

Research Terms of Reference

Accountability to Affected Populations and Community Engagement in Northeast Nigeria
 NGA2101
 Nigeria

February 2021 V1

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary

Country of intervention	Nigeria				
Type of Emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural disaster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>specify</i>)
Type of Crisis	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sudden onset	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slow onset	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	ECHO				
IMPACT Project Code	35ANW				
Overall Research Timeframe (<i>from research design to final outputs / M&E</i>)	01/02/2021 to 30/04/2021				
Research Timeframe <i>Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)</i>	1. Pilot/ training: 23/03/2021		6. Preliminary presentation: NA		
	2. Start collect data: 25/03/2021		7. Outputs sent for validation: 23/04/2021		
	3. Data collected: 31/03/2021		8. Outputs published: 30/04/2021		
	4. Data analysed: 09/04/2021		9. Final presentation: 30/04/2021		
	5. Data sent for validation: 06/04/2021				
Number of assessments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single assessment (one cycle)			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi assessment (more than one cycle) <i>[Describe here the frequency of the cycle]</i>			
Humanitarian milestones <i>Specify what will the assessment inform and when</i> <i>e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;</i>	Milestone		Deadline		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Donor plan/strategy	30/04/2021		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	07/05/2021		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cluster plan/strategy	_ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	NGO platform plan/strategy	_ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Specify):	_ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _			
	Audience type		Dissemination		

Audience Type & Dissemination <i>Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (e.g. mail to NGO consortium; HCT participants; Donors) <input type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (e.g. at HCT meeting; Cluster meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]
Detailed dissemination plan required	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
General Objective	To strengthen the evidence base around affected populations' perceptions of humanitarian assistance and feedback mechanisms, and inform human-centered approaches to humanitarian programming across Northeast Nigeria	
Specific Objective(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand the humanitarian assistance landscape of assessed settlements¹ 2. Assess awareness of humanitarian service delivery among affected populations 3. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding access to feedback mechanisms 4. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding the relevance of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models 5. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding fairness/inclusion of humanitarian service delivery 6. Understand perceptions of affected populations regarding how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors 7. Understand the protection concerns of affected populations while receiving humanitarian assistance 8. Understand the perceived barriers of affected population when accessing humanitarian assistance 	
Research Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the types of, sources of, and modalities of humanitarian assistance assessed settlements received in the 6 months prior to data collection? 2. What is the level of awareness among the affected populations about the humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled? 3. What is the perception of affected populations on response mechanisms to provide feedback about humanitarian service delivery? 4. What is the perception of affected populations on types of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models? 5. What is the perception of affected populations regarding the level of fairness/inclusion in current humanitarian service delivery? 6. How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors? 7. What are the perceived protection concerns of affected populations while accessing humanitarian assistance? 8. What is the perception of affected populations regarding barriers to accessing humanitarian assistance? 	

¹ Key characteristics of assessed settlements include sources of humanitarian assistance received, types of assistance received, modality of assistance received, and languages used (written and spoken).

Geographic Coverage	Settlements across 8 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Borno state			
Secondary data sources	2020 Accountability to Affected Pop Population (AAP) Assessment Terms of Reference 2020 Humanitarian Needs Overview-Nigeria The Vaccination Tracking system 2019 Multi-Sector Needs Assessment 2020 Multi-Sector Needs Assessment Cellphone network coverage mapping OCHA AWG list of settlements in Borno State by LGA			
Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in camp	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in informal sites
	X	IDPs in host communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs [Other, Specify]
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in camp	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in informal sites
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in host communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees [Other, Specify]
	X	Host communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]
Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i>	X	Geographical #:8 LGAs in Borno Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes X No	<input type="checkbox"/> Group #: ___ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other Specify] #: ___ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Data collection tool(s)	X	Structured (Quantitative)	X	Semi-structured (Qualitative)
	Sampling method		Data collection method	
Structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i>	X Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified simple random <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> Probability / Stratified cluster sampling <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		X Key informant interview (Target #):269 ² <input type="checkbox"/> Group discussion (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Household interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Direct observations (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Semi-structured data collection tool (s) # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i>	X Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]		<input type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #):_____ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #):_____ X Focus group discussion (Target #):6 <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #):_____ 	
Data management platform(s)	X	IMPACT	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNHCR
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]		
Expected output type(s)	X	Situation overview #: 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Report #: __	<input type="checkbox"/> Profile #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: __	X Presentation (Final) #: 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Factsheet #:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Interactive dashboard #: _	<input type="checkbox"/> Webmap #: __	<input type="checkbox"/> Map #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify] #: __		
Access	X	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)		

² The quantitative component of this assessment is assessing 10% of settlements across each of the 8 targeted LGAs. See figure 1 on page 7

Visibility Specify which logos should be on outputs	REACH
	Donor: ECHO
	Coordination Framework: none
	Partners: none

2. Rationale

2.1 Background

In May 2016, the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) brought together 9,000 participants representing governments, civil society organisations (CSOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), private sectors, and academia with the intention of generating new initiatives to better serve the world's most vulnerable populations.³ A key development from the WHS was the Grand Bargain which brings together donors and humanitarian organisations in an effort to provide more assistance to those in need while simultaneously improving the effectiveness and efficiency in which that assistance is provided. As such, the Grand Bargain has acted as an impetus for humanitarian actors to commit to greater accountability to affected populations (AAP).⁴

Since 2016, humanitarian actors with the support of the Nigerian government have provided assistance to millions of individuals in the Northeast state of Borno.⁵ However, there is limited, publicly available information surrounding beneficiaries' awareness of humanitarian assistance delivery and feedback mechanisms as well as beneficiaries' perceptions on fairness and inclusion of aid given, the relevance of aid given, and respect given from humanitarian actors. The need for quality AAP information in Northeast Nigeria is further compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic which has increased the number of people in need of urgent assistance in the Northeast by 2.7 million (from 7.9 million at the beginning of 2020 to 10.6 million since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic).⁶

In prior years, REACH in Nigeria has included AAP indicators in the yearly Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA). Due to the size of the 2020 MSNA questionnaire, the included AAP indicators were limited in scope. Due to the limited scope from the 2020 MSNA assessment, this assessment will expand on the MSNA AAP indicators to gather a more robust understanding of settlement level perceptions in targeted LGAs.⁷ The aim of this research is to inform the humanitarian response on community perceptions of service delivery to enable a more community-centred and responsive approach. The study will draw on REACH's existing field presence and key informant network in Northeast Nigeria.

2.2 Intended impact

By conducting this assessment, REACH is collecting and subsequently disseminating information that humanitarian actors can use to improve current interventions while ensuring future interventions are in line with the expectations of the populations served. Additionally, this assessment will allow for affected populations to actively participate in decision making, contributing towards a system-wide change in the context in Northeast Nigeria.

In line with REACH's mission to provide granular data, timely information and in-depth analysis from contexts of crisis, disaster and displacement, this assessment will also inform a human-centred approach to humanitarian assistance by narrowing the gap between the beneficiaries' perceptions of assistance and the programmatic intentions of humanitarian

³ Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), [About the Grand Bargain](#)

⁴ Defined by the IASC as "Accountability to affected populations is an active commitment to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organisations seek to assist".
https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/aap_psea_2-pager.pdf

⁵ Additional information on the humanitarian response in Nigeria is available from
https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GHO2021_EN.pdf

⁶ Additional information on the humanitarian response in Northeast Nigeria is available from <https://www.unocha.org/nigeria/about-ocha-nigeria>

⁷ Additional information on REACH's 2020 MSNA is available from
<https://www.reachresourcecentre.info/country/nigeria/cycle/27914/#cycle-27914>

organizations. In doing so, humanitarian actors are better positioned to provide quality assistance that is both fair/inclusive and relevant, done so in a respectful manner, and acknowledges the beneficiaries' right to information about the assistance they are entitled to.

Currently, AAP indicators are collected by REACH once a year, leading to a lack of timely AAP data. REACH intends to expand its AAP portfolio by conducting routine assessments separate from the MSNA that will provide timely feedback on settlements throughout Nigeria. The intended impact of building out REACH's AAP offerings are multi-faceted. Firstly, REACH is strategically placed to inform the wider humanitarian response in Nigeria through continual dissemination amongst cluster agencies, inter-cluster agencies, donors, and consortiums. Secondly, it is REACH's intention that routine assessments and continual dissemination will allow humanitarian programs to proactively provide the needed assistance. This is part of a broader REACH effort to increase the awareness and use of AAP information to ensure that communities are properly consulted before, during, and after humanitarian activities rather than just after program implementation.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

This assessment will use a mixed-methodology approach comprised of structured key informant interviews (KIIs) for hard to reach (H2R) areas complemented by semi-structured Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) in selected accessible garrison towns in Borno State.⁸ The KIIs will be used to provide a general understanding of settlement perceptions of humanitarian assistance while the FGDs will be used to gather nuanced perceptions of specific population groups. KIIs and FGDs will take place simultaneously throughout the month of March, with product dissemination occurring in April 2021.

Due to COVID-19 related health and safety concerns, REACH enumerators will conduct all KIIs remotely by telephone. Through a total of 269 remote KIIs, the perceptions of affected populations on humanitarian assistance across 5 themes will be assessed: awareness, feedback, fairness/inclusion, relevance, and respect.⁹ Additionally, the KIIs will assess the protection concerns in assessed settlements while accessing humanitarian assistance, and the perceived barriers that certain population groups within the settlement have when accessing humanitarian assistance.

FGDs will be used to fill in the knowledge gaps that quantitative data cannot provide. The KIIs used in the quantitative component limits the understanding of how perceptions vary between demographic groups (e.g. women versus men). Because of this limitation, the FGDs will be comprised of 6 groups disaggregated by LGA and gender to be inclusive of different perceptions within the areas surveyed. All focus groups will take place outdoors with two meters of distance between all participants and facilitators. See the COVID-19 sub-section for more detailed information on the IMPACT protocols for safe data collection.

3.2 Population of interest

Data is collected at the lowest possible administrative unit – individual settlements – as derived from the OCHA settlement dataset (in which a settlement represents a village or neighbourhood in a defined urban area), to ensure that the area for which KIIs are providing information corresponds directly to their actual area of knowledge, thereby mitigating unfounded deductions. For the purpose of this assessment, KIIs are used to assess H2R settlements which are defined as those settlements of the country that are not regularly accessible either due to poor infrastructure, active conflict or humanitarian

⁸ For the quantitative component of this assessment, 8 LGAs have been purposively selected based on findings from the 2020 MSNA indicator “% of households who received aid in the past 3 months” and accessibility. The top 5 LGAs (Kala/Balge, Mafa, Mobbar, Monguno, and Ngala) with the highest proportion of households reporting receiving aid in the 3 months prior to data collection have been selected while an additional 3 LGAs (Jere, Konduga, and Maiduguri) have been selected to overlap with locations the FGDs will take place in.

⁹ The quantitative component of this assessment is assessing 10% of settlements across each of the 8 targeted LGAs. See figure 1 on page 7

access restrictions, or a combination of these. It is important to note that for this assessment, the definition for H2R refers to areas that are not accessible for data collection by REACH staff but may be accessible to other humanitarian organisations. Furthermore, H2R settlements will be surveyed to gather data in areas that are less prone to be able to provide feedback about humanitarian assistance compared to camp sites that have more robust systems in place to provide feedback.

KIIs will be conducted in 8 purposively selected LGAs across Borno state.¹⁰ Five LGAs have been selected based off of the 2020 MSNA indicator “% of households who received aid in the past 3 months”, while also taking into account locations that are physically accessible for qualitative data collection. The 5 LGAs (Kala/Balge, Mafa, Mobbar, Monguno, and Ngala) with the highest proportion of households reporting having received aid in the 3 months prior to data collection have been selected while an additional 3 LGAs (Jere, Konduga, and Maiduguri) have been selected due to the ability to conduct both FGDs and KIIs within these areas. This assessment works under the assumption that since a high proportion of households reported having received assistance in the six month prior to the 2020 MSNA data collection in accessible areas, high proportions of hard-to-reach settlements received assistance too. Additionally, due to situation changes in the Northeast, certain settlements have recently become H2R, making it possible they have received assistance within the previous six months.

3.3 Secondary data review

- [2020 Accountability to Affected Population \(AAP\) Assessment Terms of Reference](#)- tool and indicator design is partially informed by the 2020 Nigeria AAP assessment.
- [2020 Humanitarian Needs Overview-Nigeria](#)- Used to triangulate LGAs in Borno that are most targeted with humanitarian assistance.
- [The Vaccination Tracking system](#)- VTS settlement level data is used to confirm settlement names in targeted LGAs.
- [2019 Multi-Sector Needs Assessment](#)- tool and indicator design is informed by the 2019 Nigeria AAP assessment.
- [2020 Multi-Sector Needs Assessment](#)- 8 LGAs have been purposively selected based on findings from the 2020 MSNA indicator “% of households who received aid in the past 3 months”. The top 5 LGAs with the highest proportion reporting receiving aid in the 3 months prior to data collection have been selected as well as 3 LGAs that are accessible in person for FGDs.
- [Cell phone network coverage mapping](#)- Maps are used to determine which areas are accessible via telephone and which are not, which also affects mobile coverage. Our coverage will be limited to areas with accessible mobile service only.
- OCHA AWG list of settlements in Borno State by LGA- Data provided by OCHA to REACH is used to understand how many settlements are currently occupied within Borno LGAs.

The relevant terms and definitions used for the purpose of this assessments are:

Settlement – the smallest geographic administrative unit (State > Local Government Area (LGA) > ward > settlement). A community of households residing together who typically share public infrastructure and resources such as health facilities, WASH infrastructure, schools, etc.

Local government area (LGA) – is an administrative division of a country that a local government is responsible for.

Hard to reach (H2R) area – those areas of the country that are not regularly accessible either due to poor infrastructure, active conflict or humanitarian access restrictions, or a combination of these. For this assessment, H2R areas will refer to places that are impossible to physically access for REACH staff due to security concerns but may be accessible to other humanitarian organisations.

¹⁰ KIIs will be conducted remotely via phone while FGDs will be conducted in person

Key informant- A individual who has extensive knowledge on a particular settlement whether through direct experience living there or being in close contact with individuals residing in that settlement.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

Key informant (KI) contacts will be collected through REACH's field staff relations with community leaders and local partners in the targeted LGAs. Quantitative data will be collected remotely in REACH offices in the Northeast, by a team of enumerators, supervised by REACH Field Officers and field assistants. Remote data collection will use KIIs to gather data on settlements that are H2R. KIIs will be purposively selected based on their knowledge of or experience living in the targeted, H2R settlements. The REACH Field Manager will be trained on the tool by the REACH Assessment Officer. The Field Manager will then train Field Officers and Assistants in a 2-day in person training on questionnaire content, sampling technique, and use of mobile data collection. The Field Manager will then train enumerators in a similar 2-day training. Fifteen enumerators will be used to contact KIIs in settlements in the selected LGAs with 1 Field Officer and 2 Field Assistants overseeing the enumerators, and 1 Field Manager overseeing data collection as a whole.

The rationale underpinning the use of KIIs rests on the level of humanitarian access to a geographic area and the level of access to the population of interest within a geographic area, which is driven by the extent to which the displacement context is unstable. Data collection methods are based on the level of access to targeted areas with remote KIIs deemed the most appropriate for the context. Where sufficient access is unavailable for a given geographic area, remote data collection methodologies can be employed to ensure that information can be collected on a population of concern to answer the identified research questions.

FGDs will be held in accessible locations where REACH has a current presence, with participants purposively selected based on input from community leaders and local partners. All FGD participants will be determined to be beneficiaries from a settlement which has received humanitarian assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection. FGD will be led by REACH Field Officers who are trained on discussion group facilitation techniques and sensitivity. Due to issues with accessibility in Borno, all FGDs will be held in garrison towns, or immediately surrounding areas. Participants will travel from their settlement on the day of the FGD and participate at a centralized venue that REACH will have previously set up.

Due to the rapid spread of COVID-19, the specific risk to already vulnerable communities, the importance of the Humanitarian principle of "Do No Harm" as well as general considerations for "Duty of Care" (i.e. ensuring both field staff and local communities are not spreading and/ or exposed to the risk of contracting COVID-19 due to data collection activities), IMPACT, with inputs and review support from WHO and Global Health Cluster colleagues, has developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)¹¹ to guide research teams on how to undertake data collection during the COVID-19 outbreak. The SOPs for data collection during COVID-19 will be followed to ensure of safety of participants and REACH staff. See the COVID-19 section for detailed information.

Sampling

KII

As previously mentioned, target LGAs for this assessment are selected based on the 2020 MSNA AAP data, in addition to guidance from OCHA, who are able to provide up to date information on inhabited settlements in selected LGAs. Within those LGAs, REACH will purposively select settlements that will be determined to have received humanitarian assistance in the previous 6 months. Those settlements will be identified using local guides, traditional leaders, and community gatekeepers. Additionally, these settlements will be out of camp but within or on the outskirts of garrison towns. The total sample quota is calculated using the total number of inhabited settlements in each LGA and purposively selecting 10% of total settlements from each LGA to assess. This threshold has been considered enough to get indicative data on the selected LGAs, but does not make the data representative of any geographic area since a purposive sample is utilized. While data

¹¹ [IMPACT SoP for Data Collection during COVID-19](#)

collection occurs at the settlement level, the analysis of this assessment will be aggregated across assessed LGAs to provide indicative snapshots of perceptions within the targeted LGAs.

One KI will be interviewed per settlement, with questions being asked at the settlement level. The selection criteria for a KI, applicable to any KI type, is that s/he has knowledge of a H2R settlement from within the last 6 months to ensure that gathered information is up-to-date. KIs will also be identified using local guides, traditional leaders, and community gatekeepers.

See below table for breakdown at the LGA level.

Targeted LGAs	Total Number of Settlements per LGA	Target Number of Assessed Settlements
Jere	30	3
Kala/Balge	59	6
Konduga	139	14
Mafa	60	6
Maiduguri	1510	151
Mobbar	823	83
Monguno	23	3
Ngala	29	3
Total	2673	269¹²

Figure 1

Focus Group Discussions

A total of 6 FGDs will be held in groups of 5-8 individuals, disaggregated by gender and current LGA. Additionally, the FGDs will include participants from different age groups to solicit information that is inclusive across a range of ages. FGD participants will be identified using local guides, traditional leaders, and community gatekeepers, using the following selection criteria: they should be humanitarian assistance beneficiaries, from settlements that have received humanitarian assistance in the previous 6 months, and should have knowledge of the settlement from the previous 6 months. Due to selected settlements being out of camp, participants may include both displaced and non-displaced individuals. As all participants will be beneficiaries, it has been determined unnecessary to split FGDs by displacement status and that having both population groups participating in the same FGDs may not lead to tensions between the two groups. See below table for breakdown.

Targeted LGAs	Gender	Size (individuals)
Jere	Male	5-8
Konduga	Male	5-8
Maiduguri	Male	5-8
Jere	Female	5-8
Konduga	Female	5-8
Maiduguri	Female	5-8
Total		30-48

¹² All fractional numbers have been rounded up to the next whole number

Tools

Quantitative KI Questionnaire

This assessment will utilize one structured questionnaire that will probe KIs on the perceptions of affected population on humanitarian assistance, at the settlement level, across the 5 themes of awareness, feedback, fairness/inclusion, relevance, and respect while also probing on perceived protection concerns and other barriers of affected populations when accessing assistance. Indicators are informed by the 2019 and 2020 Nigeria MSNA, sector feedback and secondary data. All KIs will be interviewed using the same questionnaire, with only KI with knowledge of a settlement that has received assistance in the previous 6 months being interviewed.

Focus Group Discussion Guide

REACH will conduct FGDs in 3 LGAs with affected community members to triangulate the information obtained from the KIs (quantitative data collection), aiming to get additional inputs to get a more comprehensive picture of the perceptions in targeted settlements. Participants will include a mixture of individuals from different population groups (displaced or non-displaced) and demographic profiles (gender, age, etc.). Groups will be divided according to gender and current LGA.

Quality Assurance

Quality of survey data is guaranteed by proper diligence at all stages of the survey. Details in the protocol related to efforts to ensure quality assurance during recruitment, sampling (e.g., efforts to ensure an updated sampling frame), training (e.g., field test), and field work (e.g. supervisor monitoring of performance) are noted in each respective section above.

In addition, a daily check of entered data will be conducted by the assessment officer to adhere to Impact Initiatives [data cleaning checklist](#). Final dataset is consistent with intended sampling strategy

- Interview duration (i.e. time taken for the interview/ survey) is reasonable
- None of the enumerators consistently follow the shortest questionnaire path or exact same path i.e. providing same responses across multiple records
- There are no inexplicable or impossible outliers i.e. an observation/ a specific data points that lies an abnormal distance from other values in the dataset
- There is logical coherence between the different responses within a record
- A clear, comprehensive cleaning log is maintained as per the IMPACT Cleaning Logbook template.
- Dataset is in a clean, tidy and usable format for purpose of analysis
- All information that can be used to identify individuals or households is removed from the dataset. Example of such information: Names; Phone numbers; Respondent occupation/ organisation; Information about enumerators / key informants; Respondent gender, age and location; etc.

COVID-19¹³

All necessary protocols will be followed to ensure that REACH field staff and FGD participants are protected from the threat of contracting COVID-19. These include:

- All FGDs will take place outside, with participants sitting at least 2 meters from one another throughout the duration of the discussion.
- Elderly (65+) individuals and individuals with chronic illnesses will be omitted from FGDs when possible.¹⁴
- No objects will be passed from participants to participant, and direct contact between individuals will be prohibited.
- FGD participants will be reminded of guidelines at the start of each discussion group.
- REACH field staff will wash their hands upon arriving at the call centre for the day, and will wipe down phones and surfaces at the end of each day.

¹³ [IMPACT SoP for Data Collection during COVID-19](#)

¹⁴ This potential bias in the qualitative data will be noted in all outputs.

- REACH enumerators and field officers will maintain a distance of at least 2 meters from each other throughout the duration of the day's data collection, with as many rooms utilized as is necessary for all staff to keep a safe distance.
- REACH staff will be reminded of protocols and procedures each day before beginning data collection.

Consent and Participant Protection

Informed consent will be received from all KIs and FGD participants before REACH staff begin with the enumeration of the questionnaires. Enumerators will be given a script which includes:

- Who the enumerator is and who they work for
- Why the respondent has been contacted and what the selection process was
- What the purpose and scope of the assessment is and how the information will be used.
- Length of interview/FGD.
- Guarantee of anonymity.
- Guarantee of reversible consent.

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

Structured KI Interview

Survey forms will be submitted on a daily basis to IMPACT's Kobo server. Data checking will be completed daily by the assessment officer and the data officer, who are tasked with reviewing data quality, using the [IMPACT minimum quality guidelines](#). Errors or suspicious entries will be entered daily into a cleaning log, which will be shared across field teams for follow up with enumerators. As data collection is completed in each LGA, cleaning logs will be finalized and the dataset will be prepared for final cleaning. Quantitative data analysis will be conducted in Excel and R. The following protocols are in place to ensure the quality of data collected:

- Weekly spot checks of enumerators conducting interviews
- Daily data cleaning by Field Officers/Managers, who identify outliers, abnormalities and logical inconsistencies and give regular feedback to enumerators through monthly and ad-hoc trainings, during spot checks as well as the daily morning brief. Data points which can't be resolved through discussions with enumerators are deleted and when records (surveys) have more than three mistakes, the entire record is deleted from the dataset.
- Weekly data cleaning by Assessment Officers, who review data cleaning conducted by Field Officers/Managers and provide additional feedback to the data collection teams in the form of re-training.
- Data aggregation and cleaning is conducted by GIS/Data Officers at the end of each data collection exercise, who provide feedback on outliers and common mistakes, which inform the design of the next debriefs and enumerator trainings for the next monthly data collection exercise. After all dataset are cleaned, the raw and cleaned dataset, along with the data cleaning log, will be saved and stored in a clearly labelled folder.

Focus Group Discussion

A detailed transcript of the discussion from the FGDs for each question will be translated into English including moderators and note takers memos and a summary of the conclusions drawn from the discussions will be drafted and formatted for analysis using a saturation grid in Microsoft Excel.

Output

A situation overview will be produced and will present the quantitative and qualitative findings together. Although all data collected from this assessment is indicative only, quantitative and qualitative findings will be presented to complement each other where knowledge gaps exist from the respective data collection methods. Quantitative data collection is used for a general understanding of the perceptions of populations in targeted settlements while the qualitative data collection will be

presented to answer “why” these perceptions are held. Quantitative data will be aggregated across all targeted LGAs except for maps where data will be presented at the LGA level.

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)
s... Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to avoid unnecessary duplication of data collection efforts?	yes	
... Respects respondents, their rights and dignity (<i>specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided</i>)?	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)?	yes	
... Does not involve data collection with minors i.e. anyone less than 18 years old?	yes	
... Does not involve data collection with other vulnerable groups e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.?	yes	
... Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of personally identifiable information ?	yes	

5. Roles and responsibilities

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
<i>Research design</i>	Assessment Officer (AO)	Research Manager (RM)	Deputy Country Coordinator (DCC) Senior GIS Officer (SrGIS), Research Design and Data Unit (RDDU)	Head of Research

Supervising data collection	AO/Field Manager (FM)	Field Manager	AO, RM	DCC
Data processing (checking, cleaning)	AO/GIS/DO	AO	RM, SrGIS, RDDU	DCC
Data analysis	Data Officer (DO)/AO	AO	RM, DCC, RDDU	Head of Research
Output production	AO	RM	DCC, IMPACT Reporting Unit	Head of Research, DCC
Dissemination	AO	RM	RM, DCC, IMPACT Communication Unit	Head of Research, CC
Monitoring & Evaluation	AO	DCC	RM, DCC, RDDU	Head of Research, CC
Lessons learned	AO	AO	RM, DCC, RDDU	CC

Responsible: the person(s) who executes the task

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

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

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

5 Data Analysis Plan

See Annex 1 and 2 for full Data Analysis Plan

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

IMPACT Objective	External M&E Indicator	Internal M&E Indicator	Focal point	Tool	Will indicator be tracked?
Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products	Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products	# of downloads of x product from Resource Center	Country request to HQ	User_log	X Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Relief Web	Country request to HQ		X Yes
		# of downloads of x product from Country level platforms	Country team		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter	Country request to HQ		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly	Country team		X Yes
		# of visits to x webmap/x dashboard	Country request to HQ		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response	Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products	# references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies)	Country team	Reference_log	
		# references in single agency documents			
Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products	Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery	Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs	Country team	Usage_Feed back and Usage_Survey template	
		Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs			
		Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs			
		Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff			
		Perceived quality of outputs/programs			

	Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products	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	Country team	Engagement_log	X Yes
		# of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
		# of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings;			X Yes

ANNEX 1: QUANTITATIVE STRUCTURED DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

Research questions	Data collection method	Indicator group sector /	Indicator Variable	Questionnaire Question	Instructions	Questionnaire Responses	Sampling
N/A	KI Interview	Meta Data	Enumerator number	Please specify your (enumerator) ID number:	Text		
	KI Interview	Key characteristics	KI Gender	Please indicate the gender of the key informant.	Select one	Male, Female	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Key characteristics	KI Age	What is your (key informant) age?	Select one	18-25; 26-35; 36- 45;46-55; 56-65;66+	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Key characteristics	KI LGA	What LGA does the key informant have knowledge of?	Select one	Jere, Kala/Balge, Konduga, Maiduguri, Mafa, Mobbar, Monguno, and Ngala	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Key characteristics	KI settlement	What settlement does the key informant have knowledge of?	Text		<i>Purposive</i>
N/A	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	% of settlements in which KIs reported receiving any	Have most people in the settlement received any assistance in the	Select one	Yes, No	<i>Purposive</i>

			assistance in the previous 6 months	past 6 months, from any sources?			
What are the types of, sources of, and modalities of humanitarian assistance assessed settlements are receiving?	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	% of settlements in which KIs reported source of assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection	What were the sources of that assistance in the past six months?	Select multiple	International NGO provided assistance, Local NGO provided assistance, Government provided assistance, Assistance from community, Family or friends, Other, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	% of settlements in which KIs reported type of assistance	What was the type or types of assistance received?	Select multiple	WASH support (water, infrastructure or hygiene promotion), Food support, Livelihoods support (vocational trainings, assets, etc.), Health support, Mental health support, Nutrition support, NFI support, Shelter support, Education support, Protection services – security, Protection services - explosive hazards awareness / mine risk education, Protection services - family reunification, Protection services - Legal counselling / documentation support, Other, please specify No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	% of settlements in which KIs reported assistance modality	What was the MAIN modality of the assistance received?	Select one	In-kind assistance (food, water, NFI, shelter, etc.), Cash assistance (bank transfer, cash distribution, voucher, mobile transfer, etc.), Mixed (in-kind AND cash), Training (livelihood, vocational, etc.), Other	<i>Purposive</i>
Demographics	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	Main spoken language	What is the main language spoken in the settlement?	Select one	Bachama, Bura, English, Fulani, Fulfulde, Gamardu, Glavda, Hausa, Higgs, Jukun, Kanuri, Kare Kare, Kibaku, Kilba, Mafa, Mandara, Marghi, Shuwa Arabic / Chadian, Arabic, Tiv, Waha, Other	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	Preferred written language	What language do most people in the settlement prefer to receive written information in?	Select one	Bachama, Bura, English, Fulani, Fulfulde, Gamardu, Glavda, Hausa, Higgi, Jukun, Kanuri, Kare Kare, Kibaku, Kilba, Mafa, Mandara, Marghi, Shuwa Arabic / Chadian, Arabic, Tiv, Waha, Other	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Settlement characteristics	Preferred spoken language	What language do most people in the settlement prefer to receive spoken information in?	Select one	Bachama, Bura, English, Fulani, Fulfulde, Gamardu, Glavda, Hausa, Higgi, Jukun, Kanuri, Kare Kare, Kibaku, Kilba, Mafa, Mandara, Marghi, Shuwa Arabic / Chadian, Arabic Tiv Waha Other	<i>Purposive</i>
Assess awareness of humanitarian service delivery among affected populations	KI Interview	Awareness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people's top three preferred types of information from humanitarian workers	What type of information would most people in the settlement like to receive from aid providers? Please choose top 3	Select multiple	No need for information, News on what is happening in your communities' area (e.g. Covid-19) Finding missing people, The security situation in area of origin The security situation in current location, How to register for assistance in food, water, cash, fuel, shelter, How to access health or nutrition services, How to get schools and education for children, Prices for food, crops, or livestock, How to get help after sexual attack or harassment, How to stay safe to prevent sexual attack or harassment, How to replace personal documentation (birth certificate, ID), How to find work, How to get transport,	<i>Purposive</i>

						<p>Info about possible return to place of origin, Info about relocation, Info about how to access justice / legal action, Info about aid agencies they are receiving aid from (e.g program activities in the area), what type of info would this be? Besides the below complaint mechanisms How to complain about the aid you are receiving, How to complain about bad behaviour of aid workers, What behaviour should be expected from aid workers, Other, No response, Don't know</p>	
	KI Interview	Awareness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people's top three preferred sources of information	Who do most people in settlement prefer to provide reliable information? Please choose top 3	Select multiple	Community leader (bulama, lawan), Religious leader, State/Federal Government officials, Local/Ward Government officials, CJTF, Military officials, Friends / family, Aid workers from United Nations, Aid workers from local NGOs, Aid workers from international NGOs, Other, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Awareness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people's top three trusted means of information	What means of receiving information do most people in the settlement prefer the most? Please choose top 3	Select multiple	Phone call (mobile phone), Text message (mobile phone), Radio, In person/ face to face, Facebook, Twitter, Whatsapp, Posters, Information desks in camps, Community events, Leaflet, Loudspeaker, Other, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Awareness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people feel like they are receiving enough information about the assistance that was available to them in the 6 months prior to data collection	Do most people in the settlement feel like they have received enough information about the assistance that was available to them over the past 6 months?	Select one	Yes, No, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

What is the perception of affected populations regarding the level of fairness/inclusion in current humanitarian service delivery?	KI Interview	Fairness	% of settlements in which KIs reported how most people perceive beneficiaries are chosen	How do most people in the settlement think people are chosen to receive assistance?	select multiple	Because humanitarian agencies have identified them as the most vulnerable and in-need of assistance Because chiefs/local leadership have identified them as the most vulnerable and in-need of assistance Because other community members have identified them as the most vulnerable and in-need of assistance Due to favouritism or family/friend relationships Because the process is random Other (please write) Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Fairness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people feel assistance goes to individuals who need it the most	Do most people in the settlement feel that the assistance goes to the individuals who need it most in the community?	Select one	Yes, always Yes, most of the time Yes, sometimes Rarely Never	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Fairness	% of settlements in which KIs reported who most people feel which population	If never or rarely, who in the community needs the assistance the most but cannot get assistance?	Select multiple	Men, Women, Adolescent boys (12 - 18 years), Adolescent girls (12 - 18 years), Boys (less than 12 years), Girls (less than 12 years), Elderly men (greater than 60 years), Elderly women (greater than 60 years), Persons based on their ethnicity/different community, Disabled individuals, Other, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

			group(s) could not access the assistance they needed				
KI Interview	Fairness	% of settlements in which KIs reported if most people are being asked about assistance they would like to receive	In the last 6 months, has anyone in the settlement been asked about what assistance they would like to receive?	Select one	Yes,No, No response, Don't know		<i>Purposive</i>
KI Interview	Fairness	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people feel their opinion is considered in the design of humanitarian activities	Do most people in the settlement feel like their opinion is considered enough in the design of humanitarian activities?	Select one	Yes,No, No response, Don't know		<i>Purposive</i>

What is the perception of affected populations on response mechanisms to provide feedback about humanitarian service delivery?	KI Interview	Feedback	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people's preferred feedback modality for aid actors	How do most people in your settlement prefer to provide feedback to aid providers about the quality, quantity and/or appropriateness aid they have or will receive?	Select multiple	Don't want to give feedback, Don't know how to give feedback, Face to face to aid worker (at home), Face to face to aid worker (at office / other location), Face to face to another member of the community, Phone call (mobile phone), Text message (mobile phone), Complaints / suggestions box, Other, No response, Don't know	Purposive
	KI Interview	Feedback	% of settlements in which KIs reported if anyone has ever raised concern on the assistance received	Has anyone in the settlement ever raised any concerns on the assistance they received through a complaint/feedback mechanism?	Select one	Yes, No, No response, Don't know	Purposive
	KI Interview	Feedback	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people are satisfied with the response received from aid	If yes, were they satisfied with the response they received from aid workers on their concern?	Select one	Yes, satisfied, Partially satisfied, Not satisfied, Never received a response	Purposive

			workers on the concern raised				
What is the perception of affected populations on types of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models?	KI Interview	Relevance	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people feel the assistance they received was appropriate to the needs of the community	Was the assistance most people in the settlement received appropriate to the needs of the community?	Select one	Yes, No, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Relevance	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people in the settlement feel satisfied with the assistance they received	Of the people who received assistance in the last 6 months in the settlement, did most of them feel satisfied with the assistance they received?	Select one	Yes, satisfied, Partially satisfied, Not satisfied	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Relevance	% of settlements in which KIs reported reasons why most people were not satisfied or partially satisfied with the assistance they received in the last 6 months	If they were not satisfied or partially satisfied, why were most people not satisfied or partially satisfied with the assistance they received in the last 6 months?	Select multiple	poor targeting, not most needed aid, too long of a distance to receive the assistance, too short of time supporting, not aware it exists, assistance came too late, protection concerns, other	<i>Purposive</i>
How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors?	KI Interview	Respect	% of settlements in which KIs reported most people in the settlement satisfied with the way aid workers have behaved in the 6 previous six months	Are most people in the settlement satisfied with the way aid workers have behaved in the previous six months when providing assistance?	Select one	Yes, No, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

			when providing assistance?				
What are the perceived protection concerns of affected populations while receiving humanitarian assistance?	KI Interview	Protection	% of settlements in which KIs reported who in the settlement is primarily responsible for retrieving in kind assistance	Who in the settlement is primarily responsible for retrieving in kind assistance?	Select one	(Men, women, children, men and women are equally responsible, I don't know/don't want to answer)	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Protection	% of settlements in which KIs reported if any women in the settlement experience protection concerns in the last 3 months?	Have ANY women in the settlement experienced protection concerns while accessing assistance in the last 3 months?	Select one	Yes,No, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Protection	% of settlements in which KIs reported if any men in the settlement experience protection concerns in the last 3 months?	Have ANY men in the settlement experienced protection concerns while accessing assistance in the last 3 months?	Select one	Yes, No, No response, Don't know	<i>Purposive</i>
	KI Interview	Protection	% of settlements in which KIs reported the main protection concerns for women while accessing assistance	What are the main protection issues women faced while accessing assistance?	Select multiple	Robbery/looting Killing/injury Sexual violence Abduction Family separation Intimidation by authorities or local leaders Intimidation by humanitarian staff Don't know or don't want to answer Other	<i>Purposive</i>

	KI Interview	Protection	% of settlements in which KIs reported the main protection concerns for men while accessing assistance	What are the main protection issues men face while accessing assistance?	Select multiple	Robbery/looting Killing/injury Sexual violence Abduction Family separation Intimidation by authorities or local leaders Intimidation by humanitarian staff Don't know or don't want to answer Other	<i>Purposive</i>
What is the perception of affected populations regarding barriers to accessing humanitarian assistance?	KI Interview	Barriers	% of settlements in which KIs reported barriers to receiving aid in the previous 6 months for most people	What are the barriers to accessing the most needed humanitarian assistance for most people in the settlement?	Select multiple	None, lack of communication between community and humanitarians, humanitarian assistance is not evenly distributed within the settlement, humanitarian assistance is not given to those who need it most, humanitarian assistance is not relevant to the needs of the community, humanitarian actors do not provide assistance in a respectful manner, settlement does not feel safe when receiving assistance, physical barrier(s) when accessing assistance, other	<i>Purposive</i>

ANNEX 2: QUALITATIVE SEMI-STRUCTURED DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

Research Questions	Data collection method	Sub-research question group	Sub-research Question	Questionnaire QUESTION	Probes	Key disaggregations
--------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	--------	---------------------

<p>What is the level of awareness among the affected populations about the humanitarian service delivery to which they are entitled to?</p>	<p>Focus Group Discussion</p>	<p>Awareness</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>How do you feel about the information you receive regarding the assistance that is available to you? (Assistance being from local or international humanitarian groups and can include In-kind assistance (food, water, NFI, shelter, etc.), Cash assistance (bank transfer, cash distribution, voucher, mobile transfer, etc.), Mixed (in-kind AND cash), Training (livelihood, vocational, etc.)</p>	<p>Was the information you received in the previous 6 months enough? If not, what information do you think you are lacking? If yes, can you provide me with an example of how humanitarian workers are providing you with relevant information? Probe for challenges specific to women and disabled persons Probe participants how they think communication about assistance can improve</p>	<p>Gender, current LGA</p>
<p>What is the perception of affected populations on response mechanisms to provide feedback about humanitarian service delivery?</p>	<p>Focus Group Discussion</p>	<p>Feedback</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>How knowledgeable do you feel about how to submit a complaint or complaints about the quality, quantity and/or appropriateness of the assistance you receive?</p>	<p>If knowledgeable, what are the complaint mechanisms you find effective or ineffective If not knowledgeable, why do you think this is? Probe for preferred feedback mechanisms and if people feel uncomfortable complaining/if they think it might impact possible future assistance / if they think it is possible to remain anonymous. Probe if specific groups have greater knowledge</p>	<p>Gender, current LGA</p>

					of how to access complaint mechanisms than others?	
What is the perception of affected populations regarding the level of fairness/inclusion in current humanitarian service delivery?	Focus Group Discussion	Fairness	N/A	Do you feel like you are being consulted enough by humanitarian actors in regards to the type of assistance you need?	Probe who do they feel is mostly consulted by humanitarian organisations? E.g. community leaders, male household members" Probe do they feel like these are the right people to be consulted? Why? Probe how they would like to be consulted	Gender, current LGA
What is the perception of affected populations on types of humanitarian interventions and beneficiary targeting models?	Focus Group Discussion	Relevance	N/A	How satisfied are you with the assistance that you are receiving?	what are the main reasons for dissatisfaction and satisfaction with humanitarian assistance? Probe- is the type of assistance provided to them in line with their main needs? Why (not)?	Gender, current LGA
	Focus Group Discussion	Relevance	N/A	How aware are you of the selection procedures of humanitarian organisations working in the settlement?	do you believe this selection process is fair? Probe do they believe the beneficiaries selected by humanitarians are those most in need of assistance	Gender, current LGA

					Why (not)?	
How do affected populations feel about how they are treated during interactions with humanitarian actors?	Focus Group Discussion	Respect	N/A	How satisfied are you with the behaviour of humanitarian workers in your interactions with them?	(If satisfied)- Can you provide me with an example of what they do to show you respect? (If not satisfied or partially satisfied)-Can you provide me with an example of something they did that made you feel disrespected? Do you feel like certain groups are more likely to feel disrespected than others? (female, elderly, certain ethnic groups, etc.) Have you ever reported if you felt disrespected?	Gender, current LGA
What are the protection concerns of affected populations while receiving humanitarian assistance?	Focus Group Discussion	Protection	N/A	How safe do you feel when receiving assistance?	(If they feel safe)-what makes you feel safe? (If they do not feel safe)- what makes you feel unsafe? Do you feel safe or unsafe at different times? (example, they could be more of a target of theft/violence after receiving assistance) Probe if concerns are unique to vulnerable populations, women, elderly, disable, etc.	Gender, current LGA
What is the perception of affected populations regarding barriers to accessing humanitarian assistance?	Focus Group Discussion	Barriers	N/A	What barriers, if any, do you feel contribute to you being unable to access the assistance you need?	(If barriers)- What do you feel can be done to access the needed assistance? (If no barriers)- What do you feel is done well that allows you to access the assistance you need?	Gender, current LGA

N/A	Focus Group Discussion	Final comments	N/A	Is there anything else regarding humanitarian aid/humanitarian workers or anything else you would like to tell us before we end this interview?		
-----	------------------------	----------------	-----	---	--	--