|  |
| --- |
| **Research Terms of Reference****Urban assessment project – Jeremie – HAITI** |
| **[Release date]** **[V.3.1]** |  |

# 1. Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country of intervention** | Haiti |
| **Type of Emergency** | X | Natural disaster |  | Conflict |  | Emergency |
| **Type of Crisis** | X | Sudden onset  |  | Slow onset |  | Protracted |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | BPRM |
| **Project Code** |  |
| **REACH Pillar** | X | Planning in Emergencies  |  | Displacement |  | Building Community Resilience |
| **Research Timeframe** | November 1st – November 23rd  |
| **General Objective** | 1. To support and promote local approaches for the urban planning response of the city of Jeremie – in the Grand Anse Department.
 |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | 1. To map out the negobourhood boundaries and main facility locations to inform and influence the humanitairan response in the city of Jeremie.
2. Use of *settlement approaches* to inform better humanitarian planning and response in urban areas.
 |
| **Research Questions** | * Which are the recognized territorial boundaries (quartiers) in Jeremie that the community recognizes and how / if do they match with other formal administrative boundaries?
* Who are the main Key informants to identify these boundaries, as well as the services and knowledge at the quartier level based on the mapping? Are these Key Informants somehow connected? How are they connected between them, if at all?
* What are the main services provided / available in each of the quartiers pre / post hurricane?
 |
| **Research Type** |  | Quantitative | X | Qualitative |  | Mixed methods |
| **Geographic Coverage** | The city of Jeremie – department of Grand Anse, Haiti |
| **Target Population(s)** | Haitian citizens and IDPs from the city of Jeremie |
| **Data Sources** | **Secondary Data:*** Google map earth - the city of Jeremie
* Urban approaches information from program proposal - ECHO
* Secondary data compilation

**Primary Data:** |
| * Neighbourhood data boundaries information captured by REACH teams in Jeremie
* Facility information boundaries captured by Key Informants through participatory mapping
* Key informant interviews with key actors and informants who can provide information in each of the neigbourhoods in Jeremie.
* Participants members of the participatory mapping in each of the neighbourhoods.
 |
| **Expected Outputs** | * Mapping of Jeremie at the neighbourhood level
* Report or overview of the pilot case study of Jeremie
* Presentation of findings
* Strategic response plan document at city level - aggregated by neighbourhood
* Steerting committee – key actors l TORs of steering committee
 |
| **Key Resources** | * Local informants, key humanitarian actors
* OCHA, COUD, AMAGA, and civil Society
* UNDP documentation
* UNOSAT damage assessment
* Primary data collection IMPACT teams
* Others – SDR included
 |
| **Humanitarian milestones** |  |
| **Milestone** | **Timeframe** |
|  | Cluster plan/strategy |  |
|  | Inter-cluster plan/strategy  |  |
| X | Donor plan/strategy  |  |
|  | NGO plan/strategy  |  |
| X | Other – Sectoral group, COUD, INGOs, and NGOs |   |
| **Audience** |  |
| **Audience type** | **Specific actors** |
| **X** | Operational | *Specify here.* |
|  | Programmatic |  |
| X | Strategic |  |
|  | Other |  |
| **Access**  | X |  Public (available on REACH research center and other humanitarian platforms)  |
|  | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) |
|  | Other  |
| **Visibility** | IMPACT, ACTED and ECHO logos. Other to be considered if needed / as needed once discussed with COUD and Majors.  |
| **Dissemination**  | Disemination will be public through the REACH Ressource Center and other usual platforms. Targetted dissemination will be also planned with organizations and platforms that would be of particular interest for this project. |

# 2. Background & Rationale

Area-based approaches[[1]](#footnote-1) promote multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action in a given territory and are ‘informed by community-decision making mechanisms reflective of the social, economic and physical features of the defined area’ (USAID, 2011). The advantages of area-based approaches over sector-specific humanitarian action have been recognized by various stakeholders (IIED 2014). Referring to the use of area-based approaches in the Haiti response, an IASC study concluded that ‘putting communities at the core of an integrated response yields higher impact’ (IASC 2010, quoted in IIED 2014). For the success of an area-based approach, two components are key:

* **The effective identification of target communities and the delineation of the territory they inhabit** (their area or settlement). In urban settings this will typically consist of neighbourhoods, while in rural areas this will vary depending on local social, economic, and physical context (a valley, draining basin, etc). This toolbox will use ‘community area’ to indicate an area delineated in this manner by community members. Community areas do often not correspond to existing administrative and service-catchment boundaries, instead reflecting informal community-based relationship and decision-making networks.
* **The identification of effective community counterparts to inform and support the implementation** of area-based programming.

This pilot study is designed is part of a broader project financed by ECHO that is looking to promote the use of settlement approaches to inform better humanitarian planning and response in urban areas. The main objective of this program is to influence and promote the positive effects of urban humanitarian planning vs. the regular sectoral humanitarian response localized to where the needs are *(for example, responding to needs and distributions in collective centres vs. doing so in neighbourhoods where people are originally from).* Understanding of area – based approaches and planning and / or territory has been often limited to geographical considerations, and very often did not include the considerations needed to understand socio economic aspects of the areas.

The main areas to which the pilot to be undertaken in Jeremie will look is organized in a two phased approach:

Phase I -

* Identify and delineate target neighborhoods part of the city center of Jeremie, which will provide a spatial framework for inter-sectoral aid coordination and planning for the Matthew response;
* Identify key actors and informants within each of these settlements able to provide regular updates on affected communities needs and intentions within their target areas;

Phase II -

* Effectively engage subnational / local stakeholders, including municipal authorities and local respondents, in responding to disasters and informing early recovery;
* Promote the use of settlement approaches for humanitarian planning at crisis-specific and global-level, through the dissemination of the results of the pilots – including Haiti and other countries.

This project is part of the AGORA Initiative – IMPACT labeled.

# Research Objectives

The main two research objectives are:

- To understand and use of settlement approach in Jeremie when planning and responding to the Matthew humanitarian response.

- To understand and engage with subnational stakeholders and promote synergies between the international led humanitarian planning and the local response.

# 4. Research Questions

* Which are the recognized territorial boundaries (quartiers) in Jeremie that the community recognizes and how / if do they match with other formal administrative boundaries?
* What are the main services provided / available in each of the quartiers pre / post hurricane?

# 5. Methodology

##### 5.1. Methodology overview

The methodology outlined will be implemented in full in the city of Jeremie – Department of Grand Anse – Haiti. In this location, IMPACT teams will implement key informant interviews and participatory mapping techniques to identify first the areas and its boundaries within the city centre, to then assess each of the ones based on a KI approach with selected knowledgeable people in each area. This approach is slightly different that the one used in other pilot locations, where REACH is implementing a household level approach.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**5.2. Detailed methodology**

**a) Identification of neighbourhood boundaries**

The first step in identifying neighbourhoods is to identify the overall population of interest. Since this methodology aims to inform an area-based approach, the population of interest will correspond to the specific area that will be identified as neighbourhood. The aim is to identify the key boundary based on key characteristics shared within these boundaries and identified by people as a common knowledge.

Once the population of interest is identified, then the first neighbourhood in the urban areas will be identified. This will be used as an entry point to the population of interest. Once the first community is identified the community may be approached via an initial key informant that can be expected to have good community level knowledge and interact with several community members on a daily basis (e.g. a teacher). This key informant can be consulted to identify participants for community area mapping focus group discussions (MFGD). The objective of these first FGDs will be to confirm the limit boundaries of the neighbourhood, then to identify smaller neighbourhood units, and then discuss the areas themselves (see below participatory mapping)

For this pilot, the first step to the assessment will be to identify the most accurate neighbourhood boundaries which divide the city of Jeremie. These delineation of boundaries will be made based on participatory mapping exercise with key informant from Jeremie city – people who are natural from the area, as well as have been living here for a long time and can provide information on admin boundaries at the admin level 0 of the city, from then to break down into smaller units into different admin units. Several similar exercises will be undertaking for this participatory mapping to compare understanding from different groups on the same concept – the city of Jeremie and their boundaries. At least 4 key informants will be interviewed about their knowledge and understanding of the boundaries in the city of Jeremie, to confirm the information gathered through other sources of information, geospatial information, and key informants.

Hands on mapping techniques implemented by key informants with in depth knowledge of Jeremie will be mainly combined with GPS point definition of those estimated boundaries.

The maps resulted of the participatory mapping will be labelled accordingly with the names of the areas identified by the participants. Once the neighbourhood boundaries have been identified in most possible admin levels, at least the highest level in the city center – information will be triangulated with other key informants and the boundaries will be adjusted / modified accordingly to come up with updated boundaries that KI agree at the same level.

**b) Selection of participants on Participatory mapping for discussion at neighbourhood level**

Participatory mapping is a tool that is relevant to communities and their needs and it relevant for their use. This is really important in contexts in which, for example in this case, humanitarian deliveries and services are to be put to the service of people after a major crisis (IFAD, 2009)

Once the neighbourhood areas have been identified and final maps have been agreed and finalized as the ones that will lead the discussions, FGD-KII questionnaires will be developed to gather detailed information on the specific humanitarian situation in each neighbourhood. For these methods. IMPACT will adjust the tool box that has been developed on the global framework of the urban settlement approach. *See toolbox.* GIS developed maps, based on the hands on techniques and boundaries drawn will be used for the participatory mapping exercises.

*Focus Groups Discussions*

MFGDs should include no more than 6 participants of the same sex, who live in different sections of the neighbourhood (so not all from the same block or street for example) and whose households rely on different types of livelihoods, to make sure several perceptions of community boundaries are captured. However, it is important to ensure a relatively homogenous range of participants in terms of social standing in the community, since power dynamics may otherwise discourage less powerful participants from speaking up. The MFGD should be led by a Moderator who facilitates the discussion and a Note-taker who takes notes[[3]](#footnote-3) and assists the Moderator. At least 2 focus group discussions, disaggregated by gender, will be interviewed in each *quartier.*

In each of the groups, there should be presence of:

* Detailed, large reference map of the immediate area on which the participatory mapping is conducted
* Less detailed, smaller reference map of the overall area on which adjacent community areas can be identified by the participants
* Marker pens in several colours to delineate boundaries and identify key infrastructures and services in the community as identified by participants

The MFGDs are best held in a space with minimum distractions, with participants arranged in a circle around the detailed reference map. The Note-taker can either sit outside the circle or within, as feels appropriate. Drinks, snacks and name labels may help participants feel comfortable and energised during the discussion.

*KI interviews*

In addition to the participatory mapping, a shortlist of key informants (KI) can be identified within each of the neighbourhoods, at the smallest administrative level possible. These KI are central to the two-way information flow between service providers and communities, which is at the heart of an area based approach. Overall they need to hold two key characteristics:

* + They need to have a community-wide understanding of access issues to services within the sector for which they are enlisted to facilitate the two-way information flow, or any other topics of interest for the subsequent data collection, as outlined in the indicator list.
	+ They need to have the best possible connections to individuals and community services for their sector-specific system or other topics outlined in the indicator list for the elements that we want to study (for example shelter, NFI, food, services, wash etc)

4 Key informants will be selected in each neighbourhood to run the interviews. The type of key informants will be mostly:

* 1 person from the education sector
* 1 person from the health sector
* 1 person from the community organizations, CBOs, NGOS
* 1 person from a recognized figure of authority in the community (local leader, church etc)

The overall goal is to eventually identify around 3 Ks at least, to enable triangulation of results for each topic. The objective with the KI mapping and social network analysis is to identify the 3 KI in the community with the best knowledge and connections for each area.

*Sampling for Key Informant interviews*

The sampling for they Key Informant interviews will be purposive, based on the key roles for services and figures of recognized authority in the community. As explained above, the intention will be to interview 4 key informants in each neighbourhood to complement and triangulate the information collected through the FGDs.

* 1. **Sampling framework**

The sampling framework has been designed to ensure the pilot objectives can be met, in terms of number of KI interviews and MFGD participants.

Sampling for participatory mapping – FGDs

The sampling for participatory mapping will be purposive based on the for following indicators

* Gender – male/female
* Age – between 18 and 40 years old ; over 40 years old

The priority will be gender based, then to try to do age disaggregated groups, and both groups will combine different professional backgrounds and socio economic activities.

At least 2 FGDs in each neighbourhood will be done, prioritizing gender disaggregation

*Selection of neighbourhoods*

The selection of the priority neighbourhoods for this pilot was done based on a combination of geospatial and qualitative methods:

* Key Informant interviews with naturals and long living citizens of the city of Jeremie to define and confirm the boundaries at the neighbourhood level
* Overlay of these boundaries with damage assessment done by UNOSAT
* The most common areas of origin of people living in each of the 15 collective centers in Jeremie

Once the information was combined, 8 priority neighbourhoods and areas were selected as a priority for this pilot study:

* Caracolie
* Makandal
* La Point
* Carmagnole
* Saint Helene
* Nan Landi
* Merlin – sub neighbourhood of Saint Helene
* Beckier – sub neighbourhood of Sain Helen

##### 5.2. Population of interest

The population of interest here consists of Haitian IDPs and host communities, in Jeremie city centre, in Grand Anse Department (Haiti). It should be noted that the results from this study will to some extent only be possible to generalise to this particular context, further pilot studies are required to test the validity of the Toolbox in other settings.

##### 5.3. Secondary data review

* Ongoing data collection initiatives in the same area, indicators and time-frame, could if available be used for further triangulation of key informant data.
* Background information on the city of Jeremie, humanitarian, non-humanitarian, urban, etc.

##### Primary Data Collection

* Key informants will provide with neighbourhood boundaries of the city of Jeremie.
* Google maps , Open Street data
* UNOSAT and COPERNICUS imagery from the city of Jeremie
* Key informant informal interviews with the local authorities (Major of Jeremie), and local leaders from Jeremie.
* Focus group discussions with participants from each of the neighbourhoods

##### Data Analysis Plan

The full list of indicators is included into Annex XXX of this TORs. As this is mainly qualitative research, the FGDs will be analysed coding the information provided in the questions per categories, then using atlas for its analysis to find common themes to the topics that are being discussed within the focus groups discussions. A list of themes will be selected and used for common analysis to the topics that are discussed in each of the questions.

Additionally, these topics will be complemented with information that is recorded through the participatory mapping in the focus group discussions.

# 6. Product Typology

Table 1: Type and number of products required

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Product** | **Number of Product(s)** | **Additional information** |
| General Profile | *One – Jeremie*  | *Template to be similar to the other profiles* |
| Profile per neighbourhood  | *8* | *Template to be similar to the other profiles*  |
| Presentation | *1 presentation*  |  |
| Map | *TBD the number of maps* |  |
| Report – assessment and response plan  | *One overall report, one response plan agregated to the city level and one per neighbourhood* |  |
|  |  |  |

# 7. Management arrangements and work plan

##### 7.1. Roles and Responsibilities, Organigram

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Description** | **Responsible** | **Accountable** | **Consulted** | **Informed** |
| Development of TORs, tools, processes, data collection forms, and overall adjustment of methods to the context | Assessment Manager | Global Coordinator  | REACH Program Officer ; GIS Global | REACH program staff, ,Global Assessment team |
| Data collection process – KII and FGDs  | Assessment Manager / GIS Officer | Global Coordinator | REACH Program Officer; GIS Global | REACH program staff, ,Global Assessment team |
| Data collection process – Mapping  | GIS team / Assessment Manager | Global GIS  | Global GIS, Global Assessment team | REACH program staff, ,Global Assessment team |
| Design and drafting of outputs – **reports**  | Assessment Officer / Manager | Global Coordinator | Global GIS, Global Assessment team | REACH program staff. ,Global Assessment team |
| Design and drafting of outputs - **mapping** | GIS team | Global GIS | Global GIS, Global Assessment team | REACH program staff ,Global Assessment team  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***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

The Ressources for this assessment are:

* REACH Assessment Manager: Overseeing all activities, coordinating the planning and implementation of the project, coordinating with local government, international and local NGOs. Ensuring harmonisation with existing efforts, coordinating logistics, and budget. This position will be also, in cooperation with the GIS Global Manager, in charge of the design of tools, methodology, sampling plan, questionnaires and data collection timeframe.
* REACH GIS team: Preparing and printing all base maps and maps for participatory mapping, digitising all imagery, preparing all mapping outputs.
* Data collection team leaders x **TBD per neighbourhood**: Leading all data collection, monitoring daily implementation of plan, managing teams of enumerators, support with data entry and debriefs.
* IMPACT global team (Geneva)
* Global Coordinator: Overseeing all technical inputs and outputs of the assessment
* Communications Intern: Supporting with translation of key documents into French and English, dissemination of all outputs at global level.

##### 7.3. Work plan

See file attached.

# 8. Risks & Assumptions

Table 3: List of risks and mitigating action

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation Measure** |
| Lack of fuel and car logisitical issues delay the implementation of the data collection  | Flexibility and anticipation with data collection plans allow for planning on time and change of data collection as needed.  |
| Divergent opinions in the definition of the neighbourhood boundaries delay the process in defining the final admin boundaries and continue with data collection per area | Anticipation and interview with several key informants knowleadeageble about Jeremie city are essential ad the early stages of the process to assure that the interviews and participatory mapping is accurrate to the reality.  |
| Lack of knowleadgeable key informants to define neigbourhoods in Jeremie at all admin levels | Initial efforts to understand the urban construction for Jeremie and finding local leaders who can act as entry points for each of the areas in each neigbourhood. |
| Tension in the neogbourhoods increases with humanitarian actors that impedes access and movement around  | Coordination of the program with humanitarian organizations, COUD, key humanitarian UN agencies, and other actors facilitates entry points and the implementation of the FGDs. Planning ahead on time and discussion pre focus group with key actors in each of the neighborhoods.  |
| Divergent opinions or lack of knowledge on the existance and definition of sub neigbourhood boundaries in each of the quartiers | Preliminary discussions with as many relevant key informants as possible in each neigbohourhood and coordination with key administrative actors and leaders of each *quartier* |
| The lead of the government and lack of active participation and approval blocks the process and publication of the report  | Direct and active engagement with the relevant authorities and coordination strucutres in country faciliatates the communication and the process during the project.  |

# 9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation targets

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Target** | **Indicator type** | **Baseline** | **How measured/documented/collected** |
| City – level informal working group stablished and organized  | 1 | Input | No group existing | Member lists of steering committees, minutes of meetings, meetings attendance sheets. |
| Questionnaires and tools developed for the participatory mapping and neighbourhood assessment  | 1 | Input  | No questionnaires or tools | Number of questionnaires, tools, guidelines  |
| Neighbourhood mapping per urban area of Jeremie | As many as neighbourhoods in Jeremie  | Input and Output | No maps existing | Number of maps developed, internally and externally for dissemination  |
| Field pilot study conducted – assessment in each neighbourhood area | As many as neighbourhoods in Jeremie | Input | 0 case studies conducted | Field study for Jeremie |

# 10. Documentation Plan

1. TORs

2. Indicator list

3. Neighbourhood maps – Jeremie

4. Questionnaires and tools for participatory mapping and interviews

5. Data Management Plan

3. Data cleaning log

4. Template case Study Report Pilot Jeremie

# Annex 1 : Data Management Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Administrative Data** |
| Project Name | Haiti Hurricane  |
| Project Code |  |
| Donor | BPRM |
| Project partners | ACTED, UCLG |
| Project Description | Area based multi-sector needs assessment of hurricane affected communities  |
| Project Data Contacts | Temporary  |
| DMP Version | Version 1 (November 2016) |
| Related Policies | Data management plan based on models and standards developed by the Digital Curation Centre (DCC), <http://www.dcc.ac.uk> |
| **Data Collection** |
| What data will you collect or create? | * Key Informant interviews: collected with ODK on smartphones, sent to server, exported to Excel. Paper forms when smartphones not feasible with data entry into excel.
* Participatory mapping through focus group discussion digitised into maps and notes written up on word.
* Data collection tools will be designed in DOCX format and then stored as both DOCX and Kobo forms. The tools will be available both in English and French.
* The data collected by the enumerators through KoBo will be exported each day to XLSX format and properly stored (see Storage and Backup section).
* All information collected in qualitative text notes will be coded into categories to be able to analyse them in an Excel database.
* All data collected as part of this project will be original. For the purposes of spatial analysis, this data will be combined with pre-existing spatial data from OCHA and other sources. Each data source will be properly referenced.

  |
| How will the data be collected or created? | * Data will be collected through a combination of different qualitative methodologies and indicators. Data collection includes a KI data collection tool and a participatory mapping tool, including also a debriefing questionnaire form.
* REACH teams will lead the technical design of these tools.
* All tools that will be used are piloted by REACH team at least one day before the full data collection is rolled out, both at office and field level, to make sure that the enumerators master the questionnaire and potential issues arise before the beginning of the data collection process.
 |
| How will be data cleaned and triangulated? | * Data will be cleaned through the regular process included data cleaning log.
* Data will be triangulated with the use of several key informants as well as with multiple participants in the FGDs. Background context information as well as discussion with key actors will also help on this.
 |
| **Documentation and Metadata** |
| What documentation and metadata will accompany the data? | * Metadata on the times of data entry and data export are automatically generated by KoBo for each data collection form submitted.
* Date, time, enumerator IMEI – enumerator IMEI will be encrypted. Data cleaning logs will be kept.
* Data sets provided will be equipped with a “readme” tab detailing the contents of the file, overall information about the project and any other information necessary to interpret the dataset.
* Datasets will be anonymized for public access.
 |
| **Ethics and Legal Compliance** |
| How will you manage any ethical issues? | * Participant, KI and HH contact details will be kept for follow-up purposes only, with only one member of the team – the data collection officer - having access to this information. Oral consent will be obtained from all participants for their participation in the mapping and key informant interviews, where information will be shared.
 |
| How will you manage copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues? | * All data collected and analysed as part of the project will be owned by REACH will publicly disseminate for public use and interest. All rights to this data are reserved to them.
 |
| **Storage and Backup** |
| How will the data be stored and backed up during the research?How will you manage access and security? | * All REACH staff laptops, mobile devices and email accounts will be password-protected, while personal laptops are not allowed for work as a general rule.
* Collected data will be protected in the encrypted, password-protected account on KoBo. The password to this account will be provided only to REACH staff members who are working directly on the assessment.
* REACH Assessment Officers and GIS officers will be in charge of backing up all the files and data on a weekly basis. Data collected in the field should be downloaded and backed up every day after data collection, internet connection allowing to do so.
* All data will be backed up on an external hard drive and later saved in the general server in IMPACT initiatives HQ for a safe copy. Data will be sent to the donor, in case request, for safe storage.
* IMPACT is in the process of securing a space on the server of the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN). As part of the REACH initiative (operated jointly with UNOSAT), IMPACT benefits from a dedicated space on the CERN server, which is highly protected against potential external cyber-attacks. Once this space is secured, all data will be store there, instead of on IMPACT HQ Geneva’s conventional server.
 |
| * Non-anonymised data with identifiers such as contact names, GPS will only be accessible to the Assessment Officer and Team leader for the management of the project. Information with the donor will be shared anonymized unless specifically requested by the donor.
 |
| **Selection and Preservation** |
| Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved? | * All data should be retained by the donor and REACH. Final products will be shared through public and diverse platforms to support the humanitarian response; raw datasets with personal identifiers can be shared upon request and validation from the donor.
 |
| What is the long-term preservation plan for the dataset? | * Data will be kept on server as a safe back up copy, and shared with the donor for their storage and use. There are no specific financial of logistics considerations which might impact the long‐term management of the data.
 |
| **Data Sharing** |
| How will you share the data? | * Final products will be done through the regular humanitarian channels. Raw data will be shared upon request after measure to respect protection concerns of those interviewed.
* Anonymized data will be available on the REACH Resource centre and distributed to the humanitarian community.
 |
| Are any restrictions ondata sharing required? | * No personal details identifying interviewees will be shared.
* No permissions will be granted to any other party for use of reuse of the non-anonymized data.
 |
| **Responsibilities** |
| Who will be responsible for data management? | * The Assessment Manager will be responsible for creating, drafting and revising the data management plan, under the direct supervision of Global Coordinator and GIS manager.
* Once the data analysis is completed, the Assessment Officer will be in charge of transferring all data to IMPACT Geneva HQ.
 |
|  |  |
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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)

# Annex 3 : Dissemination Matrix

# Annex 4 : M&E Matrix

1. Also known as settlement or, in urban areas, neighborhood approaches [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. REACH is implementing this approach in Jordan, where household level approach is being used. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The note-taker is not transcribing – i.e. the objective is not to record the discussion verbatim (see further detail under roles and responsibilities below) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)