# **Research Terms of Reference**

Shocks Monitoring Index (SMI) Research Cycle: SSD1902

January 2019

#### REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

# 1. Summary

Country of intervention	South Sudan					
Type of Emergency		Natural disaster	Х	Conflict	Х	Emergency
Type of Crisis	х	Sudden onset		Slow onset	х	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	Nee	eds Analysis Working Gro	oup (N	IAWG), Inter-Cluster Wor	rking	Group (ICWG)
Project Code	32i/	\EI				
REACH Pillar	Х	Planning in	Х	Displacement		Building Community
		Emergencies				Resilience
Research Timeframe	01/0	01/2019 to 31/03/2019				
General Objective	To build upon existing research by both REACH and external partners to conduct monthly monitoring of shocks and development of an SMI, which can then improve the humanitarian community's ability to identify and predict counties at risk of worsening food security outcomes. Outputs from the shocks monitoring will directly feed into the Integrated Needs Tracking System (INT) <sup>1</sup> To provide the "early warning" indicators for counties at risk of worsening outcomes and assist the NAWG in predicting or better-explaining counties at risk of worsening humanitarian issues.					
Specific Objective(s)	<ol> <li>Cross evaluation of existing Area of Knowledge (AoK) data on shocks with round 23 Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS) shock data, including subsequent rounds of FSNMS, to determine the validity and accuracy of AoK shock monitoring.<sup>2 3</sup></li> <li>To expand the current understanding of the interaction of various typologies of shocks (conflict, climatic, economic, policy, etc.) and the effects it has on household (HH) vulnerability and resilience, and food security.</li> <li>To understand how the timing of specific shocks affects the severity of shocks (rainy versus dry season).</li> </ol>					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The INT is a multi-tiered multi-dimension framework and information management system that uses secondary data to monitor the risk of increasing needs concerning five conceptual indicators, food security and livelihoods (FSL), WASH, Health, Nutrition, and Mortality, at the county level. As a result, the INT will feed into South Sudan Needs Analysis Working Group (NAWG) and is designed to monitor the risk of a NAWG trigger being present.

www.reach-initiative.org

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Since 2018, REACH has been collecting data on the shocks and perception of the impact of a shock on access to food. The shocks questions and themes were derived from a REACH report on shocks. Currently, there has not been any further validation of how accurate AoK is at measuring the actual impact of shocks. Current shocks questions include market prices, disease, access to food, etc. See AoK Methodology <u>here</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> FSNMS is a biannual, pre-harvest and post-harvest, a survey conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) across each county in South Sudan. The data is representative at the county level and is the largest contributor of quantitative data to the IPC. Round 23 of the FSNMS was carried out in November and December 2018.

	<ol> <li>To understand how the combination of typology, timing and intensity, as well as anticipation, of shocks affect HH decision making, such as displacement patterns and coping strategy trade-offs, such as when HHs choose to reduce meal frequency versus selling productive assets to purchase food and how these choices may change based on the type, timing and frequency of shock(s).</li> <li>Development of a Shocks Monitoring Index (SMI) that allows for a precise and accurate understanding of the severity and magnitude of various shocks.</li> <li>To implement the SMI into the INT system for real-time tracking of shocks and guide the NAWG.</li> <li>Conduct quarterly shocks verification assessments to readjust/redefine the SMI. Verification missions are based on current areas that are reportedly experiencing a severe shock, as suggested by the SMI and requested by partners for an assessment.<sup>4</sup></li> </ol>
Research Questions	<ul> <li>How to correctly weight and align the various components of shocks (typology, occurrence, intensity, recurrence and concurrence) and data sources (AoK, Climate, conflict, displacement) into a coherent, timely and applicable index?</li> <li>How do communities perceive the severity and magnitude of current shocks to previous shocks that led to times of 'extreme hunger'?</li> <li>Does the timing of specific shocks affect the severity of shocks? If so, which shocks are HHs most vulnerable to at a given period?</li> <li>How do HHs mitigate the effects of shocks and how is the decision change based on the type of shock - i.e. If markets fail, what do HHs do to mitigate the consequences?</li> <li>How do HHs mitigating strategies change based on the typology, timing and intensity of the shock?</li> <li>How do different shocks affect decisions outside of mitigating food consumption gaps?</li> </ul>
Research Type	Quantitative         Qualitative         X         Mixed methods
Geographic Coverage	<ul> <li>Bahr el Ghazal region (Northern and Western Bahr el Ghazal states)</li> <li>Equatoria region (Eastern, Central and Western Equatoria states)</li> <li>Greater Upper Niles region (Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile states)</li> <li>Warrap and Lake states</li> </ul>
Target Population(s)	South Sudanese
Data Sources	<ul> <li>Secondary Data:</li> <li>REACH AoK data</li> <li>FSL, WASH, Health and Nutrition Clusters</li> <li>WFP/FAO Monthly price monitoring</li> <li>IPC updates and reports</li> <li>FSNMS data</li> <li>SMART data</li> <li>Climate Hazards Group Infrared Precipitation with Station data (CHIRPS) remote sensing</li> </ul>

4

		Crop and food security assessment mission (CFSAM)				
		Crop and livesteek manitoring information system (CLIMIS)				
		Ad bee seesements conducted by partners				
Europeite d'Outro te		Ad-noc assessments condi	ucted by partners			
Expected Outputs		SMI Methodology Note, a s	separate document that explains the methodology			
		and calculation of the index	ζ.			
		SMI included in the INT sys	stem			
		Four shocks verification pro	ofiles in areas identified as facing worsening shocks			
		in Area of Knowledge remo	ote monitoring, 1 per quarter.			
		•				
Humanitarian Milestones	Mile	estone	Timeframe			
	х	OCHA HNO & HRP	REACH will ensure our data informs			
			Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian			
			Response Plan – September/October 2019			
	Х	Needs Analysis Working	REACH co-chairs the bi-weekly NAWG – the INT			
		Group	will feed in to support the NAWG in identifying			
			hotspots for further analysis.			
	х	Inter-Cluster Working Group	REACH attends every ICWG meeting and			
			present NAWG findings bi-weekly.			
	х	Donor Working Group	Ad hoc presentations, as requested by specific			
			donors or cluster, to present an overview of the			
		IDO Hadataa	INI			
	x	IPC Updates REACH through participation in IPC				
			working group and NAWG will provide limely			
			updates and assistance in the analysis to identify			
	v	EDDN Dorthors	PEACH will sook to share findings monthly to			
	^		ACT will seek to share infulings monthly to			
	Y	WASH Cluster	REACH has a presence in WASH cluster			
	^		meetings and will be able to provide WASH-			
			related findings to humanitarian actors			
	Х	FSL Cluster	REACH has a presence in FSL cluster meetings			
			and will be able to provide FSL-related findings to			
			humanitarian actors			
	Х	Nutrition Cluster	REACH has a presence in nutrition cluster			
			meetings, including being a member of the			
			nutrition information working group.			
Audience						
	Auc	dience type	Specific actors			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> IPC is a bi-annual workshop, typically conducted in August and January of each year. The NAWG meets every two weeks.

	X	Operational	ECHO EPRN Partners, other emergency response mechanisms such as those of UN agencies			
	x	Programmatic	NGO Forum, heads of INGO agencies, Clusters (FSL, WASH, protection, education, health), WFP Rapid Response Missions (RRM)			
	Х	Strategic	ICWG, HCT, donor working group			
		Other				
Access	х	Public – SMI via INT, cleaned	dataset, FSL/shocks profiles, factsheets.			
		Restricted				
		Other (please specify)				
Visibility	The	SMI is funded by DFID and will	include both REACH and DFID visibility.			
Dissemination	Key	activities:				
		- Dissemination emails with	bit links			
		- NAWG presentations at na	tional level + subsequent ICWG presentations			
		- Presentations to WASH, FSL, Protection, Nutrition clusters as relevant				
		Partnership	Presentations to other interesting forums such as Resilience and Recovery Partnership			
Monitoring and Evaluation	Key	Key activities:				
		- Tracking site visits + bit linl	k clicks			
		- Monitoring use of INT sys	tem for decision making through its usage in the			
		NAWG and partner feedba	ck.			
		- Tracking shock verificatio	on assessment presentations - the number of			
		presentations.	lbook (informal and formal)			
		- I racking Sivil and INT feed				
		- reports/presentations)	INT TETETETICES (I.E. HINO/HKP, NAWG			

## 2. Background & Rationale

The dynamic and multi-faceted nature of the South Sudanese displacement crisis has created significant challenges for humanitarian information management. As a result of the continued insecurity and overall unpredictability of a sudden onset shock, such as mass displacement due to intercommunal violence (ICV), it is becoming increasingly important to quickly identify and fill information gaps relating to potential areas of severe humanitarian distress in a systematic and timely manner to promote more effective humanitarian response and planning for immediate life-saving activities. In September 2018, the IPC TWG identified seven counties with populations in a humanitarian catastrophe. These seven counties had large-scale shocks which had resulted in acute food insecurity, such as ongoing access constraints, conflict or prolonged dry spells. To be able to predict acute food insecurity better, REACH decided to continue in-depth research across the three greater regions of South Sudan to identify how shocks cumulated and affected food security in localised areas. In <u>the original study</u> REACH identified that these shocks interacted in non-predictable ways, over time, to produce acute food insecurity and therefore a community-based self-reporting system would be the most effective

mechanism to track and monitor the impact of these shocks.<sup>6</sup> From the findings of this research, REACH added seven shock questions (see figure 2), and follow up questions to self-report the impact on access to food of these shocks, in its AoK remote monitoring methodology. The shocks report highlighted seven distinct thematic groups of shocks (armed conflict, displacement, climatic shocks, markets, disease, aid cessation and changing policies) that had resulted in historical experiences of "famine". Since February 2018, REACH has collected data on shocks and the self-reported impact of these shocks for 65 counties (out of 86), 5,122 settlements and 7,966 key informants.

## 3. Research Objectives

Building on the context outlined above, REACH will conduct exploratory analysis on AoK shocks data, comparing this to FSNMS shocks questions in Round 23, in addition to available secondary data to verify the extent to which self-reported impact is triangulated with other sources. Further, REACH will conduct a secondary review of shocks based monitoring and previous literature on how shocks affect food insecurity, including an HHs ability to engage in sustainable livelihoods. Based on this exploratory research, REACH will design an SMI by mid-2019 to be included into the INT system to support the future development of a conceptual framework for an early warning system. The SMI will be a composite indicator, made up of existing AoK questions, weighted, to enable quantitative tracking of varying levels of shocks in each county in South Sudan. This information will be fed into the INT system and shared with the IPC workshop analysis, mainly to support in thinking through the possible deterioration or improvement of food security, given current outcome data provided through FSNMS, in the projections. Quarterly follows up assessments in areas identified by the SMI will be carried out to adjust/refine the shock index, along with understanding communities' perspectives of the relative severity and magnitude of specific shocks compared to previous shocks and decisions made to mitigate the effects of the shock.

#### Specific objectives

- Cross evaluation of existing Area of Knowledge (AoK) data on shocks with round 23 Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System (FSNMS) shock data, including subsequent rounds of FSNMS, to determine the validity and accuracy of AoK shock monitoring.
- 2. To expand the current understanding of the interaction of various typologies of shocks (conflict, climatic, economic, policy, etc.) and the effects it has on household (HH) vulnerability and resilience, and food security.
- 3. To understand how the timing of specific shocks affects the severity of shocks (rainy versus dry season).
- 4. To understand how the combination of typology, timing and intensity of shocks affect HH decision makings, such as displacement patterns and coping strategy trade-offs, such as when HHs choose to reduce meal frequency versus selling productive assets to purchase food and how these choices may change based on the type, timing and frequency of shock(s).
- 5. Development of a Shocks Monitoring Index (SMI) that allows for a precise and accurate understanding of the severity and magnitude of various shocks.
- 6. To implement the SMI into the INT system for real-time tracking of shocks and guide the NAWG.
- 7. Conduct quarterly shocks verification assessments to readjust/redefine the SMI. Verification missions are based on current areas that are reportedly experiencing a severe shock, as suggested by the SMI and requested by partners for an assessment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> http://www.reachresourcecentre.info/system/files/resource-documents/ssd\_report\_shocks\_and\_access\_to\_food\_march\_2018\_final.pdf

# 4. Research Questions

- 1. How to correctly weight and align the various components of shocks (typology, occurrence, intensity, recurrence and concurrence) and data sources (AoK, Climate, conflict, displacement) into a coherent, timely and applicable index?
- 2. How do communities perceive the severity and magnitude of current shocks to previous shocks that led to times of 'extreme hunger'?
- 3. How do communities rank their exposure to various shock typologies and which combinations do they perceive as being most likely to reduce their resilience?
- 4. Does the timing of specific shocks affect the severity of shocks? If so, which shocks are HHs most vulnerable to at a given period?
- 5. How do HHs mitigate the effects of shocks and how is the decision change based on the type of shock i.e. If markets fail, what do HHs do to mitigate the consequences?
- 6. How do HHs mitigating strategies change based on the typology, timing and intensity of the shock?
- 7. How do different shocks affect decisions outside of mitigating food consumption gaps?

## 5. Methodology

## Overview

The SMI monitoring index is designed to explore current REACH shock monitoring activity, through REACH's AoK tool, and to further investigate the dynamic and fluid effects that shocks can have on an HH and communities resilience, and thus its decision making and ability to cope. REACH will conduct exploratory analysis on AoK shocks data, comparing this to FSNMS shocks questions in Round 23 in addition to available secondary data to verify the extent to which self-reported impact is triangulated with other sources. In addition, other data sources, such as climate, conflict and displacement data, will also be analysed to understand how these sources can best be utilised. Based on this exploratory research REACH will design an SMI to be included into the INT system to support the conceptual framework for early warning. The INT system, currently being implemented, is intended to be a cross-cutting tracking system that enables hotspot identification which can be furthered analysed by the NAWG.





Further, to enable the SMI to become more precise and accurate quarterly 'shocks verification assessments' will be conducted in locations that are being flagged by the SMI. The objectives of these assessments will be twofold:

- 1. To verify if the SMI was an accurate proxy for determining the severity of a shock through FGDs and direct observation.
- To better understand communities perspectives of shock(s) through retrospective FGDs and KIIs focusing on the current shock and related outcomes (i.e. food consumption gaps, coping strategies used) compared to previous shock(s) and its associated findings.

Shock verification assessments will enable REACH to refine and readjust the SMI to be a more accurate and precise proxy for identifying shocks and potential outcomes of reported shocks.

To achieve the overall objectives of the SMI will go through the following a quarterly cycle to ensure that is continuously accurately and precisely capturing the correct information that is relevant and useful for real-time tracking of shocks across the country:

- 1. Review of AoK shocks questions
- 2. Comparison of AoK shock questions with FSNMS shocks questions; conducted bi-annually
- 3. Recalibration of SMI, if needed
- 4. Implementation into the INT system, for real-time tracking and mapping of shocks within a multi-tier multi-sector framework.
- 5. Verification assessments identified by SMI and INT
- 6. Analysis of verification findings

## 1. Review of AoK shocks questions

The first phase of the exploratory research will be to understand better how reliable the current REACH AoK shock indicators are as a proxy for identifying shocks. In March 2018 <u>shocks study</u> REACH found that local knowledge and perception of a shock and its effect on the population, understood through focus group discussions (FGDs) and key information (KI) interviews, could be quantified but it was not possible to extrapolate the findings across a county; therefore, REACH added in shocks related questions into its AoK data collection tool. Since then, the questions have not been had any significant changes. Therefore, the first step of the SMI cycle will be to do an initial review of the AoK questions, followed by subsequent lite reviews quarterly.

Question	Answer Choices
In the last month, how bad was the hunger for MOST people because they were not able to access enough food?	<ul> <li>Almost no hunger</li> <li>Hunger is small; strategies are available to cope with the reduced access to food</li> <li>Hunger is bad, limited options to cope with the reduced access to food</li> <li>Hunger is the worst it can be, all over the settlement, and causing many deaths</li> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>
In the last month, has the arrival of IDPs or returnees had an impact on the ability to access enough food for MOST people?	<ul> <li>Positive Impact</li> <li>No impact</li> <li>Small impact</li> <li>Large impact</li> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>

Figure 2 Current REACH AoK Shock Questions

In the last month, has an increase in cereal price had any	No impact
impact on the ability to access enough food for MOST	Small impact
people?	Large impact
	<ul> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>
In the last month, have livestock disease outbreaks had any	No impact
impact on the ability to access enough food for MOST	Small impact
people?	Large impact
	<ul> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>
In the last month, has health problems had any impact on	No impact
the ability to access enough food for MOST people?	Small impact
	Large impact
	<ul> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>
In the last month, has conflict or looting had any impact on	No impact
the ability to access enough food for MOST people?	Small impact
	Large impact
	<ul> <li>I don't know or don't want to answer</li> </ul>

## 2. Comparing AoK shock questions to FSNMS shock questions

FSNMS collects data on shocks that HHs have faced in the previous six months and is represented at the county level. The crossexamination will allow for REACH to understand where its current AoK shock questions align and where they differ.

Figure 3 FSNMS Shocks Question

Question	Answer choices		
Has your household experienced any difficulties or shocks	Select multiple:		
in the past six months	<ul> <li>Loss or reduced employment for HH member(s)</li> </ul>		
	• The reduced income of a household member(s)		
	<ul> <li>Serious illness or accident of HH member(s)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Death of working HH member/head of</li> </ul>		
	household/Spouse		
	Unusually high food prices		
	Unusually high prices of fuel/transport and other non-food prices		
	<ul> <li>Drought/irregular rains, prolonged dry spell</li> </ul>		
	Unusually high level of crop pests and disease		
	Insecurity/violence/theft		
	Epidemics		

Additionally, AoK shocks questions can be compared with food consumption outcome indicators, such as HHS, to triangulate the reliability of AoK shock questions as a proxy for the current severity of the shock, allowing for more accurate and precise real-time tracking. For example, using the AoK data from August and FSNMS data collected in July and August when comparing the "Hunger Worst" answer choice from the hunger shock question "Hunger worst" answer from the hunger shock question with the percentage

of HHs in counties that reported HHS of 5-6 (indicative of IPC phase 5 conditions), AoK data was within a 5% range in 35 counties that had coverage and REACH AoK data only overestimated in 3 of the 35 counties, in remaining counties both indicators were 0% or HHS reported a higher percentage than AoK. Based on the outcomes of the initial cross-analysis of AoK shock indicators and shock indicators from FSNMS round 23, AoK shock questions may be modified, removed or added. Overall, the initial set of shock questions that will contribute to the SMI will not exceed 10.

After cross-examining AoK shock questions with FSNMS data and readjustment of core AoK shock questions, in combination with climatic, conflict and displacement data, the Shock Monitoring Index will be designed. To ensure that the SMI is 1) technically sound and 2) has sufficient political buy-in, REACH will consult key partners, such as WFP, FAO and FEWSNET, and working groups, such as the NAWG and sector clusters. These partners will ensure that the right data is being used and that there is general buy-in from the partners for the SMI The composite index will have a maximum score of 100, for straight forward calculation and establishing thresholds, and will be designed to be easily implemented into the INT's underlying threshold framework. Each of the AoK shock questions will be weighted based on its relative accuracy and precision to FSNMS shock questions. For example, further research could show that the AoK shock question relating to the impact of a sharp increase of cereal prices on the ability to access food (cereal price shock) has a high positive correlation with HHs reporting unusually high food prices as a significant difficulty or shock in the previous six months. As a result, the cereal price shock question will be weighted higher relative to other questions that have a lower correlation with FSNMS data. Also, a key finding of the REACH shocks report was the co-occurrence of multiple shocks often led to periods of 'extreme hunger'; by combining each indicator into a composite index, it is possible to capture cooccurrence of shocks.

Finally, after the initial SMI is created, the index will be tested against a series of known shocks in South Sudan, enabling REACH to calibrate the index accordingly. Examples of potential shocks include the sharp increase in prices experienced in Northern Bahr el Ghazal during November 2018 and livestock disease outbreaks in eastern Lakes state in June and July 2018. Additionally, the SMI can be compared with the counties respective IPC phase; to understand further the degree that the SMI can capture real-time information relating to IPC classifications.

### 3. Integration into the INT system

The SMI is designed to be an underlying feature of the INT system, particularly as an early warning component. As highlighted in the REACH shocks report, typology, occurrence, intensity, reoccurrence and concurrence, can all having different effects on the impact a shock has on an HH or location's food security, engagement in negative coping strategies, and resilience to future shocks.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the use of the shock index as an early warning indicator within the INT system is crucial, allowing users to analyse the impact of shocks in combination with the other five conceptual indicators (FSL, WASH, Health, Nutrition and Mortality). To operationalise the SMI within the INT, the following steps will be utilized:

- 1. Identify which indicators that are already included in the INT can be used to monitor shocks, such as climate, AoK shock questions, market prices.
- 2. Identify indicators that currently do not fall under a current INT category, such as incidences of conflict or displacement.
- 3. Build the SMI from data sources identified in steps 1 and 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> i. Typology: Given prior knowledge of core livelihoods activities in different areas of South Sudan, which events are the most common and which events are the most impactful, considering impact as deterioration by IPC Phase and the attendant gaps in food consumption and shifts in livelihoods and coping capacity?

ii. Occurrence: What are the events that have occurred over various periods, such as since the start of the current nationwide conflict for most core livelihoods and since the CPA signing for livestock?

iii. Intensity: How severe was the effect on food security and livelihoods of a given event each time it occurred?

iv. Recurrence: How often has the same event, at varying intensities, occurred over a defined period?

v. Concurrence: When have different events affected the area simultaneously or in close succession?

4. Treat the SMI within the INT as a multiplier effect on the risk categorization – i.e., if a county is at 'moderate risk' based on the standard INT categories but has a very high SMI score than the county, maybe updated to a 'high risk' category.

Similarly to the other indicators within the INT system, the SMI will have set thresholds for the different classifications (Minimal risk, moderate risk, high risk, very high risk). However, unlike the other conceptual indicators, the SMI will be both backwards-looking, by telling users that a shock has reportedly occurred, and forward-looking, as continued shocks reduce HH resilience, increasing the risk of growing humanitarian needs, see figure 4.

Figure 4 Interaction between INT conceptual indicators



## **Shock Verification Assessments**

The second major part of the SMI project is to use the index to identify potential counties or sub-county locations, to carry out quarterly shock verification and exploration assessment in one identified and agreed upon area. The assessment will be triggered by the SMI, NAWG or ICWG and likely be carried out within the geographic area affected – varying on the type and scope of the shock observed. The first ad-hoc assessment is to help guide the development of the SMI, piloting new tools and understandings of shocks that were revealed by previous REACH rapid assessments. The subsequent assessments will gather information on the ground for refining and adjusting the index, along with exploratory research on the community perception of shocks and their impacts. Each assessment will be designed to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the index through FGDs, KIIs, direct observation and, when necessary, HH level data collection through a multi-sector quantitative tool Additionally, to better conceptually understand the impact of shocks exploratory questions will be utilised to explore the following topics:

- The interaction of various typologies of shocks (conflict, climatic, economic, policy, etc.) and their effects on HH vulnerability
  and resilience, and food security.
- How does the timing of specific shocks affect the severity of shocks (rainy versus dry season)?
- The effects shocks have on HH decisions outside of mitigation food consumption gaps, such as reducing protection risks.

• How does the combination of typology, timing and intensity of shocks affect HH decision makings, such as displacement patterns and trade-offs?

### **Determining Verification Location**

The location of the verification assessment will follow similar protocols for each assessment.

- The location is triggered by the INT system as "Current risk high" or "Current risk very high."
- The SMI is at a similar category
- The NAWG and ICWG recommend a follow-up mission.

By following these strict parameters for assessment locations, the verification assessments will inherently fill information gaps that are adequately informing the humanitarian response.

### **Assessment Protocols**

Additionally, all verification missions will follow a similar data collection structure, allowing for comparability and consistency. The FGDs, KIIs and quantitative data collection, will support the objectives of the SMI (understanding the typology, occurrence, recurrence and concurrence of shocks) by ensuring that qualitative and quantitive data are used to triangulate the magnitude and severity of the reported shock. Additionally, the assessments will have add on exploratory modules, such as perceptions of shocks from a community level, to improve the understanding of how shocks affect various populations. As a result, the following minimal assessment protocols will be followed:<sup>8</sup>

- FGDs 6x disaggregated by gender and HH displacement status; see annexe
- Participatory mapping 2x; see annexe
- KIIs 3x including both local officials, community leaders and humanitarian actors; in development
- Multisector quantitive survey (dependent on the data requirements) Dependent on the geographic scope of the shock, quantitative data collection will be 2 stage cluster sampling, simple random or purposive (i.e. catchment zone); see below<sup>9</sup>

### **Quantitative Assessments – Sampling Strategy**

The sampling strategy will be dependent on multiple factors, including time available, access, objectives of the survey. As a result, sampling strategy will vary between Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) sampled surveys, which will provide representative data, and purposive data, providing high-quality data but not representative of the target population.

	LEVEL OF DATA COLLECTION ACCESS					
(5)				No Access	Restricted Access	Access
D SAMPLING	<b>Research</b> Requires research	<b>Question:</b> qualitative		Remote Key informant intervi Remote participatory mapping Focus group discussions	ews g	
CONTEXT AN	Dynamic (high movement)	population	Purposive	Remote key informant interviews Remote participatory mapping Focus group discussions	Direct key informant interviews Participatory mapping Focus group discussions	Direct key informant interviews Participatory mapping Focus group discussions Direct household interviews

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The data collection tools are still being verified. The tools will build from previously tested tools, including FGD/Surveys used in previous successful rapid assessments, such as the Pibor FSL rapid assessment, Gogrial East, Twic and Mayom rapid assessment, Atar 3 displacement rapid assessment, etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> A quantitative assessment would be necessary when 1) It is requested by NAWG 2) The ground conditions allow for quantitative data collection.

			Probability			
Stable (low populati	population	Purposive	Remote key informant interviews Remote participatory mapping Focus group discussions	Direct key informant interviews Participatory mapping Focus group discussions	Direct key informant interviews Participatory mapping Focus group discussions	
	movement)		Probability			Direct household interviews
Highest p	possible data r	eliability				

**PPS** – A minimum of 6 sites will be selected within the designated assessment area (likely the payam) using PPS sampling. The most up-to-date list of accessible settlements will be attained at the field level. Sampling for children will depend on an assessment of the size of the settlement when the field team arrives:

- Scenario 1: If the settlement is <=200 households, all households will be visited, and all children between 67cm to 110cm will be measured for MUAC and oedema.</li>
- Scenario 2: If there are greater than 200 households, the Field Supervisor and Assessment Officer will discuss on the most appropriate household sampling method given the site (whether systematic random sampling or simple random sampling from a household list). All children in those randomly selected households will be measured.
   Assuming a sample size of 200 within a given site, we expect the findings will be represented with a 95% level of confidence and roughly 7% margin of error.

**Purposive -** In the even that purposive sampling, the methodology will be based on freedom of movement in the target locations:

- A list of proposed geographic locations within the target locations, likely at the boma level, will be developed. KIs on the ground and the assessment team will go through the list to decide which areas are accessible.
- Upon the arrival of the assessment location, the team will use a snowball sampling approach targeting as many HHs within the geographic scope.
- Minimal of 100 HHs

Verification assessment and AoK shocks analysis.

After each verification assessment, the data will be analysed from shocks and needs perspective. The data will feed into 1) A shock verification brief that examines the magnitude and severity of the shocks, community perceptions and the reported needs in the area, including FSL, WASH, Health, Shelter. 2) The data will be used to reexamine current shocks questions, through adding new questions or editing the questions to improve the accuracy and precision of AoK shocks questions. The data analysis will primarily focus on:

- 1. When compared with data from verification assessments, how accurate was the AoK questions and subsequent SMI at correctly identifying a shock, including its perceived effect, on the population?
- 2. If needed, what changes should be made to improve the accuracy of AoK shock questions and the SMI?

By following these protocols the SMI and the follow up verification assessments will lead to a better understanding of how communities perceive and react to various shocks, including the combination of different shocks, allows actors to be better prepared when a shock does occur. Also, there could be positive synergies by combing the broader understanding of how HHs cope with shocks with REACH's ongoing research into displacement patterns, further support actors decision making when shocks occur. The below outlines the two data processing approaches anticipated during this research cycle:

- Qualitative → All transcripts will be written up and stored in a clearly labelled folder or server (once available). Saturation tracking table utilized to ensure enough focus group discussions or key informant interviews conducted and saved in Dropbox or server. Thematic analysis will be used to code and analyse FGD and KIII transcripts from semi-structured data collection.
- 2) Quantitative → All datasets will be cleaned, and the raw and cleaned dataset, along with the data cleaning log, will be saved and stored in a clearly labelled folder. The analysis will be conducted using SPSS or Excel, depending on if weighting is needed in the analysis. Data Analysis – FGD notes, and notes from KII and field observations will be typed up for documentation. Results will be analysed thematically, looking for differences reported by site, gender and residency status (host community vs IDP). A saturation grid will be used for organization of ideas as they are identified in the FGDs, and to track when a sufficient number of FGDs have been conducted.

Data Checks and Processing – The following data quality checks will be used for the nutrition and household data:

- 1. GPS points will be mapped and visually checked for quality of enumerator work (i.e. many records in one location, overlapping of data collection by multiple teams, etc.)
- 2. Grouping by enumerator ID and checking for bias towards certain answer choices, such as always selecting four HH members.
- 3. For established indicators, using known cleaning methods, such as removing all food consumption score observations that are below five.
- 4. Data will be cross-checked for general logic, i.e. stating main not consuming wild foods in the past seven days but stating that wild foods are the main source of food.

# 6. Product Typology

Table 1 Type and number of products required

Type of Product	Number of Product(s)	Additional information
SMI methodology note	1	Detailed methodology note on the SMI, including indicators used, weighting, and rationale for inclusion. Will be updated as needed.
SMI included in the INT System	1	Full implementation of the SMI into the INT system.
Verification and exploration assessment briefs	4	A 3-4 brief detailing the key findings of the assessment including any recommended changes to the SMI

# 7. Management arrangements and work plan

## 7.1. Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram

The SMI is being developed and monitored by the FSL AO and in close collaboration with sector-specific AOs (Nutrition, WASH) and AO leading the displacement research. The FSL AO is responsible for conceptualising the index, calibrating the index based on research, and focal point for verification assessments.

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Development of SMI	REACH FSL Officer	Assessment manager	GIS Officer, FSL Officer, WASH Officer, Senior AOs, Headquarters in Geneva and AOs with area- specific knowledge	NAWG
Implementation of SMI into the INT	REACH FSL Officer	Assessment manager	GIS officer, County representative	NAWG
Verification assessments	REACH FSL Officer	Assessment manager	NAWG, Geneva HQ, Country representative	NAWG, cluster coordinators
Review/Recommendations for the SMI	REACH FSL Officer	Assessment manager	Sector AOs, country representative, NAWG	NAWG
Monitoring SMI	INT FP	FSL Assessment Officer	GIS officer, sector AOs	Assessment manager, NAWG

Responsible: the person(s) who execute the task

Accountable: the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable for 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

The FSL AO is the primary focal point for all activities related to the development of the SMI. The AO is being supported by the rapid assessment FC. After the initial development of the index, the INT FP is the primary person in charge of ensuring the index is regularly updated in the INT system, including trend monitoring. Logistical planning for verification assessments follows similar protocols to other REACH assessments that are outside of a static base, including security clearances, movement plans, budgeting and contact

with staff on the ground. The Assessment Manager and country representative assist in overseeing the project from an external partner engagement view, whilst the Geneva HQ provides technical backstopping.

## 7.3. Work plan

Table 2 Key phases, activities, outcomes and duration for rapid assessments

Phase	Key activities	Expected Outcomes	Estimated duration
Review of current AoK shock questions	Comparing AoK shock indicators with round 23 FSNMS shock questions	A better understanding of how well aligned REACH AoK shock data is with HH level FSNMS data	20 days
External engagement	Engaging with partners and key stakeholders for feedback on the initial framework.	Increased political buy-in by key stakeholders	20 days
Developing SMI	Selecting, adjusting and establishing weights of the AoK shock questions that are included in the index.	Composite SMI being implemented into the INT system	15 days
Quarterly recalibration	Verification and exploration assessment based on outcomes from the SMI. Refinement/Readjustment of the SMI	Revised index	90 days
Shocks Brief	Analysing the data gathered during the verification and exploration assessment.	3-4 page brief based on the verification and exploration assessment, including recommendations for the SMI.	15 days

# 8. Risks & Assumptions

Risk	Mitigation Measure
Lack of political buy-in for the INT	The SMI is most useful when integrated with the INT. Therefore, it is crucial to ensure that clusters and decision-makers feel that they are involved in every step of the process. By giving them ownership of the product, they are more likely to use it regularly.
Inability to conduct verification missions on a timely basis	Ensure there are AOs that are familiar with the tool and can quickly deploy to areas that are triggered by the SMI.
Collection of contradicting information during similar periods.	Review of methodology and data sources to ensure high-quality data is used
Duplicating efforts of other partners	Through research and conversation with other organisations that may be or have intentions to build a shock monitoring index.

www.reach-initiative.org

# 9. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

IMPACT Objective	External M&E Indicator	Internal M&E Indicator	Focal point	Tool	Will indicator be tracked?
	Number of humanitarian	# of website visits	Country request to HQ		Yes
Humanitarian stakeholders are	accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of INT factsheets from Relief Web	Country request to HQ	User_log	Yes
products	Number of	# of downloads of INT factsheets from Country-level platforms	Country team		Yes
Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products IMPACT implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response IMPACT stakeholders are using IMPACT	accessing IMPACT services/products	# of page clicks on INT website link from the country newsletter, sending blue, bit.ly	Country team		Yes
IMPACT activities contribute to better program	Number of humanitarian	# references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies)	Country	Poforonco log	NAWG, ICWG, 2019 South Sudan HPC. IPC updates, FSL/WASH Cluster updates
coordination of the humanitarian response	utilising IMPACT services/products	# references in single agency documents	team		Assist VSF, Oxfam, ICRC, ACTED, Save the Children with prioritising operational areas.
	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making.	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs			Conversation and survey monkey with key stakeholders on how they use REACH RA products, what they find useful and how to improve
Humanitarian	aid planning and delivery	Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs		Usage_Feedb	
stakeholders are using IMPACT	Number of	Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs	Country team	ack <i>and</i> Usage_Surve	
products	humanitarian documents (HNO,	The perceived capacity of IMPACT staff		y template	
	HRP, cluster/agency	Perceived quality of outputs/programs			
	strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			
Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT	The number and/or percentage of humanitarian organisations	# of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation	Country team	Engagement_ log	Yes

#### **REACH SMI**

programs throughout the research cycle	directly contributing to IMPACT programs (providing	# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis	Yes	
	resources, participating in presentations, etc.)	# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;	Yes	

## **10. Documentation Plan**

- Methodology note on the SMI
- ToRs for verification assessments, including FGD/KIIs and quantitative tools used.

## 11. Annexes

- 1. Detailed work plan
- 2. Data Management Plan

# Annexe 1: Workplan

							201	19						2020	
ACTIVITY 3 SHOCKS MONITOR ING	Janu ary	Febru ary	Mar ch	Ap ril	M ay	Ju ne	Ju ly	Aug ust	Septe mber	Octo ber	Novem ber	Decem ber	Janu ary	Febru ary	Mar ch
Activity 3.a. Develop ment of a shock monitori ng index															
Analysis of AoK Shocks data															
Developm ent of SMI															
Activity 3 c. Verificatio n AoK Shocks monitorin g															

First								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt								
First								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nurepon								
Second				 				
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt								
Second								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt report								
published.								
Third								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt								
Third								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt report								
published.								
Fourth								
n								
11 255255mg								
nt								
Fourth								
Verificatio								
n								
assessme								
nt report								
published.								

# Annexe 2: Data management plan

Administrative Data											
Research Cycle name	Shocks Monitoring Index										
Project Code	SSD1902										
Donor	DFID										
Project partners	N/A										
Research Contacts	Matthew Day (Mathew.day@reach-initiative.org) – Project Lead										
Data Management Plan	Date: 15/06/2019	Vers	ion: 1								
Version											
Related Policies	-Data will be collected via personalized kobo lead. -Raw data will be cleaned to remove sensitive -All data is anonymous, stored on a password -Anonymous data will be shared if requested,	ount that is only accessible by the project formation otected computer and online storage. a will feed into an online platform.									
What documentation and Metadata	- Data analyzia nlan		Data Cleaning Log, including:								
motodoto will accompany			Data Cleaning Log, Including:								
the data?			Deletion Log								
Select all that apply			Value Change Log								
Sciect an that apply	□ <mark>Codebook</mark>		Data Dictionary								
	Metadata based on HDX Standards		[Other, Specify]								
Ethics and Legal Compliance		1									
Which ethical and legal measures will be taken?	Consent of participants to participate		Consent of participants to share personal information with other agencies								
	□ No collection of personally identifiable		Gender, child protection and other								
	data will take place		protection issues are taken into account								
	All participants reached the age of majority.		[Other, Specify]								
Who will own the copyright and Intellectual Property Rights for the data that is collected?	IMPACT / REACH Initiative										
Storage and Backup											
Where will data be stored and backed up during the	IMPACT/REACH Kobo Server		Other Kobo Server: [specify]								
research?	□ IMPACT Global Physical / Cloud Server		Country/Internal Server								
	On devices held by REACH staff		Physical location Harddrive of secure								
			REACH computer								
	□ [Other, Specify]										
Which data access and	□ Password protection on		Data access is limited to REACH								
security measures have	devices/servers	1	Assessment Manger and Field Officer								
been taken?	□ Form and data encryption on data		Partners signed an MoU if accessing								
	collection server		raw data								
		1									
	□ [Other, Specify]										

Kobo Access		Person				Account Na	ne
View Form	Traine organiz Matthe	d enumerators, partner zations, Kunduma Lamton w Day	r S	SSD_S	MI		
View and Edit Form	Kundu REACI	ma Lamton, Matthew Day H AOs	,	SSD_S	MI		
View Form and Submit Data	Traine Lamtor	d enumerators,,Kunduma n, Matthew Day	a (	SSD_S	MI		
Download Data	Matthe	w Day		SSD_S	MI		
Raw Data Access Rights							
Raw Data Access		Reason				Perso	n
Accountable	Accour	ntable	1	Matthe	w Da	У	
Access	To cle during	an/process data both afte assessment	r and l	Kundur	na La	amton	
Access	Superv quality	vise and run additional checks	data /	Matthe	w DA	У	
Preservation							
Where will data be stored for long-term preservation?	□ IMF Phy	PACT / REACH Global Clo vsical Server	oud /		OCI	HA HDX	
	D RE/	ACH Country Server			[Oth	er, Specify]	
Data Sharing							
Will the data be shared publically?	<mark>□</mark> Yes	i			No,	only with mand	ating agency/body
Will all data be shared?	□ Yes	3			No, con	only anony solidated <i>[delet</i>	vmized/ cleaned/ te what does not
					app	ly] data will be s	hared
	□ No,	[Other, Specify]					
Where will you share the data?	<mark>□</mark> RE/	ACH Resource Centre			OC	HA HDX	
	🗆 Hur	nanitarianResponse			<mark>Onl</mark> i	ine INT Platform	
Data protection risk asses	sment						
Have you completed Indicators Risk Assessm table below?	the	5			No, ider colle	no information ntification of i ected.	that potentially allows individuals is to be
	[Please	complete the first four column	ns in the Ir	ndicator	s Risł	k Assessment tab	le below]
Risk indicator identi	ype of fication risk	Disclosure implications	Be	enefits		Class	Required mitigation

GPS points of HHs interviewed	Identifying of HHs that sensitive information	location provide	Loss privacy/potential of armed actors]	of target	Ensuring tha data collectors are going to the right locations.	t [To be completed by IMPACT HQ]	[To be specified by IMPACT HQ]		
Responsibilities									
Data collection		Casual	labour - Enumera	tor – NA	; Supervisor – Kund	luma Lamton – <i>R</i>	EACH Field Officer		
		– <u>rovin</u>	g.field-coordinator(						
Data cleaning	ning Kunduma Lamton – REACH Field				Field Officer – roving.field-coordinator@reach-initiative.org				
Data analysis Matthew Day – Assessment Man					ager – <u>Mathew.day</u>	@reach-initiative.	org		
Data sharing/upload	Matthe	w Day – Assessme	ent Mana	ager -					

# **Annexe 3: Tools for verification missions**

## Area of Knowledge Food Security and Livelihoods Focus Group Discussions FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTION ROUTE

Moderator Name:		Assistant Moderator Name:						
Focus Group Name/Code:		Started at		Completed at				
Name	Area of knowledge	How do they know about area? (Recently left, HH member visited, Regular contact etc.)	State of origin	Age	Sex			
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								

8			
9			
10			

#### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Facilitator's welcome, introduction and instructions to participants [5 minutes]

- Welcome and thank you for volunteering to take part in this discussion. You have been asked to participate as your point of view is important. I appreciate your time.
- This discussion is designed to understand the overall welfare situation in your community and factors and risks affecting this welfare amongst communities like yours across South Sudan.
- Participation in this discussion is entirely voluntary, and anyone who does not desire to participate can leave. It is not
  mandatory to answer all the questions.
- Anonymity: I would like to assure you that the discussion will be anonymous. We would appreciate it if you would refrain
  from discussing the comments of other group members outside of this session. If there are any questions or discussions
  that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so; however please try to answer and be as involved
  as possible.
- The discussion will take no more than 1 hour.
- The FGD uses the generic word "shock" to represent an acute event that has directly affected livelihoods in the area being assessed. It could be one or multiple events and has reportedly led to a large decrease in access to livelihoods, food, and critical services. The 'shock' should be pre-identified before the assessment.

#### B. Ground rules [2 minutes]

- The most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- You do not have to speak in any particular order.
- When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.
- You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group.
- Does anyone have any questions? (*answers*)
- With this in mind, may I tape the discussion to facilitate its recollection? (if yes, switch on the recorder)
- OK, let's begin.

#### **QUESTION ROUTE (60minutes)**

#### Stage 1: IDENTIFYING LIVELIHOODS [10 minutes]

www.reach-initiative.org

Note to facilitator: the purpose of this stage is to identify "normal" livelihoods, before the shock. Make sure that participants are talking about their day to day livelihoods.

- 1. **[Engagement Question]** In normal times, what main activities do most households in your area engage in to access and acquire resources that meet their needs?
  - > [Probing Questions]
    - a. How important is agriculture (crops and livestock) as an activity for most households in this area? In a normal year, what challenges (if any) are faced in undertaking agricultural activities?
    - b. What are other sources of livelihoods usually available in this area? (add on flipchart)

[Participatory Mapping] Direct participants to the map and ask participants to mark the following:

**Note to facilitator:** Introduce participants to the map, show them key features (big roads, rivers) and ask them to find their settlement of knowledge on the map. Get each participant to help you mark where their settlement is, <u>do</u> <u>not</u> try and do this for them, or let others do so, encourage touching and pointing of the map so they all feel comfortable and understand how to read the basic geographical features and where they live.

- [If agricultural activities present] Where on the map are agricultural activities (crops and livestock) being regularly undertaken? (outline with a blue marker where these activities are being used)
- [if other income/resource generating activities present] Where on the map are different employment opportunities and IGAs available (outline with a black marker where these activities are being used)?
- 2. What challenges are most households in your area facing in terms of livelihoods this year?

3. Are there longstanding problems that affect the households' ability to rely on traditional livelihoods?

### Stage 2: IDENTIFYING IMPACT OF A SHOCK ON LIVELIHOODS AND ACCESS TO FOOD 10 minutes]

2. How has the recent shock affected access to livelihoods (agriculture and livestock rearing, fishing...) for most households in your area?

#### 2.1. How has the recent shock affected agriculture in your area?

- [Probing Questions]
  - a. How is the harvest this year, and how does it compare to the 2018 harvest?
  - b. In comparison to previous years, how many feddans are people planting? (I.e. Are they planting more or less compared to previous years?)

**[Participatory Mapping]** Direct participants to the map and ask participants to mark the following:

- a. [If agricultural activities present] Where on the map have agricultural activities been affected by shock the most?
- b. [If agricultural activities present] Where on the map has access to pasture for livestock been affected by shock the most?

www.reach-initiative.org

#### 2.2. How has the recent shock affected livestock rearing in your area?

#### [Probing Questions]

- a. Has access to cattle been affected by shock or other factors this year?
- b. Has the recent shock affected cattle migration patterns? If so, how?
- c. Do livestock keepers expect there to be any reduction in access to grazing area during the dry season? If so, where will they go? Will livestock be over crowded?

[Participatory Mapping] Direct participants to the map and ask participants to mark the following:

a. Draw cattle migration patterns. If the migration patterns have been modified as a result of the shock, draw the "normal" migration routes and the "new" migration routes with two different colours.

# 2.3. Have any other factors affected access to livelihoods this year? If so, which ones? (probe for pests, conflict, insecurity, other climatic problems, etc.)

**[Participatory Mapping]** Direct participants to the map and ask participants to mark the following:

a. Draw any other shocks that may have affected livelihoods over the past 3 months.

# 3. What is currently the main source of food in [AREA OF INTEREST]? Which other sources of food do most households rely on in this area?

- [Probing Questions]
  - a. Is there sufficient access to food [AREA OF INTEREST)?
  - b. If no, how does access do food compared to the period before the shock?
  - c. If no, which are the reasons for absence/insufficient access to food?

#### 4. Has market access been affected by shock in this area? If so, how?

- a. Are prices for retail staple foods increasing, decreasing or staying the same?
- b. How do HHs expect the prices to change in the next few months, and why?
- c. Do HHs expect that their access to functioning markets will reduced be due to challenges inflicted by shock?

# 4. Do you foresee that HHs will be facing more challenges in their ability to access enough food in the near future due to the shock? If so, how?

### [Probing Questions]

a. How long do you expect harvest to last from the current cultivation cycle?

- b. Are HHs planning to engage in smaller agricultural activities such as planting vegetables?
- c. How do HHs expect that hunger may compare with previous historical episodes of hunger in the area?

**Note to facilitator**: On a flipchart, list key periods of hunger with the local name and descriptions/causes. Probe participants on whether they expect this year will be worst or better than these episodes.

#### Stage 3: RISK RESILIENCE AND MITIGATION [20 minutes]

# 1. What are the usual strategies that most households in your area adopt to cope with a lack of resources to meet your families basic needs?

#### > [Probing questions]

- a. Are households of your area currently able to use these strategies to cope with a lack of resources?
- b. If not, why are they unable?
- c. Are there some HHs that are considering migration to Sudan as a coping strategy? If so, which members of the household will be migrating?

#### 2. Have the strategies used by most households of your area to cope with a lack of resources changes in the past 30 days?

- > [Probing questions]
  - a. If these strategies have recently changed, what strategies are HHs now using?
  - b. Why have these strategies recently become unavailable?

# 3. Do households in your area rely on family networks, neighbours and friends to share resources and receive support when facing food or resource shortages?

#### > [Probing questions]

- a. Could you please describe how these networks of support work?
- b. Are these networks of support still functioning?
- c. If not, why not?
- d. If not, since when have these support networks ceased to function?

### **CONCLUSION [5 MINUTES]**

- Thank you for participating. This has been a very successful discussion. We hope you found it interesting
- Your opinions will be a valuable asset to the study
- I would like to remind you that any comments featuring in this report will be anonymous.
- Before you leave, please ensure you have completed the personal details. questionnaire

# Key Informant Interview Tool

- Will be the first tool used in the assessment
- This tool is broad topics to be discussed with key informants (KIs) on the ground
- Target KIs, NGO FSL and WASH officers, government ministers from the health and agriculture departments.

1. Have any recent shock(s) disrupted food availability or the communities' ability to access food? (Availability is the general level of food in the area; access reflects a HHs ability to obtain the food – physical, financial or social restrictions apply)

- Probing questions
  - i. Describe the shock security, climatic, economic
  - ii. How much of the population was affected?
  - iii. Are their particular groups that were more effected?

## 2. How does this year's harvest compare to previous years?

- > Probing questions
  - If worse, why?
    - Pest, erratic rainfall, less land planted why? Lack of tools, insecurity
  - What are the primary crops planted?
  - What are the main areas for crop production?

# 3. How does access to food for the general population in the affected location changed during the previous 3 months compare to the same period last year?

- How long do you expect harvest to be available for consumption for the current cultivation cycle?
- o If worse, why?
- o If worse, how does this year compare to 'years of extreme hunger'?

# 4. Did shock(s) affect other livelihoods and people's ability to access enough food? (fishing, livestock rearing...) If so, how?

### Probing questions

- How did shock(s) affect livestock rearing?
- Are most traditional grazing grounds still accessible following the shock(s)?
- How did shock(s) affect fishing?
- How did shock(s) affect market supply?

### 4. Over the past six months, what were other challenges to livelihoods apart from the shock(s)?

- > Probing questions
  - Has there been an outbreak in disease (both cattle and human) in the past 6 months?
  - Has there been an increase in insecurity (intra-communal or inter-communal) that has limited access to traditional livelihoods in the past 6 months?
  - Has the availability of resources such as agricultural inputs and tools, or fishing kits, decreased in the past 6 months?

5. How have communities coped with the impacts of the shock(s) mentioned previously on their livelihoods and on their access to food?

- > Probing questions
  - Human migration to other locations?
  - Have households change cattle migration routes as a result of the destruction of pasture by shock(s)?
  - Has there been an increased dependence on certain livelihoods?
  - Have people been limiting their consumption of food to cope with limited access to food?
  - Increased raiding for resources (including cattle)

6. Since climatic shocks have been taking place regularly most years, how have communities been adapting their livelihoods in order to mitigate vulnerability to shocks and to build resilience?