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Overview

The Danish Refugee Council and a team of graduate students from Tufts University’s Feinstein International Center have worked in partnership to develop and pilot monitoring tools and guidance to support the further uptake and implementation of multipurpose cash grant (MPG) programmes. The monitoring tools and guidance are part of a wider ‘MPG Toolkit’ produced in 2017-18 by the ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC)–funded Consortium for the uptake of quality, collaborative, multi-purpose grants (‘ERC Consortium’).

The creation of the tools and guidance included a desk review and consultation with ERC Consortium, and regional and pilot country-based partners; initial tool development; and successive rounds of piloting and tool revision in Borno State, Nigeria, and Jijiga, Ethiopia between June 2017 and March 2018. Continued tool revision took place in Ethiopia in January-March 2018. This report documents the case study of the Ethiopia round of piloting.

Somali Region Context

The monitoring toolkit was piloted with two programmes run by different aid organisations, IOM and Oxfam, in the Somali Region of Ethiopia. The Tufts team was based in DRC’s Jijiga field office. Jijiga is the regional capital and is where various aid organisations base their operations in the region. The Somali Region has suffered from intermittent drought in the past few years, and has seen a growing IDP population due to rising inter-ethnic conflict in the Oromia and Somali Regions of Ethiopia.

Timeframe and Locations

The DRC-Tufts team was in Ethiopia for six weeks in January, February, and March 2018. Both pilots of the monitoring tools and guidance targeted beneficiaries of cash transfer programmes in the Somali region. The first pilot took place on January 24-26 in Qologi 2, an IDP camp in the Fafan zone. The second pilot took place on February 12-14 in the Jarar zone in three different village communities, each located 15-18 km from the town of Ararso.
Brief Description of Pilots with IOM and Oxfam

The DRC-Tufts team arrived in Jijiga in late January 2018 and chose to work with IOM and Oxfam as both had conducted multipurpose cash grant (MPG) programmes in the region. The nature of our partnership was that the DRC-Tufts team would pilot the monitoring tools with recipients of these organisations’ cash programmes, which had either already been completed (IOM) or were ongoing (Oxfam), by using – and further developing, adapting and contextualising – the tools that had been developed in Nigeria. The two rounds of piloting allowed the team to revise and adapt the tools to the Somali Region context.

The IOM cash programme took place in November 2017. This was a one-time cash distribution conducted in the Qologi 2 IDP camp. The cash transfers, although unconditional and unrestricted, were designed with the objective of supporting IDPs to meet their shelter and non-food item (NFI) needs (complementary to other types of assistance, including food).

The Oxfam cash transfer programme took place over three months from November 2017 to January 2018. The cash programme was conducted in four villages in the Jarar zone. These communities were made up of agro-pastoralists who, due to drought, had lost most of their livestock and agricultural production. The transfers were unconditional and unrestricted, distributed once a month over a period of three months.

Breakdown/Introduction of Tools

The monitoring toolbox developed in Nigeria and further refined in Ethiopia is composed of three separate tools: a household (HH) survey, a key informant interview (KII) guide, and a focus group discussion (FGD) guide. Each tool attempts to provide a snapshot in time of how an MPG programme is being received, perceived and utilised by a community, and what its effects have been on people’s basic needs – across process, and both immediate, and to the extent possible, medium-term outcomes. These tools should be used following a baseline assessment or previous round(s) of monitoring to be able to compare data and support analysis – and where necessary adapting or improving the programmatic response.

The purpose of using three different tools is to ask questions about a set of topics in a diverse array of ways to be able to tease out more information than would have been attained by using just one of the tools. They allow the research team to ask questions in different settings and to people of different statuses in the community. For example, the HH surveys were conducted with randomly selected beneficiaries, and when possible, in the privacy of a household. KIIIs were conducted with leaders of the community. FGDs were conducted with beneficiaries in a group setting. This multiple tool approach allows different perspectives to be voiced and for the triangulation of information. For example, if a particular trend arises from the HH surveys, this trend can be confirmed and further elaborated upon via the KIIIs and FGDs. In this way, it is possible to obtain a more clear and complete understanding of how cash assistance was being used, perceived, and its impact on beneficiaries as well as their local community. The information collected by the tools revolved around several indicators.

The indicators were:

- The community’s basic needs
- Barriers to meeting those basic needs
- Preferred modality, and mechanism, for receiving assistance
- Indicators around protection issues
- The process of collecting the cash/receiving a cash transfer
- Indicators on coping strategies before and after the cash distribution(s)

Household (HH) Survey
The HH Survey was where the most quantitative data was collected. The surveys were administered individually and when possible, in a private and/or confidential setting. The survey took about 30 minutes to complete and contained questions designed to facilitate the gathering of relevant data against the identified indicators.

Key Informant Interviews (KII)
The KIIIs were one of the tools used to collect qualitative information. These interviews were conducted with members – usually leaders and/or representatives of the community – who were knowledgeable of the cash programme and its effects. The questions covered the same indicators as the HH survey. Beyond allowing the team to gather qualitative information on the identified indicators, the KIIIs were valuable to dive deeper into specific questions. Each KII took roughly one hour. Interviewers spoke with an equal number of men and women in order to capture both their perspectives.

Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
The FGDs were the second qualitative information gathering tool. The team’s discussions were generally held with 6-8 beneficiaries. As with the KII, questions were asked that covered the same indicators as the HH Surveys. Each FGD lasted between 1-1.5 hours and were organised as all male and all female FGDs. Mixed FGD groups were avoided following standard good practice, in particular due to the risk that this would likely lead to men dominating the conversation and little female involvement. Each FGD began with a proportional piling exercise which was a group activity that had the participants place pieces of macaroni over pictures of basic needs. This ice breaking activity kick started discussion on how beneficiaries had been spending their cash transfers.

Summary of Pilot I – IOM
For a more thorough overview of Pilot I with IOM, see Appendix A.

Programme Description and Context
As of January 2018 Qologi 2 was made up of 4,800 households. These where primarily city dwellers who had previously owned and run small businesses prior to their displacement. In November 2017, IOM distributed unconditional and unrestricted cash transfers to 1,604 households. Transfers were of 3,200 ETB (roughly 93 euro) value. Beneficiaries were selected by community according to vulnerability criteria.

Schedule for Pilot
The monitoring pilot was conducted January 24-26, 2018. HH surveys were conducted over all three days while KIIIs and FGDs were conducted on days two and three.
Conducting the Pilot

IOM gave the DRC-Tufts team a complete list of beneficiaries. Via random selection, the team selected beneficiaries who would take part in the HH survey. Upon arrival at camp, a representative from IOM introduced DRC-Tufts team to local Ethiopian government (DPPB) and community leaders.

The team that went to Qologi 2 was composed of two members of the Tufts research team, one DRC representative, one IOM representative, two translators, and five enumerators.

DPPB and community leaders were instrumental in conducting the pilot. They facilitated the process of finding beneficiaries to participate in the piloting of the tools.

Due to lack of time and capacity, the research team decided against conducting enough HH surveys to reach a full random sample. Instead, they calculated that each enumerator could complete 12 surveys per day and that by the end of three days, they could complete 180 surveys.

Privacy was a primary concern as initially enumerators were placed in locations where surveys would not have been administered confidentially. Following assistance from DPPB and community leaders, the team was able to place the enumerators in locations where the surveys could be completed privately.

The respondents for the KII were leaders in the community who were familiar with how the community had been affected by the cash program. The KII was held within households which offered a good level of privacy. KII was held with the IDP Site Manager, a religious leader, and a female community leader.

The FGDs were beneficiaries who matched our criteria of diversity in age (however, they did skew towards over 40) and who had not been involved in the selection process of the cash distribution. The discussions were also held within the privacy of households, albeit one FGD was momentarily disrupted by community members who wanted to join the discussion.

Key Lessons from planning and conducting Qologi Pilot

- Connect and form a good relationship with the local government and community leaders. The pilot would not have succeeded without their knowledge of the community.
- Prioritise privacy for respondents.
- Ensure enough time to prepare any technologies that you may want to use for your monitoring.
- Test the enumerator’s language skills. Do not assume they speak the local language fluently.
- Review HH surveys to check if enumerators are administering them in a manner consistent with how they were discussed during the enumerator training.
Presenting Results/Issues with the Questions
This section covers some of the most important findings from the HH survey and the challenges the team found with some questions. It is structured according to the indicators that were mentioned earlier in the report:

- The community’s basic needs
- The barriers to meeting those basic needs
- Indicators around protection issues
- The process of collecting the cash

Additional indicators were added for the second Oxfam pilot, but for the IOM pilot data was collected on the four above.

Community’s Basic Needs
To capture information on basic needs, the team used Save the Children’s categories from their Basic Needs Assessment tool. The HH survey approached asking about household’s basic needs by first asking the respondent what were the top three items that their household purchased using the cash transfer. It then asked the family to rate their present ability to meet their basic need and their ability to meet them in three months if no additional assistance was provided. The survey then asked which basic need would become more difficult to meet due to seasonal changes.

The survey results show that household items were the number one expenditure, followed by shelter. The survey also found that households spent a significant amount on food, which was notable since food was provided in the camp. Via informal conversation, the team found out that a lot of the food that had been distributed in the camp would not have been the first choice of a family when purchasing food. The high percentage of people spending on household items does appear to show that IOM’s objective of the cash transfer meeting non-food (household) and shelter item needs was successful.

![Diagram showing needs listed as number 1 expenditure](image)

When taken into account how often an item was mentioned as a top three expenditure, the results changed slightly, but NFIs and shelter items still remained at the top.
To capture data on what households felt their ability was to meet a basic need, the team used the following four-point scale:

1: Sufficient to cover all of our family needs
2: Just enough/barely enough to cover all of our family needs
3: Insufficient to cover all our family needs
4: Totally insufficient to cover all our family needs

Respondents were asked to rate each of the basic needs. There were several discussions on the merits and demerits of using a Likert Scale, with a particular concern about what it meant for each person to meet vs. barely meet a basic need. The team was also concerned about how the enumerators were asking the question and interpreting the answer. This brought out the concern that in addition, each respondent could potentially be interpreting the scale differently. In the end, the team decided to use the Likert Scale for lack of a better option and chose to focus on how each need compared to each other. For example, it is important to know that water in Qologi 2 is a need that is relatively well met, while clothing needs are not.

Finally, the team found that the basic needs people felt most worried about meeting in the next three months were food, clothing, and shelter. These questions were asked on a scale of 1-5:

1: I don’t feel worried at all about meeting this need
2: I feel worried, but we should be able to cope
3: I feel worried for some or all family members and I’m not sure we will be able to cope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Unable to Meet Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unable to meet (3-4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the team found that the basic needs people felt most worried about meeting in the next three months were food, clothing, and shelter. These questions were asked on a scale of 1-5:

1: I don’t feel worried at all about meeting this need
2: I feel worried, but we should be able to cope
3: I feel worried for some or all family members and I’m not sure we will be able to cope
4: I feel worried for the health of some or all family members
5: I feel worried for the life of some or all family members

The team was also concerned about this scale because it did not seem completely relevant to some basic needs. For example, a lack of education does not seem to relate to a scale where one of the points is an endangerment of life. It was decided to interpret a rating of 5 to mean that a person was concerned for their own mortality due to the lack of a basic need. Following conversations with Save the Children, they explained that the rating system was created this way to help capture the importance of some basic needs over others. For example, the scale for this question, would help tell you whether people valued water or education more.

The survey results showed that in three months, food, healthcare, and shelter were the basic needs that people were most concerned about meeting.

![Survey Results Table]

**Barriers to Basic Needs**

The next indicator focused on were the barriers people faced to meeting their basic needs. When piloting this tool, the primary issue observed was that the survey did not disaggregate the barriers by each basic need. Rather, the question simply asked what were the barriers to meet all of a household’s basic needs. Following the pilot, the team also felt that some of the categories could be consolidated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Basic Needs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient money to purchase or access goods or services</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>79.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient assistance or support provided by government</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient goods/services/Infrastructure available locally</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient traders in the area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscurity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient diversity of goods and services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain and logistical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient skills and competencies of service providers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient safety or reliability of provided goods or services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient local reserve/stock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Protection Issues**

To find out about protection issues regarding the cash, beneficiaries were asked if they felt safe on the way to the collection point, at the collection point, and returning home with the cash. Across all three questions not a single person mentioned any safety issues. The team followed up in the KII and FGDs but no complaints about security arose from those either and respondents highlighted the fact that everyone in the camp was Somali and in one way or another connected via the clan system making theft rare.

**Process of collecting cash**

The final indicator was to capture how well organised the process of cash distribution was. Among the questions the team asked were how long it took beneficiaries to reach the distribution point, the queue to collect the cash, and if they had to pay any sort of fee to collect their cash. The last question was an attempt to identify instances of diversion or corruption.

First, the team found that most people did not have to walk very far to reach the cash distribution point. The distribution point was at the centre of the camp and due to the camp not being geographically large, it was a short trip for most.

![Time to Distribution Point](chart.png)

The results for how long people had to wait to receive their cash were a bit more varied. This could be because the first people to arrive naturally waited less time than people who arrived later and had to wait longer in line.

A suggestion for future monitoring projects is to have questions that can get at the security and protection issues in a more roundabout way rather than asking directly – such as asking whether respondents had heard of cash being stolen or misplaced from someone else’s home.
Finally, the survey asked if beneficiaries had to incur any expenses or make any payments to access the cash. 168 out of 169 people said that there were no expenses or payments, and the one dissenter had left the answer blank. It must be noted, however, that in one of the male focus groups, a group stated that they knew of cases where community members had used their family connections with a community leader to enter the list of beneficiaries. They stated that this was not widespread and that there were few cases of this. They also explicitly stated that they had not heard of anyone paying to be included on the list.

**Primary Challenges in Using the Tools**

**Logistical challenges and things to keep in mind**

1. Establish a relationship with local government and inform them of what you are doing in the camp.

2. Fairly dense population within the camp. Upon arrival, the team was surrounded by a couple hundred people who believed the DRC and IOM transportation meant the arrival of goods and/or services. Even with prior communication to DPPB and community leaders that there would be no distribution, it took all of the first day to communicate that the team was just there to collect information.

3. Enumerators were spread out around the camp in different houses. While there were no problems, in a situation with higher security risk, it is not recommended to separate enumerators in the way it was done with the IOM pilot. Proposed solution could be for enumerators to work in teams of two, each conducting their surveys in privacy, but close enough to each other for support. In addition, the entire research team must have each other’s cell phone numbers. In case of lack of network, it is not advisable to separate enumerator team.

4. For security reasons, team must leave Qologi 2 by 4:30 pm. This was not an issue for the team as most days were complete by 3:30 pm.

**Household Surveys**

1. Given the short amount of time to pilot the tools and the fact that the project had ended, there was limited access to programme documentation from IOM to understand the details of their cash programme and of the Qologi 2 community.
2. At first, lack of privacy. The team resolved this by having enumerators placed within households where surveys could be administered one on one.

3. Three enumerators had PhDs and extensive research experience. While the team was at first encouraged by this, they found that each enumerator had their own interpretation of the questions based on their own experiences. This required debriefing at the end of each day to ensure that all enumerators were on the same page regarding the objective of each question.

4. Working with enumerators who had a less than fluent ability in Somali. It is recommended to have a language exam to identify whether a person is fluent in speaking and reading in the local language.

5. Some enumerators went faster than others. The team suspected that these enumerators were going through the survey too quickly, not carefully explaining the questions nor giving respondents enough time to think about the question. Some recommendations on how to address this is role play during training and demonstrate how long each survey or section of the survey should take. It may also be helpful to establish a recommended amount of time for each section of the survey, for example, the Basic Needs section of the survey should take 7-10 minutes to complete.

6. Translation issues: To be covered at the end of the report.

7. Lack of time to analyse quantitative data before moving on to qualitative data collection. Consider having two different phases. One being quantitative and the other being qualitative. Allow enough time between each phase to analyse the data from phase one to inform any adjustments for phase two.

Focus Group Discussions

1. Most participants were generally over 40 years old. Lack of representation from younger population. It is unclear why this was the case. Recommend highlighting to partner organisation and other local partners that age diversity is important.

2. There would usually be one or two people who would dominate the conversation. We recommend countering this by firmly but politely explaining that it is important to hear everyone’s voice and perspective. Be willing to ask a person who has spoken a lot to hold their point and direct the question to the other members of the group who have not spoken as much.

3. One group had several community members who were not identified to be part of the FGD enter into the room and give out their own opinions before they were asked to leave. Recommend at the start of discussion, stating that participants are free to leave as they wish, however, new participants cannot join. If people do try to join, firmly yet politely communicate that the discussion is taking place within this particular group and it requires privacy.
Summary of Pilot II with Oxfam

Programme Description and Context
Oxfam’s programme focused on people who were suffering from drought conditions rather than IDPs. This particular cash programme was based in the Jarar zone of the Somali region. The DRC-Tufts team chose to focus on three villages which had been part of the cash programme. These communities were made up of agro-pastoralists who were used to migrating with their livestock in search of grassland. Due to the drought and lack of grassland, they had settled in village communities for mutual support. The beneficiaries received three separate transfers of 1,200 ETB, which were distributed once a month.

Schedule of Pilot
The pilot was conducted February 12-14, 2018. DRC’s protection advisor, Brennan Webert, was available to participate in the pilot on the first day. To leverage his expertise, the team conducted one FGD and one KII on the first day as well as the HH surveys, which like the first pilot, took place over all three days. Day two saw KIIs and day three saw FGDs.

Changes in Tools
Following the first pilot, the DRC-Tufts team worked to further adapt the tools. Brennan arrived a week before the Oxfam pilot. This allowed him to assist in changing the tools the better capture information on protection and coping strategies.

Following analysis of data and review of tools from the first round of piloting, the team rephrased, specified, added, and deleted questions across all three tools. Changes were made in order to have the tools better fit the context of the communities (such as adding livestock as a basic need), and adapting sections of the survey into ways that the team thought could provide more actionable information. With input from Brennan, the team also added coping strategy questions. KII and FGD questions were streamlined and standardized.

Conducting Pilot
As with the IOM pilot, an Oxfam representative was present for the pilot. The team’s composition was mostly the same as the IOM pilot, the two Tufts researchers, Brennan, a representative from DRC, a representative from Oxfam, five enumerators, and two translators.

Oxfam set up a meeting with the local government in order to introduce the team and explain the objectives of our work. This pilot saw less interfacing with local government compared to Qologi 2 and more with community leaders.

The team was only given list of beneficiaries upon arrival at each community. The team would select beneficiaries at random from the list and with consultation from a community leader, would identify which beneficiaries were present in the community that day and able to participate in pilot.

This created the potential issue of a community leader acting as a ‘gatekeeper’ and selecting who he wanted the team to speak to. While there was no indication that this was the case, it did create the potential that the community leader could purposefully include or exclude people based on their own criteria, therefore defeating the purpose of a random selection.
Due to the location of the communities being far from Jijiga, the DRC-Tufts team decided that they would complete less HH surveys. They did not want to have the enumerators try to speed through them to hit an arbitrary number that would not have reached the representative sample amount.

For KIIs, the team tested speaking with non-beneficiaries as well in order to capture their perspective on the cash programme.

Due to the lack of male beneficiaries, the male FGDs often had cash committee members (who were not beneficiaries and had led the community selection process), or cash for work beneficiaries instead of ‘regular’ unconditional and unrestricted cash beneficiaries. This resulted in directing the FGDs more towards the community’s basic needs rather than questions about Oxfam’s unconditional and unrestricted cash programme.

### Key Lessons from planning and conducting Oxfam Pilot

- If possible, acquire a beneficiary list before arriving at location. Also, if possible, do not work through gatekeepers for risk of making the selection of beneficiaries biased.
- Include non beneficiaries within the KIIs to capture a different perspective on community dynamics.
- Be aware of gender split in the program and whether there will be enough men or women to conduct FGDs.
- If you are not trying to reach a random sample of the population, be flexible in how many beneficiaries you interview.

### Presenting Results/Issues with the Questions

This section will cover some of the most important findings from the HH survey and the challenges the team found with some questions. It is structured according to the indicators mentioned earlier in the report:

- Community’s basic needs
- Barriers to meeting those basic needs
- Indicators around protection issues
- Process of collecting the cash
- Preferred modality of receiving assistance
- Indicators on coping strategies before and after the cash distribution.

The final two indicators are ones the team added for the Oxfam pilot.

### Basic Needs

As mentioned above, the team changed how they asked basic needs questions in the HH survey. They created three base questions, the first asked the respondent their ability to meet the basic needs for their family on a scale of 1 to 5 with one being completely able to meet their basic need and five being completely unable to meet their basic needs. The team followed up by asking what are the main barriers to meeting each basic need. Third, the team asked what kind of assistance the household prefers to meet each specific basic need.
It was found that the needs that most people were unable to meet were travel, HH items, and food. Given the distance from Ararso, lack of transportation, and poor road access, it was clear why transportation was the most unmet need. Energy, education, and livestock on the other hand were relatively better met.

As for barriers to meeting these basic needs, the team found that money was the most significant barrier, followed by amount of services and goods available in the area.

### Percent unable to meet needs

**Unable to meet (4-5)** | **Can barely meet (3)** | **Can meet (1-2)**
---|---|---
Travel | 0.7754 | 0.21 | 0.01
HH Items | 0.6824 | 0.29 | 0.02
Food | 0.66 | 0.33 | 0.01
Communication | 0.6588 | 0.25 | 0.09
Water | 0.6548 | 0.24 | 0.11
Health | 0.6353 | 0.21 | 0.15
Hygiene | 0.6353 | 0.29 | 0.07
Clothes | 0.6118 | 0.38 | 0.01
Shelter | 0.54 | 0.37 | 0.08
Livestock | 0.5088 | 0.47 | 0.02
Education | 0.4675 | 0.43 | 0.1
Energy | 0.4118 | 0.46 | 0.13

### Barriers to meeting needs

- **Money**
  - Insufficient money to purchase/access goods or services
- **Amount**
  - Insufficient amount of goods/services available
- **Quality**
  - Insufficient quality of goods/services
- **Travel**
  - Travel or distance makes it difficult to access markets/service providers
- **Skill**
  - Insufficient skills and competencies of service providers
- **Insecurity**
  - Insecurity makes it difficult to access markets/service providers
- **Discrimination**
  - Social discrimination makes it difficult to access markets/service providers

### Need Percent Unable to Meet

- **Food**
  - Money: 99%
  - Amount: 16%
  - Quality: 5%
  - Travel: 6%
  - Skill: 0%
  - Insecurity: 1%
  - Discrimination: 0%
- **HH Items**
  - Money: 95%
  - Amount: 28%
  - Quality: 7%
  - Travel: 6%
  - Skill: 0%
  - Insecurity: 0%
  - Discrimination: 0%
- **Clothes**
  - Money: 94%
  - Amount: 18%
  - Quality: 9%
  - Travel: 5%
  - Skill: 2%
  - Insecurity: 1%
  - Discrimination: 0%
- **Shelter**
  - Money: 87%
  - Amount: 35%
  - Quality: 29%
  - Travel: 1%
  - Skill: 0%
  - Insecurity: 0%
  - Discrimination: 0%
- **Communication**
  - Money: 82%
  - Amount: 28%
  - Quality: 12%
  - Travel: 4%
  - Skill: 0%
  - Insecurity: 0%
  - Discrimination: 0%
- **Energy**
  - Money: 75%
  - Amount: 40%
  - Quality: 16%
  - Travel: 19%
  - Skill: 0%
  - Insecurity: 0%
  - Discrimination: 0%
Next, the pilot looked at which assistance modalities were preferred for each basic need. The preferred modality for food was cash, as it gave people the ability to purchase the foods that they preferred to eat. Water was the need that received the largest modality preference of in-kind/service. The team found from the FGDs and KII that the communities preferred in-kind/service of water rather than cash because it was better to have the water physically provided in the community rather than have the cash to walk to Ararso, purchase, and return with the water. The survey did not specify whether the community needed potable water or if non-potable water was sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preferred assistance modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cash only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH items</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further improve this question, it is recommended to ask individually which modality the respondent prefers, but also all possible combinations of modalities. Meaning cash + in kind or cash + service, etc. Asking this question also requires well trained enumerators. The order in which enumerators ask the components of this question may affect the answers. There can be an anchoring effect where if the enumerator asks the person if cash is the best way to receive assistance, the respondent will tend to choose the first option that was presented to them.

Protection Issues
Much like the pilot with IOM, the result from the HH surveys showed that not a single person out of the 84 respondents had any issues with keeping their cash secure. The team added an additional question asking if people felt safe storing their cash within the house and this also produced that people felt completely safe with their cash.
Process of Collecting Cash

The data shows that, similar to IOM’s cash assistance in Qologi 2, most people were fairly close to the cash distribution point. However, based on data gathered in KIIs we were informed that the furthest person was a 6 km walk from the distribution point.

The results also did find that one person said that they had to pay some sort of fee to enter into the beneficiary list, pointing out that there may have been one case of corruption. The team followed up on this during the KIIs and FGDs but there were no complaints about people paying fees or using social connections to be included on the beneficiary list.

Primary challenges in using the tools

Logistical challenges and things to keep in mind

1. Distance from Jijiga to communities. The trip took between 1.5 to 2 hours to arrive at each community. This meant the team had less time in each community.
2. Lack of beneficiary list which meant that beneficiaries were being selected when we arrived at the community, and took time away from the pilot itself.
3. Required to work through ‘gatekeepers’ (i.e. community leaders) in order to speak to beneficiaries.
4. Lack of time to review results from HH survey to inform KIIs and FGDs. Allow time for data analysis between quantitative and qualitative phases in order to notice and follow up on trends.

Household Surveys

1. Challenges with using Magpi. Did not allow us to disaggregate data by community due to inaccurate time stamps for each survey. Team was unable to decipher which surveys had been completed in day one, two, or three.
2. Slightly different contexts in each community.
3. Coping strategy questions. First time piloting this question which naturally led to areas for improvement:
   a. Are the coping strategies used relevant to the community? Were there any that were missed? Team was missing input from community on development of list of coping strategies. We recommend a pre-monitoring qualitative exercise where you have a few KIIs and FGDs to capture what sort of coping strategies are relevant. Use information from this pre-round to inform the HH survey.
   b. It is difficult to assess what effect a cash transfer has had on a household’s coping strategies. This is because there may be other variables affecting the household’s abilities to meet their basic needs. For example, take a household that loses 5,000 ETB worth of livestock to drought in the same month that they receive a 1,200 ETB transfer. The cash won’t cover their livestock losses and their usage of coping strategies may actually increase following the transfer due to the continued drought conditions. The presence of multiple variables affecting coping strategies makes it difficult to capture a cash transfer’s effects on coping strategies.

Key Informant Interviews
1. For some KIIs, the respondents themselves had been involved in the selection process of beneficiaries. This means that for questions asking about the selection process, the team was unlikely to receive unbiased information.

Focus Group Discussions
1. Due to lack of male beneficiaries, one focus group was composed of four cash for work beneficiaries and three MPG beneficiaries. It was decided to go ahead with the FGD, but focus on questions regarding the community’s basic needs and their ability to access markets.
2. Coping strategy questions. Team began by asking open ended questions on what coping strategies the community used when they could not meet a basic need. Question was not understood well, may need to reformulate the question or work with translator to explain what is meant by coping strategy. At times, it was necessary to additionally prompt on a particular coping strategy. For example, in one group the facilitator asked whether respondents had been forced to send children to work. The group answered yes, children are sometimes sent to work and then expected to send money back to the family. Due to the information being prompted, raises the question if it was an accurate statement or an attempt to negotiate for more cash transfers.
3. Presence of cash committee members in the groups. The first FGD discussion included four cash committee members out of the eight total participants. They dominated the conversation and potentially caused other participants to be less willing to share information. The team asked the Oxfam representative not to include cash committee members in future groups, however they were still present, albeit in fewer numbers. Facilitator attempted to navigate this by asking a few questions specifically to committee members and specifically to beneficiaries to try to tease out differences.
Ethiopia Pilot Schedule

Below is how the DRC-Tufts team scheduled the monitoring pilots. This is to provide an understanding of the pilot’s timeline, and in case of use as a guidance for future pilots or monitoring activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8 – End of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tufts team arrival in Jijiga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting tools to Ethiopian context</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with IOM and Oxfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring enumerators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training enumerators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising field logistics (transport, food, beneficiary list, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerator debrief (on car rides back to Jijiga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputting Data into Excel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting Tools for Oxfam pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerator training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input survey to Magpie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on Schedule and Possible Amendments
- The above schedule is how the team conducted the pilot according to scheduled time in Ethiopia. More time in country would have been helpful to provide more time for adaptation of tools and data analysis (particularly to add time between quantitative and qualitative rounds).
- When arriving in a new context and needing to adapt tools accordingly, it is helpful to either have good secondary data on the context of the community were the cash is being distributed, and/or to gather your own additional information in order to have an appropriate understanding of the context you are entering so that you can adapt tools including formulating questions to best fit the context in question.

Translation Challenges
During the Oxfam pilot, the team was fortunate enough to work with a Somali enumerator who had a very good command of English, had previous experience working in data collection, and was thoughtful regarding how the questions were being translated from English to Somali. The team contracted him to write a report on the translation challenges he noticed while conducting the HH surveys, main findings from which were as follows:

Primary Challenges
- Respondents must understand the questions. Even if they are translated into Somali that the enumerators understand, it may be Somali that is not clear to the respondents.
- Enumerators must sit together before surveys are conducted to decide on common approach to ask question. This is especially important for questions that have more technical jargon-heavy language. As for the research team, they must highlight questions that are flagged as having more jargon and work to make the language clear.
- Questions on basic needs were too broad. People in different contexts will have different understandings of what fits into each basic need category.

Guidance on constructing surveys for vulnerable people in the Somali region
- Administering a survey requires a native speaker who is aware of local dialects.
- It is better to have a shared understanding of the concepts behind questions rather than specific word for word translations which may not be clear to respondents.
- Need to be aware of people’s daily schedule’s when administering the survey. For example, the morning is a difficult time for women as that is when they usually fetch water.
Appendices

Appendix A: Pilot I with IOM – Further details

Programme Description
The first round of piloting of the monitoring tools was of IOM’s cash programme in the Qologi 2 IDP camp. This was a camp that had been established 80 kilometres outside of Jijiga. Qologi 2 neighbors the at capacity Qologi 1 camp. By January 2018, Qologi 2 had roughly 4,800 households and was still growing. The residents of Qologi 2 had primarily been city and town dwellers, many who owned and ran small businesses prior to their displacement. In contrast, the residents of Qologi 1 were primarily agro-pastoralists. In November 2017, IOM had distributed a one-off 3,200 ETB (93 euro) transfer to 1,604 households in Qologi 2. Beneficiaries were selected by the community themselves on the basis of a set of vulnerability criteria. Households headed by children, elderly, people with special needs, or women breastfeeding or lactating were prioritized. While beneficiaries were allowed to spend the cash on whatever helped them best meet their basic needs, IOM provided guidance that they would like the beneficiaries to spend the transfer on NFIs. This was due to IOM having completed an assessment which found that shelter and NFIs were the primary need for IDPs in Qologi 2.

Schedule for Pilot
The IOM pilot was conducted on January 24-26, 2018. The team conducted household surveys on days one, two and three. Day two included KIIs, and day three FGDs. The rationale was to collect quantitative data to spot trends which could then be explored in the qualitative data rounds. It also provided an opportunity for team leaders to be more present in organising and assisting enumerators on the first day of the pilot given that it was their first time working with this particular survey.

Conducting the Pilot
In preparation for the pilot, the team asked that a representative from IOM be present to lead introductions with the local Ethiopian government (DPPB) and community leaders. The IOM representative would also be there to provide representation of their organisation in case there were any questions or complaints regarding the programme. In total, the team that went to the camp were two members of the Tufts research team, one DRC representative, one IOM representative, two translators, and five enumerators.

The most valuable partners at the camp were the DPPB and community leaders. They assisted the team by alerting beneficiaries in the camp that the team would be arriving for surveys, interviews and group discussions in order to improve IOM’s cash programme. The team communicated to the DPPB and community leaders what the schedule for the three-day pilot would be so that they could help organise the beneficiaries.

The first day at Qologi II was the least organized of the field days, as expected with field work. The goals and schedule for the pilot had been communicated ahead of time, but the team still got off to a slow start.

After arrival, the first step was to meet with DPPB and go over in detail the schedule and logistics for the pilot. In the days prior to the arrival at Qologi 2, IOM provided a complete list of all of their Qologi 2 cash beneficiaries. The team pulled a random sample of 180 beneficiaries from the list and assigned 36 of them to each of the five enumerators. Each enumerator completed 12 surveys per day. Alternates were also
added to the list in case the chosen beneficiaries could not be located or were busy on the days of the survey. In the absence of sufficient time or resources to capture a full random sample of the population, it was decided that by calculating 12 surveys per day per enumerator for three days, the team could survey 180 beneficiaries.

It was arranged with DPPB that on day two and three of the pilot the team wished to speak to key informants as well as organise two male and two female FGDs. For the KIIs, the team stressed that it was important to find people who could speak on how the community had been affected by the cash programme. For the FGDs, the team stressed that they would like to speak to ‘regular’ beneficiaries from several age ranges. This meant not having people who had been involved in the community selection process. To make respondents feel more comfortable, female research lead Kate spoke with/led the female KIIs and FGDs, and male research lead Andre spoke with/led the male ones.

Respondents’ privacy became a main concern on the first day of the pilot. The DPPB originally placed the team in a fairly open traditional structure where anyone who wanted to could listen in to the surveys. In addition, all five enumerators were asked to conduct the surveys in a single room which would have caused respondents to be able to listen in to the answers of others, and potentially influence each other’s responses. The team raised these privacy concerns with DPPB. They agreed with the team’s concerns and the DPPB and community leaders selected five households where each enumerator would conduct their surveys.

To find the beneficiaries that had been selected, the team shared the list with DPPB and the community leaders. It was assessed that this did not present a privacy or potential protection issue as the cash distribution itself was completed in the centre of the camp and the community was already well aware of who the beneficiaries were.

With the list, the DPPB and community leaders collected the beneficiaries and took them to the enumerator’s locations. All respondents were gathered at once which meant that the beneficiaries had to wait while others completed the survey. Respondents were informed that they did not need to wait directly outside the household. Eventually a pattern emerged that the waiting beneficiaries would not wait outside of the household itself but walk around or wait in the surrounding area. Once the previous beneficiary was finished, the former would call the next one for the survey. This was not ideal and the research team considered going to each of the community member’s households. However, this would require spreading out enumerators and making them difficult to find. Since this was the first time working with this set of enumerators on this particular survey, the team leaders wanted to be present in case there were any questions or problems. Attempts were made to use cell phones to conduct the surveys via the app Magpi. However, due to delays caused by poor internet connection, it was not possible to load the survey onto the cell phones and so it was decided to have the surveys done by paper.

Challenges were faced with one enumerator who conducted the surveys with a different interpretation of the questions than what had been established during the enumerator training. This required disposing of some of this enumerator’s surveys, lowering the total from 180 to 169. This particular enumerator also missed the second day of the pilot without warning. He was not brought back for the Oxfam pilot.
The respondents for the KIIs were leaders in the community who were familiar with how the community had been affected by the cash programme. The KIIs were held within households which offered a good level of privacy. KIIs were held with the IDP Site Manager, a religious leader, and a female community leader.

The FGDs were set up with help from DPPB and community leaders. They brought beneficiaries who matched our criteria of diversity in age (however, they did skew towards over 40) and who had not been involved in the selection process of the cash distribution. The discussions were also held within the privacy of households, albeit one FGD was momentarily disrupted by community members who wanted to join the discussion.

Once the surveys, KIIs, and FGDs were all completed, the Tufts team began to sift through the collected data. The first step was to input the paper surveys into Excel. While this was an arduous process, going over each survey enabled noticing patterns and picking out questions which appeared to be resulting in confusing or incongruent answers with what had been observed from camp, the KIIs, and the FGDs.

Appendix B: Pilot II with Oxfam – Further details

Programme Description and Context

For the second pilot, the research team partnered with Oxfam to monitor one of their cash transfer programmes in the Jarar zone of the Somali region. The dates of the pilot were February 12-14, 2018. Unlike the IOM intervention, the Oxfam cash programme focused on people who were suffering from drought. These were agro-pastoralist communities whose livelihoods revolved around migrating from pasture to pasture with their livestock. They would only return to the village where they had planted crops when it was time for harvest. However, due to the drought and large losses of cattle, most of the communities had returned to their villages in an attempt to support each other. The importance of led the team to adapting all three tools to properly address this important livelihood aspect.

Oxfam gave three separate cash transfers, each of 1,200 ETB in consecutive months to several communities. It was decided to focus the monitoring on three particular communities, due to limitations of time and distance from Jijiga. Each of the communities were between 15-40 kilometres outside of Ararso, the nearest shopping town for the communities. The three communities piloted were Adadyaley, Sanku-marle, and Dintaub.

While the villages had similarities in size, ethnic composition, livelihoods, and distance from Ararso, they each had unique features which affected the population’s abilities to meet their basic needs. For example, Adadyaley had a small clinic, cisterns, as well as a relatively large school. Sanku-marle did not have a clinic and the school was a small structure made from wood and thatch which taught students up until the fourth grade. The school’s capacity was roughly 15 people. Dintaub also did not have a clinic but did have a concrete building for a school.

Schedule of Pilot

Ararso was 110 kilometres from Jijiga and due to the three villages being distant from each other, the team decided to work in one village per day. Due to the further distances and worse quality roads than in
the IOM pilot, the team was obliged to spend less time in each community. Therefore, the team conducted fewer HH surveys than had been completed at Qologi 2.

The schedule of the three days were similar to the IOM pilot with one change. Brennan Webert, the Protection Advisor for DRC, joined the team in the week prior and for the first day of the pilot. Brennan joined the team in the preparatory stages of the Oxfam pilot and assisted in thinking about how to better capture monitoring information on protection, and how to add coping strategies indicators to the tools. This discussion led to changes and additions in the tools covered in more detail later in this report.

To further leverage Brennan’s expertise, the team held one KII and FGD on the first day. The remaining days followed the same pattern as the IOM pilot, with enumerators conducting surveys over all three days. Day two saw four KIIs and day three had four FGDs. While there were some differences in responses in each village due to the different contexts, the team felt that there were enough similarities, particularly given that Oxfam had run the same programme in all three communities, that the information captured was still valuable.

**Changes in Tools**

Following the IOM pilot, it was decided to make some revisions to the tools. The main changes were adding two indicators and getting those reflected in the tools. Questions were added focusing on beneficiaries’ preferred modality for receiving assistance, and the coping strategies they typically employ.

Some questions were also removed that while interesting, were not the most pertinent to improving the cash transfer programme. The following questions were removed:

- Highest education level of head of household.
- Household’s ability to send children to school.
- Number of people in household who contributed to income.
- Household’s estimate of how many days they could support themselves on current income.

The team also specified, rephrased and added questions:

- Added livestock as a basic needs category.
- Defined what special needs meant.
- Specified when asking about sources of income that cash assistance should not be counted.
- Expanded list of sources of income to: day labourer, livestock and/or animal products, remittances, and selling food aid.
- Asked how many rounds of cash transfers the respondent received.
- Asked whether the respondent felt that they had received enough information regarding the cash amount and distribution location.
- Asked if person felt safe storing cash at home.
- In question regarding feedback mechanisms, changed options to better reflect the options that were available.
- Asked if households were able to purchase goods that household has been previously unable to purchase but were now able to due to cash transfer.
- Changes in Basic Needs questions
- Coping strategy questions
The most substantial changes came in capturing information about people’s basic needs. It was found that in the previous pilot, the questions lumped all basic needs together and did not provide enough actionable information. Therefore, on the second pilot, the team isolated each basic need and created a series of three questions for each need. For example, the first question was to rate the family’s current ability to meet their food needs. They were then given the following 1 to 5 scale.

1: We can meet our needs without worry
2: We can meet our needs
3: We can just barely meet our needs
4: We are not able to meet our needs
5: We are completely unable to meet our needs

The second question asked what were the barriers to meeting that specific need. This is a significant change from the IOM pilot. The data captured would now provide information on what the specific barrier was for each need rather than all needs. The team also consolidated the barrier options that had been given in the IOM survey to simplify the question. Finally, the team asked a new question, which was what kind of assistance would the household prefer to meet the particular need. This provided actionable data regarding whether the household thought cash, services, in kind, or a combination were the best option to help them meet their basic need.

With input from Brennan, the team also added coping strategy questions. This was the first time these specific tools attempted to capture coping strategies and their relation to a cash transfer. The coping strategies presented focused on economic coping strategies. Ideally, what the coping strategy questions would capture was the change in coping strategies from before and after the transfer, while also collecting information on how or why the cash transfer affected (or did not affect) the coping strategies in question. The team did not attempt to find causality between the cash transfer and the reduction of a coping strategy. The purpose was to pilot these questions and understand what were their successes and failings as tools to measure coping strategies, and in particular what the challenges are to relating a change in coping strategy to a cash transfer programme.

The KII and FGD questions were also streamlined/standardized. Previously, each tool had different language for each question even though they were getting at the same message. The team also added questions regarding coping strategies to the KIIs and FGDs.

Conducting Pilot

As with the monitoring of the IOM cash assistance, an Oxfam representative was requested to be present with the team during the pilot. The Oxfam monitoring pilot team included the two Tufts researchers, Brennan, a representative from DRC, a representative from Oxfam, five enumerators, and two translators.

As with the IOM monitoring pilot, the research team was required to stop at the offices of the local government in Ararso and inform them of our presence and our work. Following this brief meeting, the team drove to the first village, Adadyaley.

Oxfam did not have the beneficiary list in Jijiga so the team was not able to prepare a random selection of beneficiaries as had been done previously with the IOM pilot. As the beneficiary list was only available in Ararso, the selection of beneficiaries for the survey was completed at the beginning of each day when the team arrived at each community.
Each village had roughly 300 beneficiaries. Upon arrival, the team would take the list to the community leader and, with his consultation, choose the beneficiaries who were either in the community that day, or had households that were near enough to walk to. This was necessary as some beneficiaries did not live near the centre of the community, or were far from the village tending to their livestock. This essentially required the team to ask the community leader who was available for the HH surveys. This was not ideal as it made the community leader a gatekeeper who could potentially control who the team spoke with. While there were no indications that the community leaders were being dishonest in telling us who lived near the camp and were available to speak, it did create the potential that the community leader could purposefully include or exclude people based on their own criteria, therefore defeating the purpose of a random selection. The team did not have any way to adapt to this so they took it at the community leaders’ word that they were being pointed towards the actual people who were being randomly selected from the list. The selection took place by selecting a certain number of names at random from each page of the beneficiary list, with the community leader informing the team if that beneficiary was available or not. If not, the team would move on to select another name until enough beneficiaries were selected.

Due to having to select beneficiaries upon arrival, the team accepted that the set up time would take longer than it had at Qologi 2. For this reason the team decided to decrease the amount of people that enumerators would survey to 84. The team decided this was acceptable as they did not have the ability to survey a random representative sample. They also did not see much sense in pushing the enumerators to speed through surveys and reach an arbitrary number that would not have reached the representative sample or been of sufficient quality in terms of the data collected.

Selection of people for KIIs and FGDs followed a similar pattern as with the monitoring of the IOM cash assistance. The team informed Oxfam’s field staff regarding the criteria and number of KIIs and FGDs they planned to conduct. However, due to the Oxfam programme being focused mostly on women, it became difficult to find men to participate, particularly in the FGDs. This meant that the team had to include beneficiaries who were part of the selection committee for the cash transfer. The team wanted the FGDs to be made up entirely of beneficiaries so that they would feel more comfortable to speak freely on the cash programme, particularly its selection process. In addition, due to the low number of male beneficiaries, the final group was made up of half cash for work beneficiaries and half MPG beneficiaries. This caused the facilitator to adapt the questions to focus more on the basic needs and barriers to reaching basic needs in the community, rather than on the other indicators that were more relevant to the MPG programme.

The team also wanted to test speaking with non-beneficiaries to better capture the community dynamics from the non-beneficiary perspective. To do this, the team spoke to two non-beneficiaries for the KIIs. While the team did not receive answers that were different than what had been stated by the beneficiary group, they still felt that it was helpful to include non-beneficiaries voices to be able to get a more complete picture of how a community has been affected by a MPG programmes.

Appendix C: Guidance on Enumerator Training

Overview:
Trainings of enumerators were conducted prior to each pilot. Both trainings were half a day in length. The training covered the following:
- Schedule for each day of the pilot
- Expectations of enumerators and key principles to remember while administering surveys.
- Expectations enumerators should have of trainers.
- Explanation of the purpose and goals of the pilot.
- Going over survey question by question, checking translations, and building a shared understanding of the goal of each question.
- Introduce Magpi interface on cell phones.

To remember before starting training:

- Ensure that enumerators are clear on the days that the pilot will be and how much they will be paid.
- Arrange for food and drink.
- Check with local staff if there are any time restrictions. For example, Friday at noon is time for prayer. Do not schedule training during this time.

Sample Training Script

Note: This was a script used for the piloting of the tools. There will be changes that need to be made to fit the training for your purposes.

Introduction

Good afternoon everyone, thank you for being here. My name is _____ and this is my colleague _____. We are working for the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) to monitor a cash transfer programme for internally displaced people in the Somali region. This programme, carried out by IOM, gives cash to IDPs so they can spend that money on basic needs such as food and shelter. Our objective is to better understand what have been the effects, positive and negative, of this cash assistance programme to IDPs. We are especially curious about what has worked and what could be improved about the programme.

To do this well, we need your help and that is why we have brought you here for this training. The goal of this training is to prepare you to carry out household surveys in the Qologi 2 camp. Our agenda for today is the following.

First, ____ and I will introduce ourselves and then we will give each of you a chance to give a quick introduction of yourselves. As we are a team, it will be important for us to work well together and know a little bit about each other.

Next, I will go into more details about the Danish Refugee Council’s project and IOM’s programme so that you can better understand the purpose of our and your work.

After that I will explain our sampling process, or how we selected the people that will participate in the survey. I will also tell you more about what the three days in Qologi 2 will look like and the schedule for each of the days.

Next, we will go over key principles or things to remember when you are carrying out the surveys in Qologi 2.
After that, _____ will take charge and she will work with you on going over the survey and understanding each of the questions as well as practicing them. We will close by having time for you to ask questions and make comments.

Trainer and Trainee Introductions:
My name is ____ and I ______.
My name is ____ and I ______.

Now let’s go around the room so that each of you introduce yourself. Tells us a bit about yourself, such as where you are from, and whatever else you would like to add, perhaps if you are going to or teaching at a university and what you are teaching or studying.

Explanation of Project and Key Principles
Now let us go over what the objectives for this project are. Please feel free to stop me at any time if you need me to explain more.

We are developing tools to monitor cash transfer programmes in order to learn if a cash transfer programme is working well or not. This project began in Nigeria in the summer of 2017. The reason behind this project is because around the world there is a growing number of IDPs and refugees. International organisations such as Save the Children and the Danish Refugee Council are working to improve the way in which we help these IDPs and refugees. One of the ideas is to provide cash assistance to IDPs and/or refugees so they can spend it on what is most important to them – for example on things like food and shelter.

Our organisation, the Danish Refugee Council, is working to find the best way to monitor and see if giving cash to IDPs and/or refugees is an effective way to help them. One tool to find out if the cash transfer programme is working is the household survey that you will be working with. Our colleagues created this survey in Nigeria and used it to examine a cash transfer programme there. We are here in Ethiopia to use this survey to find out if the cash transfer programmes that have been completed work well or not. Part of our project is also to improve this household survey and make it better. This means making the questions more clear, adding new questions that collect important information, and phrasing questions in a way that makes respondents feel comfortable and willing to answer.

The surveys we will complete for this week will be for the International Organisation of Migration’s (IOM) cash transfer programme. In the coming weeks we will conduct one more survey for Oxfam, another NGO, to examine their cash transfer programme. This means that there is a chance for us to hire you again for another project if we work well together.

As I mentioned, the project for this week will be with IOM. In late November of last year, IOM gave cash to about 1,600 IDPs so that they could reach their basic needs. Basic needs are the essential goods and services that people need to live a stable life and provide for their households. This includes things such as buying food, buying material for housing, paying for healthcare, paying for children’s school fees, among a few other needs as well. This cash was given mostly to women who are the heads of household.

The goal of DRC and for our team is to understand if this cash programme is helping, or not helping the IDPs meet their basic needs. If there are problems with the programme, DRC and IOM will then look at
the surveys you have completed as well as through other data collection tools (interviews and community
group discussions) to understand how they can improve the programme. Your part in this will be to
interview the heads of households in the community, record their responses, and hear what they have to
say about the programme.

The second goal is to improve this household survey. That is why ___ and I are very open to hearing your
ideas or suggestions as to how to improve both the survey and this training. For example, this can be by
suggesting ideas for how to improve the questions. So, when you are training with _____, please feel free
to write down and think of suggestions on how to improve the questions and we can discuss as a group.
As the surveys will start tomorrow we will not have time to change them, but we will take all your
comments and use them to improve this survey when the week is over. Therefore, it is important that
when we are at the camp, we ask the questions exactly as they are written down, even if we have thought
of ways to improve the questions. If you have any suggestions for how to improve the survey when we
are at the camp, please note them and tell it to us on the bus ride back home. With that being said, if you
find a problem or need our help on the day, please feel free to find us and ask us. You will have our cell
phone numbers.

Now we will talk about how we selected the participants of the survey and what Wednesday, Thursday,
and Friday will look like.

We have selected about 180 people to take the survey. 70% will be women and 30% will be men. This is
the same as how the transfer was distributed. Ages of participants will be from 16-80.

When in camp, you will be assigned to a community leader. The community leader will then take you to
each of the houses of the recipients of the cash transfer. You will conduct the survey inside the person’s
home so that their answers remain private. ____ and I will be walking around the camp along with DRC
and IOM staff to check on you and see how the surveys are going as well as to offer any help if you need
it. You will each have enough paper surveys from which to work during the day.

On Wednesday you must arrive at this office at 8:00 am sharp. We will leave DRC at 8:15. We must be at
the camp by 9:15 am, it will look bad if we are late. We will begin data collection at 9:45 and continue
until 12:00. We will then have a period for lunch which we will provide. This will allow us to come together
and to discuss what you have seen from your data collection and raise any questions that you may have.
We will then go back to the surveys at 12:45 and continue until 4:30 pm. We will then drive back here to
the DRC offices. On the bus we will discuss any improvements we can make to the survey.

On Thursday and Friday we will have a very similar schedule but with one difference. ____ and I will be
doing some interviews with people in the camp. However, we will make sure that at least one of us is
always around to make sure that the surveys are going well. You will also still be walking with the
community leaders. On Thursday and Friday we will arrive in the morning at DRC at the same time and
leave the camps at the same time. We will also again provide lunch at the camps.

To finish off my section and before you move on to ____ who will walk you through the survey, I want
to present five principles that I would like us all to follow when we are conducting the survey. First and
most importantly is accuracy. We must record exactly what the respondents say. Do not try to guess what
you think their answer is. Listen to them and record what they say. If they do not want to answer a
question, it is ok to leave it blank.
The second principle is to speak with the respondents in a friendly and polite way. They are going through a difficult time and we are asking them personal questions. We want to make sure that they feel comfortable with us and willing to answer our questions.

The third principle is to not react in a positive or negative way to what people say. Keep your face calm as you conduct the survey. This is because we want the people to respond truthfully to the questions and if you show a reaction, it may cause them to change their answers and not respond accurately.

The fourth principle is to take your time. This is not a race to see who can do the most surveys. It is most important and helpful to us to conduct surveys that are accurate. We think that each survey should take about 30 minutes to complete.

The fifth principle is that we want you to feel free to bring up criticisms/suggestions for the survey itself, how the training was run, and if you see any ways for us or the tools to improve. We will have time for this at the end of today and when we are on the buses coming back from Qologi. But, if there is something very serious that you think ___ and I need to know during the days at Qologi, please call us and speak with us.

With all that being said, I will pass it on to _____ who will take you through the survey itself.

At this point, we recommend going through every survey question and double checking the translation. There will be points of disagreement on questions and how to improve them to better reflect the objective of the question. This is also a good time to ensure that all enumerators are clear on the purpose and meaning of each question so that if respondents have difficulty understanding the questions, the enumerators will be able to explain clearly and accurately what the question is supposed to mean.

This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.