

Research Terms of Reference

IDP Intentions to Return, Relocate and Settle in Place

Borno State, Nigeria

6 September 2017

Version 1

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

1. Summary

Country of intervention	<i>Nigeria</i>					
Type of Emergency		Natural disaster	x	Conflict		Emergency
Type of Crisis		Sudden onset		Slow onset	x	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	TBD – Likely Protection Sector					
Project Code	35 iADN					
REACH Pillar	x	Planning Emergencies	in	Displacement		Building Community Resilience
Research Timeframe	June – August 2017					
General Objective	To provide a geographical distribution of internally displaced persons (IDPs) ¹ in Borno State and their possible future locations of residence, based on their intentions to return, relocate or settle in place, with corresponding estimated caseloads for each of those three groups					
Specific Objective(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify current geographical distribution of IDPs that intend to return, relocate or settle in place 2. Identify patterns previous displacement, including triggers and consequences 3. Identify potential timing, scale and geographical destinations of movements 4. Identify needs and risks/vulnerabilities that may influence movement intentions or be exacerbated by choices to return, relocate or settle in place 5. Identify relevant information IDPs have on other areas, which may influence their decision to move to other locations 					
Research Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. What are IDPs current locations, type of settlement camps, informal camps and host communities) and demographics (composition and size of household)? B. What are IDPs areas of origin, previous displacement patterns, triggers and consequences (e.g. family separation)? C. What are IDPs movement intentions (if any) and what reasons motivate them? D. What are the living conditions, vulnerabilities and coping mechanisms of IDPs in current location? E. What information do IDPs have on previous and future locations (including security and access to services) and how to they obtain it? 					

¹ IDP are "persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border" (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.I, February 11. New York: United Nations). This assessment, whose purpose is to map IDPP intentions to move from their current location (at village level), will focus on IDPs who have left their **village of origin**.

	F. Based on desire to return, relocate or settle in their places of displacement, what support will IDPs need in to find adequate shelter, access critical services and resume their productive lives and livelihoods?			
Research Type	Quantitative		Qualitative	X Mixed methods
Geographic Coverage	12 Local Government Areas in Borno State (capitals plus other accessible areas where applicable)			
Target Population(s)	IDPs living in formal camps, informal camps and integrated with host community populations			
Data Sources	<p>Secondary Data: Existing intentions assessments conducted by IOM and UNHCR</p> <p>Primary Data: To be collected from June 2017 on through a mixed-methods approach, including quantitative household surveys as well as focus group discussions with IDP communities</p>			
Expected Outputs	1 factsheet per Local Government Area assessment, 1 comprehensive report, 1 intention map per population; 1 presentation of findings			
Key Resources				
Humanitarian milestones	Milestone	Timeframe		
		Cluster plan/strategy		
		Inter-cluster plan/strategy		
		Donor plan/strategy		
	X	NGO plan/strategy		
	Other			
Audience	Audience type		Specific actors	
	X	Operational	National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), OCHA, UNDP, Sector Coordination, NGOs working in camps	
	X	Programmatic	National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), OCHA, UNDP, Sector Coordination, NGOs working in camps	
		Strategic		
		Other		
Access	X	Public (available on REACH research centre and other humanitarian platforms)		
		Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)		
		Other		
Visibility	ECHO, Protection Sector, REACH, DRC, NRC			
Dissemination	All outputs will be disseminated though REACH Nigeria mailing list, Protection Sector and Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG)			

2. Background & Rationale

Since May 2013, the Boko Haram insurgency in Northern Nigeria has destroyed infrastructure, provoked dramatic livelihoods erosion and triggered the displacement of over 2 million people, out of which 1.4 million people are in Borno State. The humanitarian situation of IDPs in Borno State is critical. Following years of conflict, the majority of the State's rural areas are empty. The population has fled to the relative safety of Maiduguri or capitals of Local Government Areas (LGAs). In IDP

camps in Maiduguri and especially in the enclaved LGA capitals the entire population is extremely vulnerable and in need of basic humanitarian support. While some areas have recently experienced returns in proximity of main roads (for example Benisheikh in Kaga LGA), the population from many LGAs is likely to remain displaced for the medium term, lacking security, shelter and livelihoods in their villages of origin. When returns are made possible, it will be essential to accompany returning populations in order to enable them to rebuild their livelihoods and remain in their villages, which are in most cases completely destroyed while anticipating potential sources of conflict with local populations.

In response to the crisis in North-Eastern Nigeria, humanitarian assistance has been recently scaling up. The recent increase in access to LGA capitals (largely enabled by UNHAS helicopters) has resulted in outreach by humanitarian partners beyond Maiduguri, with a number of NGOs establishing themselves in newly “liberated” LGA capitals such as Biu and Monguno. However, the existing humanitarian capacity is by far insufficient to respond to the scale of the crisis. Even within Maiduguri internally displaced populations are not receiving regular food aid, leading to intolerable Severe Acute Malnutrition (20% and more) and mortality rates. IDP camps and camp-like settlements are disorganized, flood-prone and unsanitary, with extreme humanitarian indicators across all sectors (e.g. in Muna Garage El Badawa camp/settlement, there is only one latrine per 642 IDPs or in GGS there is only one functional shower per 1,118 IDPs). Beyond Maiduguri, Monguno and Biu, the situation is even worse with aid actors so far not able to establish any presence and humanitarian response hardly taking place and highly insufficient. As new LGAs are made accessible thanks to UNHAS flights, humanitarian actors are not able to provide support to them as they are already overstretched in the areas where they are working.

Additionally, there is a clear lack of information and information coordination in North East Nigeria to support the planning and delivery of humanitarian assistance. Despite the current efforts conducted by IOM on DTM, OCHA as well as sectors, operational actors in Borno often lack specific evidence based and localized information to support their planning and anticipate populations’ movements and needs.

With a highly dynamic and difficult to access context, Nigeria remains a crisis with limited amount of evidence available to humanitarian partners for aid planning and delivery. In such context, it is key to ensure that the humanitarian community continues to have regular access to data on humanitarian needs and context in Nigeria. Specifically, in Borno State, there is a there is a lack of information on IDP intentions to return, relocate or settle in their areas of displacement. In light of the ‘liberation’ of many formerly insurgent-occupied areas by the Nigerian military and resulting potential for movement (both voluntary and forced) of IDPs back into these areas, there is a clear need to understand if and where IDPs intend to move, what information they have about these areas and how they get it, and what support they may or may not need upon their return. This evidence will inform more effective targeting of limited humanitarian resources.

3. Research Objectives

REACH seeks to provide a geographical distribution of IDPs in Borno State and their possible future locations of residence, based on their intentions to return, relocate or settle in place, with corresponding estimated caseloads for each of those three groups. In order to achieve this, REACH will:

1. Identify current geographical distribution of IDPs that intend to return, relocate or settle in place
2. Identify patterns previous displacement, including triggers and consequences
3. Identify potential timing and geographical destinations of movements
4. Identify needs and risks/vulnerabilities that may influence movement intentions
5. Identify relevant information IDPs have on other areas, which may influence their decision to move to other locations
6. Estimate corresponding caseload

4. Research Questions

- A. What are IDPs current locations, type of settlement camps, informal camps and host communities) and demographics (composition and size of household)?
- B. What are IDPs areas of origin, previous displacement patterns, triggers and consequences (e.g. family separation)?
- C. What are IDPs movement intentions (if any) and what reasons motivate them?
- D. What are the living conditions, vulnerabilities and coping mechanisms of IDPs in current location?
- E. What information do IDPs have on previous and future locations (including security and access to services) and how to they obtain it?

5. Methodology

5.1. Methodology overview

REACH will use a mixed-methods approach, beginning with a household level assessment of IDPs, disaggregated by primary housing location types (formal camp, informal camp, outside camps amongst host communities) across 12 LGAs. IDP households in all three population groups will be randomly sampled. While IDP households living in formal and informal camps will be sampled through a random selection of numbers attributed to each house, IDPs in host communities will be sampled according to randomly-generated GPS points (which will lead to the interviewing of the nearest IDP household).

The initial sample sizes were calculated based on data derived from IOM DTM round XVI². Some sample sizes were updated in cases where REACH Team on the ground encountered clearly different sizes of IDP populations, the sample size was recalculated based on information obtained on the ground from IOM officer, camp managers and/or community leaders. In some cases, some locations listed as formal camps were found to be informal camps, which also affected sample size calculations. The assessment was finally carried out with a total sample of 3455 households, representing 89512 households (see Table 3) and 508810 IDPs (see Table 1) across twelve LGAs.

The structured household level data collection will be followed by semi-structured qualitative data collection through FGDs, to contextualise household level data and explore topics in further detail.

5.2. Population of interest

REACH will specifically target LGA capitals that:

1. have a large number of IDPs;
2. have not recently been the subject of a large-scale intentions assessment;
3. hold large numbers of IDPs from currently inaccessible areas.

The above targeting omits the two LGAs, Maiduguri and Jere, that have by far the largest IDP Populations (445,314 and 335,765, respectively), as well as Konduga (95,792) as they have been recently assessed by UNHCR³. However, the proximity of these areas and their populations to the epicentre of the humanitarian response in Borno means their needs and intentions are inherently better understood than those in more distant LGAs. It will prove more useful to both the response and the displaced themselves to focus assessment efforts on areas that receive less attention than those immediately adjacent to Maiduguri M.C.

Table 1. Total number of IDPs in targeted LGAs, and number of IDPs covered by the assessment

LGA	Kaga	Ngala	Nganzai	Bama	Monguno	Gwoza	Dikwa	Damboa	Hawul	Biu	Kala/Balge	Mafa	Total
Total IDP population	18811	86983	19648	46023	122809	62555	97964	48346	27813	43703	43734	6772	625161
IDP population surveyed	15389	86333	13772	14585	122809	38034	97964	30088	16118	30721	43734	6772	516319

Table 2. Areas covered and not covered

LGA	Areas Surveyed	Areas Not Surveyed
Kaga	Benisheikh	Mainok Ngamdu

² 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-may-2017>.

³ See UNHCR "Nigerian: Return Intentions Survey – Borno", April 2017. https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/ris_borno_apr_2017.pdf

Ngala	Ngala Ward	N/A
	Old Gamboru 'A'	
	Gamboru 'B'	
	Gamboru 'C'	
Nganzai	Gajiram	Jigalta
Bama	Kasugula	Kumshe/Nduguno
Monguno	Monguno	N/A
Gwoza	Gwoza	Hambagda/Liman Kara/New Settle
		Pulka/Bokko
Dikwa	Dikwa	N/A
Damboa	Damboa	Abori
Hawul	Bilingwi	Dzar/Vinadum/Birni/Dlandi
	Kida	Gwanzang Pusda
	Pama/Whitambaya	Kwajaffa/Hang
	Hizhi (Azare)	Marama/Kidang
	Shaffa	Sakwa/Hema
Biu	Kenken	Buratai
		Dadin Kowa
	Dugja (Dugja and Tabra)	Dugja (Nzukuku, Dashawa and Tum)
		Garubula
	Sulumthla	Mandara Girau
		Miringa
Zarawuyaku	Yawi	
Kala/Balge	Rann	N/A
Mafa	Mafa	N/A

In the list above (Table 2), the areas not surveyed were excluded from the assessment because they were outside the LGA Capital or otherwise too far to be covered. In addition, even in some areas listed as covered, some sites had to be excluded. That was the case for the host community Zamuya, in Gamboru 'B' (Ngala LGA), where community members did not allow REACH team to conduct interviews. It was also the case of informal camps "Gasarwa Pri School" and "Behind Secretariat", in Gajiram (Nganzai LGA), and in host community PAMA Whitambaya, in Hawul LGA, which were inaccessible by car.⁴

Within each of the selected LGAs, REACH will conduct sampling at 90/7 within three populations groups:

1. IDPs residing in **formal camps** (representative)
2. IDPs residing in **informal camps** (representative)
3. IDPs living outside camps, amongst host communities

However, not all population groups are present in every LGA (as illustrated in table below). In such cases, only the groups that exist will be targeted.

Table 3. Number of IDPs and households in covered areas

LGA	Population group	IDPs in covered areas	Households in covered areas	LGA	Population group	IDPs in covered areas	Households in covered areas
Kaga	Formal camp	1948	370	Dikwa	Formal camp	0	0
	Informal camp	10881	2176		Informal camp	80295	14216
	Host communities	2560	512		Host communities	17669	3552
	Total	15389	3058		Total	97964	17768
Ngala	Formal camp	0	0	Damboa	Formal camp	7509	1158
	Informal camp	81288	14325		Informal camp	15070	3042
	Host communities	5045	845		Host communities	0	0
	Total	86333	15170		Total	22579	4200
Nganzai	Formal camp	0	0	Hawul	Formal camp	0	0

⁴ The first informal camp was in the bush and not safe to access; the second camp was not possible to locate.

	Informal camp	9222	1787		Informal camp	0	0
	Host communities	4550	827		Host communities	16118	2147
	Total	13772	2614		Total	16118	2147
Bama	Formal camp	14585	4847	Biu	Formal camp	0	0
	Informal camp	0	0		Informal camp	3937	621
	Host communities	0	0		Host communities	26784	3679
	Total	14585	4847		Total	30721	4300
Monguno	Formal camp	101222	16551	Kala/Balge	Formal camp	43734	6644
	Informal camp	10209	1791		Informal camp	0	0
	Host communities	11378	2187		Host communities	0	0
	Total	122809	20529		Total	43734	6644
Gwoza	Formal camp	0	0	Mafa	Formal camp	0	0
	Informal camp	5487 ⁵	1072		Informal camp	6093	1419
	Host communities	32547	5424		Host communities	679	320
	Total	0	6496		Total	6772	1739

5.3. Secondary data review

At present, relevant secondary data on IDP return, relocation and settlement intentions in Nigeria is limited to the following sources:

1. UNHCR “Nigerian: Return Intentions Survey – Borno”, April 2017. https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/ris_borno_apr_2017.pdf
2. IOM “Return Intentions Survey: Maiduguri, Nigeria”, October 2016. <https://nigeria.iom.int/sites/default/files/dtm/IOM%20Nigeria%20Return%20Intention%20Survey%202016%20Final.pdf>

Other 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/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/15042017_ocha_nga_ne_sitrep_no_09_1_15_apr_2017_0.pdf

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. <http://reliefweb.int/country/nga>

5.4. Primary Data Collection

Primary quantitative data collection will take place over an estimated 30 working days using 5 teams of 6 enumerators, each lead by a permanent staff member, working in as many as 3 separate LGA capitals at any given moment. FGD's will be collected by Senior Field officers and/ or international staff members concurrent with quantitative data collection.

Quantitative (Household-level) Sampling

Sample sizes will be determined based on most current, reliable information available at the start of the assessment in each LGA. Representative sampling will be conducted at the household level, aiming for a confidence level of 90% with a 7%

⁵ The number of IDPs in informal camps in Gwoza is based on IOM DTM data, as explained above. However, the number of households in informal camps in that LGA was update by REACH team on the ground, from 667 households (in the DTM) to 844; nonetheless, the team was not able to obtain updated figures for the number of IDPs.

margin of error. The assessment will take place only in LGA capitals and/or secure areas immediately accessible by vehicle from these areas. Due to the dynamic security landscape, the exact geographic area of the assessment will be fixed based on security conditions at the start of the assessment in each LGA.

Household sampling will be conducted dividing the IDP population into three population groups, and a representative sample of 90/7 (plus a buffer of approximately 10%) will be produced for each of the following groups using 2 stages random sampling: IDPs in formal camps, IDPs in informal camps, IDPs living outside camps (i.e., amongst host community populations).

REACH will use random sampling method to select households. In the identified camps REACH will base the sampling frame on the most current, reliable information on population figures. When population figures are missing REACH will identify the number of IDP households integrated into the host community per ward in each LGA by triangulating responses from key interlocutors such as NEMA/ SEMA, UN Agencies, operational partners and community leaders (Bulamas). The expected sample size and population is as follow:

Table 4. Sample size per location

LGA	Population group	IDPs in covered areas	Households in covered areas	Confidence/Error	Sample size (households interviewed)	Total sample
Kaga	Formal camp	1948	370	90/7	146	425
	Informal camp	10881	2176	90/7	157	
	Host communities	2560	512	90/7	122	
Ngala	Informal camp	81288	14325	90/7	134	274
	Host communities	5045	845	90/7	140	
Nganzai	Informal camp	9222	1787	90/7	136	288
	Host communities	4550	827	90/7	152	
Bama	Formal camp	14585	4847	90/7	190	190
Monguno	Formal camp	101222	16551	90/7	204	486
	Informal camp	10209	1791	90/7	138	
	Host communities	11378	2187	90/7	144	
Gwoza	Informal camp	5487 ⁶	1072	90/7	152	303
	Host communities	32547	5424	90/7	151	
Dikwa	Informal camp	80295	14216	90/7	154	308
	Host communities	17669	3552	90/7	154	
Dambo	Formal camp	7509	1158	90/7	137	294
	Informal camp	15070	3042	90/7	157	
Hawul	Host communities	16118	2147	90/7	148	148

⁶ See *supra* note 5.

Biu	Informal camp	3937	621	90/7	135	298
	Host communities	26784	3679	90/7	163	
Kala/Balge	Formal camp	43734	6644	90/7	144	144
Mafa	Informal camp	6093	1419	90/7	174	297
	Host communities	679	320	90/7	123	
Total						3455

In the course of the assessment, anecdotal evidence indicated the presence of refugees amongst IDPs in certain locations, notably in LGAs bordering other countries. While refugees were systematically excluded from the assessment, the calculation of sample sizes relied on the total number of households in each location, which may have included refugee households.

Qualitative Sampling

1. FGDs will be conducted for each the three population groups in each LGA assessment area
2. FGDs will be gender disaggregated within each population group
3. Participants will be gathered based on their availability at the time of assessment
4. REACH will conduct a total of 46 FGDs, distributed amongst LGA according to research needs revealed during quantitative data collection

5.5. Data Analysis Plan

Factsheets

Clean quantitative data will be rapidly analysed using Excel and SPSS following the completion of each LGA-level household assessment, and presented in as a draft factsheet for Protection Sector partner review and validation. This product will contain summary statistics and analysis, disaggregated by population group (IDPs in formal camps, informal camps, and within host communities) where relevant, and maps identifying pre-displacement location and areas of preferred return or relocation. No further multivariate analysis or qualitative data will be presented. Following validation, the factsheets will be uploaded to the REACH Resource Centre and disseminated via email through the Protection Sector and ISWG.

Report

Part of the report will build on the quantitative data analysed for the factsheets, as described above. In addition, following the completion of qualitative FGD components, qualitative data will be compiled and analysed using Excel. Both quantitative and qualitative datasets will be triangulated with 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 Maiduguri with aid actors that have been involved in the assessment process to enable discussion around preliminary findings and contribution to the final analysis. REACH will consolidate workshop outputs and recommendations into a final assessment report. Upon validation by the Protection Sector, 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.

Table 5: Core indicators

Indicator category	IN #	Indicator / Variable	Data collection method
Disaggregation	A.1	IDP household current place of residence	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.2	Type of settlement (formal camp, informal camp, host community)	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.3	Gender of head of household	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.4	Age of head of household	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.5	Gender of respondent	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.6	Age of respondent	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.7	Marital status of head of household	Household Survey
Disaggregation	A.8	Size of household	Household Survey

Disaggregation	A.9	Ethnicity of head of household	Household Survey
Initial displacement	B.1.1	Pre-displacement place of residence	Household Survey
Initial displacement	B.1.2	Time of initial displacement	Household Survey
Initial displacement	B.1.3	Triggers of initial displacement	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.1	Occurrence of intermediate displacement	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.2	Number of locations of intermediate displacement (up to three)	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.3	Intermediate displacement location	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.4	Type of settlement (intermediate displacement)	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.5	Time of arrival at intermediate displacement location	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.6	Time of departure from intermediate displacement location	Household Survey
Intermediate displacement	B.2.7	Triggers for leaving intermediate displacement location	Household Survey
Current location	B.3.1	Time of arrival at current location	Household Survey
Current location	B.3.2	Means of arrival at current location	Household Survey
Current location	B.3.3	Pull factors (in relation to current location)	Household Survey
Current location	B.3.4	Reasons for staying in current location	Household Survey
Family sep. before displ.	B.4.1	Family separation BEFORE arriving at current location	Household Survey
Family sep. before displ.	B.4.2	Reason for separation (BEFORE)	Household Survey
Family sep. before displ.	B.4.3	Whereabouts of family members separated (BEFORE)	Household Survey
Family sep. before displ.	B.4.4	Contact with separated family members (BEFORE)	Household Survey
Family sep. after displ.	B.5.1	Family separation AFTER arriving at current location	Household Survey
Family sep. after displ.	B.5.2	Whereabouts of family members separated (AFTER)	Household Survey
Family sep. after displ.	B.5.3	Primary reason for separation (AFTER)	Household Survey
Family sep. after displ.	B.5.4	Contact with separated family members (AFTER)	Household Survey
Impact of family separation	B.6.1	Impact of family separation on vulnerabilities (if any)	Focus group discussion
Impact of family separation	B.6.2	Family reunification as motivation for return/relocation	Focus group discussion
Family sep. after displ.	B.6.3	Reasons for not joining separated family members (AFTER)	Focus group discussion
Intermittent displacement	B.7.1	Occurrence of intermittent displacement (left and returned to current location)	Household Survey
Intermittent displacement	B.7.2	Location of intermittent displacement	Household Survey
Intermittent displacement	B.7.3	Primary reason for intermittent displacement	Household Survey
Intermittent displacement	B.7.4	Primary reason for return from intermittent displacement location	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.1	Intentions to leave current location	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.2	Date planned to leave current location	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.3	Nature of future displacement (temporary or permanent)	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.4	Reasons for temporary displacement	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.5	Push factors (in relation to current location)	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.6	Potential future locations	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.7	Pull factors (in relation to potential future location)	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.8	Deterrent factors (i.e., which may prevent movement to potential future location)	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.9.1	Safety of movement (to leave current location)	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.9.2	Reasons for safety of movement (or lack thereof)	Focus group discussion
Movement intentions	C.10	Decision making	Household Survey
Movement intentions	C.11	Preference for return or relocation	Focus group discussion
Movement intentions	C.12	Reasons for preferring to return or relocate	Focus group discussion
Movement intentions	C.13	Challenges upon return/relocation	Focus group discussion
Movement intentions	C.14	Support upon return/relocation	Focus group discussion
Movement intentions	C.15	Anticipated needs upon return/relocation	Focus group discussion
Local integration	D.1.1	Conditions in current location (compared to pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Local integration	D.1.2	Reasons for living conditions being better/same/worse	Focus group discussion
Key concerns	D.2	Key concerns regarding living conditions	Household Survey
Security	D.3.1	Security: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Security	D.3.2	Security: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Security	D.3.3	Security: reasons for specific vulnerabilities	Focus group discussion
Security	D.3.4	Security: challenges faced	Focus group discussion
Health	D.4.1	Health: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Health	D.4.2	Health: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Education	D.5.1	Education: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Education	D.5.2	Education: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Food	D.6.1	Food: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Food	D.6.2	Food: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Water	D.7.1	Water: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Water	D.7.2	Water: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.1	Shelter: Land for shelter	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.2	Shelter: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.3	Shelter: Relationship with landlord	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.4	Shelter: proof of rent/ownership	Household Survey

Shelter	D.8.5	Shelter: form of payment (rent)	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.6	Shelter: amount of payment (cash)	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.7	Shelter: form of in-kind payment	Household Survey
Shelter	D.8.8	Shelter: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Land	D.9.1	Access to land (for cultivating/grazing): Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Land	D.9.2	Access to land: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Cash	D.10.1	Access to cash: Coping mechanisms	Household Survey
Cash	D.10.2	Cash: specific vulnerable groups (if any)	Household Survey
Language	E.1	Language(s) spoken	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.1	Last time received information on pre-displacement location	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.2	Frequency of information on pre-displacement location	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.3	Source of information (for pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.4	Level of trust in information received (on pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.5	Language of information (for pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.6	Preferred source of information (on pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.7	Priority topics of information (for pre-displacement location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.8	Perception of conditions in pre-displacement location (compared to current location)	Household Survey
Info on village of origin	E.2.9	Level of access to information on your preferred location of return	Focus group discussion
Info on future location	E.3.1	Last time received information on preferred future location	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.2	Frequency of information on preferred future location	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.3	Source of information (for preferred future location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.4	Level of trust in information received (on preferred future location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.5	Language of information (for preferred future location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.6	Preferred source of information (on preferred future location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.7	Priority topics of information (for preferred future location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.8	Conditions in preferred future location (compared to current location)	Household Survey
Info on future location	E.3.9	Level of access to information on your preferred location of relocation	Focus group discussion
Livelihoods	F.1	Livelihood before displacement	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.2.1	Casual Labourer, Skilled, Professional, Government, Services: Employment opportunities in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.2.2	Casual Labourer, Skilled, Professional, Government, Services: Ability to resume job in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.3.1	Trading business: Lost of stock after displacement	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.3.2	Trading business: Ability to resume trading activity in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.4.1	Crop cultivation: access to land to cultivate in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.4.2	Crop cultivation: access to agricultural inputs in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.5.1	Livestock: whereabouts of livestock	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.5.2	Livestock: ability to retrieve livestock in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.6.1	Fishing: whereabouts of fishing tools	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.6.2	Fishing: ability to resume fishing activity in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Livelihoods	F.7	Student: ability to resume studies in current/return/future location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.1	Shelter arrangement in pre-displacement location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.2	Proof of ownership of shelter in return location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.3	Ability to reclaim shelter in return location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.4	Shelter conditions in pre-displacement location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.5	Ability to re-inhabit shelter in return location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.6	Is shelter in pre-displacement location being squatted?	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.7	Ability to expel squatters	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.1.8	Reasons for inability to re-inhabit shelter in return location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.2.1	Access to shelter in preferred future location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.2.2	Shelter arrangement in preferred future location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.2.3	Planned arrangement to access shelter in preferred future location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.2.4	Proof of ownership of shelter in preferred future location	Household Survey
Land tenure	G.2.5	Ability to (re-)inhabit shelter in preferred future location	Household Survey

A detailed data analysis plan for the report will be finalised based on the indicators above following their approval or amendment by Protection Sector partners. This TOR will be amended to reflect that agreement.

6. Product Typology

Table 6: Type and number of products required

Type of Product	Number of Product(s)	Additional information
<i>Report</i>	1	Synthesises from all LGAs assessed
<i>Factsheet</i>	12	One per LGA
<i>Presentation</i>	1	Likely given multiple times, but should not be need for multiple products
<i>Map</i>	3	Intention map per population group

7. Accountability to affected populations

IDP communities have given time to contribute to the assessments, answering to questionnaires and participating in focus groups discussions. Likewise, REACH will take the time to share the results of the assessments back with them when and if possible.

Resources are not currently available to provide feedback to participating communities. However, subsequent assessments in forthcoming research cycles will be conducted in the same areas. When REACH returns to assessed areas, providing the political climate allows, they will share the key findings with communities and obtain their feedback, which will potentially be used to inform further assessments or provide updates to previous products.

8. Management arrangements and work plan

8.1. Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram

- Regional Coordinator:
 - External engagement
 - Review of tools, methodology, plans and outputs
- Assessment Officer (2x)
 - Coordinate and oversee data collection processes
 - Develop research design, methodology, work plans, assessment implementation plans
 - Create data collection tools and training materials
 - Lead output production
- GIS Officer (2x)
 - Design and draft factsheets
 - Proved maps for targeting assessment locations
 - Data analysis support
- Senior Field Officer
 - 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 Officer (2x)
 - Support FGDs 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

- Junior Field Officer (3x)
 - Management of field teams
 - Communication point between field and assessment/ analysis teams
- Enumerators x 30
 - Conduct data collection in the field

Table 7: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Define research scope	RC	RC	Protection Sector, DRC, NRC, REACH Global Team	Donors, ISWG
Design questionnaire	RC	RC	Protection Sector, DRC, NRC, REACH Global Team	Donors, ISWG
Define sampling frame	RC	RC	Protection Sector, DRC, NRC, REACH Global Team	Donors, ISWG
Organise Data collection	Senior Field Officer	AO	RC, GIS-O, Logs	ACTED CD
Data cleaning	GIS Officer	AO	Field Officers	RC
Factsheet production	GIS Officer	RC	AO, FOs, REACH Global Team, Protection Sector, DRC, NRC	Donors, ISWG
Report production	AO	RC	GISO, FOs, REACH Global Team, Protection Sector, DRC, NRC	Donors, ISWG

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

8.2. Resources: HR, Logistic and Financial

DRC and NRC, who are in an SDC funded consortium, have funding for a similar assessment but no capacity to manage the data collection. REACH will leverage their funding to support the hiring of enumerators, purchase of 16 additional smart phones, and vehicle, driver and accommodation hire (as needed), whilst REACH funding supports REACH coordination, assessment, GIS and field staff.

8.3. Work plan

Activity	Jun				Jul				Aug				Sept			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Tool design	█	█	█													
Tool review		█	█	█												
Tool validation				█												
TOR/ Methodology design	█															
TOR/ Methodology review		█	█	█												
TOR/ Methodology validation				█												
Training				█												
Assessment pilot					█											
Assessment LGA 1					█											
Assessment LGA 2						█										
Assessment LGA 3						█	█									
Assessment LGA 4						█	█	█								
Assessment LGA 5							█	█								
Assessment LGA 6								█	█							
Assessment LGA 7									█							
Assessment LGA 8										█						
Assessment LGA 9										█						
Assessment LGA 10											█					
Assessment LGA 11												█				
Assessment LGA 12													█			
Factsheet production													█	█		
Factsheet dissemination														█		
Data aggregation and analysis																
Report drafting																
Report review																
Report dissemination																

9. Risks & Assumptions

Table 8: List of risks and mitigating action

Risk	Mitigation Measure
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

10. Monitoring and Evaluation

See table in annex 4.

11. Documentation Plan

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

12. 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	IDP Intentions to Return, Relocate and Settle in Place
Project Code	35iADN

Donor	ECHO
Project partners	DRC, NRC
Project Description	Wide-reaching representatively sampled assessment of the intentions of IDPs in Borno State to return, relocate or settle in place
Project Data Contacts	Eric Kramak – eric.kramak@reach-initiative.org
DMP Version	Draft v1
Related Policies	None
Data Collection	
What data will you collect or create?	<p>Secondary and primary (qualitative, quantitative)</p> <p>Data format- word document, excel and R/ STATA/ SPSS. These formats enable sharing and long-term access to data.</p>
How will the data be collected or created?	Quantitative data collected with ODK and stored on UNHCR KoBo account; Qualitative data collected through FGD
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) ○ 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). <p>Codebook- A document that describes data content- values, type of variables, missing values.</p>
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 IMWG, 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)

Please note the below are still in draft phase; links will be updated when tools are finalised.

Quantitative tool

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/bwdakcdcqfmhuax/AACjEXpHPffPLOy-yz4es2Lga?dl=0>

FGD tool

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/v0ofay8wf9nopw2/AABOTVUI0ZDP_3-6MsgU8_Jva?dl=0

Annex 3: Dissemination Matrix

Dissemination Channel	Comments
Protection Sector	Sharing of products, presentation
ISWG	Sharing of products, presentation
Information Management Working	Sharing of anonymised data sets
Resource Center	Upload all products to the resource centre

Annex 4: M&E Matrix

Goal	External M&E Indicator	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, sendingBlue, 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) # references in single agency documents	Reference monitoring	Country team	Reference_log	Protection Sector Strategy for 2018 DRC and NRC Country Strategies; UNHCR Protection Strategy
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 (<i>providing resources, participating to presentations, etc.</i>)	# 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;				