

Research Terms of Reference

Tabqa Service Area Mapping: Northeast Syria NGO Forum Area-Based Coordination Mechanism

SYR2401

Syria

February 2024

Version 1.1

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Country of intervention | Syria | | | | | |
| Type of Emergency | <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural disaster | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Conflict | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (specify) |
| Type of Crisis | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sudden onset | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slow onset | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Protracted |
| Mandating Body/ Agency | Northeast Syria (NES) NGO Forum, Early Recovery & Livelihoods (ERL) Working Group, Area-Based Coordination Mechanism (ABCM) | | | | | |
| IMPACT Project Code | 16AWN | | | | | |
| Overall Research Timeframe (from research design to final outputs / M&E) | 21/1/2024 to 15/04/2024 | | | | | |
| Research Timeframe Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1) | 1. Pilot/ training: 26/02/2024 | | 6. Preliminary presentation: 19/03/2024 Debriefing conversation with NES ERL coordinator to convey how the MFGDs went, and overview preliminary findings from the (text) responses in the MFGDs while the digitization of the maps is underway. | | | |
| | 2. Start collect data: 28/02/2024 | | 7. Outputs sent for validation: 31/03/2024 (Digitized maps and 2-3 page brief) | | | |
| | 3. Data collected: 29/02/2024 | | 8. Outputs published: 08/04/2024 | | | |
| | 4. Data analysed: Text data analyzed from the MFGDs by 18/03/2024 | | 9. Final presentation: 11/04/2024 | | | |
| | 5. Data sent for validation: MFGD notes shared on 18/03/2024 | | | | | |
| Number of assessments | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Single assessment (one cycle) | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Multi assessment (more than one cycle) [Describe here the frequency of the cycle] | | | | |
| Humanitarian milestones Specify what will the assessment inform and when e.g. The shelter cluster | Milestone | | Deadline (can be tentative) | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Donor plan/strategy | _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _ | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _ | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cluster plan/strategy | _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _ | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NGO platform plan/strategy | 30/04/2024 | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (Specify): | _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _ | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------|---|
| will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal; | | | |
| Audience Type & Dissemination Specify <i>who</i> will the assessment inform and <i>how</i> you will disseminate to inform the audience | Audience type | | Dissemination |
| | X Strategic X Programmatic X Operational <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | | X General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) X Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting : Mailing to NES Forum Early Recovery and Livelihoods (ERL) Cluster – Area-Based Coordination Mechanism (ABCM) partners X Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) To NES Forum – ERL Cluster ABCM partners X Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] |
| Stakeholder mapping Has a detailed stakeholder mapping been conducted during research design to identify all actors that could contribute to and/or benefit from the research? | X | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| General Objective | This Service Area Mapping aims to inform the strategy, planning, and implementation of the NES Early Recovery and Livelihoods (ERL) Working Group's Area-Based Coordination Mechanism (ABCM) in targeted areas of Northeast Syria, using Tabqa city as a pilot area. It will do so by identifying and mapping basic services and the stakeholders engaged in providing them, as well as dynamics between neighbourhoods and differential access to services, with the aim of informing operational and programmatic planning for partners engaged in the ABCM in Tabqa. | | |
| Specific Objective(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Map basic services infrastructure within Tabqa. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Understand relationship between Tabqa and surrounding communities in accessing basic services provision. 2) Identify primary actors (mainly local authorities) engaged in basic services delivery in Tabqa. 3) Understand existing sectoral gaps and needs in basic services provision in Tabqa. 4) Explore the role of socioeconomic dynamics (between social groups and / or neighbourhoods) in accessing to basic services provision in Tabqa. | | |
| Research Questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where are basic services infrastructures and facilities located within Tabqa, and to what extent are they functioning? - Are there certain neighbourhoods within Tabqa which face difficulties accessing basic services infrastructures? If so, why? - Under which authorities are basic services infrastructures managed? - What are the sociodemographic differences (if any) between neighbourhoods within Tabqa? (i.e. based on culture, religion, ethnicity, tribe, or other) | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there areas of Tabqa which are inaccessible either due to safety reasons or because they are inaccessible for certain groups (i.e. women, IDPs, persons with disabilities, or other)? - Are there certain groups of people within Tabqa who face difficulty accessing basic services infrastructures? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Who are they and why? o Are such groups concentrated within any particular neighbourhoods within Tabqa, and if so, which ones? - What are the neighbouring community areas near Tabqa, and to what extent are basic services infrastructures linked between these areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is the social and economic relationship between Tabqa and neighbouring communities? - Are there IDPs living within Tabqa amongst the host community, or in informal settlements? If they are concentrated in certain areas, in which areas are they located? | | | |
| Geographic Coverage | Tabqa (Al-Thawrah), city in Ath-Thawra District of Ar-Raqqa Governorate of Northeast Syria (NES) | | | |
| Secondary data sources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Data from the Multisectoral Needs Assessment (MSNA) 2023 – REACH</i> • Data from Humanitarian Situation Overview of Syria (HSOS) – REACH • Data from the Syria Joint Market Monitoring Initiative (JMMI) – REACH and CWG • Damage & Rehabilitation Assessment – Syria – Al-Thawrah (Tabqa) • Syria – Ar Raqqa Governorate – Tabqa / Al Thawrah Reference Map 2018 – REACH <p style="text-align: center;"><i>See Section 3.3 for more secondary data sources.</i></p> | | | |
| Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in camp | X | IDPs in informal sites |
| | X | IDPs in host communities | X | IDPs in collective sites |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in camp | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in informal sites |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees [Other, Specify] |
| | X | Host communities (see “Community representatives”) | X | <p>Local authorities representatives with knowledge of basic services provision relevant to: markets, food infrastructure (bakeries), agricultural lands, healthcare, education, businesses/production sites, water services, sanitation services, and electricity)</p> <p>Community representatives, including: community leaders, CSO / CBO leaders, women’s representative, youth representative, persons with disabilities representative</p> |
| Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i> | X | Geographical #: Tabqa Population size per strata is known? X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Based on UN 2023 figures: | <input type="checkbox"/> Group #: _ _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> [Other Specify] #: _ _ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tabqa population estimated to be 37,974 - Gender disaggregation: 26,931 women; 28,913 men - Persons with disabilities: estimated to compose 10% of the population. - Estimated number of IDPs is 17,844 as of 2023 | | | | |
| Data collection tool(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Structured (Quantitative) | X | Semi-structured (Qualitative) | | |
| | Sampling method | | Data collection method | | | |
| Structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i> | X Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | | <input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ X Group discussion (Target #): 2 Mapping Focus Group Discussions (MFGDs), between 4-8 participants per MFGD: One MFGD with local authorities; One MFGD with community representatives. <input type="checkbox"/> Household interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input type="checkbox"/> Direct observations (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ | | | |
| Target level of precision if probability sampling | _ _ % level of confidence NA | | _ _ +/- % margin of error NA | | | |
| Disaggregation by gender and age <i>Are you planning to conduct sex/age disaggregated analysis?</i> | Gender | | Age | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes | | |
| | X | No – Seeking representation from men and women in both MFGDs but cannot guarantee gender balance | X | No – A youth representative will participate in the community representatives MFGD, but beyond this we will not be able to perform an age-disaggregated analysis. | | |
| Data management platform(s) | X | IMPACT | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNHCR | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] | | | | |
| Expected output type(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Situation overview #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Report #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Profile #: _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Final) #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Factsheet #: _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interactive dashboard #: _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Webmap #: _ _ | X | Map #: 7 Service Area Maps , indicating the locations of infrastructure points in Tabqa, in relation to: |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture & Food - Education - Electricity - Livelihoods - Health - Markets - Water and Sanitation |
| | X | Brief #: One 2-3 page brief presenting the findings in relation to the role of socioeconomic dynamics within Tabqa city on access to basic services provision | | | |
| Access | X | Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms) – 2-3 page brief may or may not be published, depending on sensitivity of information gathered and discussions with the ERL Working Group. | | | |
| | X | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) – Service area maps will be restricted to ERL Cluster ABCM partners to avoid targeting of civilian infrastructure. | | | |
| Visibility Specify which logos should be on outputs | | REACH | | | |
| | | Donor: SDC | | | |
| | | Coordination Framework: Early Recovery and Livelihoods Working Group, NES NGO Forum | | | |
| | | Partners: N/A | | | |

2. Rationale

2.1 Background

Approximately 290,000 displaced persons inhabit Northeast Syria's camps, Informal Settlements, and Collective Centres. Individuals residing in Collective Centres and Informal Settlements are particularly underserved, lacking access to basic services including WASH infrastructure, health services, and adequate shelter conditions.¹ With Syria in its thirteenth year of war, returns are unlikely to take place toward areas controlled by the Government of Syria or to Northwest Syria for reasons related to safety and security, lack of livelihood opportunities, and fear of persecution.² IDPs living in such sites in NES are at risk of eviction by authorities, further contributing to the precariousness of living in these sites. In addition to poor healthcare, WASH, and shelter conditions for those living in displacement, the humanitarian response itself is also unsustainable, with funding expected to decrease in the coming years, resulting in reduced capacity of humanitarian actors to provide assistance to IDPs in Northeast Syria.³

Under the Northeast Syria NGO Forum's Area-Based Coordination Mechanism (ABCM), the Early Recovery and Livelihoods (ERL) Working Group has been in the process of identifying alternative, sustainable solutions to improve living conditions in NES' IDP sites. Partners engaged in the ABCM are in the process of developing an Area Resilience and Recovery Plan (ARRP), which is intended to act as a tool for "operationalizing a multi-partner, multi-sectors, and multi-donor response in a given target area."⁴ Such plans will focus on implementing humanitarian programming in Northeast Syria focused on maximizing impact and sustainability through engagement with local communities, stakeholder mapping, conflict sensitivity analyses, needs assessments and partner inputs.⁵ The ERL Working Group has identified Tabqa (Al-Thawrah) a city west of Raqqa, as the pilot location for implementing an area-based approach, which will contribute to identifying sustainable alternatives to displacement in the area, later to be replicated in other areas of Northeast Syria. As a first step in this process,

¹ NES NGO Forum. "Approaches to Sustainable Integrated Alternatives for IDPs in Last Resort Sites in NES." June 2023.

² NES NGO Forum. "Approaches to Sustainable Integrated Alternatives for IDPs in Last Resort Sites in NES." June 2023.

³ NES NGO Forum. "Approaches to Sustainable Integrated Alternatives for IDPs in Last Resort Sites in NES." June 2023.

⁴ NES NGO Forum Early Recovery & Livelihoods Working Group. "Framework for Area-Based Coordination Mechanisms for Resilience and Recovery in NES." August 2022.

⁵ NES NGO Forum Early Recovery & Livelihoods Working Group. "Framework for Area-Based Coordination Mechanisms for Resilience and Recovery in NES." August 2022.

the NGO Forum has requested the support of REACH in conducting a mapping of service providers in Tabqa city, which will ultimately feed into the Tabqa city ARRP. As a first step toward developing the ARRP, the ERL Cluster in NES has requested REACH to support in conducting a mapping exercise of basic services infrastructures to feed into operational and programmatic planning for the upcoming implementation of the Tabqa ABCM.

It should be noted that REACH was asked to undertake this exercise because the ERL Cluster leads previously saw the digitized map outputs (a mapping of services infrastructures) from the RER Unit's Mansoura ABA which took place in 2023, and asked the RER team if it could create similar outputs for the Tabqa ABCM in 2024. Due to this, the basis of this research cycle was developed firstly with the output in mind (digitized maps of services infrastructure), with the research questions developed *after* consulting the ERL Cluster what type of information was necessary and relevant to include in the final output for the work of implementing partners. To this end, the suggested methodology does not comprehensively answer the chosen research questions, but rather provides initial indicative findings to support implementing organizations as they identify their approaches to programming under the ABCM in Tabqa.

2.2 Intended impact

This assessment aims to provide actionable findings to guide and implement the Tabqa city ARRP in partnership with ERL Working Group partners. The findings from this exercise will support implementing partners in adapting their response in Tabqa to be in line with local capacities, identifying and filling in sectoral gaps where useful, necessary, and based on feedback from local experts. While this Service Area Mapping is focused on Tabqa, lessons will ultimately be drawn from this pilot ARRP to consider how similar area-based approaches ought to be implemented in other parts of Northeast Syria in the future. As such, this assessment will not only aim to have an impact on identifying sustainable solutions to displacement in Tabqa, but also more broadly within NES.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

This Service Area Mapping will consist of one Services Mapping Focus Group Discussion (MFGD) and one Community Representatives MFGD, taking place on the 28th and 29th of February 2024. MFGD facilitators will use printed maps (created by the GIS team) and a map legend to map with MFGD participants relevant basic services infrastructures. At the same time, they will take notes in a template to detail verbal responses that cannot be captured on a map.

The **Services Mapping FGD** will focus on consulting between 4-8 local representatives who have in-depth knowledge on all basic services provision in Tabqa, in relation to infrastructures concerning health, education, water, sanitation, electricity, agricultural services, local food infrastructures (bakeries), markets, and business / production sites. ERL partners have already conducted scoping to ensure that the appropriate representatives are present.

The **Community Representatives MFGD** will complement the information about services infrastructures by consulting community members about:

- Whether certain groups of people (based on geographic location, social, and / or economic status) lack access to certain services within Tabqa, and if so, for what reasons.
- The relationship between Tabqa and surrounding areas in terms of basic services provision. (For example, if people from surrounding areas come to access healthcare in Tabqa, or if people from Tabqa access jobs in neighbouring areas, etc.)

Scoping for community representatives is ongoing and is being led by REACH Raqqa field teams and ERL partners.

The primary outputs will be seven Service Area maps, indicating the locations of basic services infrastructures within Tabqa. This will be accompanied by a 2-3 page brief summarizing key findings in relation to social and economic dynamics impacting basic services provision within Tabqa.

Key definitions:

Basic Services: For the purpose of this assessment, the assessment team (in consultation with the ERL cluster) is adopting a definition of basic services similar to that of the indicator for SDG 1.4.1, which interprets basic services as “public service provision systems that meet human basic needs including drinking water, sanitation and hygiene, energy, mobility, waste collection, health care, education and information technologies.”⁶ The tools account for all components in this definition except for services related to information technologies as this is not a component of programming attached to the ERL cluster’s Area-Based Coordination Mechanism. Beyond the services falling under this definition, the ERL Cluster Coordinators have requested REACH to ask FGD participants about access to the following local infrastructures:

- **Markets:** food and non-food. Such infrastructures are relevant to the ABCM as partner organizations are trying to gain a multisectoral understanding of existing markets throughout the city that sustain households’ livelihoods through the purchase and/or sale of goods.
- **Business and production sites:** Such sites are relevant primarily as current or potential employers of people residing within (or nearby) Tabqa. Furthermore, this information is directly relevant as scoping information in preparation for a Livelihoods Assessment that the RER Unit is undertaking aimed at understanding demand for labour in Tabqa – also in partnership with the ERL cluster – in April.
- **Bakeries:** Bakeries are an infrastructure that the ERL Cluster is interested in as a function of ensuring food security to households within Tabqa.
- **Agricultural Land:** Agricultural land plays an important role in access to basic needs in NES, as agriculture is both an important component of sustaining livelihoods and contributes to household food security. As such, the ERL cluster wants to understand where within Tabqa (and surrounding areas) agricultural land is located and what entities manage it.

3.2 Population of interest

The **Services Mapping FGD** will engage exclusively with individuals (primarily local authority figures) who have in-depth knowledge and / or expertise in sectors related to basic service provision across sectors, including health, education, water, sanitation, electricity, agricultural services, local food infrastructures (bakeries), markets, and business / production sites. However, as the ERL Cluster in NES is undertaking an area-based approach (the ABCM), the population of interest includes all population groups located within the boundaries of Tabqa. As such, the **Community Representatives MFGD** will consult community leaders, CSO / CBO leaders, representatives of the displaced, women’s representatives, youth representatives, and persons with disabilities representatives to account for the viewpoints of individuals residing in Tabqa.

3.3 Secondary data review

The following sources have been reviewed in order to identify data gaps relevant to Early Recovery in Tabqa city. To the extent that time allows, the 2-3 page brief may pull from the following data sources to further contextualize the findings from the MFGDs:

⁶ UNHABITAT. “Metadata on SDGs Indicator 1.4.1 Indicator category: Tier II.”
https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/11/metadata_on_sdg_indicator_1.4.1_10_2020_1.pdf

- [Syria – Ar Raqqa Governorate – Tabqa / Al Thawrah Reference Map 2018 - REACH](#): Reference map indicating the location of key infrastructures in Tabqa, including administrative buildings, churches, mosques, educational facilities, healthcare facilities, train station(s), water towers, the electrical grid, parks, and transport networks.
- [Data from the Syria Multisectoral Needs Assessment \(MSNA\) 2023 – REACH](#): Multisectoral data representative at the sub-district level that can help provide an overview of indicators relevant to livelihoods, healthcare, non-food items, education, water, and shelter needs.
- [Data from Humanitarian Situation Overview of Syria \(HSOS\) – REACH](#): Monthly, multisectoral data on humanitarian conditions and priority needs. Potential use for trends analysis over the last 1-3 years to contextualize current situation in Tabqa.
- [Data from the Syria Joint Market Monitoring Initiative \(JMMI\) – REACH and CWG \(November 2023\)](#): Data on availability and prices of basic commodities in Tabqa / Al Thawrah sub-district.
- [Northeast Syria Informal Sites and Settlements Profiles Dataset \(Round 12\)](#): Cross-sectoral, indicative KI data across 14 IDP informal sites / settlements near Tabqa. (Does not comprehensively cover all informal sites in NES.)
- [Damage & Rehabilitation Assessment – Syria – Al-Thawrah \(Tabqa\)](#): September 2021 REACH output providing basic contextual information on geographic features worth considering in Tabqa, including the hydroelectric dam and the Tabqa military airbase. Further findings presented includes the percentage of damaged and destroyed structures in Tabqa and surrounding areas, identified via GIS/RS analysis.
- UN Population Dataset for Syria (2023): Tabqa population data between 2019-2023; estimated number of residents / IDPs / returnees, sex and age distribution, disability rate, average family size, marital status
- [Tabqa Information Landscape Analysis – NES ERL Working Group and REACH](#): Multisectoral Indicator Mapping spreadsheet providing an overview of indicators related to Education; Food Security and Livelihoods; Health and Nutrition; Protection; Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (PSEAH); Water; Sanitation and Health (WASH); Shelter and Non-Food Items (SNFI); Sites and Settlements; Cash and Livelihoods; Early Recovery; Demographics, Social Cohesion & Governance; and Durable Solutions.
- [Tabqa Information Needs Analysis, WASH – NES NGO Forum](#): Written output based on the above landscape analysis discussing existing data sources on WASH in Tabqa.
- [Tabqa Information Needs Analysis, Livelihoods, Cash & Markets – NES NGO Forum](#): Written output based on the above landscape analysis discussing existing data sources on Livelihoods, Cash & Markets in Tabqa.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

Mapping Focus Group Discussions will be conducted on February 28th and 29th, 2024 in Tabqa, Ar-Raqqa Governorate. While MFGDs previously completed by the Syria RER unit have focused on defining the boundaries of a given area, these MFGDs will not be focused on defining community boundaries. Instead, these MFGDs are focused on understanding basic services infrastructure points and the relevant authorities and actors overseeing the delivery of such services (through the Services Mapping FGD), with an added component (via the Community Representatives MFGD) focused on understanding social dynamics and relationships between neighbourhoods, which may influence access to service provision within Tabqa. Participants for both MFGDs have been purposively selected through a combination of efforts between REACH field officer networks as well as through the ERL Cluster's contacts stemming from its work on the Area-Based Coordination Mechanism in Tabqa.

Participants for the **Services Mapping FGD** have been selected based on their technical knowledge of respective basic services. Such participants will predominantly (if not exclusively) be local authority figures. They may be members of Tabqa Local Council, Municipality, technical departments, and / or directorates. They will be selected based on a preliminary scoping exercise being performed by the ERL deputy coordinator which will help identify the most relevant authorities willing to participate in the MFGD on the given dates.

Participants for the **Community Representatives MFGD** will be selected to account for maximum diversity across social groups, including based on age, gender, displacement status, and disability status. They will also be selected to ensure

maximum geographic spread across Tabqa, to gather input about access to services across different neighbourhoods in the area (avoiding bias toward any one neighbourhood of Tabqa).

For both MFGDs, there should be a maximum of eight participants, with the exercise being led by two REACH field officers, one of whom will be the moderator, while the other will take notes. The team of two will use the respective tools to lead the discussion and engage in the participatory mapping exercise. There will be three base maps available as visual aids, upon which the moderator will ask participants to identify and mark services infrastructures located throughout Tabqa (for example, healthcare facilities or schools) with different coloured markers (and guidance from a mapping legend, included in each MFGD tool).

Trainings for the MFGD will be planned and implemented by the RER Senior Assessment Officer alongside the Raqqa Field Manager. The moderator and note taker Field Officers will engage in practice sessions during the training so as to become well-acquainted with the tools for each MFGD, as well as the Map Key and instructions for mapping relevant service infrastructures on the maps. With the consent of participants, MFGD sessions will be audio recorded should they be needed to gather more detailed notes after the MFGDs have been completed.

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

Once the MFGDs are completed, a debrief will take place between the RER assessment staff, Raqqa Field Manager, the Field officers who conducted the exercise, and the GIS Officer responsible for digitizing the maps. The Field Officers will provide photos of the maps once the exercise was completed, which will be handed over to GIS staff to digitize as outputs (later to be shared with the NES ERL Cluster ABCM partners). The Field Officers will also transcribe (and upload to SharePoint) the Arabic notes taken during each MFGD exercise alongside English translations of the notes, indicating key points of discussion, agreement, and disagreement. The maps and notes together will be used to produce the final outputs for this assessment, including the 2-3 page brief and the digitized maps.

In addition to working with the GIS team to produce digitized “Service Area Maps,” the RER SAO will conduct a thematic analysis across the two sets MFGD notes, producing a summary of key findings for each MFGD (that would not otherwise be captured in the digitized maps). These documents will identify the main talking points from the MFGDs, including an analysis of any topics on which participants conveyed disagreement, as well as any similarities or differences in responses between the Services Mapping FGD and Community Representatives MFGD. Such summary documents will be used to produce the outline for the 2-3 page brief.

3.6 Limitations

The primary limitation of the MFGD exercise is that it is purposively sampled, and therefore the findings from these MFGDs can only be considered indicative. Information produced by the Services Mapping FGD may not be completely comprehensive of basic services in Tabqa, and likewise, the Community Representatives MFGD cannot represent the views and opinions of all social groups residing within Tabqa.

The assessment team is seeking to bolster representativeness of findings by pre-identifying members of the community to participate in these MFGDs with 1) broad technical knowledge of access to services across all relevant sectors (via local authorities) and 2) in-depth knowledge about the experiences of different social groups in accessing basic services Tabqa, and who can thus speak to the “end-user” experiences of accessing basic services. This includes representatives of the displaced, persons with disabilities, women, youth, and CSO / CBO leaders.

Finally, while this exercise can provide an indicative overview of the availability of services (as well as some geographic and social barriers to accessing them), there are important components of service provision that these MFGDs do not cover (such as the financial accessibility or quality of services). However, the Early Recovery and Livelihoods Cluster in NES

requested that the REACH team produce such a mapping to support the Tabqa ABCM, with the knowledge that findings associated with MFGDs are indicative and meant to be an initial information-gathering exercise in the early stages of the area-based approach, providing implementing organizations information that they can then follow up on. Any dissemination of the findings will emphasize these points and encourage partners to continue information gathering as they plan their programming.

4. Key ethical considerations and related risks

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

| The proposed research design... | Yes/ No | Details if no (including mitigation) |
|---|----------------|---|
| ... Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to avoid unnecessary duplication of data collection efforts? | Yes | |
| ... Respects respondents, their rights and dignity (specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided)? | Yes | |
| ... Does not expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| ... Does not expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| ... Does not involve collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatizing for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)? | Yes | |
| ... Does not involve data collection with minors i.e. anyone less than 18 years old? | Yes | |
| ... Does not involve data collection with other vulnerable groups e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.? | Yes | |
| ... Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of personally identifiable information ? | Yes | |

5. Roles and responsibilities

| Task Description | Responsible | Accountable | Consulted | Informed |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Research design | SAO | SAO | RER RM, IMPACT HQ | ERL Cluster Coordinators |
| Supervising data collection | Field Manager, Field Officers | SAO | RER RM | REACH Syria DCC |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | SAO | SAO | Field Manager, Field Officers | RER RM |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|--|
| Data analysis | GISO SAO | SAO | RER RM, IMPACT HQ | REACH Syria DCC |
| Output production | GISO SAO | SAO GISO | RER RM, IMPACT HQ | REACH Syria DCC |
| Dissemination | SAO | SAO | RER RM, IMPACT HQ | ERL Cluster, ABCM partners, REACH Syria CC and DCC |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | SAO | RM | HQ | IMPACT HQ |
| Lessons learned | SAO | SAO | RE RM, HQ, Field Officers | IMPACT HQ |

Responsible: the person(s) who executes the task

Accountable: the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone

Consulted: the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented

Informed: the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed

6. Data Analysis Plan

Data Analysis Plan can be found [here](#).

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

| IMPACT Objective | External M&E Indicator | Internal M&E Indicator | Focal point | Tool | Will indicator be tracked? |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products | Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products | # of downloads of x product from Resource Center | Country request to HQ | User_log | X Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Relief Web | Country request to HQ | | X Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Country level platforms | Country team | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter | Country request to HQ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly | Country team | | X Yes |
| | | # of visits to x webmap/x dashboard | Country request to HQ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response | Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products | # references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies) | Country team | Reference_log | X Yes <i>References in programme docs of ABCM partners & ERL Cluster</i> |
| | | # references in single agency documents | | | |
| Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products | Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery Number of humanitarian | Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs | Country team | Usage_Feed back and Usage_Survey template | <i>[Outline here the usage survey to be implemented for this research cycle E.g. Usage survey to be conducted in November 2017, following the release of x outputs, targeting at least 10 partners]</i> |
| | | Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs | | | |
| | | Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|----------------|---|
| | documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products | Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff Perceived quality of outputs/programs Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | <i>E.g. Usage survey to be conducted at the end of the research cycle related to all outputs, targeting at least 20 partners]</i> |
| Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle | Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs (<i>providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.</i>) | # of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation | Country team | Engagement_log | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | | # of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis | | | X Yes |
| | | # of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings; | | | X Yes |

