

Research Terms of Reference

Multi-Sector Needs Assessment – Yobe State [MSNA], [Nigeria]

[October 2017]

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

1. Summary

Country of intervention	Nigeria					
Type of Emergency		Natural disaster	x	Conflict		Emergency
Type of Crisis		Sudden onset		Slow onset	x	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency						
Project Code						
REACH Pillar	x	Planning in Emergencies	x	Displacement		Building Community Resilience
Research Timeframe						
General Objective	Inform multi-sector humanitarian programming for Nigerian Humanitarian Response					
Specific Objective(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a comprehensive evidence base of multi-sectorial needs among conflict-affected populations in Yobe state, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) residing within host community populations o Returnees o Non-Displaced Population - Provide robust evidence to support the Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plan for 2018. 					
Research Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the situation for specific population groups (IDPs, returnees and non-displaced) regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Levels of needs, access and vulnerabilities across Protection, Food Security, Health, Livelihoods, NFI, Shelter, WASH, and Education sectors? - What are the current conditions of WASH facilities in health centres and schools? 					
Research Type		Quantitative		Qualitative	x	Mixed methods
Geographic Coverage	8 Local Government Area Capitals in Yobe State					
Target Population(s)	Non-displaced households, returnee households and IDPs integrated with host community populations					
Data Sources	<p>Secondary Data: IOM DTM data on IDP figures and their location;</p> <p>Primary Data: To be collected during September 2017 – October 2017 through a mixed-methods approach, incorporating a quantitative household survey, Key Informant Interview (KII) and Direct Observation.</p>					
Expected Outputs	1 comprehensive report; 1 presentation and workshop on preliminary findings					

Key Resources		
Humanitarian milestones		
	Milestone	Timeframe
		Cluster plan/strategy
	x	Inter-cluster plan/strategy <i>Will inform 2018-2019 HPC – findings required by mid-October</i>
		Donor plan/strategy
		NGO plan/strategy
Audience		Other
	Audience type	Specific actors
	X	Operational National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), NGOs working in assessed areas
	X	Programmatic National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), OCHA, Sector Coordination, NGOs working in assessed areas
	X	Strategic National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), OCHA, Sector Coordination
		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		
Dissemination		

2. Background & Rationale

Despite the relocation of the coordination elements of the response to Maiduguri, and the refocusing of relief efforts on vulnerable populations, massive humanitarian needs in northeast Nigeria continue to grow as the conditions of civilians displaced by the violent eight year conflict deteriorate further during the annual rainy season. The conflict between armed opposition groups and Nigerian and regional security forces has resulted in 8.5 million people in urgent need of life-saving assistance in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe, the three most affected states in northeast Nigeria. More than 5.2 million people in northeast Nigeria remain food insecure, with 450,000 children suffering from severe acute malnutrition (SAM)¹. Continuing waves of displacement spurred by a dynamic landscape of ongoing conflict between armed opposition groups and security forces, coupled with both spontaneous and coerced returns from areas within Nigeria and neighbouring countries exacerbate the already complex landscape of needs.

The humanitarian response – from both the government and the international community – focuses on newly accessible areas of Borno State, host of the majority of displaced civilians (1.37 million) in Northeast Nigeria.² The response largely ignores the neighbouring, more stable states of Adamawa and Yobe. These states have largely stabilised and have seen considerable returns over the past nine months. In Adamawa, while nearly 140,000 remain displaced more than 666,000

¹ Lake Chad Snapshot 07 July 2017.

http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Lake%20Chad%20Snapshot_07%20July%202017.pdf

² IOM DTM Round XVIII, Aug 2017.

https://nigeria.iom.int/sites/default/files/dtm_reports/01%20DTM%20Nigeria%20Round%20XVIII%20Report%20August%202017.pdf

have returned to their pre-displacement locations; Yobe had experienced returns at a lesser scale (90,000) and has a slightly larger displaced population (196,000).³

The focus of the response on Borno has contributed to a continued lack of information in Adamawa and Yobe. While no current, comprehensive or reliable baseline assessment of the needs of IDPs, returnees and non-displaced Nigerians exists for any of these states, the focus of the response on Borno has resulted in more secondary data being available. This is largely due to a much higher concentration of actors who share information based on assessments and field visits. This has resulted in humanitarians being able to piece together enough secondary data to provide a useful, if incomplete, understanding. However, the lack of emphasis on Adamawa and Yobe means that response coordination entities, donors and the international community have virtually no understanding of humanitarian conditions and the needs of vulnerable populations – whether IDP, returnee or non-displaced - in these locations.

It is within this context, and in light of rapidly approaching HNO/HRP deadlines, that the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) approached REACH to conduct a Multi-sectorial Needs Assessment (MSNA) in Yobe State, which aims at providing a baseline understanding of needs of the IDP population, returnees and the non-displaced population in 8 LGA capitals. Findings from the assessment will feed into to the 2018 HNO/HRP process as well as inform current and future programmatic interventions across Yobe.

3. Research Objectives

General objective:

- Inform multi-sectoral humanitarian programming in Yobe state.

Specific objectives:

- Provide a comprehensive evidence base of multi-sectorial need among conflict-affected populations in Yobe state, including:
 - Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) residing within host community populations
 - Returnees
 - Non-Displaced Population
- Provide robust evidence to support the Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plan for 2018.

4. Research Questions

- What is the situation for specific population groups (IDPs, returnees and non-displaced) regarding:
 - Levels of needs, access and vulnerabilities across Protection, Food Security, Health, Livelihoods, NFI, Shelter, WASH, and Education sectors?
- What are the current conditions of WASH facilities in health centres and schools?

5. Methodology

5.1. Methodology overview

REACH will use mixed-methods data collection driven by a household-level tool quantitative and methodology developed through close coordination between OCHA, sector leads and the Global WASH Cluster Assessment Specialist to collect baseline, multi-sectorial data on the needs among IDPs residing in host community populations, returnees and non-displaced populations across 8 LGA capitals in Yobe state. In parallel, a combination of direct observation and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) will be used to assess the conditions of WASH facilities in schools and healthcare facilities. The quantitative household level assessment will produce representative results with a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. There is currently no accepted, reliable data set that provides accurate non-displaced population figures at

³ ibid

the LGA capital or ward level. As such, an infinite, equally distributed population will be assumed for at the LGA capital level, with samples equally distributed between wards within the capital; sampling for IDP populations residing in host community settings will be derived from IOM DTM round XVII;⁴ sampling for returnee households will be based on cumulative figures captured by IOM DTM at the LGA level. The IDP population sample will be proportionally stratified by location to ensure findings are representative of the IDP population residing in host community settings overall. A total sample of 1,800 households is anticipated (see below Tables 2 and 3).

The structured household questionnaire will be accompanied by a WASH assessment of school and health facilities. This will involve a Key Informant Interview (KII) with a school/health administrator as well as direct observation.

5.2. Population of interest

REACH will specifically target LGA capitals that are⁵:

1. Secure and accessible
2. Have large IDP populations
3. Have returnee populations
4. Have general vulnerabilities, as identified by OCHA and sector leads

Within each of the selected LGA capitals, REACH will conduct sampling at 95/10 within three populations groups:

1. Non-displaced persons (simple random)
2. Returnees⁶ (simple random)
3. IDPs (systematic random)

Table 1. Areas assessed/ not assessed

LGA	Non-displaced community and returnee areas assessed	IDP locations assessed	IDP locations not assessed
Fune	Fune (lga capital)	Damagum Town	Dogon Kuka/Gishiwari/Gununu
		Gaba Tasha/Aigada/Dumbulwa	Fune/Ngelzarma/Milbiyar/Lawan Ka
			JAJERE/BANELLEWA/BABBARE
			KOLLERE/KAJAJE
Geidam	Geidam (lga capital)	Asheikri	Balle/Gallaba/Meleri
		Hausari	Ma'anna/Dagambi
		Shame Kura / Dilawa	
Gujba	Gujba (lga capital)	Buniyadi North / South	Bunigari/Lawanti
		Gujba	Goniri
			MUTAI
			NGURBUWA
Gulani	Gulani (lga capital)	Bularafa	Bara
		Bumsa	Borno Kiji/Tetteba

⁴ IOM. "DTM Nigeria Round XVI Dataset of Site Assessments" and "DTM Nigeria Round XVI Dataset of Location Assessments", available at <https://nigeria.iom.int/dtm-june-2017>

⁵ Damaturu will be Omitted as it is the centre of the response and should have at least some information available.

⁶ REACH will define 'returnee' as "someone who has permanently returned to their habitual pre-displacement residence (or, pre-displacement home) after having been displaced as either an IDP or refugee"

		Gabai	Dokshi
			GULANI
			NJIBULWA
Jakusko	Jakusko (lga capital)	Gidgid / Bayam	Buduwa / Saminaka
		Jakusko	Dumbari
			JAWUR/KATAMMA
			ZABUDUM / DACHIA
Nguru	Nguru (lga capital)	Bulabulin	Bulanguwa
		Garbi/Bambori	Dumsai/Dogon-Kuka
		Hausari	Maja-Kura
		Kanuri	Mirba-Kabir/Mirba Sagir
		Nglaiwa	
Potiskum	Potiskum (lga capital)	Bare-Bare/Bauya/Lalai Dumbulwa	Danchuwa/Bula
		Bolewa 'A'	Dogo Nini
		Bolewa 'B'	Mamudo
		Dogo Tebo	
		Hausawa	
		Ngojin/Alaraba	
		Yerimaram/Garin Daye/Badejo/Nahu	
Yunusari	Yunusari (lga capital)	Ngirabo	Bultuwa/Mar/Yaro
			Dilala/Kalgi
			Mairari
			Mozogun/Kujari Wadi/Kafiya

5.3. Secondary data review

At present, relevant secondary data on multi-sectoral needs in NE Nigeria can be found at, but not limited to the following sources:

1. OCHA: Humanitarian Needs Overview, September 2017
http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/12092017_northeast_nigeria_humanitarian_overview.pdf

Sources of information that will be used to identify target population and sample size are:

1. IOM-DTM Round XV <https://nigeria.iom.int/dtm-march-2017>
2. UNOCHA Humanitarian Emergency Situation Reports
<http://reliefweb.int/report/nigeria/nigeria-northeast-humanitarian-overview-september-2017>

Further, Humanitarian Response and Relief Web will be monitored to for pertinent information uploaded by partners

1. <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/nigeria>
2. <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/nigeria/yobe-state-coordination>
3. <http://reliefweb.int/country/nga>

5.4. Primary Data Collection

Primary quantitative data collection will take place over an estimated 27 working days using a team of 18 enumerators, each led by a Field officer and 2 field assistants.

Quantitative (Household-level) Sampling

Sample sizes will be determined based on the most current, reliable information available at the start of the assessment in each LGA. REACH will conduct simple random sampling at the household level, aiming for a confidence level of 95% with a 10% margin of error. The assessment will take place only in LGA capitals due to security considerations. Due to the dynamic security landscape, we will only be able to fix the exact geographic area of the assessment within each LGA capital based on security conditions at the start of the assessment in each LGA.

REACH will conduct household sampling to produce a random, representative sample of three target groups – IDPs, returnees and non-displaced households, with the IDP population proportionally stratified by location to ensure that findings are representative of the IDP population overall.

REACH will use random sampling method to select IDP households. In the identified wards, REACH will base the sampling frame on the most current, reliable information on population figures provided by DTM figures and corresponding GPS location. Once arriving at a selected location, data collection teams will randomly select households for the group to be sampled. The target sample sizes for each ward will be confirmed based on latest DTM data including and up-to-date access information nearer the start of data collection. A systematic random sampling approach will be used, ensuring as equal as possible intervals between interviewed households.

REACH will use simple random sampling based on randomly generated points to select non-displaced and returnee households within each LGA capital assessed. There is currently no accepted, reliable data set that provides accurate population figures at the LGA capital or ward level for non-displaced populations. As such, an infinite, equally distributed, population will be assumed for non-displaced populations at the LGA capital level, with samples equally distributed between wards within the capital. Cumulative figures for returnees captured by IOM DTM are only provided at the LGA level. Therefore, a number of lat/long points will be generated within each ward for each of the two population groups (two different sets of points) equal to the required number of samples for that ward. Enumeration teams will navigate to each point and select the nearest household of the relevant population type for assessment. Should the selected household be non-responsive, enumerators will spin a pen and select the next household in the direction it indicates.

The expected sample size and population is as follow:

Table 2. Population and expected sample size by location

LGA	Population group	HHs	Individuals	Sample per group	Confidence/Error	Total sample
FUNE	Non-displaced community	*	*	107	95/10	182
	Returnee Community	-	-	-		
	IDP	332	2524	75		
GEIDAM	Non-displaced community	*	*	107		289
	Returnee Community	4512	28970	95		
	IDP	802	2514	87		
GUJBA	Non-displaced community	*	*	*		181
	Returnee Community	5416	35195	95		

	IDP	642	4173	86	
GULANI	Non-displaced community	*	*	*	129
	Returnee Community	2205	16537	93	
	IDP	55	358	36	
JAKUSKO	Non-displaced community	*	*	107	142
	Returnee Community	-	-	-	
	IDP	50	405	35	
NGURU	Non-displaced community	*	*	107	199
	Returnee Community	-	-	-	
	IDP	2000	11089	92	
POTISKUM	Non-displaced community	*	*	107	198
	Returnee Community	-	-	-	
	IDP	1594	11133	91	
YUNUSARI	Non-displaced community	*	*	107	243
	Returnee Community	1112	7116	89	
	IDP	86	568	47	
Total Sample					1565

Key Informant Interviews/Direct Observation - WASH in Schools and Health Facilities

A combination of direct observation and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) will be used to assess the conditions of WASH facilities in schools and healthcare facilities. Locations of health and school facilities will be provided by the health and education sector leads in Yobe State. In instances where GPS coordinates have not been provided, field teams will ask community leaders, bulamas, etc for the location of the facility. One KI interview will be captured at each facility. Where possible, teams will try to interview an administrator or someone in a managerial position at the facility.

Table 5: Number of Health and WASH facilities, per LGA⁷

LGA	Number Of Schools	Number Of Health Facilities ⁸
Fune	3	51
Geidam	6	28
Gujba	X	21
Gulani	X ⁹	34
Jakusko	6	49
Nguru	12	20
Potiskum	9	26
Yunusari	4	36

Table 4: Core indicators

Sector	IN #	Indicator / Variable	Data collection method
General	1.01	% of HHs by area of origin	HH interview
	1.02	% of individuals by age group and sex	HH interview

⁷ Figures provided are at LGA level. Teams are anticipating to assess less facilities as they assessment is restricted to the LGA capital level only.

⁸ Inclusive of dispensaries.

⁹ Number of schools in Gubja and Gulani were not provided by the Education sector

	1.03	Average size of HHs	HH interview
	1.04	% of female- and male-headed HHs	HH interview
	1.05	% of HHs with vulnerable persons	HH interview
	1.06	% of children who are unaccompanied or separated	HH interview
	1.07	% of women aged 12 to 59 who are pregnant or lactating	HH interview
	1.08	% of individuals with chronic illnesses	HH interview
	1.09	% of individuals with disabilities	HH interview
Livelihoods	2.01	% of HHs by source of income	HH interview
	2.02	% of HHs which have earned an income in the past 30 days	HH interview
	2.03	% of HHs which cultivated during 2017	HH interview
	2.04	% of HHs by reasons for not cultivating crops	HH interview
	2.05	% of HHs owning livestock	HH interview
	2.06	% of HHs by coping mechanisms (to ensure livelihoods)	HH interview
Food Security	3.01	% of HHs accessing food by source	HH interview
	3.02	% of HHs able to access local markets	HH interview
	3.03	Average Food Consumption Scores	HH interview
	3.04	% HHs by Food Consumption Score ("poor", "borderline" and "acceptable")	HH interview
Health	4.01	% of HHs by reported primary health care provider	HH interview
	4.02	% of HHs who have sought treatment and faced challenges in accessing health care	HH interview
	4.03	% of HHs by reported challenge in accessing healthcare	HH interview
	4.04	% of HHs by reported health issue affecting HHs members in the past two weeks	HH interview
	4.05	% of children under 5 years old who have been vaccinated for polio	HH interview
	4.06	% of children under 5 years old who have been vaccinated for measles	HH interview
Nutrition	5.01	% of HHs which accessed supplementary feeding programmes	HH interview
Education	6.01	% of HHs with school-aged children	HH interview
	6.02	% of children who are school-aged	HH interview
	6.03	% of school-aged children attending schools per gender, age group and type of education (formal and informal)	HH interview
	6.04	% of HHs whose children never attended school	HH interview
	6.05	% of HHs whose children dropped out of school	HH interview
	6.06	% of HHs by reported barriers to ensure school attendance of their children	HH interview
WASH	7.01	% of HHs using an Improved Water Source	HH interview
	7.02	% of HHs by main source of water	HH interview
	7.03	% of HHs accessing less than 15 litres of water per person per day	HH interview
	7.04	% of HHs by challenges to ensuring access to water	HH interview
	7.05	Coping mechanisms for lack of water	HH interview
	7.06	% of HHs for whom fetching water constitutes a problem and calculation of time	HH interview
	7.07	% of HHs having soap	HH interview
	7.08	% of HHs having received hygiene promotion in the last 30 days	HH interview
	7.09	% of HHs accessing/using a functioning latrine	HH interview
	7.10	% of HHs facing severe environmental hygiene problems (solid waste and wastewater)	HH interview
	7.11	% of HF with access to improved water sources	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.12	% of HF with at least one usable improved toilet	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.13	% of HF with toilets specifically designated for women and girls	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire

	7.14	% of HFs with toilets accessible to persons with disabilities	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.15	% of HFs with hand hygiene stations available	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.16	% of HFs with soap and water available	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.17	% of HFs which dispose of medical waste appropriately	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.18	% of HFs with	HF Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.19	% of schools with a secure fence around the perimeter	School Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.20	% of schools with water available	School Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.21	% of schools with single-sex toilets	School Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.22	% of schools with washing facilities	School Infrastructure Questionnaire
	7.23	% of schools with soap and water	School Infrastructure Questionnaire
Shelter	8.01	% of HHs by type of shelter	HH interview
	8.02	% of HHs by forms of shelter occupancy	HH interview
	8.03	% of HHs which share shelter with other families	HH interview
	8.04	% of HHs who rent their shelter and have a written rental contract	HH interview
	8.05	% of HHs facing eviction threats	HH interview
	8.06	% of HHs with shelter vulnerabilities (flooding and leaks)	HH interview
NFI	9.01	% of HHs by type of NFIs owned	HH interview
	9.02	Top three NFI priorities	HH interview
Protection	10.01	% of HHs by security incidents experienced	HH interview
	10.02	% of HHs by social cohesion issues experienced (inter/intra communal tensions)	HH interview
	10.03	% of HHs with a member who was married as a child	HH interview
	10.04	% of HHs with adult members lacking legal documentation	HH interview
	10.05	% of HHs with child members lacking legal documentation	HH interview

5.5. Data Analysis Plan

Report

Quantitative datasets will be triangulated with available secondary data sources with the express aim of answering the research questions of the assessment (see above). REACH will present preliminary assessment findings in a dedicated workshop in Yobe with OCHA focal points, sector leads and relevant partners to enable discussion around preliminary findings and contribution to the final analysis. REACH will consolidate quantitative findings, along with workshop outputs and recommendations into a final assessment report. Upon validation by OCHA focal points REACH will upload a final clean report, quantitative dataset, and analysis scripts to the REACH Resource Centre and OCHA's HDX web-portal, or on other appropriate platforms identified in consultation with the sector. It will also be disseminated via email through the OCHA focal points in Yobe and ISWG.

6. Product Typology

Table 1 : Type and number of products required

Type of Product	Number of Product(s)	Additional information
Report	1	Synthesises data from all LGAs assessed
Presentation	1	Likely given multiple times, but should not be need for

multiple products

Dataset

1

Personally identifying information will be removed

7. Management arrangements and work plan

Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram

- Country Focal Point
 - External Engagement
 - Develop research design, methodology and workplan
 - Review of tools and outputs
 - Coordinate assessment implementation plans
- Regional Coordinator:
 - Review of tools and outputs
- Assessment Officer (1x)
 - Oversee assessment implementation
 - Draft data collection tools and training materials
 - Lead output production
- GIS Officer (1x)
 - Design and draft factsheets
 - Provide maps for targeting assessment locations
 - Data analysis support
- Field Officer (1x)
 - Coordinates access to research locations
 - Identification of enumerators
 - Conduct training of field teams
 - Oversight of fieldwork
 - Communication point between field and assessment/ analysis teams
- Field Assistants (2x)
 - Support HH data collection and KIIs through community mobilisation, translation and facilitation
 - Conduct training of field teams
 - Management of field teams and oversight of fieldwork
 - Communication point between field and assessment/ analysis teams
- Enumerators x 18
 - Conduct data collection in the field
- Database Officer
 - Clean data

Table 7: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Define research scope	RC/ CFP	RC	ISWG + OCHA YOBE, REACH Global Team	OCHA + ISWG Borno
Design questionnaire	CFP	CFP	ISWG + OCHA YOBE, REACH Global Team	OCHA + ISWG Borno

<i>Define sampling frame</i>	CFP	CFP	ISWG + OCHA YOBE, REACH Global Team	OCHA + ISWG Borno
<i>Organise Data collection</i>	Senior Field Officer	AO	CFP, GIS-O, Logs	ACTED CD
<i>Data cleaning</i>	DB Officer	AO	Field Officers	CFP
<i>Factsheet production</i>	GIS Officer/AO	CFP	AO, FOs, ISWG + OCHA YOBE, REACH Global Team	OCHA + ISWG Borno, Donors
<i>Report production</i>	AO	CFP	GISO, FOs, ISWG + OCHA YOBE, REACH Global Team	Donors, OCHA + ISWG Borno

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

Funding from the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) will provide support for operations. This will cover Country-level assessment coordination, assessment staff, logistic/ security staff, technical equipment, field accommodation and vehicle rental. REACH will leverage existing assets and concurrent operations to provide other necessary staff and support equipment.

7.3. Work plan

Activity	August		Sept				Oct				November	
	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1		
Tool design												
Tool review												
Tool validation												
TOR/ Methodology design												
TOR/ Methodology review												
TOR/ Methodology validation												
Training												
Quantitative Assessment pilot												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 1												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 2												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 3												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 4												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 5												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 6												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 7												
Quantitative Assessment LGA 8												
Data aggregation and analysis												
Joint Analysis Workshop												
Factsheet production												
Factsheet dissemination												
Report drafting												
Report review												
Report dissemination												

8. Risks & Assumptions

Table 3 : List of risks and mitigating action

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>
Assessment locations become inaccessible due to security concerns, rendering primary data collection impossible.	Flexible work plan to allow movement of assessment alternative locations should security in target areas decline; if the security situation subsides data can be collected at a later point in the data collection period.
Randomly selected sample of households generate non-responses	Ensure overall sample contains a 10% buffer, with the aim to survey 10% more respondents than needed to reach the target sample size
Interviewees are unwilling to participate in the assessment	Survey questions will respect humanitarian protection guidelines and respondents will be approached in a courteous and respectful manner, while emphasising the importance of the information gathered. If households remain unwilling to participate, enumerators will be instructed to move on to other households

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

See table in annex 4.

10. Documentation Plan

- Terms of reference
- Indicator list
- Data analysis plan
- Data collection tools
- Raw dataset and cleaning log
- Clean datasets
- Presentation of findings
- Summary report synthesising all findings once the exercise has been completed

11. Annexes

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

Annex 1 : Data Management Plan

Administrative Data	
Project Name	MSNA – Yobe State
Project Code	35CYB
Donor	ECHO
Project partners	OCHA, Yobe Sector partners
Project Description	Wide-reaching representatively sampled assessment of multi-sectorials need among conflict-affected populations in Yobe state
Project Data Contacts	Tessa Richardson, REACH Country Focal Point Tessa.richardson@reach-initiative.org
DMP Version	Draft v1
Related Policies	None
Data Collection	
What data will you collect or create?	Secondary and primary (qual, quant)
How will the data be collected or created?	Quantitative data collected with ODK and stored on IMPACT's KoBo account; Data format- word document, excel and R/ STATA/ SPSS. These formats enable sharing and long-term access to data.
Documentation and Metadata	
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?	Value change log. Documents changes to the dataset in order to track all the amendments made to the data values. Data cleaning log. Documents data cleaning process i.e. checking for inconsistencies, running logical checks, renaming variables, dropping variables if need be, generating new variables, merging or appending datasets if need be.

Analysis log Documents the analyses commands, either auto-generated by R/STATA/ SPSS or in a do-file. The log will make it possible to replicate the analyses command for other projects too.

Data dictionary (for an actual dataset, this object highly connected with “Tool” sheet) – should contain information on data types and metadata for each variable. Usually represented in a structured format with the next fields:

- Variable ID
- Variable Name
- Section
- Data Type (e. g.):
 - Integer
 - Numeric
 - Logical (TRUE/FALSE)
 - Text
 - Date
 - Time
 - DateTime
- Semantic Data Type (e. g.):
 - Single Choice
 - Multiple Choice
 - Id
 - Geopoint
- Technical Data Type (e. g.):
 - Auto fill
 - Calculated
 - User Input
- Reference Field – in case we have related variables, for example one variable with concatenated multiple choices and set of binary responses for each choice, or variable that triggers another answer (like “yes” → reason or “Other” → Specify), this field should contain reference to the primary variable (id).

Codebook- A document that describes data content- values, type of variables, missing values.

Ethics and Legal Compliance

How will you manage any ethical issues?

Consent - All the respondents and FGD participants will be asked for their consent prior to the interviews.

Anonymization - all the personally identifiable information (PII) will be removed or anonymised from shared datasets

How will you manage copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues?

NA. IMPACT/ REACH will own the data and it will be made public

Storage and Backup

How will the data be stored and backed up during the research?

All digital data will be uploaded to KoBo and stored in Nigeria folder of South Sudan Dropbox on a daily basis and backed up weekly to NAS in Juba

How will you manage access and security?

Only senior team will have direct access to data; access by others team members will be closely controlled and on an a needed basis only

Selection and Preservation

Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved?

All digitized will be retained in password protected, limited access files on Dropbox; only anonymized data will be shared

What is the long-term preservation plan for

Archived in South Sudan Dropbox and NAS – to be transferred to NGA

the dataset?	Dropbox/ server once established
Data Sharing	
How will you share the data?	Data will be uploaded to REACH Resource Centre, shared via WASH Sector, given to any requesting
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	Personally identifying information must be removed from the data set prior to sharing
Responsibilities	
Who will be responsible for data management?	DB Officer

Administrative Data	
Project Name	IDP Intentions to Return, Relocate and Settle in Place
Project Code	35ixxx
Donor	GWC
Project partners	Nigeria WASH Sector
Project Description	Wide-reaching representatively sampled assessment of the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of IDPs, returnees and non-displaced populations in Borno State toward WASH
Project Data Contacts	Tessa Richardson, REACH Country Focal Point Tessa.richardson@reach-initiative.org
DMP Version	Draft v1
Related Policies	None

Data Collection	
What data will you collect or create?	Secondary and primary (qual, quant)
How will the data be collected or created?	Quantitative data collected with ODK and stored on IMPACT's KoBo account; Qualitative data collected through FGD Data format- word document, excel and R/ STATA/ SPSS. These formats enable sharing and long-term access to data.

Documentation and Metadata	
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?	<p>Value change log. Documents changes to the dataset in order to track all the amendments made to the data values.</p> <p>Data cleaning log. Documents data cleaning process i.e. checking for inconsistencies, running logical checks, renaming variables, dropping variables if need be, generating new variables, merging or appending datasets if need be.</p> <p>Analysis log Documents the analyses commands, either auto-generated by R/STATA/ SPSS or in a do-file. The log will make it possible to replicate the analyses command for other projects too.</p> <p>Data dictionary (for an actual dataset, this object highly connected with "Tool" sheet) – should contain information on data types and metadata for each variable. Usually represented in a structured format with the next fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable ID • Variable Name • Section • Data Type (e. g.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integer ○ Numeric ○ Logical (TRUE/FALSE)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Text ○ Date ○ Time ○ DateTime • Semantic Data Type (e. g.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Single Choice ○ Multiple Choice ○ Id ○ Geopoint • Technical Data Type (e. g.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Auto fill ○ Calculated ○ User Input • Reference Field – in case we have related variables, for example one variable with concatenated multiple choices and set of binary responses for each choice, or variable that triggers another answer (like “yes” → reason or “Other” → Specify), this field should contain reference to the primary variable (id).
	Codebook - A document that describes data content- values, type of variables, missing values.
Ethics and Legal Compliance	
How will you manage any ethical issues?	<p>Consent - All the respondents and FGD participants will be asked for their consent prior to the interviews.</p> <p>Anonymization - all the personally identifiable information (PII) will be removed or anonymised from shared datasets</p>
How will you manage copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues?	NA. IMPACT/ REACH will own the data and it will be made public
Storage and Backup	
How will the data be stored and backed up during the research?	<p>During data collection, all paper forms (FGDs) will be securely stored in locked premises. Once digitized, these will be destroyed.</p> <p>All digital data will be uploaded to KoBo and stored in Nigeria folder of South Sudan Dropbox on a daily basis and backed up weekly to NAS in Juba</p>
How will you manage access and security?	Only senior team will have direct access to data; access by others team members will be closely controlled and on an a needed basis only
Selection and Preservation	
Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved?	All digitized will be retained in password protected, limited access files on Dropbox; only anonymized data will be shared
What is the long-term preservation plan for the dataset?	Archived in South Sudan Dropbox and NAS – to be transferred to NGA Dropbox/ server once established
Data Sharing	
How will you share the data?	Data will be uploaded to REACH Resource Centre, shared via WASH Sector, given to any requesting
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	Personally identifying information must be removed from the data set prior to sharing
Responsibilities	

Who will be responsible for data management?	DB Officer
--	------------

Adapted from:

DCC. (2013). Checklist for a Data Management Plan. v.4.0. Edinburgh: Digital Curation Centre. Available online: <http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/data-management-plans>

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

Quantitative HH questionnaire can be found here:

<https://kobo.humanitarianresponse.info/#/forms/asMDJd77aNhKL8UEqfGaVi>

KI School and Health facilities can be found here:

<https://kobo.humanitarianresponse.info/#/forms/a4fTYGxrDTWTmwdUjtBYwF>

Annex 3 : Dissemination Matrix

Dissemination Channel	Comments
OCHA - Yobe	Sharing of products, presentation
ISWG	Sharing of products, presentation
Information Management Working	Sharing of anonymised data sets
Resource Centre	Upload all products to the resource centre

Annex 4 : M&E Matrix

Goal	External Indicator	M&E Internal M&E Indicator	Methodology	Focal point	Tool	Research-specific information (to be filled by country team for each research cycle/ToR)
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	User monitoring	Country request to HQ	User_log	Y
		# of downloads of x product from Relief Web		Country request to HQ		Y
		# of downloads of x product from Country level platforms		Country team		N
		# of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter		Country request to HQ		N
		# of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendinBlue, bit.ly		Country team		N
		# of visits to x webmap/x dashboard		Country request to HQ		N
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)	Reference monitoring	Country team	Reference_log	HNO/HRP for 2018; National WASH Cluster strategy for 2018
		# references in single agency documents				Partners Country Strategies
Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs	Usage M&E	Country team	Usage_Feedback and Usage_Survey template	Usage survey to be conducted at the end of the research cycle related to all outputs, targeting at least 20 partners
		Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs				
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs				
		Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff				
		Perceived quality of outputs/programs				
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs				
Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs throughout the research cycle	Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs (providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.)	# of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation	Engagement Monitoring	Country team	Engagement_log	Running log to be kept of all contributions, inputs and engagement
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis				
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;				