**Research Terms of Reference**

**CCCM Durable Solutions Assessment**

**UKR2306**

**Ukraine**

**April 2023**
**Version 1**

**REACH** Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

# 1. Executive Summary

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Country of intervention** | Ukraine | | | | | |
| **Type of Emergency** | □ | Natural disaster | **X** | **Conflict** | | |
| **Type of Crisis** | □ | Sudden onset | □ | Slow onset | **X** | **Protracted** |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | UNHCR | | | | | |
| **Project Code** | IMPACT code - 64AYT, ACTED code - 64FJZ | | | | | |
| **Overall Research Timeframe (2 Rounds)** | 20/03/2023 – 31/12/2023 | | | | | |

| **Research Timeframe Round 1** | 1. Start collecting data: 23/05/2023 | 5. Output (Report) sent for validation: 22/07/2023 |
|---|---|---|
| | 2. Data collected: 03/06/2023 | 6. Output (Report) published: 29/07/2023 |
| | 3. Data sent for validation: 09/06/2023 | 7. Final presentation: 19/08/2023 |
| | 4. Data analysed: 09/06/2023 | |

| **Number of assessments** | □ | Single assessment (one cycle) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **X** | **Multi-assessment (more than one cycle):** two rounds (baseline assessment in May-June and consequent progress assessment in November-December) | |

| **Humanitarian milestones** | **Milestone** | | **Deadline** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | □ | Donor plan/strategy | XX/XX/XXXX |
| | **X** | **Cluster plan/strategy** | 15/08/2023 |
| | **X** | **Working group strategy** | 15/08/2023 |
| | □ | NGO platform plan/strategy | _ _/_ _/_ _ _ _ |
| | □ | Other (Specify): | _ _/_ _/_ _ _ _ |

| **Audience Type & Dissemination** | **Audience type** | | **Dissemination** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **X Strategic** **X Programmatic** **X Operational** □ [Other, Specify] | | □ General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) **X Cluster Mailing** **X Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster, Durable Solutions Working Group meetings)** **X Website Dissemination (UNHCR, Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre)** □ [Other, Specify] | |
| **Detailed dissemination plan required** | **X** | **Yes** | □ | No |

| General Objective | To inform the strategic and programmatic decision-making of international, national and local actors on durable solutions (DS) for Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) by identifying the demographic characteristics of IDP households at risk of protracted residence in collective sites (CSs), their displacement-related vulnerabilities, and the contextual factors influencing the achievement of DS over time in Uzhhorod, Mukachevo, Vinnytsia, and Dnipro. |
|---|---|
| Specific Objective(s) | <ul><li>To identify the demographic characteristics and vulnerabilities of IDPs at risk of protracted residence (living in CSs for more than 3 months) in Uzhhorod, Mukachevo, Vinnytsia, and Dnipro.</li><li>To determine the displacement-related vulnerabilities that undermine/might undermine the achievement of durable solutions (DS) for IDPs living in CSs through the comparison of IDPs with a control group (non-IDPs) living in the same settlement against the IASC criteria.</li><li>To assess the progress towards DS for IDPs at risk of protracted residence in collective sites in six months for every settlement and in comparison with the host community (non-IDPs).</li><li>To identify preferred DS options and trends for IDPs in CSs at risk of protracted residence (return to their initial area of origin, local integration in their current settlement, integration in a third settlement in Ukraine).</li><li>To identify the contextual factors relevant to DS achievement at the settlement level (Uzhhorod, Mukachevo, Vinnytsia, and Dnipro).</li></ul> |
| Research Questions | 1) What are the demographic characteristics and vulnerabilities of IDPs at risk of protracted residence in CSs and their key reasons for protracted residence?<br><br>2) What are the key displacement-related vulnerabilities and contextual factors that hinder the achievement of durable solutions for IDPs at risk of protracted residence in collective sites?<br><br>3) What are the key trends and discrepancies in terms of durable solutions achievement between IDPs in CSs and non-IDPs?<br><br>4) What are the durable solutions preferences of IDPs at risk of protracted displacement living in collective sites?<br><br>5) What is the level of progress towards durable solutions for IDPs at risk of protracted displacement living in collective sites over time? |
| Geographic Coverage | Four settlements- Uzhhorod & Mukachevo, Vinnytsia, and Dnipro (fourth level of administrative division of Ukraine) - for baseline and consequent progress assessments. |
| Secondary data sources | REACH, Collective Sites Monitoring Household Survey – Round 5, November 2022<br>REACH, Collective Site Monitoring (CSM) – Round 6, December 2022<br>REACH, Area-based assessment, Dnipropetrovska oblast, August 2022<br>REACH, Area-based assessment, Lvivska oblast, February 2023<br>IOM, Internal Displacement Report — General Population Survey Round 12, 16 - 23 January 2023<br><br>**On Ukrainian context and legislative framework:**<ul><li>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Ukraine Humanitarian Needs Overview 2023, January 2023.</li><li>DRC, Desk Research: Best International Practices on IDPs Integration Criteria and Indicators 2020 Case Studies: Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Serbia, July 2021.</li><li>UNHCR, Intentions and perspectives of Internally displaced persons in Ukraine, February 2023.</li><li>Chuiko O. & Fedorenko O., Levels of Social Integration of Internally Displaced Persons in the Host Community (ku.lt), August 2022.</li></ul> |

- Verkhovna Rada, Refworld | Ukraine: Law No. 1706-VII, on Ensuring Rights and Freedoms of Internally Displaced Persons, November 2014.
- Government of Ukraine, UNHCR, Strategy for Integration of Internally Displaced Persons and Implementation of the Mid-Term Solutions as to Internal Displacement until 2024, October 2021

**On durable solutions:**
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs - World | ReliefWeb, April 2010.
- EGRIS, International Recommendations on Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (IRIS) (europa.eu), March 2020.
- Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), Durable Solutions Indicators & Guide, 2018.
- UN, UN SG, Shining a Light on Internal Displacement: A Vision for the Future, September 2021.
- NUDP, Turning the Tide on Internal Displacement: a Development Approach to Solutions, November 2022.
- EGRIS, Compilers' Manual on Displacement Statistics, March 2020

| Population(s) | X | **IDPs in collective sites** | □ | IDPs in informal sites |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | □ | IDPs in host communities | □ | IDPs [Other, Specify] |
| | □ | Refugees in camp | □ | Refugees in informal sites |
| | □ | Refugees in host communities | □ | Refugees [Other, Specify] |
| | X | **Host communities** | □ | [Other, Specify] |

| Stratification | X | **Geographical #: 3 settlements** Population size per strata is known? **X Yes** □ No | □ | **Group #: 2 population groups (IDPs in CSs, non-IDPs).** Population size per strata is known? **X Yes** □ No | □ | *[Other Specify]* #: _ _ Population size per strata is known? □ Yes □ No |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Data collection tool(s) | X | **Structured (Quantitative)** | □ | Semi-structured (Qualitative) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | **Sampling method** | **Data collection method** |
|---|---|---|
| **Structured data collection tool # 1** | □ Purposive / Snowballing<br>□ Probability / Simple random<br>**X Probability / Stratified simple random**<br>□ Probability / Cluster sampling<br>□ Probability / Stratified cluster sampling<br>□ [Other, Specify] | □ Key informant interviews: _ _ _ _<br>□ Group discussion (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>**X Household interview (600 interviews with IDPs and 400 interviews with host community representatives)**<br>□ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>□ Direct observations: _ _ _ _<br>□ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| Semi-structured data collection tool # 2 | □ Purposive<br>□ Probability / Simple random<br>□ Probability / Stratified simple random<br>□ Probability / Cluster sampling<br>□ Probability / Stratified cluster sampling<br>□ [Other, Specify] | □ Key informant interviews:<br>□ Group discussion (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>□ Household interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>□ Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>□ Direct observations: (Target #):_ _ _ _ _<br>□ [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |

| Target level of precision if probability sampling | 95% level of confidence | 5% margin of error |
|---|---|---|

| Data management platform(s) | X | **IMPACT** | □ | UNHCR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | □ | [Other, Specify] | | |

| Expected output type(s) <u>per round</u> | □ | Situation overview #: _ _ | X | **Report #: 1 final report based on two rounds of data collection** (baseline and consequent assessments) | □ | Profile #: _ _ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | X | **Factsheet: 6 (3 settlement profiles for two rounds)** | X | **Presentation: #4 Final presentations** (Overall presentation + 3 settlement profiles per each round) | □ | Stand-alone reference maps: |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | □ | Interactive dashboard #: _ _ | □ | Webmap #: _ _ | □ | Map #: _ _ |
| | □ | [Other, Specify] #: _ _ | | | | |
| **Access** | X | **Public (available on REACH resource centre and other humanitarian platforms)** | | | | |
| | □ | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms) | | | | |
| **Visibility** | *REACH* | | | | | |
| | *Donor: UNHCR* | | | | | |
| | *Coordination Framework: CCCM Cluster* | | | | | |
| | *Partners: CCCM Cluster partners / UNHCR* | | | | | |

# 2. Rationale

## 2.1. Background

As of 23 January, 5.4 million persons are estimated to be internally displaced (IDP) across Ukraine, a number that has been steadily declining since August 2022. However, displacement is being prolonged, with 83% of current IDPs being displaced for at least three months, and 58% for at least six months.[1]

Despite clear willingness from most IDP households to eventually go back to their settlement of origin, a majority of them do not report clear intentions to move from their current settlement of residence in the short term. According to the IOM General population survey Round 12 (January 2023), while 74% of IDPs in Ukraine have an overall long-term intention to return, only 5% reported clear intentions to return to their areas of residence in the next two weeks (compared to 10% in December 2022).[2] Similarly, the last UNHCR report on the future intentions of IDPs indicates that while 79% of IDPs have an overall long-term intention to return, only 12% plan to return within the next three months.[3] It was also observed in the last ABA in Lvivska oblast, where only 7% of surveyed IDP households reported a clear intention to move from their current settlement in the next month.[4] This standstill is for the most part explained by the instability of the security context in areas of origin of IDPs, in particular for IDPs originating from frontline and conflict-affected areas. Other barriers to dignified and sustainable return also include the lack of adequate housing, unavailability of water and electricity infrastructure, health care services, or the lack of working opportunities.[5]

In this context, many IDPs search for accommodation alternatives in collective sites across the country. According to the CCCM cluster master list, about 130,000 people reside in collective sites as of March 2023. However, those who chose to be hosted in these facilities often do so as a last resort, as they don't have any alternatives, especially due to the lack of affordable housing. Indeed, they are often categorised by higher rates of vulnerabilities (chronic illnesses, pensioners, disabled) and are more socio-economically fragile.[6] In turn, they run the risk to be hosted in facilities that lack the necessary arrangements for a long-time stay and fail to meet living standards fully.[7] Therefore, it is postulated that securing durable solutions for the site population might be more challenging compared to displaced households located outside collective sites, and for the host community. In addition, the displaced population residing in collective sites appear potentially at higher risk of prolonged residence. According to the CSM vulnerability Index (Round 5 – November 2022), only 26% reported intentions to return to their area of origin in the long term[8].

---

[1] IOM, General Population Survey Round 12, January 2023.

[2] IOM, General Population Survey Round 12, January 2023.

[3] UNHCR, ukraine_intention_report3.pdf (unhcr.org), February 2023

[4] REACH, Area-based Assessment Lvivska oblast, February 2023

[5] UNHCR, ukraine_intention_report3.pdf (unhcr.org), February 2023

[6] REACH, Area-based Assessment Lvivska oblast, February 2023

[7] REACH, UNHCR, Ukraine: Collective Site Monitoring (CSM) - Round 4, November 2022.

[8] REACH, Multisectoral CCCM Vulnerability Index - Round 5, March 2023

In these circumstances, there is an ongoing commitment of international and national actors to work collaboratively in Ukraine towards strengthening activities of early recovery and durable solutions, particularly for IDPs living in CSs. Partners aim at adopting a common evidence-based approach driven by context-specific data and in-depth analysis to support programmatic decision-making.

## 2.2 Intended Impact
H

### Analytical objectives

**Comparative analysis:** the assessment will compare durable solutions achievement between IDPs in collective sites (population of interest) and host communities (control groups) to identify key displacement-related vulnerabilities and contextual features that influence the achievement of durable solutions in four target settlements – measured mainly through the lenses of the IASC criteria (see data processing and analysis).

**Longitudinal analysis:** the assessment will be conducted in two rounds separated by a period of 4 to 6 months. IDPs respondents surveyed for the second round will be the same as for the first round to assess progress towards the achievement of durable solutions. In this logic, the first round will provide baseline data. The second round will allow to develop further transversal analysis based on the confirmation (or refutation) of previously observed trends.

### Outputs

Final outputs and dissemination activities will be adapted to the different partners and stakeholders to better meet their information needs for operational and strategic planning. Three different written outputs will be elaborated for the first round, and four for the second round:

- **3 short-form factsheets**: for each round, one factsheet will be drafted for each settlement. These outputs will provide a quick snapshot of profiles, needs and progress towards durable solutions at the time of data collection. They will exclusively focus on data collected at the settlement level and will primarily inform strategic and operational planning of local, national, and international actors implementing early recovery activities in the city analysed.

- **1 transversal analysis:** for the second round, one "long-form" report will be drafted to provide a comparative analysis spanning across the four settlements. It will aim to analyse transversal trends and generate broader conclusions that will inform strategic programming at the national level. It will therefore primarily be oriented towards actors operating across the country.

- **Dissemination activities:** different dissemination activities will be conducted for each round to directly engage with local, national, and international actors operating in early recovery activities.

### Outcomes

This assessment aims to have the following final impact:

1. Support ongoing efforts to strengthen evidence-based DS programming in Ukraine: with this assessment, REACH aims to address information gaps, and inform strategic and operational planning of early recovery activities in Ukraine. By doing so, it also aims to support efforts to bridge humanitarian and early recovery activities under the nexus approach.

2. **Support the joint work of local, national, and international actors seeking to meet the long-term needs of beneficiaries in the 3 assessed settlements**. By informing partners with settlement-level data, REACH aims to encourage international actors to further engage with local actors (local authorities, CSOs and NGOs, volunteer initiatives) on durable solutions objectives in the four settlements assessed.

# 3. Methodology

## 3.1. Methodology Overview

The research cycle will utilise a **quantitative approach**, with structured households' interviews (standardized closed questions) to collect data from the two populations of analysis (see population of interest). Leading up to and during quantitative data collection, the assessment staff will also conduct an extensive secondary data review on relevant literature, reports, and government statistics relevant to the analysis of CS and early recovery activities in Ukraine. In addition, they will engage with local authorities in the assessed settlements to seek contextual expertise and foster greater engagement in the research cycle, thereby increasing the likelihood of acceptance of the analysis findings.

**Key steps in the assessment**

1. **Secondary data review:** a secondary data review will be conducted to inform the assessment methodology, questionnaire design, and to verify/triangulate primary data and findings (see secondary data review).
2. **Quantitative data collection:** a representative sample of IDP HHs in CSs (population of interest) and non-IDP HHs (control group) will be surveyed in the four assessed settlements (see primary data collection).
3. **Engagement with local authorities:** meetings with representatives from relevant departments (e.g., social affairs) will be organised to seek contextual expertise and foster engagement of local actors.
4. **Data processing:** the surveyed responses of IDPs will be cleaned by the data team (see data processing and analysis).
5. **Data analysis:** all indicators will be primarily analysed by the assessment team using frequency tables and correlation coefficients provided by the data team (see data processing and analysis).
6. **Drafting outputs:** written outputs will be drafted by the assessment team in close cooperation with the CCCM cluster and partners.

**Key definitions**

**Internally displaced person** – an internally displaced person is a citizen of Ukraine, a foreigner or a stateless person staying on the territory of Ukraine on legal grounds and being entitled to permanent residence in the territory of Ukraine, who was forced to leave or abandon his/her residence place as a result of or in order to avoid the negative impact of armed conflict, temporary occupation, situations of generalized violence, mass violations of human rights and disasters of natural or human-made origin.[9]

**Durable solutions** – a situation when IDPs no longer have specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination resulting from their displacement.[10] Durable solutions can be achieved through IDP integration in their host territorial communities, where IDPs were initially displaced, resettlement in other host territorial communities within the country or through their return to places of origin.

**Household (HH)** – the family consisting of persons who live together, are connected by common life and have mutual rights and responsibilities.[11]

**Vulnerable household** – for this document, vulnerable households are defined as those households that have at least one member with a disability or that is chronically ill, single-parent households, households with only elderly members and households with a pregnant woman.

---

[9] Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of Internally Displaced Persons". URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1706-18#Text

[10] Inter-Agency Standing Committee Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs. URL: IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons, April 2010.pdf (interagencystandingcommittee.org)

[11] Family Code of Ukraine. URL: Сімейний кодекс України | від 10.01.2002 № 2947-III (rada.gov.ua)

## 3.2. Population of Interest

**Primary population of interest:** the primary population of interest in this assessment are the <u>IDP households living in CSs</u>, presupposed to be facing greater barriers to achieving durable solution objectives.

**Control group:** progress for each criterion (and associated indicators) will be measured in comparison with <u>non-IDPs/host community</u> in the same settlement. This process will allow for isolating more thoroughly displacement-related vulnerabilities and flag structural and contextual issues, impacting the achievement of DS regardless of the displacement status of respondents.

**Eligibility criteria:** Importantly, not all IDPs in CSs will be surveyed. To target precisely IDP households in – or in a higher risk of – prolonged residence, only IDP households that have established for **a minimum of three months** in the collective site will be eligible for the study. This criterion will naturally not concern the non-displaced population.

**Geographic scope:**  the geographic scope of the assessment consists of four urban settlements (Uzhhorod, Mukachevo, Vinnytsia, and Dnipro) chosen for their key role as hosting hubs for IDPs in collective sites. Importantly, Uzhhorod and Mukachevo will be sampled and analysed together due to the lower number of IDPs in CSs in these two settlements compared to the two Vinnytsia and Dnipro.

## 3.3. Secondary Data Review

REACH, <u>Collective Sites Monitoring Household Survey – Round 5</u>, November 2022
REACH, <u>Collective Site Monitoring (CSM) – Round 6</u>, December 2022
REACH, <u>Area-based assessment, Dnipropetrovska oblast</u>, August 2022
REACH, <u>Area-based assessment, Lvivska oblast</u>, February 2023
IOM, <u>Internal Displacement Report — General Population Survey Round 12,</u> 16 - 23 January 2023

<u>**On Ukrainian context and legislative framework:**</u>
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), <u>Ukraine Humanitarian Needs Overview 2023</u>, January 2023.
- DRC, <u>Desk Research: Best International Practices on IDPs Integration Criteria and Indicators 2020 Case Studies: Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Serbia</u>, July 2021.
- UNHCR, <u>Intentions and perspectives of Internally displaced persons in Ukraine</u>, February 2023.
- Chuiko O. & Fedorenko O., <u>Levels of Social Integration of Internally Displaced Persons in the Host Community (ku.lt)</u>, August 2022.
- Verkhovna Rada, <u>Refworld | Ukraine: Law No. 1706-VII, on Ensuring Rights and Freedoms of Internally Displaced Persons</u>, November 2014.
- Government of Ukraine, UNHCR, <u>Strategy for Integration of Internally Displaced Persons and Implementation of the Mid-Term Solutions as to Internal Displacement until 2024</u>, October 2021

<u>**On durable solutions:**</u>
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), <u>IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs - World | ReliefWeb</u>, April 2010.
- EGRIS, <u>International Recommendations on Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (IRIS) (europa.eu)</u>, March 2020.
- Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), <u>Durable Solutions Indicators & Guide</u>, 2018.
- UN, UN SG, <u>Shining a Light on Internal Displacement: A Vision for the Future</u>, September 2021.
- NUDP, <u>Turning the Tide on Internal Displacement: a Development Approach to Solutions</u>, November 2022.
- EGRIS, <u>Compilers' Manual on Displacement Statistics</u>, March 2020

<div style="background-color:gray">**Key functions of the secondary data review**</div>

The secondary data review will be conducted mainly to inform area identification, questionnaire design, and to verify/triangulate primary data and findings.

➢ **Area Identification:** the identification of assessed locations has been carried out in consultation with the CCCM cluster based on available data on the following criteria: 1) the number of collective sites in the settlement; 2) areas of intervention of CCCM partners.

---

➢ **Main indicators and questionnaire design:** achievement of durable solutions by the populations of analysis will be predominantly assessed through the lenses of the IASC Durable Solution Criteria (2010), adapted to the Ukrainian context through a desk review and consultations. To operationalize the criteria into specific, measurable indicators and draft the questionnaire, the JIPS indicator library will be primarily used. The latter will also provide key indicators of demographic characteristics and preferred routes of respondents towards durable solutions (return, integration in the current settlement, integration in another settlement). Indicators on social cohesion will also be added, based on previous research cycles in Ukraine by REACH (e.g., ABAs) or partners.

➢ **Triangulation:** to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness, the primary data gathered will be verified through triangulation and supplemented with relevant secondary data. The secondary data will primarily consist of contextual documentation, including legislative tools such as Law No. 1706-VII, which pertains to the protection of the rights and freedoms of internally displaced persons, as well as strategic frameworks such as the "Strategy for the Integration of Internally Displaced Persons and Implementation of Medium-term Solutions to Internal Displacement until 2024" published in 2021. Additionally, previous analyses on the achievement of development goals in the context of internal displacement in Ukraine will also be consulted.

## 3.4. Primary Data Collection

REACH Field Officers (FOs), Field Team Leaders, and Enumerators will collect primary data under the guidance of the REACH Field Coordinator (FC) and the REACH Assessment Officers (AOs). Joint training sessions will be held for enumerators by FOs and AOs to ensure consistency, standardization, and effective operations. Whenever feasible, pilot testing will be conducted as part of the training process.

Most questions of the questionnaires will be asked to the respondent at the household level. However, respondents will be asked to provide individual answers for all members of the household for certain indicators (e.g., sex, age, employment status, access to education).

Sampling methods

**IDP households in Collective Sites:** The CCCM master list has been used to locate collective sites in the four settlements assessed. Since the number of IDP households in CSs is relatively low (see point below on sample sizes), the Field Team will aim to conduct interviews in all collective sites of the assessed settlements. In addition, household selection for the survey will be done conveniently, with enumerators interviewing willing households that meet the eligibility criteria (see eligibility criteria in the population of interest). Importantly, this convenient selection should not be done with insistence, to avoid biasing the selection process, already weakened by the nature of the convenient sampling. This limitation will be acknowledged in the methodology section of the final report.

/!\ Due to the longitudinal nature of the assessment, IDP respondents taking part in the survey must consent to be surveyed a second time for round 2 (i.e., two times in the span of 4-6 months). When approved, enumerators will conduct interviews and collect contact information for each surveyed household.

**Non-IDPs:** GPS points will be randomly allocated to all surveys in the four settlements. Enumerators will then survey the household located nearest to the assigned GPS point. Buffer GPS points will also be generated to account for the potential lack of responses from nearby households. Different households will be surveyed for each round, no need therefore to collect contact information.

Sample sizes

**IDP households in Collective Sites:** The CCCM master list has been used to evaluate the total population of IDPs living in collective sites in each settlement assessed. The total population has then been divided by 2.5 to determine the total number of households. The ratio of 2.5 individuals by household was determined by data from the MSNA R1 in which the average number of members per household was 2.457.  Based on these estimations, the number of HHs to be surveyed was determined by using an online sample size calculator. For instance, Vinnytsia is estimated to have 1,575 IDP HHs living in collective site. To meet high research standards (95% confidence level and 5% margin of error), 309 HHs should be surveyed.

To ensure consistency in surveying similar households across both rounds, it is recommended to include in addition <u>a buffer of +30% of households</u> in Round 1 as an "oversampling" strategy. This adjustment is necessary to meet the research standards for Round 2, considering the estimated attrition rate of 30%, i.e., households lost during the two rounds (e.g., those who refuse to participate or have changed their phone numbers). Using the same example, in Vinnytsia, 441 households should be interviewed in Round 1 to ensure the availability of the required 309 households for Round 2.

Taking into consideration these two elements (research standards of 95/5 + attrition rate), it is important to note that samples calculated represent an <u>important proportion of the total population surveyed</u> – up to 28% for instance in the case of Vinnytsia. It raises important questions about the practical feasibility of data collection. Indeed, it is unlikely that enumerators will be available to speak for instance to almost a third of IDP households in collective sites in Vinnytsia.

For this reason, it was decided to adopt a **flexible approach** regarding the sample sizes for IDP HHs in CSs, defining three sampling levels (see table below for a breakdown of the calculations):

- <u>Tentative sample</u> (GREEN): This represents the ideal sample size, providing a 95/5 confidence level for Round 1 and exceeding the buffer needed for a 95/7 confidence level for Round 2. However, it may be challenging to realistically achieve this sample size due to its significant proportion of households in collective sites (CSs).
- <u>Intermediary sample</u> (YELLOW): This sample size ensures the necessary buffer for a 95/7 confidence level in Round 2. It also represents a substantial portion of households in CSs, making it potentially difficult to attain.
- <u>Minimum sample</u> (BLUE): The minimum sample size required to achieve a 95/7 confidence level for Round 1. Maintaining the same respondents will make it impossible to reach a 95/7 confidence level for Round 2 unless the attrition rate is 0%.

During the data collection phase, the Field Team will prioritize reaching the tentative sample. However, if it proves to be unfeasible, the sampling objective will be adjusted to the intermediary or minimum sample, depending on the level of difficulty encountered on the ground.

*Table 1 – sample size calculation for IDP HHs in CSs*

| City | Population size (P) | HHs population size (P/2.5) | 95/5 | | | | 95/7 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sample size | % of HHs | R1 (+30%) | % of HHs | Sample size | % of HHs | R1 (+30%) | % of HHs |
| Uzhhorod + Mukachevo | 2967 | **1187** | 291 | 25% | 416 | 35% | 169 | 14% | 241 | 20% |
| Vinnytsia | 3938 | **1575** | 309 | 20% | 441 | 28% | 175 | 11% | 250 | 16% |
| Dnipro | 7491 | **2996** | 341 | 11% | 487 | 16% | 185 | 6% | 264 | 9% |

**Non-IDPs:** most up-to-date population data have been used to evaluate the total population of non-IDPs living in each settlement assessed. The <u>number of non-IDP households was then also calculated based on the 2.5 ratio derived from the MSNA.</u> Based on these estimations, the number of HHs to be surveyed was determined by using an online sample size calculator. For instance, Vinnytsia is estimated to have 148,239 HHs living in the settlement, to meet high research standards (95% confidence level and 5% margin of error), 384 HHs should be surveyed. As no buffer is needed for this population (they will only be interviewed once) and the total population is large, the sample size will be rounded to 400 HHs in each settlement. See sample size calculations below.

*Table 2 – sample size calculation for non-IDP HHs*

| City | Population size (P) | HHs population size (P/2.5) | 95/5 | | 95/7 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sample size | % of HHs | Sample size | % of HHs |
| Uzhhorod + Mukachevo | 121098 | 46264 | 382 | 0.8% | 196 | 0.4% |
| Vinnytsia | 370598 | 148239 | 384 | 0.3% | 196 | 0.1% |
| Dnipro | 845728 | 338291 | 384 | 0.1% | 196 | 0.1% |

### 3.5. Data Processing & Analysis

**Data processing:** data will be collected using the Kobo Platform. The surveyed responses of IDPs will be cleaned and analysed using R, according to the IMPACT SOPs for cleaning and analysis. A cleaned database and analysis/frequency table in MS Excel will be published for use by partners.

**Data analysis:** all indicators will be primarily analysed using frequency tables and correlation coefficients provided by the data team. Frequency tables will allow the establishment of trends and discrepancies between the three population groups and the four localities. Correlation coefficients will allow the establishment of covariance between variables. Data will be displayed in a user-friendly way to allow IMPACT HQ RDD and partners to access it freely.

**Progress measure towards DS:** the achievement of durable solutions by the population of interest and the control group will be assessed against 8 criteria (IASC) – long-term safety and security; adequate standard of living; access to livelihoods and employment; mechanisms to restore housing, land, property; access to documentation; family reunification; participation in public affairs; effective remedies and justice. Every DS criterion will be broken down in the questionnaire into a limited number of key indicators- For each of these indicators, targets will be set. These targets will either be determined by a pre-established benchmark (e.g., 100% rate of family reunification) or will be determined by results from the control group (e.g., the employment rate for non-IDPs).

# 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 the length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, and ensuring accurate reporting of information provided)? | Yes | |
| … Does not **expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| … Does not **expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result** of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| … Does not involve **collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising** for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)? | No | Sensitive questions will be posed regarding personal experiences of displacement, or the impact of the conflict.<br>- Enumerators will summarise the subjects that the questionnaire will cover before asking for consent.<br>- Respondents will be reminded at the beginning of the interview that their participation is voluntary, and that they can withdraw their consent at any time<br>- Data collection will be conducted by Ukrainian staff |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | who are able to effectively communicate with respondents about voluntary consent to participate, and who can recognise if respondents become uncomfortable. |
| … Does not involve **data collection with minors** i.e. anyone less than 18 years old? | Yes | |
| … Does not involve **data collection with other vulnerable groups** e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.? | No | Vulnerable groups will not be targeted for data collection, however, in the context of conflict and displacement, it is likely that some respondents will be victims of the conflict. In order to mitigate the risk of harm to these vulnerable respondents, the following measures will be taken: <br> - Enumerators will summarise the subjects that the questionnaire will cover before asking for consent. <br> - Respondents will be reminded at the beginning of the interview/ FGD that their participation is voluntary, and that they can withdraw their consent at any time <br> - Data collection will be conducted by Ukrainian staff who are able to effectively communicate with respondents about voluntary consent to participate, and who can recognise if respondents become uncomfortable. |
| … Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of **personally identifiable information**? | Yes | |
| …Does not involve **collecting personally identifiable information of participants** e.g. name, age, gender, contact details, clan affiliation | No | Respondents' phone numbers will be collected only from those respondents who agreed to participate in the consequent assessment in 4-6 months with their consent. Data is then downloaded from the Kobo form into one drive and stored under strict access (only DO and SAO have access to it). <br><br> All personally identifiable information (respondents' phone numbers) will be deleted directly after the second round. |

# 5. Roles and responsibilities

**Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities**

| Task Description | Responsible | Accountable | Consulted | Informed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Research design* | *Assessment Officers (AOs)* | *Research Manager (RM)* | *GIS Officer (GISO); Country Coordinator (CC); CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners; Impact HQ Research Design and Data Unit (RDD)* | *CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners; IDP Working group; OCHA.* |
| *Supervising data collection* | *REACH Field Officers* | *REACH Field Coordinator* | *AO; RM; GISO.* | *CC; CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners; OCHA regional offices.* |
| *Data processing (checking, cleaning)* | *Data officer; REACH Field Officers.* | *AO; GISO (for GIS data); RM.* | *CC; IMPACT HQ Research Design and Data unit.* | *CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners* |
| *Data analysis* | *AOs GSIO* | *RM* | *CC; IMPACT HQ Research Design and Data unit; CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners* | *CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners* |
| *Output production* | *AOs GSIO* | *RM* | *CC; IMPACT HQ Research Reporting Unit; CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners* | *CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners* |
| *Dissemination* | *AOs GSIO* | *RM CC* | *IMPACT HQ Research Reporting and Communication Units; CCCM Cluster Coordinators and Partners.* | *CCCM Cluster Coordinators and partners.* |
| *Monitoring & Evaluation* | *AOs GISO* | *RM¨ CC* | *IMPACT HQ Research department* | *Cluster Coordinators and partners* |

| | AO
RM | CC | All REACH staff involved;
CCCM Cluster partners involved | Cluster Coordinators and partners;
Impact HQ |
| *Lessons learned* | | | | |

**Responsible:** *the person(s) who executes 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*

# 6. Data Analysis Plan

Available upon request.

# 7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

| IMPACT Objective | External M&E Indicator | Internal M&E Indicator | Focal point | Tool | Will the 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 DSA products from Resource Centre | Country request to HQ | User_log | Yes |
| | | # of downloads of DSA products from Relief Web | Country request to HQ | | Yes |
| | | # of downloads of DSA products from IMPACT bitlinks | Country team | | Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on DSA products from the REACH Global newsletter | Country request to HQ | | Yes |
| | | # of visits to the CCCM DSA website | Country request to HQ | | Yes
Yes |
| **IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response** | Number of humanitarian organisations utilising IMPACT services/products | # references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies) | Country team | Reference _log | CCCM DSA Master List |
| | | # references in single agency documents | | | CCCM DSA Master List |
| **Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products** | Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision-making, aid planning and delivery
Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, | Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs
Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs
Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs
The perceived capacity of IMPACT staff
Perceived quality of outputs/programs
Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | Country team | Usage_Fe edback *and* Usage_Su rvey template | Usage survey to be conducted at the end of the research cycle related to all outputs, targeting at least 10 partners |

| | cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products | | | | 14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle** | Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organisations directly contributing to IMPACT programs *(providing resources, participating in presentations, etc.)* | # of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation<br><br># of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis<br><br># of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings; | Country team | Engagem ent_log | Number of areas covered by partners Number of partner staff conducting ToT |

## 8. Detailed Dissemination Plan

| Product | Message | Stakeholders | Means of dissemination | Purpose | Responsible | Timeframe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Level presentation | Key findings at the regional and national levels | National-level Inter-Sectors Coordination partners, CCCM FCUs, Government representatives | Presentation of findings | Inform the humanitarian community to influence the response | AOs | End of July 2023 |
| DSA Report – national level | Key DSA findings at the national level- Inter-sectoral analysis. | Humanitarian partners, CCCM cluster, government agencies, decision-makers | Publication on the REACH Resource Center Mailing list If possible, presentation in relevant coordination bodies (IMAWG, IDPWG) | Inform the humanitarian community to influence the response | AOs | End of July 2023 |
| DSA factsheets | Key DSA findings at regional level - Inter-sectoral analysis. | Humanitarian partners, CCCM cluster, government agencies, decision-makers | Publication on the REACH Resource Center Mailing list If possible, presentation in relevant coordination bodies (IMAWG, IDPWG) | Inform the humanitarian community to influence the response | AOs | End of July 2023 |