Annexes

Annex 1: Guide for global-level interviews during inception phase

Introduction of the SAVE research project:

Humanitarian Outcomes and the Global Public Policy Institute (GPPi) are conducting this three-year programme together in order to examine how to deliver an effective humanitarian response amid high levels of insecurity. Secure Access in Volatile Environments (SAVE) is based on field work in Afghanistan, South Central Somalia, South Sudan and Syria. It consists of three components:

1. Presence and coverage: To what extent are aid agencies present in the most dangerous places and how is that affecting humanitarian coverage of needs?
2. Access and quality: What are the key determinants for enabling access and delivering quality aid in situations of reduced oversight and control?
3. Accountability and learning: How are aid agencies monitoring their programmes and maintaining accountability, and what are the areas of good or promising practice?

Check for prior contacts and/or explain other components may reach out to them as well. Start with the following overview questions and follow-up depending on interviewees expertise and background:

- Looking at the humanitarian situation in Somalia/Afghanistan/Syria/South Sudan, what purpose should M&E primarily fulfil?
- Where do you see the biggest gaps and unmet expectations with regards to current M&E practice and how it is being conducted in conditions of insecurity or violence?
- What measures have been applied in your context to monitor and evaluate assistance despite insecurity?
- How successful would you say individual measures to monitor and evaluate despite insecurity have been?
- What positive examples are there and what are the biggest problems involved?
- Can you recommend guidance documents or literature we should take into account?
- Can you recommend other experts we should consult on the topics discussed?

Explain next steps and offer to keep updated about SAVE findings as they emerge.

Annex 2: Field interview guide on third-party monitoring (aid actors)

Theme	Questions
Mapping	1. Why have you started working with TPMs? What is the purpose of TPM? 2. Please list the TPM providers you are working with or you have worked with over the past five years, indicating for which programme, in which area and for what purpose for each of them. 3. We would like to take precise examples of your agency's experience with TPM. Can you share: a) One example that you considered to be a (relatively) successful experience? b) One that you considered to be a (relatively) unsuccessful experience? c) What explains these different outcomes, in your opinion?
Relationship between agency and third-party monitor	4. How long have you been working with this partner? 5. What is its exact scope of responsibilities? 6. How many TPM staff are dedicated to your programme? 7. Who is in charge of managing that relationship within your agency?
Budget	8. What is the absolute cost of relying on TPM? 9. What share of the programme budget? 10. Can you estimate the number of man-days dedicated by your agency to the selection and training of TPM? 11. Can you estimate the number of man-days dedicated by your agency to the management of TPM, once selected? 12. Are TPM staff using some of the agency's resources to do their work: desk, transportation means, material (computers, phone, etc.)? 13. Have you noticed significant differences in costs depending on the nature of the TPM provider (NNGO, INGO, Afghan private company, etc.)? Do you have examples?
Contracting & assessment	14. Is there a vetting system for TPM (details/examples)? 15. How do you assess the level of access that TPM providers have? 16. How do you assess their staff's technical capacities? 17. How do you assess their reporting capacities? 18. Is there a restitution clause in the contract with TPM in case of under-performance?
Training of third-party monitor	19. Who is in charge of training TPM providers and field monitors? 20. What type of training is offered (length, frequency, content)? a) Are there components of the training that focus on humanitarian principles? b) How are monitors supposed to introduce themselves in the field? In insecure areas in particular?
Monitoring by third-party monitor	21. Who is in charge of developing logframes and monitoring frameworks? At what stage of the project cycle do TPMs typically come in? 22. What type of data are TPM providers supposed to collect for monitoring? a) Quantitative? b) Qualitative? c) Socioeconomic indicators? d) Feedback and complaints from beneficiaries? e) What level of results is data collected on (outputs, outcomes, impacts)?

	23. What tools are used for data collection? a) Standardised formats? Can you share these? b) Use of ICT (GPS, stamped pictures, etc.)? 24. How often do monitors visit each site per project? 25. Who is in charge of processing the data? 26. How is the data used by your agency? Examples? 27. Who is in charge of data analysis and reporting?
Quality of monitoring	28. How do you judge the quality of the monitoring process conducted by the TPM? 29. How do you judge the quality of the data provided by the TPM? 30. How would you rate the credibility of the data you get, on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 = completely trustworthy)? 31. Does your agency have means for triangulating and checking the monitoring data provided by the TPM? a) How? b) How systematically is the data triangulated and verified? 32. What other monitoring mechanisms do you rely on?
Independence vs. access	33. Have you identified conflicts of interest (e.g., TPM implementing and monitoring activities)? 34. Do you think the access of the TPM staff to certain areas means a lesser degree of independence? a) Do you have examples (if possible, documented) of when this was a problem? b) Do you have examples of when TPMs were able to identify issues of aid diversion, gatekeepers and beneficiary selection in the field? 35. Do you have documented examples of fraud, misleading information, etc., from one of your TPM providers?
Risk transfer	36. Have you considered that there could be a transfer of risks from your agency to the TPM? 37. What mitigation measures are in place to limit that risk? 38. Have there been any security incidents? Please provide examples.
General assessment of TPM system	39. What are the biggest benefits of TPM for your agency? 40. What are the drawbacks of working with TPM? 41. If you look at the total number of TPM monitoring experiences, how would you rate their usefulness (1–10)? 42. Is reliance on TPM increasing or decreasing? 43. For which types of programmes do you think TPM works best/worst? 44. Which type of TPM providers do you find best suited to conduct robust monitoring (international companies, Afghan companies, Afghan NGOs, INGOs)?
Further contacts	45. Who else should I talk to in your agency? 46. What other organisations should I talk to? 47. Can you share the contact information of TPM providers you have worked with?

Annex 3: Field interview guide on community feedback mechanisms (aid actors)

Field interview guide on community feedback mechanisms in volatile environments
Focused at M&E staff and programme staff (if existent: FM focal point)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Where are you currently based and what is your position within the agency?
2. In which sector(s) does your agency operate?
3. In which provinces does your agency operate? Which are particularly insecure (district level)?
4. How does your agency collect feedback? Please rank the importance of the different channels you use (from most important to least important). Why are some more important than others?
5. Have you personally used collected feedback in your work? If yes, how?
6. For which specific program(s) is feedback being collected?
7. *In case the agency has multiple programs with FMs, document all cases, but for all following questions focus the interview on one specific example. If possible, choose a program that takes place in a* ***volatile environment*** *and that has a* ***mature*** *FM.* Specifically for this program, through which channels do you receive feedback from affected communities?
8. In case of Hotline / SMS: is the service toll-free?
9. Since when is the FM running? Is it still running? If not, when has it stopped and why is the FM not running anymore?
10. How was the FM introduced to the community? Were there procedures to build acceptance and trust of communities in the FM?

II. AGENCY-SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES

11. Who is/are responsible for the FM within the agency? Is somebody explicitly assigned at the capital level? And at the field level? How many people are responsible/working on the FM? Is there at least one person dedicated to it within your agency? Are these persons well-informed about what is expected? Is the feedback mechanism included in that person's TOR / job description?
12. Did the responsible staff receive training on how to establish and run the FM? What kind of training (duration/quality)?
13. Please describe the feedback loop step by step.
14. Are there specific guidance / standards in place to guide the staff that is responsible for the FM? How useful is this guidance?
15. Is there a specific budget for the FM? What share of total program budget?
16. Does your agency have mechanisms in place to reassess / adjust the FM? Which systems? Are they functioning?
17. What are your expectations of the FM? What is its purpose?
18. Who is the main audience of the feedback that is collected within your agency?
19. Do you feel like feedback mechanisms are a priority for the agency's management?
20. How supportive is the management with regards to program changes based on community feedback? How often is the management aware of the program changes that are being made? Does the management receive the feedback collected? In what form?
21. Is there a formal requirement for you to take feedback from communities into account?

III. QUALITY/EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FEEDBACK MECHANISM

22. What is the amount of feedback that you collect? How many SMS/phone calls/messages per month? Total per year? How many persons reached with FGDs/consultations (non-technical)? How many complaints in the box? How many visits to do consultations? What share of your total beneficiary number do you receive feedback from?
23. How many people do you aim to receive feedback from? Is there a fixed quota you need / want to achieve?

24. What type of feedback are you mostly collecting? Does the feedback directly concern the program or also other issues? Does the feedback concern issues that the agency is able to influence/change? What share of the collected feedback concerns relevant larger issues / strategic issues / macro-level changes? What share concerns sensitive issues such as theft, harassment, etc. ? Do you receive security warnings or threats through the FM?
25. Is the collected feedback representative according to gender and age? In particular, do you get feedback from women? How?
26. Does the feedback represent minority groups?
27. How is the collected feedback shared with the relevant person in the agency? Is the collected feedback analyzed? Who is/are responsible for the analysis within the agency? How much of the feedback requires a response?
28. How many instances can you think of where community feedback led to changes in programming? How many instances can you think of where relevant community feedback was collected, but not acted upon? Why was it not reacted upon?
29. Are the response and follow-up actions (both if taken or if not taken) communicated back to the community / affected population? Which channels do you use to give the response to the community?
30. Overall, would you consider your FM as effective? In your experience, what is the biggest success factor for a functioning FM?

IV. EXTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

31. To what extent is the usage of technology socially accepted by the communities in the implementation area? Does gender make a difference here? Age? Province?
32. Is insecurity problematic in the area of concern? If yes, how does it affect the effectiveness of the FM?
33. How often is the agency staff that is responsible for complaints / feedback able to visit implementation sites at the project level?

V. QUESTIONS FOR AGENCIES WITH INFORMAL FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

34. How regularly is the feedback collected? How and by how?
35. Can you estimate the approximate amount of feedback that your organization is receiving?
36. What kind of feedback is collected?
37. Who is the main audience of this type of feedback?
38. What does the agency do with the feedback it receives? Who gets the information? Is it recorded anywhere? Is it sent to the M&E team too?
39. Do you have examples of adjustments to the project based on informal feedback?
40. Does the organization have means to check that the informal feedback is taken into account?
41. Are your informal feedback mechanisms inclusive? (minorities, women, etc.)
42. Do you consider this feedback valuable?
43. Do you think these informal ways of collecting feedback are effective? What could be improved?
44. Do you feel like feedback mechanisms are a priority for your agency's management?
45. How supportive is the management with regards to programme changes based on community feedback? How often is the management aware of the program changes that are being made? In what form does the management receive the feedback?
46. Does the organization have means to check that the informal feedback is taken into account?
47. Is there a formal requirement for you to take feedback from communities into account (from donors or by management)? And is it encouraged by your peers / management?

Annex 4: Field interview guide on bringing M&E back to basics

INTRODUCTION

- Has the interviewee already been informed about SAVE in general or this specific research?
- If not, provide a short introduction:
  - This is part of the larger SAVE project
  - The research topic was determined through consultations with partner organisations to ensure that the focus is relevant.
  - The interest in exploring how monitoring can be brought "back to basics" stems from a concern that especially in insecure contexts humanitarian organisations do not have enough capacities to meet the various demands and expectations for monitoring.
  - Our research explores where there could be potential for bringing monitoring systems "back to basics". We do that by exploring at all levels where monitoring data are generated and used. We want to study:
    (1) What kinds of data do actors at each level need as a minimum?
    (2) What data are they collecting / receiving and how?
    (3) What data are they using and how?
    (4) Where are crucial data gaps and / or redundant / unused data?
- The results of the research will be used to a) provide specific advice to the two partner organisations participating in the exercise and b) derive more general lessons on how to bring monitoring systems in insecure settings "back to basics."
- The interview will be confidential: We will not share interview notes outside of the research team; findings will not be attributed to any individual informant; we will not publish information about their monitoring system unless with the express permission of the organisation.

TARGET GROUPS FOR INTERVIEWS QUESTIONS

Agency staff at the following levels:

- Local level: active data collectors; M&E staff; programme staff; management;
- Country office: M&E staff; programme lead; management
- Regional / global level: M&E, programme and management

Food security cluster: at local, Nairobi and global level
Consortia (if applicable): M&E staff; management
Donors (e.g. ECHO, DFID, USAID, other important donors for the organisation): at local level (if representations exist), Nairobi and global level.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Theme	Questions	Target / remarks
Background	1. Please briefly describe your position and background *(Position incl. job title; how long with organisation / in the country; any direct experience with monitoring or reporting?)*	all
Why?	2. Why are you monitoring / collecting data? *(Donor instructions; HQ / country office instructions; own definition …)* 3. What do you and your colleagues at this level need monitoring data for – what is the minimum you believe a functional monitoring system should deliver?	all

What and how?	4. What data collection instruments are you using? Could you please share samples of the instruments with us? *(e.g. post-distribution monitoring; household surveys; key informant interviews; focus groups; using mobile data collection; traditional paper-based questionnaire; pictures; phones; satellite images etc.?)* 5. What kinds of data are you collecting? *(qualitative, quantitative; on inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact …)* Precise list of indicators? 6. How and by whom is it determined which kind of data to collect for each project? 7. Do you collect different kinds of data for each project? How so? Why? 8. Who collects the data? (international/ national staff; hired enumerators; outsourced to other company …) • Independent M&E? Programme staff? 9. How often do you collect data? Based on what? 10. How large is the sample of people from which you collect data? How is this determined? 11. How do you ensure data quality and validity? 12. What are the main problems you encounter when collecting data? 13. From where / from whom are you receiving data?	M&E staff / data collectors Request documents! All others
Insecure contexts	14. Do you collect different data in safer regions/situations? 15. Do you have different data collection methods or tools in safer regions/situations?	Especially HQ / global level
Data use	16. Are you analysing or directly using any of the data you collect / receive? *Which parts?* *Which ones are you not analysing / using?* *For what are you using them?* 17. Who are you reporting the data to and do you know how they are using it? *(Inside your organisation and outside your organization, e.g. clusters, consortia, donors)* • Please describe the data flow (to the extent of your knowledge) 18. How is the data recorded? • Database? Format? Number? • Who is in charge of cleaning, updating and using the database? 19. Are you often receiving / using data from other organisations? 20. How strong is the willingness to share data with peer organisations?	All
Problem analysis	21. When you compare your ideas about the minimum requirements for monitoring systems and the current situation: Do you see any gaps or overlaps / redundancies in the current monitoring system?	All
Proposals	22. If you could change one or two things about the current monitoring system to adapt it better to insecure contexts, what would they be? *(How could this goal be achieved?)*	All

Annex 5: Online survey with M&E practitioners & experts (aid actors)

The online survey was disseminated to a targeted group of M&E experts and practitioners in the four focus countries. The initial pool of respondents was purposively composed to include a mix of agency types in each context. To cover sufficient parts of the professional M&E community in the countries studied, respondents were asked to forward the survey to their peers. For Syria, the research team made use of an additional Arabic version. Note: These templates were adapted slightly for each country. The example below is the template used for M&E practitioners and experts in Turkey/Syria.

SAVE SURVEY: M&E IN SYRIA

Thank you for your time! With this research project, we want to investigate how aid organisations can track and assess their work in insecure environments. Specifically, we want to:

1. Help donors and aid organisations decide on appropriate monitoring & evaluation approaches given the constraints in insecure contexts.
2. Identify practical solutions to monitor and evaluate despite insecurity.

Please note that this survey covers the Syrian crisis, and all questions relate to this specific context, including cross-border assistance. It is aimed specifically at those familiar with the M&E situation in Syria - this includes those who are working there now, or who have worked in this crisis in the last two years and are now based elsewhere.

The survey takes about 10 minutes to complete. **All your answers will be analysed anonymously.**

If you have questions or comments, please write to esagmeister@gppi.net. For more information, see www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/save.

With best regards,
the SAVE research team

BACKGROUND

1. What type of organization are you working for? Please mark the option applicable to you.

○ Donor
○ UN Agency
○ International NGO
○ National NGO
○ Red Cross/Red Crescent
○ Private Company
○ Other

2. What is your current position in your organization?

○ Management
○ Technical / programme expert
○ M&E expert
○ Other

Please specify your position if necessary

---

3. ***In which sector(s) does your organization mostly operate? (Choose one)***

- All / multi-sector
- Camp coordination and camp management
- Disaster risk reduction
- Early recovery
- Education
- Emergency telecommunications
- Food security
- Health
- Mine action
- Nutrition
- Protection
- Shelter
- Water, sanitation and hygiene
- Coordination
- Logistics

Other (please specify)

4. ***How would you describe your organization?***

- Development organization
- Humanitarian organization
- Multi-mandate organization (doing both development and humanitarian work)

Other (please specify)

5. ***My organization mostly implements…***

- …through local partners
- …through commercial contractors
- …through our own staff

None or a combination of the above (please specify)

6. ***What are your three most important expectations of M&E? Please indicate your first priority by entering "1", your second priority by entering "2" and your third priority by entering "3".***

- M&E should show immediate outputs reached.
- M&E should show the longer term impact of aid.
- M&E should show unintended impact of interventions and help avoid harm.
- M&E should inform operational decisions.
- M&E should ensure accountability to donors / tax payers.
- M&E should ensure accountability to beneficiaries.
- M&E should help prevent fraud or corruption.
- M&E should show aggregated or country-wide effects.
- M&E should produce data that is disaggregated for gender and age.
- M&E should show efficiency or value for money.
- M&E should help to gain a better understanding of the conflict.

7. ***How well does your current M&E system and practice meet these expectations?***

	poor	*fair*	*good*	*excellent*
M&E should show immediate outputs reached.	○	○	○	○
M&E should show the longer term impact of aid.	○	○	○	○
M&E should show unintended impact of interventions and help avoid harm.	○	○	○	○
M&E should inform operational decisions.	○	○	○	○
M&E should ensure accountability to donors / tax payers.	○	○	○	○
M&E should ensure accountability to beneficiaries.	○	○	○	○
M&E should help prevent fraud or corruption.	○	○	○	○
M&E should show aggregated or country-wide effects.	○	○	○	○
M&E should produce data that is disaggregated for gender and age.	○	○	○	○
M&E should show efficiency or value for money.	○	○	○	○
M&E should help to gain a better understanding of the conflict.	○	○	○	○

8. ***How satisfied are you with your organization's ability to monitor and evaluate under conditions of insecurity?***

○ Very satisfied
○ Satisfied
○ Not so satisfied
○ Not satisfied at all

Why? (Please specify)

---

9. ***What hinders good M&E in your context?***

	disagree	*partly agree*	*agree*	*agree strongly*
Security regulations of aid organizations.	○	○	○	○
Lack of M&E capacity in aid agencies.	○	○	○	○
Lack of M&E capacity in local partners.	○	○	○	○
Lack of willingness to share data or lessons between organizations.	○	○	○	○
Insufficient technical infrastructure (e.g. network coverage, internet access).	○	○	○	○
Lack of time to adequately plan and implement M&E.	○	○	○	○
Incentives from donors not to report negative results.	○	○	○	○
Cost of M&E is too high.	○	○	○	○
Lack of guidance on how to do M&E in insecure settings.	○	○	○	○
Existing guidance on how to do M&E in insecure wsettings is not being applied.	○	○	○	○

10. What else stands in the way of adequate M&E in Syria?

11. How useful do you find the following M&E approaches to be in your context?

	not so useful	***useful***	***very useful***	***no experience***
Field visits by agencies' own staff (face-to-face)	○	○	○	○
Field visits by third party	○	○	○	○
Covert monitoring or "ghost monitoring" (monitors not known to implementers)	○	○	○	○
In-person surveys	○	○	○	○
Remote surveys (phone/SMS)	○	○	○	○
GPS tracking of goods	○	○	○	○
Photo or video documentation	○	○	○	○
Satellite pictures	○	○	○	○
Crowd-sourced data or maps	○	○	○	○
Smart phones & social media	○	○	○	○
Unmanned aerial vehicles	○	○	○	○
Risk Management Units (RMU)	○	○	○	○
Collaborative monitoring with other aid agencies (incl. peer monitoring)	○	○	○	○
Complaints hotline	○	○	○	○
SMS feedback system	○	○	○	○
Online feedback platform	○	○	○	○
Suggestion boxes	○	○	○	○
Continuous conflict assessments and analysis	○	○	○	○
Integrating conflict sensitivity assessments or indicators in M&E	○	○	○	○
Integrating do-no-harm in M&E	○	○	○	○

12. What other approaches did you find useful?

13. Which M&E options would you like to learn more about? Which issues in your opinion can benefit from more research?

14. Do you know an example of good practice concerning M&E in an insecure setting?

Country

Organization(s) involved

Please provide some details on the good practice

---

15. Please help us keep in touch.

May we inform you about the results of the SAVE project? **YES/ NO**
May we contact you with follow-up questions? **YES/ NO**

Please enter your email address here

Thank you for your time and interest in our survey!

Annex 6: Overview of all in-country events/workshops with aid actors

All four focus countries saw three rounds of workshops with aid actors. The focus of these workshops varied between contexts. In Afghanistan and Somalia, round 1 at the beginning of the research, served to introduce the SAVE research project to selected stakeholders, verify and complete the team's overview assessment of the current M&E situation in countries, and identify and agree with partners on research priorities. The second round of workshops served to present and discuss selected preliminary findings based on field research and ongoing work with learning partners.

The staggered approach meant that in South Sudan and Turkey (for Syria), the first workshops already included presentations of findings from research in the other countries. The final round of workshops in all countries served to familiarize participants with research findings, to verify the relevance of findings for the specific contexts, and to jointly reflect on further opportunities for disseminating and using the findings. In South Sudan partners expressed the priority to meet and exchange experiences. The team therefore organised a total of seven meetings there. The average number of participants per workshop for all four countries was approximately 20 people.

Tabel:
Overview of all events with aid actors in focus countries

Somalia

Country visit 1: January 2015	**Mogadishu & Nairobi**	• Workshop with learning partners to introduce the research project, to verify the team's assessment of the current status of M&E in Afghanistan and to identify research priorities. • Individual meetings with donors. • Individual meetings with other aid agencies to review interesting M&E practices.
Country visit 2: August 2015	**Nairobi**	• Workshops with aid agencies and donors to discuss preliminary research findings. Specific focus on using technologies for monitoring, community feedback mechanisms and third-party monitoring.
Country visit 3: March 2016	**Mogadishu & Nairobi**	• Workshops with aid agencies and donors to discuss final results from research, to verify the relevance of the findings for the specific contexts and to jointly reflect on further opportunities for disseminating and using the findings.

Afghanistan

Country visit 1: February 2015	**Kabul**	• Workshop with learning partners to introduce the research project, to verify the team's assessment of the current status of M&E in Afghanistan and to identify research priorities. • Individual meetings with donors. • Individual meetings with other aid agencies to review interesting M&E practices.
Country visit 2: August 2015	**Kabul**	• Workshop with aid agencies and donors to discuss preliminary research findings. Specific focus on using technologies for monitoring and community feedback mechanisms.

Country visit 3: April 2016	**Kabul**	• Workshop with aid agencies and donors to discuss final results from research, to verify the relevance of the findings for the specific contexts and to jointly reflect on further opportunities for disseminating and using the findings.

Syria

Country visit 1: September 2015	**Gaziantep**	• Workshop with Turkey-based aid agencies to introduce the research project, to present emerging research findings from Somalia and Afghanistan and to define the research agenda for Turkey-based aid to Syria.
Country visit 2: February 2016	**Gaziantep**	• Workshop to debrief aid agencies on preliminary research findings. Specific focus on third-party monitoring and on using online platforms for monitoring.
Country visit 3: May 2016	**Gaziantep & Antakya**	• Workshop with aid agencies and donors to discuss final results from research, to verify the relevance of the findings for the specific contexts and to jointly reflect on further opportunities for disseminating and using the findings.

South Sudan

Country visit 1: June 2015	**Juba**	• Individual meetings with potential learning partners for the project. • Participation in the Common Humanitarian Fund's Monitoring and Reporting meeting
Country visit 2: September 2015	**Juba**	• Workshop with learning partners and other interested actors to do participatory research on context conditions in South Sudan. Discussion of emerging findings.
Country visit 3: November 2015	**Juba**	• Workshop with partners and other interested parties on remote monitoring options. • Workshop with CHF technical secretariat, CHF monitoring and report specialists and cluster coordinators on the CHF monitoring and reporting system to discuss findings and potential adaptations. • Presentation at National NGO Forum on training options. • Informal briefing of DFID staff of key findings.
Country visit 4: April 2016	**Juba**	• Presentation at the National NGO Forum. • Workshop with partners and other interested parties to discuss final results from research, to verify the relevance of the findings for the specific contexts and to jointly reflect on further opportunities for disseminating and using the findings.

Annex 7: Guide to consultations with affected populations

Note: A generic guide was developed and then slightly adopted for each country context. Questions were also slightly adopted for different subsets of the local population (e.g. small business owners, local relief committees, female committees etc.). The version below is the guide used to consult affected people in Afghanistan.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The third component of SAVE's research on aid in insecure environments focuses on monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Together with our learning partners (3 organisations providing humanitarian assistance in Afghanistan: UNICEF, Save the Children, People in Need), we have decided what the research will focus on. One of the focus areas will be options for conducting and implementing M&E in such a way that it centers on, or is even owned by, beneficiaries and communities.

We found that a lot of guidance exists already on how to design participatory approaches in general, including beneficiary feedback mechanisms and other participatory M&E methods. One of the generic recommendations in these guidance materials is that M&E systems should be adapted to the local cultural and political context. We therefore want to find out more about what this means in different parts of Afghanistan. In addition, we feel that the communities themselves are probably best placed to suggest what feedback and monitoring systems would best suit their needs and preferences.

We are therefore planning to conduct community consultations on M&E in Kandahar, Uruzgan, and Khost.

SCOPE / AUDIENCE

We suggest conducting focus group discussions and consultations with individuals who have been involved in consultations relating to humanitarian aid. This could include for example community committees (CDCs), but also smaller committees or health networks, as well as informed individuals such as teachers, village leadership or local authorities.

In addition, a smaller number of people / groups without any such experience should be consulted to cross-check and validate information.

At least 15 focus group discussions should be held in the three provinces. Each focus group should involve approximately 5-20 participants, including extra groups for women and minority groups where appropriate. If you expect differences between different groups, arrange separate discussions. A focus group discussion is estimated to last around 1 hour. Where feasible, a small number (about 5) of individual consultations with people that have provided feedback to aid agencies in the past or have experience with feedback mechanisms should be held.

QUESTIONS

Introduction: Explain that this discussion is about HOW agencies collect feedback. We are not from the agency, we are not here to collect feedback. We want to learn IF and HOW agencies collect feedback, IF and HOW people can communicate with agencies.

1. Are the aid organisations working here asking for feedback?

[If the answer is no, ask why not and continue with question 5]

If yes, how can you provide feedback to them? [First ask openly, then go through possible examples: Is there a complaints box where you can leave messages? Is there a phone number you can call? Are aid organisations calling people by phone? Are they sending SMS surveys? Are officials of the aid agencies visiting and talking to people? Do you have a committee that checks whether organisations deliver what they promise and check the quality of services? Are there other ways that you can provide feedback?]

Suggestion: Write different feedback mechanisms participants mention on cards and place them on the wall or floor for everybody to see. No need to ask participants to write anything down, you can document for them, potentially also using symbols or illustrations.

2. What do you like about the feedback mechanisms used here and what do you not like?

Suggestion: Go through the different feedback mechanisms one by one to discuss them. Start with the mechanisms that were mentioned most often.

Where feasible, you can also note comments on cards (for example using one colour for positive aspects, another for negative aspects) and place them next to the card with the relevant feedback mechanism. Take a photo of all the cards before you leave.

Make sure to document why people like or dislike mechanisms, why some mechanisms work better than others.

3. Have you heard back from the organisation about your feedback or complaint? Do you know what they did with your feedback?

In principle, would you like to give (more) feedback to the aid agencies?

4. What kind of information would you like to give to the aid agencies? What feedback is most important to you, e.g. to give feedback about goods or services received? Or about "more serious" issues such as potential wrongdoing by staff, corruption or abuse? Why?

5. Can you think of a different way to monitor aid that would fit your preferences better or that would give you a greater say? If yes, what is it and how would it work?

REPORTING

For each focus group discussion, please prepare the following documentation as an email or word document:

Location and date: When and where did the focus group discussion take place?

Number and type of participants: How many people participated in total; how many men, how many women; what position do they hold

Photographs of cards as placed on the wall or floor

Write-up of answers and suggestions for each of the questions (especially 2, 3 and 4)

Annex 8: Structured survey with affected populations

Questions on whether crisis-affected populations are consulted by aid agencies were integrated in structured surveys conducted as part of SAVE research on Presence and Coverage.[1] These garnered 3313 responses across the four countries. Remote, mobile phone surveys, using 'interactive voice response' (IVR) technology were used in Afghanistan, Somalia and South Sudan. In Syria, the survey was conducted in person. The version below is the household survey used in Syria.

INFORMATION TO BE COLLECTED

Gender: (male, female)
Status: (IDP, host, neither)
Number times internally displaced since the onset of the conflict:
Living condition: [Proximity to elaborate on what this entails – they usually collect this]

Number of people in the household, broken down by age:
Head of the household: (male, female)
Pregnancies: (yes, no)
Last time they received aid:
What kind of aid it was:

1. ***Are you in a camp/settlement, in your home, or staying with someone else?***
   a) Camp/settlement
   b) In my home
   c) Staying with someone else

2. ***Have you, your family, or neighbors received international or local aid in the past year?***
   a) Yes
   b) No

3. ***If yes, was the aid provided what you and your family most needed:***
   a) Yes
   b) No

4. ***Who provides aid in your area? For this question, please tick any of the following groups that provide aid in your area:***
   a) Government authorities
   b) Opposition forces
   c) Local aid organizations
   d) Red Crescent society
   e) ICRC - International Committee for the Red Cross
   f) UN
   g) International NGOs
   h) Community groups
   i) Local businesses
   j) Independent donor
   k) Syrian groups from abroad

5. ***What sort of aid is being provided? For this question, please tick any of the following aid type provided in your area:***
   a) Food
   b) Water/sanitation (ex: latrines, garbage collection)

[1] For a full overview of all survey results, see: Stoddard, A. & Jillani, S with Caccavale, J., Cooke, P., Guillemois, D. & Klimentov, V. (2016). The Effects of Insecurity on Humanitarian Coverage (Report from the Secure Access in Volatile Environments (SAVE) research programme: www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/save)

c) Shelter /housing
d) Health
e) Children's education
f) Agriculture
g) Cash
h) Non-food items (prompt: such as (but not limited to) hygiene kits, lamps, mosquito nets, etc.)
i) Other (indicate)

6. ***What sort of help is most needed? (pick one):***
   a) Food
   b) Water/sanitation (ex: latrines, garbage collection)
   c) Shelter
   d) Health
   e) Children's education
   f) Agriculture
   g) Cash
   h) Protection
   i) No outside help is needed
   j) Other (indicate)

7. ***In general, have the needs of people in your district increased or decreased compared to the year before?***
   a) Increased
   b) Decreased

8. ***Are there more or fewer aid organizations helping you, your family or neighbors in your community now compared to the past few years?***
   a) More aid organizations
   b) Fewer aid organizations
   c) Do not know

9. ***Have any aid agencies asked you for your opinion about the aid projects?***
   a) Yes
   b) No

10. ***[If yes] What mechanisms can you use? (Select all that apply)***
    a) Hotline
    b) Suggestion box
    c) Meetings
    d) Feedback committees
    e) Email
    f) Through personal networks/friends/relatives
    g) Through local authorities
    h) Do not know
    i) Other

11. ***Which of these mechanisms is most useful? (Select one)***
    a) Hotline
    b) Suggestion box
    c) Meetings
    d) Feedback committees
    e) Email
    f) Through personal networks/friends/relatives

g) Through local authorities
h) Do not know
i) Other

12. Which of these mechanisms is least useful? (Select one)

a) Hotline
b) Suggestion box
c) Meetings
d) Feedback committees
e) Email
f) Through personal networks/friends/relatives
g) Through local authorities
h) Do not know
i) Other

13. In terms of corruption, would you say that aid in your area is:

a) Not at all corrupt
b) Somewhat corrupt
c) Very corrupt
d) I don't know

14. Is it dangerous for international aid organisations to operate in your area?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

15. Is it dangerous for local aid organisations to operate in your area?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

16. In general, have you received aid in a timely way (i.e. in time to meet your needs)?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

17. Is it ever dangerous for local people to try to receive aid?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

18. Do people receiving aid in your area face any risks of damage to their reputation?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

19. Do people in this area face physical danger when they try to collect aid during distributions (e.g. food or non-food items (prompt: including but not limited to hygiene kits, lamps, mosquito nets, etc.))?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Do not know

20. ***If yes, is it more dangerous for:***
    a) Men
    b) Women
    c) No difference
    d) Do not know

21. ***Would you say that the distance travelled to collect aid during distributions (e.g. food or non-food items (prompt: including but not limited to hygiene kits, lamps, mosquito nets, etc.)) is:***
    a) Okay / acceptable
    b) Too far
    c) Do not know

22. ***Who usually goes to distribution sites to collect aid in your family? (Select one)***
    a) Men (above 18)
    b) Women (above 18)
    c) Boys (under 18)
    d) Girls (under 18)

23. ***In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge to people receiving aid in your area: (select one)***
    a) Insecurity/violence
    b) Corruption
    c) Insufficient quantity
    d) Transportation difficulty

Annex 9: Overview of practitioner's guidance on feedback mechanisms

This table gives an overview of existing guidelines for setting up a feedback mechanism, as well as important literature on the topic.

Guidelines

ALNAP - CDA (2014) *"Effective Feedback in Humanitarian Contexts: Practitioner Guidance"*	This practical guideline is part of ALNAP and CDA's joint research project on what makes feedback mechanisms effective. It starts with a one-page "digested read" for practitioners who have only limited time. http://www.alnap.org/resource/10676.aspx In addition, there is a 45-minute online course with the main findings. http://cdacollaborative.org/about-us/cda-updates/updates/new-course-closing-the-loop-effective-feedback-mechanisms-in-humanitarian-contexts/
ALNAP & Groupe URD (2009) *"Participation Handbook for Humanitarian Field Workers – Involving Crisis-Affected People in a Humanitarian Response"*	This handbook contains practical advice for how to develop a participatory approach and implement it at every stage of the project cycle. http://www.alnap.org/resource/8531.aspx
CCVRI Helpdesk (2013) *"Beneficiary Feedback in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States"*	A comprehensive paper on "how to do beneficiary feedback best" in fragile and conflict-affected states. http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/128358/CCVRI-Help-Desk-Request-and-Response-Beneficiary-Feedback-in-FCAS-Finance-Performance-and-Impact-Department-UK.pdf
CDA (2011) *"Feedback Mechanisms in International Assistance Organizations"*	An extensive study on the use of community feedback mechanisms in international aid efforts. It lists useful examples of various agencies with "closed feedback loops." http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/48015/Feedback-Mechanisms-In-International-Assistance-Organizations.pdf
CDA (2014) *"Lessons from the Beneficiary Feedback Pilot in Pakistan: DFID Access and Beneficiary Feedback Pilots Programme"*	Based on an evaluation of the beneficiary feedback mechanism pilot funded by DFID in Pakistan, this paper presents key lessons on setting up a functioning system. It is part of a larger series of feedback mechanism pilots in DFID's Access and Beneficiary Feedback Pilots Programme that will be evaluated.
CHS Alliance (2015) *"Humanitarian Accountability Report"*	This volume of the CHS Alliance consists of contributions from 13 speakers on how to make accountability to affected populations a reality. It offers many recommendations and actionable solutions for humanitarian aid actors. http://www.chsalliance.org/resources/publications/har

Danish Refugee Council (2008) *"Complaints Mechanism Handbook"*	The handbook provides a step-by-step guide, including a number of practical tools and exercises to facilitate the process of setting up and managing a complaint mechanism. It also lists a set of minimum requirements for agencies to ensure that the mechanism is of satisfactory quality and that the expected benefits materialise. http://www.drc.dk/fileadmin/uploads/pdf/IA_PDF/HAP/complaints_mechanism_handbook_2008.pdf
Feedback Commons (2016)	This online platform is a tool from Keystone Accountability that helps aid agencies to listen and respond to those they seek to help, while gaining insight from other agencies doing similar work. It provides a repository of survey questions and associated benchmarks that organisations can use to collect and interpret feedback in order to improve their performance and get better results for their beneficiaries. http://feedbackcommons.org/
Feedback Labs (2016) *"Real Conversations, Real Actions*	Feedback Labs is a collective of like-minded organisations that believe that affected citizens should drive the policies and programmes that affect them. Their online platform contains a quiz to test how good your organisation is at closing the feedback loop and a useful collection of actionable resources to help you improve feedback processes. http://feedbacklabs.org/
Food Security and Agriculture Cluster Afghanistan (2013) *"Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanisms"*	This paper summarises the formal and informal feedback mechanisms that are currently used by the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster (FSAC) member agencies in Afghanistan. It is aimed at helping other agencies to consider establishing or amending their own mechanisms. http://www.alnap.org/resource/10672.aspx
ITAD & the Rockefeller Foundation (2014) *"Emerging Opportunities: Monitoring & Evaluation in a Tech-Enabled World"*	This discussion paper provides an overview of how the practice of M&E is learning to better use ICT for more-inclusive feedback from affected populations. It discusses the promises, limitations and inherent risks of emerging technologies. https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/emerging-opportunities-monitoring/
Plan International, World Vision Int. & IOM (2015) *"Who's Listening? Accountability to Affected Populations in the Haiyan Response"*	This recent case study on the response to typhoon Haiyan offers valuable insights on how agencies can improve their efforts to be accountable to affected populations. https://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/file/494700/download/539031
World Vision International (2009) *"Complaint and Response Mechanisms: Resource Guide"*	This practical guide discusses how to implement formal complaint and response mechanisms. It is aimed at practitioners in food programming, with a focus on community help desks and suggestion boxes. http://www.alnap.org/resource/8770

Annex 10: Inventory of global M&E training options

This document presents as analysis of the training options available globally for strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacities. After a mapping of the available international and national training options, those which were found to be most adequate for the needs in South Sudan were selected. This list should serve as an easy to use resource for those looking for readily accessible training courses as well as online platforms available for building M&E capacities.

Training Courses	Description
Claremont University Professional Evaluation Department http://cgu.edu/workshops	Rated: high Registration required, scholarships available for evaluators from developing countries They conduct professional development workshops on evaluation on their campus. Some workshops are also available online.
International Program for Development Evaluation Training http://www.ipdet.org	Rated: high Expensive, but scholarships available The program is aimed at managers and practitioners working in evaluation. The program includes a two-week core course, followed by two weeks of in-depth workshops conducted by experts from Southern and Northern organizations. The program takes place every summer in Ontario, Canada.
Technology for M&E, by Tech Change https://www.techchange.org/online-courses/technology-for-monitoring-and-evaluation	Rated: quite good Cost- between $300- $500 This is an entirely web-based certificate course which focuses on building skills and strategies to better collect, manage, and analyze data using ICT and a variety of tech tools. It also features live interactions with leading M&E practitioners and data scientists.
MIT Open Courseware http://ocw.mit.edu/resources/res-14-002-abdul-latif-jameel-poverty-action-lab-executive-training-evaluating-social-programs-2011-spring-2011/index.htm	Rated: high Free, online course MIT offers several open source courses so that the syllabus, lecture notes, and videos are freely available online and can be downloaded free of charge. Their course on evaluating social programs is ideal for those seeking to learn more about M&E with a focus on international development projects.
EvalPartners Platform, ALNAP http://www.alnap.org/what-we-do/evaluation/e-learning	Rated: good Free, online course The platform offers a free online course “Introduction to Evaluating Humanitarian Action” on the platform. The course has been developed by ALNAP and UNICEF and offers an overview of evaluation practice in humanitarian contexts and features guides and tips, online lectures, videos and other sources. It also allows you to tailor the course according to your own needs. Courses are open three times a year.

Capacity Africa Institute http://www.capacityafrica.com/index.html Their most recent listing on Relief Web: http://reliefweb.int/training/970506/project-cycle-management-training-workshop	Rated: good Paid courses and certification, both online and conducted in locations in several countries including South Sudan. They organize training workshops and online certification courses on a number of topics including monitoring and evaluation, project cycle management. Courses are conducted in the form of training workshops over 2 to 3 day periods and are quite comprehensive.

Learning Platforms	Description
Better Evaluation http://betterevaluation.org	Rated: high Free and online A comprehensive learning platform that provides methods and tools for evaluation, different approaches that can be used etc. Resources available include: webinars, downloads, events, and online writing workshops.
Key Stone Accountability for Social Change https://www.keystoneaccountability.org/	Rated: good Free and online platform They have developed resources to improve the effectiveness of organizations using better ways of planning, measuring and reporting social change. Resources include: downloadable guides, reports, presentations, and published articles.
GrantCraft Platform http://www.grantcraft.org/guides/mapping-change	Rated: good Free and online platform This is a platform for learning good grant writing including resources for better planning. They have free and downloadable resources in more than 10 languages and multiple formats. The website has a separate issue area for M&E, with easy-to-read brochures on e.g. participatory M&E.
FSG Consulting http://www.fsg.org/	State of the art Provides information on how to develop a shared measurement practice, with multiple stakeholders. Advanced level training.
The Sphere Project http://www.sphereproject.org/learning/	Rated: High Free online resources for monitoring and paid trainings & online seminars This is an online collection of resources on humanitarian principles and standards, as well as courses on monitoring and evaluation. In their events calendar they have information on trainings on topics such as mobile phone based data collection using ODK
TechChange https://www.techchange.org/	Rated: High Paid online courses and certification for M&E The courses here focus on the use of technology in monitoring & evaluation, and aspects such as data collection & survey design, data visualization, mobile phones for data collection, knowledge management etc. Courses are available online and take place over a period of 4 weeks. They do require a registration fee which starts from $300 onwards. Successful completion of some courses provides a certification (for e.g. a Diploma).

Annex 11: Forthcoming SAVE products (fall 2016)

Briefing Note on Accountability and Learning in Volatile Environments:
Steets, J. & Sagmeister, E. (2016). Addressing the Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation in Volatile Environments: Lessons from Humanitarian Organisations in Afghanistan, Somalia, South Sudan and Syria.

Full Report on Community Feedback Mechanisms:
Ruppert, L., Sagmeister, E., Steets, J. (2016). Listening to Communities in Insecure Environments: Lessons From Community Feedback Mechanisms in Afghanistan, Somalia and Syria.

Full Report on Third-Party Monitoring:
Sagmeister, E. & Steets, J. with Derzsi-Horvath, A. and Hennion, C. (2016). The Use of Third Party Monitoring in Insecure Contexts: Lessons from Afghanistan, Somalia and Syria.

Technology Toolkit:
Dette, R., Steets, J. & Sagmeister, E. (2016). Technologies for Monitoring in Insecure Environments: A Menu of Options.

Briefing Note on Bringing M&E Back to Basics:
Steets, J., Ruppert, L. (2016). Monitoring and Evaluation in Insecure Contexts: Back to Basics?

Full Report on the CHF Monitoring & Reporting Mechanism in South Sudan:
Steets, J. & Caccavale, J. (2016). The Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism of the Common Humanitarian Fund in South Sudan

Briefing Note on Context Constraints for Monitoring in South Sudan:
Steets, J. & Caccavale, J. (2016). Overview of Context Constraints and Mitigation Options for Aid Monitoring in South Sudan.