table below for further details

- Identify specific barriers being faced by women, youth and refugees in each target municipality in terms of accessing municipal services, engaging with the municipality, participating in the development of the local community, and understand how these barriers can be overcome for these specific groups.

In addition to these aspects, a degree of flexibility should also be accounted for to be able to conduct FGDs once initial quantitative analysis has been conducted.[9] This will allow the assessment team to identify interesting trends in the municipalities assessed, such as significant differences in indicators, and incorporate these findings into the design of Focus Group Discussions to explore and explain these potential differences.

Participants will be purposively selected by data collectors in the field based on selection criteria for each sample group. Each focus group will consist of 6 – 8 participants which is, in the experience of REACH, the optimal number to conduct a constructive discussion. To account for the sensitive nature of information which might be discussed during the FGDs, female facilitators will be hired to conduct the female FGDs and male facilitators for the male FGDs. REACH's in-house staff will conduct training on conducting Focus Group Discussions for all team members prior to data collection.

Key Informant Interviews

In addition to FGDs, Key informant (KI) interviews will also be conducted as part of the qualitative data collection. Firstly, these interviews will be conducted with key municipality staff (one per municipality) and project stakeholders at the capital (Amman) level (four in total). These interviews will have the following goals:

- Understand current municipal capacities for service provision and responsiveness to community priorities, and challenges.
- Establish current management, planning, and implementation practices in municipalities.
- Provide a comparison of best practices in terms of current institutional arrangements and functional processes between municipalities.
- To provide supporting data for specific project performance indicators, for example "Number of avenues established for soliciting community feedback".

Key informant interviews will be conducted following an iterative process throughout data collection. This will allow both quantitative and qualitative data collection to inform ongoing key informant interviews.

One interview per municipality will also be conducted with People with Disabilities (PWDs) or with caretaker(s) of PWDs.[10] The purpose of these interviews will be to identify specific barriers being faced by PWDs in each target municipality in terms of accessing municipal services, engaging with the municipality, participating in the development of the local community, and to understand how these barriers can be overcome for this specific group of beneficiaries. REACH will try to approach both capital and local level stakeholders (such as Handicap International, CBOs, municipalities) who are likely to be working with this demographic group to identify potential key informants for the baseline. REACH can also use data from the quantitative survey (respondents who were identified as having a disability and who reported engaging with the municipality) to identify these key informants.

Table 3: Number of KI interviews to be conducted, by sample group

	KI Selection Criteria		
	Capital Level Stakeholders[11]	**Municipality Staff**	**People with Disabilities/ Caretaker(s) of People with Disabilities**

---

[9] Subject to the availability of time and resources at the end of quantitative data collection
[10] In cases where the person with disability himself/ herself is unable to participate in the interview (for example, people with mental disabilities, learning difficulties, speech impairments), the interview will need to be conducted with the caretaker(s) instead.
[11] This could include stakeholders at the capital (Amman) level, such as staff at the Ministry of Municipal Affairs

No. of interviews per municipality	N/A	1	1
Total no. of interviews	4	33	33
	70		

KI interviews will be conducted using both closed questionnaire (municipal staff KIIs) and open-ended questionnaires (for KIIs with PWDs) administered by experienced REACH staff. REACH field staff have extensive experience of conducting key informant interviews at the municipality and national level, with strong contacts at many municipalities and a good understanding of the roles of various municipality bodies. In April 2017, staff from REACH's roster of key data collection personnel had also participated in a one-day training on the Washington Group Questions provided by Handicap International in Amman, Jordan. Given the sensitive nature of the interview to be conducted with PWDs, REACH will try to ensure, as much as possible, that only those staff who undertook this training are deployed to conduct the KI interviews with PWDs.

5.5. Data Analysis Plan

Once all data has been collected and cleaned, the REACH Assessment Officer will lead the quantitative and qualitative analysis process with support and inputs from other project staff and from data management and analysis specialists at HQ. Data from the survey will be analyzed using SPSS which will enable the performance of statistical tests where relevant and necessary, adding a further layer of robustness to the findings finally presented. REACH will also liase with the CITIES team throughout the analysis and reporting process to ensure that the findings are as closely tailored to programming needs as possible. Once the report has been finalized it will be sent to the donor for a final review. Any required comments or changes will be incorporated. REACH will then conduct a final findings presentation for the donor.

A list of key indicators that will guide the analysis for the baseline study have been outlined in Annex 5. A more detailed data analysis framework will be shared with the USAID CITIES team as a separate attachment to the inception report.

6. Product Typology

Table 4: Type and number of products required

Type of Product	Number of Product(s)	Additional information
Summary of preliminary findings	1	Summary of preliminary findings for service satisfaction indicators in 16 key municipalities[12]
Cleaned dataset	1	A full cleaned database which includes the raw data sheet, the cleaned data sheet, and the cleaning log
Baseline Report	1	Final report detailing key findings and in-depth analysis for all key indicators
Findings presentation	1	Presentation of key findings from the baseline study

---

[12] These 16 municipalities have been pre-identified by the USAID CITIES team as the locations for which baseline data is needed more urgently for programming purposes

7. Management arrangements and work plan

7.1. Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram

Table 5: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	*Responsible*	*Accountable*	*Consulted*	*Informed*
Development of research tools	REACH Assessment Officer	REACH Assessment Manager	Global Assessment Coordinator, CITIES M&E Manager	Global Assessment Coordinator, CITIES M&E Manager
Training of enumerators for data collection	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager, CITIES M&E Manager
Tracking data entry/ submission	REACH Database Officer	REACH Assessment Officer	REACH Assessment Manager, REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Assessment Manager, REACH Senior Field Manager
Leading and coordinating primary data collection	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager, CITIES M&E Manager
Data cleaning and analysis	REACH Assessment Officer	REACH Assessment Manager	Global Assessment Coordinator, Data Management and Analysis Specialist (REACH HQ)	Global Assessment Coordinator, Data Management and Analysis Specialist (REACH HQ), CITIES M&E Manager
Final output production (report, presentation)	REACH Assessment Officer	REACH Assessment Manager	Global Assessment Coordinator, HQ Programme Officer, CITIES M&E Manager	Global Assessment Coordinator, HQ Programme Officer, CITIES M&E Manager
Capacity building/ training sessions	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Senior Field Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager	REACH Assessment Officer, REACH Assessment Manager, CITIES M&E Manager

Responsible: *the person(s) who execute the task*

Accountable: *the person who validate 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*

7.2. Resources: HR, Logistic and Financial

REACH has all required resources (human resources, office space, laptops, analysis software, and smartphones) to be able to complete the tasks outlined in this Terms of Reference. The staff for the baseline study will be drawn from REACH's core in-country team (Assessment Manager, Assessment Officer, Senior Field Manager, Senior Management Information System officer, Senior Field officer), as well as a team of data collectors hired for this project. REACH in Jordan has a roster of data collection personnel who have worked

with the organization previously and have proven capacity and expertise in data collection, especially with regards to implementing community perception surveys. All staff are highly experienced in conducting data collection and well trained in leading gender and disability sensitive interviews and discussions. All staff have previously undergone training on both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques, including training on gender and disability-sensitive data collection techniques.

Additional HR, logistical and financial support is provided to REACH by ACTED who provides in-country logistical support to all REACH Initiative projects, allowing REACH to reduce the number of support and operations staff employed. This support will consist of the management of payments made in country, financial and accounting support, logistical support such as management of vehicles and other assets, and the provision of accommodation for international staff.

7.3. Work plan

The following workplan for the baseline study is proposed, taking into consideration the deliverables schedule agreed upon in the sub-contract. The project will take 14 weeks to be completed from inception to the delivery of the final report and will be set out across three key phases as shown below.

Month	November		December				January				February			
Week	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Phase 1: Planning and preparation														
Kick-off meeting		■												
Finalisation of data collection plan, methodology, sampling framework, risk management and quality assurance plan	■	■												
Submission of inception report (Deliverable 1)			■											
Literature Review	■	■	■											
Develop quantitative and qualitative research tools in English and Arabic (Deliverable 2)	■	■	■											
Finalise logistics for data collection (recruitment and training of data collectors, development of field schedule, etc.)		■	■											
Phase 2: Primary data collection														
Training of enumerators			■											
Field pilot of research tools				■										
4,158 surveys				■	■	■	■	■						
132 focus group discussions				■	■	■	■	■						
Capital level KI interviews (4)					■									
33 KI Interviews with People with Disabilities/ Caretaker(s) of People with Disabilities				■	■	■								
33 KI Interviews with Municipality Staff						■	■							
Phase 3: Data cleaning and analysis														
Data cleaning				■	■	■	■	■	■					
Data analysis				■	■	■	■	■	■	■				

Task														
Preliminary findings (Deliverable 4.1)						▓								
Finalise data cleaning							▓							
Submission of cleaned dataset and report on the administration of data collection instruments (Deliverables 4.2 and 4.3)								▓						
Report drafting						▓	▓	▓						
Submission of draft baseline report (Deliverable 5)								▓						
Finalisation of baseline report, including CITIES and REACH HQ review										▓	▓			
Baseline presentation (Deliverable 6)											▓			
Capacity building and training (Deliverable 3)														
Training session 1- North region							▓							
Training session 2- Middle region							▓							
Training session 3- South region								▓						

7.4. Quality Assurance Plan

REACH employs a rigorous internal quality control process, including reviews of all key processes and outputs at both the country and international levels. REACH's review team in Geneva, including data analysis specialists, will conduct a rigorous and thorough review to ensure the robustness of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis and well as the quality of the written report. No outputs are shared unless they have been reviewed and validated by HQ. The Global Assessment Coordinator in HQ will also review and validate all relevant tools at the research design phase, including the methodology, research instruments, and data analysis framework. Please refer to Table 5 in section 7.1 above for a more detailed description of which staff member will be responsible, accountable and consulted for each specific task, which will ensure all necessary quality control steps have been taken for each task within this activity.

8. Risks & Assumptions

Table 6: List of risks and mitigating action

Risk	Mitigation Measure
Randomly selected sample of respondents unwilling to participate in survey/ generates non-response	If respondents are unwilling to participate, enumerators will be instructed to move on to the closest household to identify other respondents. A buffer of respondents will also be included in the sample to allow for those who refuse to participate.
Community members do not agree to participate in Focus Group Discussions	REACH will leverage the contact networks of local partners to build confidence in the target population and to set up focus groups as per required selection criteria.
Unable to find refugees in some municipalities to conduct Focus Group Discussions	REACH anticipates that in some of the municipalities (particularly the ones in the south such as in Maan or Aqaba governorates), it might be difficult to find refugees who are living

	within municipality boundaries. If this is found to be the case, REACH will discuss with the CITIES team which other sample group should be targetted for this FGD, potentially men from the local community.
Men and women are not equally participating in mixed gender Focus Group Discussions for refugee sample group	REACH anticipates this to be a risk for specific areas, and will take a number of steps for mitigation. To ensure that both men and women are encouraged to participate and express their views equally, REACH will deploy a mixed team of male and female moderators to co-faciliate these discussions. If this approach is found to work in most municipalities but not in a few, REACH will try to conduct additional FGDs with male/ female refugees separately. However, if moderators conclude that this approach does not work in the field at all, REACH will discuss again with the CITIES team to revise the selection criteria for this specific sample group. Possible solutions in this scenario could be (1) alternating between male and female FGDs for every other municipality or (2) grouping municipalities into 3-4 groups based on shared characteristics and conducting equal number of male and female FGDs in each group.
Deterioration of the security situation which impacts movement for data collection	Field teams are trained on safety and security procedures when conducting assessments, such as how female data collectors can conduct interviews in safe environments. If the security situation does deteriorate and data collection is delayed, REACH will coordinate with the CITIES team to come up with a contingency plan.
Logistical impediments at the field level delays data collection	REACH has developed procedures for dealing with inaccessibility and will schedule the research in a way that allows sufficient time for accessing difficult-to-reach areas

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Please refer to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) matrix in Annex 4

10. Documentation Plan

The following key documents and outputs should be filed for further reference:

1. Research Terms of Reference/ Inception Report
2. Compiled desk review summary document
3. Qualitative data (completed debriefs, notes- both original and translated- from KI interviews and FGDs)
4. Raw and cleaned survey dataset (including data cleaning log)
5. Preliminary and final presentation

6. Final report (including all draft versions)

11. Annexes

1. Data Management Plan
2. Questionnaire(s) / Tool(s)
3. Dissemination Matrix
4. M&E Matrix
5. Data Analysis Plan

Annex 1 : Data Management Plan

Administrative Data	
Project Name	USAID CITIES Baseline Study
Project Code	13 DEP
Donor	Chemonics
Project partners	Chemonics, USAID
Project Description	Baseline Study for USAID CITIES Project
Project Data Contacts	Global Assessment Coordinators (elisabeth.vikman@impact-initiatives.org, vincent.annoni@impact-initiatives.org), REACH Country Assessment Manager (samuel.brett@reach-initiative.org)
DMP Version	Not applicable
Related Policies	Not applicable
Data Collection	
What data will you collect or create?	Secondary Data (compiled), Key Informant Interview notes (original and translated) and debrief forms, Focus Group Discussion notes (original and translated) and debrief forms, survey dataset
How will the data be collected or created?	Desk review, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, Survey
Documentation and Metadata	
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?	KII and FGD notes and debrief forms, Kobo form submissions extracted from the online server in Excel format
Ethics and Legal Compliance	
How will you manage any ethical issues?	Data collection will adopt the 'do no harm' approach to avoid causing any harm or injury to assessment participants. Throughout the assessment design, data collection, and dissemination process, REACH will take into consideration the impact of the assessment on both participants and the broader community, especially vulnerable individuals, such as female headed households and disabled individuals. Moreover, all data collected will be kept on a secure, in-house server to ensure data protection and storage. • Informed consent: respondents will be aged 18 years or above and voluntary. • Confidentiality: all personal information and any means of identification will be kept anonymous in datasets and excluded from the Key Findings Presentation and Final Report. Ethical evidence gathering: this assessment will take into consideration the cultural contexts in Jordan, especially for women, and the wider host communities. REACH will further ensure that all questions are appropriately asked, especially to PWDs or their caretakers, in the appropriate setting, and by the appropriate individuals
How will you manage copyright and Intellectual	In discussion with the CITIES team as and when issues arise, and take steps as deemed necessary

Property Rights (IPR) issues?	
Storage and Backup	
How will the data be stored and backed up during the research?	All data will be saved/ uploaded to the in-house office server at the end of each day of data collection
How will you manage access and security?	Access to REACH's in-house server is restricted to REACH staff only. If data is to be shared externally, data will only be shared following approval from the CITIES team
Selection and Preservation	
Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved?	The raw data will be cleaned and all changes to the original data set logged. The data will exist as an original data sheet, and a cleaned data sheet with accompanying data cleaning log to record any changes made. FGD and KII notes will need to be translated, and both Arabic and English versions will be properly filed to enable verification later on if needed.
What is the long-term preservation plan for the dataset?	The dataset will be given to the CITIES team and a copy will also be stored on the in-house server
Data Sharing	
How will you share the data?	A full database (including raw data sheet, cleaned data and cleaning log) along with notes and debriefs from KI Interviews and FGD forms will be shared with CITIES upon completion of data collection. A more user-friendly data set can be produced for dissemination with relevant partners if requested by CITIES to share data externally
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	All data sharing outside of REACH must be approved by CITIES
Responsibilities	
Who will be responsible for data management?	REACH Database Officer with oversight from the REACH Country Assessment Manager and REACH Assessment Officer

Adapted from:

DCC. (2013). Checklist for a Data Management Plan. v.4.0. Edinburgh: Digital Curation

Centre. Available online: http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/data-management-plans

Annex 2 : Questionnaire(s) / Tool(s)

The following primary data collection instruments have been developed for this baseline study and submitted to the CITIES team in a separate document:

1. Survey questionnaire
2. Key Informant interview questionnaire for municipal staff
3. Key Informant interview questionnaire for people with disabilities (PWDs)
4. Key Informant interview guide for capital-level stakeholders
5. Focus Group Discussion question route

Each of these instruments have also been translated into Arabic and approved by the CITIES team for data collection. All primary data collection instruments will also be included as annexes in the final report.

Annex 3 : Dissemination Matrix

To be finalised upon discussion with USAID CITIES team.

Annex 4 : M&E Matrix

IMPACT Objective	External M&E Indicator	Internal M&E Indicator	Methodology	Focal point	Tool	Research-specific information
Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products	Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of baseline report from Resource Center	User monitoring	Country request to HQ	User_log	To be filled in after completion of research cycle
		# of downloads of baseline report from Relief Web		Country request to HQ		To be filled in after completion of research cycle
		# of page clicks on baseline report from REACH global newsletter		Country request to HQ		To be filled in after completion of research cycle
		# of page clicks on baseline report from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly		Country team		To be filled in after completion of research cycle
IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response	Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products	# references in single agency documents	Reference monitoring	Country team	Reference_log	To be filled in after completion of research cycle
Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	Perceived relevance of IMPACTcountry-programs Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff Perceived quality of outputs/programs	Usage M&E	Country team	Usage_Feedback *and* Usage_Survey templaye	Usage and feedback survey to be conducted in February 2018, after the release of the final report. Survey respondents to be identified by the USAID CITIES team and results shared with stakeholders as deemed necessary by USAID CITIES team

		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs				
Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle	Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs *(providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.)*	# of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation	Engagement Monitoring	Country team	Engagement_log	Not applicable
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis				CITIES MEAL Team, USAID if deemed necessary by CITIES
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;				All relevant country-level stakeholders of CITIES- exact number and profiles to be determined in consultation with CITIES team prior to key findings presentation

Annex 5 : Data Analysis Plan

Research Question	Indicator	Data Collection Method	Disaggregation(s)
(RQ1) What are the current municipal capacities to effectively deliver key services and to respond to the needs of the community? Which key factors determine these capacities?	# of targetted municipalities that report to have the required capacity to effectively deliver the main services being provided by the municipality, by type of service[13]	KI Interviews	Municipality
	# of targetted municipalities that perceive service provision to be effective, by type of service	KI Interviews	Municipality
	Service sector that is perceived to be a priority in terms of need for improvement	KI Interviews	Municipality
	# of targetted municipalities where service provision capacity is perceived to have improved as a result of the implementation of the new Decentralization Law, by type of improvement	KI Interviews	Municipality
	# of targetted municipalities that report to have the required staff capacity to engage constructively with the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
	# of targetted municipalities that were able to respond to complaints received from the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
	Average time taken for targetted municipalities to respond to complaints received from the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
	# of targetted municipalities that cite 'lack of staff capacity to follow-up' or 'lack of resources' as a primary reason for being unable to respond to complaints received from the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
(RQ2) To what extent do community members perceive municipal governments to be effective?	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be effective/ ineffective in providing services within municipal mandate	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs

---

[13] Please refer to the municipality KI interview guide for the types of capacities being assessed for each type of service

What factors determine community members' perceptions of municipal effectiveness?	Key reasons why community members perceive municipalities to be effective/ ineffective	FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
(RQ3) To what extent are community members in targetted municipalities satisfied with municipal service delivery? What factors determine community members' satisfaction with municipal service delivery?	% of community members who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with municipal service delivery, by type of service	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Key reasons why community members are dissatisfied with municipal service delivery, by type of service	Survey, FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Top three municipal service sectors perceived to be a priority community need by community members	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who perceive municipal services to be a source of tension/ significant source of tension within the community, by type of service	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
(RQ4) To what extent do community members in targetted municipalities perceive municipal entities to be responsive to local community needs? What factors determine community members' perceptions of municipal responsiveness?	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be responsive to community needs in municipal service provision, by type of service	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Key reasons why community members perceive municipalities to be responsive/ unresponsive	FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be responsive to complaints issued by the community	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who have issued a complaint to the municipality in the past three years, by type of complaint issued	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs

	% of community members who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with the process undertaken to issue a complaint to the municipality in the past three years	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Most commonly reported reason(s) for being 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with process undertaken to issue a complaint to the municipality in the past three years	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with the outcome of a complaint issued to the municipality in the past three years	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Most commonly reported reason(s) for being 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with the outcome of the complaint issued to the municipality	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
(RQ5) To what extent do community members in targetted municipalities perceive municipalities to be able to solve problems identified by the community within the mandate of the municipality? What factors determine community members' perceptions in this regard?	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be able/ unable to resolve problems being faced by the community, by type of service	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Most commonly reported reasons for municipality being unable to resolve problems facing the community	Survey, FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who have issued a complaint to the municipality in the past three years and are 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the outcome of the complaint	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be effective/ ineffective in addressing service-related tensions within the community	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
(RQ6) What are the key channels of communication being used by community members to provide input and feedback to the municipality/ by the municipality to solicit input and feedback from the	% of community members who communicate with the municipality to discuss needs/ complaints at least once a month or more	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs, length of time

community? To what extent are these perceived to be effective and why? What barriers are faced specifically by GESI groups in this regard?			in current location, education level
	# of targetted municipalities that are officially communicating with local communities, by frequency (monthly/ quarterly/ biannually/ annually)	KI Interviews	Municipality
	% of community members who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with their interaction with elected council members to convey needs and priorities	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of community members who perceive the municipality to be effective/ ineffective at promoting positive engagement with women/ youth/ refugees/ persons with disabilities	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Most commonly reported channel used by community members to communicate with the municipality	Survey, FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	Most common method used by targetted municipalities to communicate and discuss needs/ decision-making with the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
	% of women/ youth/ refugees/ people with disabilities within the community who perceive their group to be facing specific challenges/ barriers that limit their participation in planning and decision-making processes related to the development of their local community	Survey	Municipality
	Most important barriers faced by women/ youth/ refugees/ people with disabilities in engaging with the municipality and elected municipal council members	FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
	% of women/ youth/ refugees/ people with disabilities within the community who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with their participation in decision-making related to the planning, budgeting and delivery of municipal services	Survey	Municipality

% of women/ youth/ refugees/ people with disabilities within the community who are satisfied/ dissatisfied with how the municipality engages with their group specifically to discuss municipal/ community issues	Survey	Municipality
Most efficient and sustainable way identified by women/ youth/ refugee/ people with disabilities to enhance their participation in community-based activities and meetings (such as those organized by the municipality/ local development unit/ voluntary bodies/ etc.)	Survey	Municipality
% of community members who are aware of where/ how to issue a complaint regarding municipal services	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs, length of time in current location, education level
Most commonly reported avenue used by community members to issue complaints to the municipality	Survey, FGDs, KI Interviews	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
Most common method used by the municipality to receive complaints from the community	KI Interviews	Municipality
% of community members who wanted to issue a complaint in the past three years regarding municipal services but did not end up issuing the complaint, by reason	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs
% of community members who perceive their engagement with the municipality to have improved since the implementation of the new Decentralisation Law	Survey	Municipality, sex, age, nationality, PWDs/ households with PWDs