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## Introduction:

This document is a quick overview of an analytic methodology to ‘diagnose’ existing information systems for a cluster, and prioritise map and plan the development of a comprehensive set of systems to be used by WASH Coordination Platforms. It is accompanied by a simple adaptable tool that can be used at any stage of the emergency, always with the objective of improving IM services for the WASH emergency response.

## Purpose:

Effective information management is essential to inform strategic decisions, facilitate information exchange, and the functioning of the cluster. Information management for a cluster has multiple components, which can be challenging to scope and prioritise, whether at the onset or during an ongoing response. The diagnostic process takes stock of the existing systems and context, identifying information and system requirements, as well as resource requirements. This leads into an Information Management Framework & Workplan aiming at improving current and future responses.

## Method:

The basic methodological structure is summarised in the diagram below. This structures the process, although the actual implementation of these steps will depend on the purpose and scope of the exercise. Additional references are provided in the Annexes, in addition to specific templates that can be adapted to specific contexts.

 Steps 1 & 2 will define who needs to be targeted and how for Step 3 – if limited in time it will be key to prioritise.

  While quick-wins might be addressed on the cuff, development or changes to a system should not be done lightly. Clarity will be needed on purpose, expected outputs, user-expectations, user-capacities, resources available, etc.

The duration of the diagnostic will vary and can be a process of 1-2 weeks upon arrival, to a process of 1-2 months for an in-depth diagnostic and workplanning which might be undertaken around a CCPM exercise, or as part of ongoing Preparedness.

## Cluster Information Management requirements:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cluster Lead Agency – IM responsibilities** | **Cluster Core Functions – IM aspects** |
| **IASC Operational Guidance on Information Management** | Cluster/Sector leads at the country level are responsible for the following:* An IM focal point is in place with the necessary human and financial resources and technical expertise.
* Encourage the sharing of IM resources and capacities within and across clusters.
* Ensure IM activities support national information systems, standards, build local capacities and maintain appropriate links with relevant Government, State and local authorities.
* Ensure IM focal points adhere to global / national IM norms, policies and standards.
* Ensure IM focal points contribute to and support inter-cluster IM coordination led by OCHA.
* Ensure IM focal points work with OCHA for effective information sharing with cluster partners related to inter-/cross-cluster issues.
* Ensure up-to-date cluster specific information (e.g. contact lists, meeting minutes, standard forms, policy or technical guidance, datasets, needs/gap analysis, etc.) is easily available.
* If needed, establish a data confidentiality and privacy policy within the cluster.
* Ensure all information is age and sex disaggregated where appropriate.
 | C**luster Coordination Reference Module** | The 6+1 core functions of the Cluster each involve elements of information management and analysis. 1. Provide a mechanism to avoid duplications
2. Ensure needs assessment / data collection
	1. Provide *ACTIONABLE* analyses of gaps (geographical, financial, coverage, sub-sectoral, sub-standard, population sub-groups, etc.)
3. Develop a strategic monitoring framework
	1. Ensure ability to track adherence to standards
4. Regular reporting on:
	1. Activities
	2. Needs
	3. Strategic indicators / key metrics
5. Preparedness:
	1. Advanced preparation for HPC elements
	2. Identification of risks & populations at risk
	3. Relationship building with national authorities / structures / architecture
	4. Relationship building with key / critical partners
	5. Reinforcement (or establishment) of coordination structures and information sharing agreements / protocols
	6. Clarify roles and responsibilities
6. Advocacy issues:
	1. Identify and collect information on issues for advocacy (cf. identified gaps)
7. *Accountability to Affected Populations*
 |
| **IASC Operational Guidance - Principles for Humanitarian Information Exchange** |
| **Accessibility** | Humanitarian information should be made accessible by applying easy-to-use formats and tools and by translating information into common or local languages when necessary. |
| **Inclusiveness** | Information exchange should be based on a system of partnership with a high degree of ownership by multiple stakeholders, especially representatives of the affected population and Government. |
| **Inter-operability** | All sharable data and information should be made available in formats that can be easily retrieved, shared and used by humanitarian organizations. |
| **Accountability** | Users must be able to evaluate the reliability and credibility of information by knowing its source and having access to methods of collection, transformation and analysis. |
| **Verifiability** | Information should be relevant, accurate, consistent and based on sound methodologies, validated by external sources, and analyzed within the proper contextual framework. |
| **Relevance** | Information should be practical, flexible, responsive, and driven by operational needs in support of decision-making throughout all phases of a crisis. |
| **Objectivity** | A variety of sources should be used when collecting and analyzing information so as to provide varied and balanced perspectives for addressing problems and recommending solutions. |
| **Neutral** | Information should be free of political interference that distorts a situation or the response. |
| **Humanity** | Information should never be used to distort, to mislead or to cause harm to affected or at risk populations and should respect the dignity of those affected. |
| **Timeliness** | Humanitarian information must be kept current and made available in a timely manner. |
| **Sustainability** | Humanitarian information should be open sourced, preserved, cataloged and archived, so that it can be retrieved for future use, such as for preparedness, analysis, lessons learned and evaluation. |
| **Confidentiality** | Sensitive data and information that are not to be shared publicly should be managed accordingly and clearly marked as such. |

## Process / Steps

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | Resource | Expected outputs | Main actions | Utility |
| Rapid audit | [Annex I – Rapid Systems Audit](#_Annex_I:_rapid)[Annex II – Key Stakeholders](#_Annex_II:_Key) | Broad overview of existing structures and systems, their usage and maintenance.  | Through dialogue with IMO / Coordination Unit, analyse the adequacy of the existing system against needs / requirements | Identify quick wins and critical gaps to explore further. |
| define objectives & Scope |  | Define the scope and priorities to be explored | Through dialogue with IMO / Coord Unit / SAG, determine expected outputs, and any associated requirements (e.g. contacts, budget, etc) | Ensures the relevance of the diagnostic and its outputs.Informs methodology used |
| map systems & stuctures | [Annex II – Key Stakeholders](#_Annex_II:_Key)[Annex III – Example Questions to be adapted](#_Annex_III:_Example)[Annex IV – Steps in an IMS development](#_Annex_IV:_Steps)[Annex V – Drilling down into a system](#_Annex_V:_Drilling-down) | A mapping of existing system(s) and data flows against information requirements | Through dialogue with stakeholders map out information requirements, and seek feedback on existing systems, products and services. Through dialogue with stakeholders identify any issues in the data cycle.  | Identify potential improvements.Identify information gaps and potential sources.Identify areas with strong potential – interest or capacity.  |
| develop framework & prioritised workplan | [Annex VI – Analytical frameworks](#_Annex_VI:_Analytical)[Annex VII – Validation / Workplanning](#_Annex_vII:_consultation)[Annex VIII – Detailed Report Outline](#_Annex_vIII:_in-depth) | An IM framework and prioritised workplan, with short, medium and long-term objectives, and resource requirements identified.  | Based on analysis of the findings and consultation with stakeholders, develop a prioritised IM strategy and workplan.  | Provides a basis for understanding of resources required, validation and buy-in.  |

## Adapt to context

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | Quick & Dirty | system-focused | in-depth |
| Rapid audit | Implemented with Coordination Unit / SAG primarily. Identify critical and dysfunctional systems. | Broader Data Audit and Secondary Data Review |
| define objectives | Focus on the essentials / basics; keep an eye out for things to follow up | Focus on Systems’ data cycle and success factors *See Annex V*  | Wider focus and broader scope, potentially drilling into multiple systems / partner requirements |
| map systems & stuctures | Aim for user-input from a cross-section of partners and stakeholders. Use face-to-face where feasible, phone calls where not. | Inputs from users / actors at every level of the system. Methods might include a combination of face-to-face interviews, field visits, online surveys, workshops/focus groups, etc.  | Inputs from users / actors at every level of the system and structures. Methods might include a combination of face-to-face interviews, field visits, online surveys, workshops/focus groups, etc.  |
| develop framework & prioritised workplan | In consultation with coordination unit/SAG. Keep an eye out for quick wins, strong capacities, and useful synergies.Identify key capacity gaps, and initial capacity-development plan.  | In consultation with key stakeholders. Identify quick-wins and clarify resource requirements for roll-out / support. | Higher-level validation / work-planning workshop. Identify quick-wins and actors / donors able to support longer-term/ underlying needs.  |

## Annex I: rapid Systems AUDIT

As a starting point, the initial checklist represents a list of basic minimum deliverables drawing on the above requirements and good practice that can be adapted and completed rapidly with the IMO / CC. It also notes existing IMTK reference materials that are available for each deliverable.

The principle is simple:

1. To implement a quick audit of the existing system(s) against a generic list of key deliverables
2. To broadly evaluate each system in terms of its attainment of the **Objective**, its current **Usage**, and its ease of **Maintenance**.
3. Thus providing a quick snapshot of what is currently in place, and identify areas of potential improvement to be examined in more depth with cluster stakeholders

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **IM Deliverable** | **Purpose / Function** | **IMTK Resource** | **Achievement** |  | **Usage** |  | **Ease of maintenance** |  |
| **Operational platform to avoid duplication** | List of partners regularly updated | *A structured contact list exists, is regularly updated, and is easily accessible to cluster personnel and partners* | 1.1 Contacts | Consolidated across sub-clusters? |   | Systematically used by coordination team? |   | Time/effort to sign up / remove / update? |   |
| Accessible to Cluster members? |   | Data flow / responsibilities clear? |   | Time/effort to consolidate across sub-clusters? |   |
| Up-to-date? |   |   |   |   |   |
| Regular cluster meeting organised WITH minutes and action points | *Regular coordination meetings are organised and documented* | 1.3 Meeting Templates | Publically accessible (national / sub-national)? |   | Systematically used by coordination team? |   | Time/effort to upload? |   |
| Up-to-date? |   | Data flow / responsibilities clear? |   | Data flow / responsibilities clear? |   |
| Standard Templates for basic products: PPT presentations; Minutes; etc. | *Standard templates for recognisable products* | 1.2 Basic Product Templates | Available (national / sub-national)? |   | Systematically used? |   |   |   |
| System / platform for internal information sharing | *Is there some form of platform, repository, or organised system for information exchange?* | 1.4 Information Repositories | Available (national / sub-national)? |   | Systematically used? |   |  |   |
| Up-to-date? |   | Data flows / procedures for adding content clear? |   |   |   |
| National Website for Humanitarian WASH Coordination | *Is there a central WASH website for the response?* | 5.60 HR.info Websites | Available (national / sub-national)? |   | Website Analytics stats |   | Ease of calendar / contact / content management? |   |
| Up-to-date? |   |   |   | Data flows / procedures for posting content clear? |   |
| **Needs Assessment & Analyses** | WASH-specific harmonised / joint assessment tools agreed and in place | *WASH-specific assessment tool, or harmonised questions/indicators agreed amongst Cluster-partners* | 2. Needs Assessments | Available (national / sub-national)? |   | Systematically used? |   | Ease of collection? Compilation? |   |
|   |   | % of partners committed to adopting assessment tools? |   | Ease of Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| Joint sectoral analysis of the WASH situation | *[Primary/Secondary] Data reviews of humanitarian WASH needs conducted [regularly] and accessible to partners* | 2. Needs Assessments | Date of last analysis? |   | Website Analytics stats |   | Easy of collection / compilation / analysis? |   |
| **Strategic Planning** | Analysis of gaps and overlaps derived from the mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities | *Analysis highlighting operational gaps is regularly updated, easily accessible, and discussed during coordination meetings* | 4. Strategic Planning & Response Monitoring | Available (National / Sub-national)? |   | Website Analytics stats |   | Ease of collection? Compilation? |   |
| Date of last analysis? |   | Active advocacy on issues? |   | Ease of Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| WASH Humanitarian Response Plan Monitoring Framework | *Jointly agreed response plan addressing priority needs identified during data review and including:* | 4.1 Strategic Indicators | Logframe and indicators defined? |   | Reporting rates? |   | Ease of collection? Compilation? |   |
| *- priorities (geographic, activity, etc.)* | Sources of information identified / developed? |   | Activity-tracking system provides core information? |   | Ease of Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| *- key strategic indicators* | Able to identify adherence to minimum standards? |   | Imbalances / gaps in response identifited and flagged? |   |   |   |
| *- minimum standards* | SADD where appropriate? |   |   |   |   |   |
| Cross-cluster IM table / matrix | *Identification and delimitation of areas of overlap between Clusters / Sectors relevant to the specific emergency response, including information needs and clear roles and accountabilities.* | 4.121 Inter Cluster Matrices | Agreement on data formats / flows? |   | Systematically used in operational products? |   | Ease of collection? Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| **Monitoring & Reporting** | Regular Monitoring / SitRep reports tracking progress against strategic plans | *Regular communication / information product by coordination platform covering:* | 4. Strategic Planning & Response Monitoring5. Monitoring & Reporting | Standard calculations in place to generate progress updates? |   | Systematically used by coordination team? |   | Ease of collection? Compilation? Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| *- tracking of progress against strategic plan / indicators* | Standard products in place to present progress updates? |   | Active advocacy on issues? |   |   |   |
| *- tracking of funding status of overall cluster / sector* | Standard products in place to present funding status? |   |   |   |   |   |
| *- highlighting important geographic / programmatic gaps* | Standard products for gaps / disparities? |   |   |   |   |   |
| *- highlighting key advocacy concerns* | Common advocacy products |   | Active advocacy on issues? |   |   |   |
| Triangulation of Quality | *Identification of potential avenues for feedback on programme quality, and their development* | 4. Strategic Planning & Response Monitoring | Available (national / sub-national)? |   | Systematically used by the coordination team?  |   | Ease of collection? Compilation? Analysis/query? Presentation? |   |
| **Preparedness** | HPC preparations | Internal preparations in the run-up to the various HPC phases |   | Datasets collected *on an ongoing basis* to inform analysis? |   | Have they worked? |   |   |   |
| Response framework developed in consultation with partners? |   | Are coordination team clear on steps, info requirements ,etc? |   |   |   |
| Mechanism to avoid geographic overlap in project submissions?  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Regular Joint Preparedness planning | *Secondary Data Reviews and Capacity Mapping exercises to inform joint identification of risks, mapping of existing capacities and gaps, and contingency planning - updated on a regular basis (seasonal, etc.)* | 2.3 Secondary Data Reviews3.2 Capacity Mapping | Ongoing data collection / regular updates on known hazards and risks? |   | Used by coordination team? |   | Ease of collection / data flow? |   |
| Regular / relevant capacity mapping? |   | Used by coordination team? |   |   |   |
| Technical learning | An easily accessible repository for technical lessons learnt, TWIG outputs, successful designs, etc.  |   | Technical learning, guidance and standards are easily accessible by cluster members? |   | Used by coordination team? |   | Process of validating or uploading documents? |   |
|   | Website Analytics Stats? |   |   |   |
| Capacity building of national counterpart | *The information component of a Cluster Strategy for phase-out / transition to government coordination, including capacitation. Such a strategy should be based on an in-depth analysis of the coordination framework for the sector overall (development, emergency, governmental, NGO, etc.)* | 6. Capacity Building Tools | Have trainings been conducted / are basic capacity building materials & references available for core tasks? |   | Has it improved information flow? |   |   |   |

## Annex II: Key Stakeholders / Systems

In its second phase, the example lists of specific questions for specific stakeholders can be adapted to drill-down into user requirements and information needs.

|  |
| --- |
| emergency dependent - not comprehensive |
| **Key Stakeholders (not comprehensive)** | **Specific Areas of Enquiry (not comprehensive)** |
| Line Ministry | WASH (emergency) coordination and response structures / resources and IM tools / systems WASH (development) monitoring systems (access, quality, resources, service, etc.)Other Government Structures responsible for the provision of WASH services |
| Ministry of Health / Health Cluster | Epidemiological surveillanceKnown public health hazards / risksWater Quality Monitoring programmesHealth / Hygiene ECD materials / departmentsWASH services in health centers |
| Ministry of Nutrition / Nutrition Cluster | SAM / MAM ratesWASH services in feeding centers |
| Ministry of Education / Education Cluster | WASH services in schoolsDamages to WASH facilities in schools |
| Ministry of Social Affairs / Protection Cluster | Specific needs / vulnerabilities of population sub-groups |
| CCCM Cluster | WASH services in campsCamp complaints/feedback mechanisms  |
| IOM / Shelter Cluster | WASH in Shelter / NFI tracking Displacement Tracking Matrix |
| OCHA | Reporting requirements / formats / frequenciesUpcoming HPC dates |
| CLA | Reporting requirements / formats / frequenciesHPM indicators and monitoring systemRRM indicators and assessment tools |
| ICRC / Red Cross / MSF | Assessment and monitoring systems / capacities e.g. volunteer networksAreas of complementarity Mutual Information sharing |
| INGO Partners | Assessment and monitoring systems / capacitiesInformation / Coordination Needs |
| NGO/LCO Partners | Assessment and monitoring systems / capacitiesInformation / Coordination Needs |
| Local Media Groups | Media / avenues of information dissemination / collection |

## Annex III: Example questions for stakeholders

By mapping the Objectives and Scope, this helps determine the stakeholders and required inputs. The *example* below can and should be adapted to the in-country need. In addition, Annexes IV – VI may provide some food for thought in elaborating initial questions. Especially during interviews and focus groups, use the questions as an entry-point and drill-down into key points.



## Annex IV: Steps of the IM system design process

**Stage 1**

* NWC/Sectors must identify what key decisions the WASH Sector has to make in each phase of the emergency and determine the evidence needed for ‘evidence based decision-making’. Key decisions that a NWC/Sector must make change in different phases of the emergency response. The evidence needed changes accordingly.
* The focus must not only be on decision-making of the WCC but also the decision-making of partners; IM system needs to be useful to all partners.
* IM system and tools must produce quality evidence needed in a timely fashion.
* Assessing the IM environment is fundamental in order to be realistic and keep the IM system and tools as simple as possible.

**Stage 2**

* This stage involves the collection and storage of data through the use of the IM tools designed / mapped in Stage 1.
* This stage includes gathering data relevant for WASH analyses from other clusters.

**Stage 3:**

* This stage is the core of IM. Figure II shows five different types of analyses that the NWCs/Sectors carry out during emergency preparedness, emergency response and recovery.
* Gap analysis is essential to generate information useful for decision-making and reporting. Gap analysis is cross-cutting amongst most types of analyses to produce actionable information.

**Stage 4:**

* This stage brings us full circle to Stage 1; the outcomes of IM is the reliable evidence-base and services that underpin and support the WASH Cluster Core Functions. And the cycle begins again…

## Annex V: Drilling-down into a SYSTEM

Establishing or modifying an information system will potentially require considerable time and effort to design, successfully establish, and maintain. The following provides a generic outline of factors to consider in drilling-down into a specific system; they are simply to be borne in mind in structuring our questions to different stakeholders.

Success Factors:

Petter et al (2008) provide a useful model for information systems adoption and success, outlined in the schematic below, identifying relationships between six critical aspects to be borne in mind throughout.

******

1. Information Quality – refers to the quality, relevance, timeliness and usability of information that is stored in the system
2. System Quality – refers to the user-friendliness, flexibility, and reliability of the system
3. Service Quality – refers to the support received from system personnel
4. System use – the frequency, nature and purpose of system usage. It is useful to understand both the intentions of users and their actual usage
5. User satisfaction – satisfaction with the system products and support services
6. Net benefits – extent to which the system products contributes to improved decision-making, operational efficiencies, etc.

Potential process:

In keeping with these success factors, and the principles of humanitarian information exchange, the process undertaken might broadly resemble the following:

* Map out the System(s)
* Review System Components
* Evaluate against requirements
* Obtain inputs from users

Stakeholder & Problem Identification

* Objectives & Analysis Plan
* Data Collection / Flows
* Compilation
* Products
* Dissemination
* Resources required

Initial Framework

* Collect and analyse data
* Reflection / comments
* Adaptations / reorganisation
* Initial capacitation of focal points
* Refinement of capacitation needs
* Present/agree revised framework incl:
	+ Expected outputs
	+ Partner requirements
	+ Timeline and next steps
	+ Where to get support
	+ Etc.
* Training / briefing sessions
* Reference materials
* Follow-up on entry errors
* Timely products with iterative improvements
* Use of the products!

Piloting / Initial iterations

Validation & Information

Roll-out & Support

Mapping the systems/structures:

In identifying system weaknesses and revising the system framework, it will be useful to consider a ‘typical’ Data Cycle, component by component. Furthermore, iterative improvement is implicit in the Data Cycle, and should be built into the workflow if not present i.e. improvements in quality of dataset, regular feedback from users, review of website analytics, etc.

***Collect***

* + Primary data collection
	+ Secondary data review
	+ Data flows
	+ Completeness
	+ Usability
	+ Identify data types

**Acquisition & extraction**

**Examination**

***Communicate***

* + Identifying your message
	+ Adapting to audience
	+ Communicating results
	+ Preserving your data
	+ Documenting methods
	+ Protecting sensitive data

**Presenting & sharing**

***Clean***

* + Screening
	+ Diagnosing
	+ Treatment
	+ Quality check

**Cleaning**

***Prepare***

* Data requirements
* Analysis plan
* Data collection tools
	+ Data collection Methods
	+ Data requirements
	+ Analysis plan
	+ Data collection tools
	+ Data collection Methods

**Research design**

***Explore***

* + Parsing
	+ Merging
	+ Converting/coding
	+ Deriving new values
	+ Calculations
	+ Removing

**Transformation**

* + Comparing
	+ Interpreting
	+ Forecasting

**Analysis**

* + Interacting and manipulating data
	+ Identify patterns, trends and relationships

**Exploration**

Strategy

Research Question

Operational **requirements**

**Objectives**

**IMO**

**Compilation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **System Aspect** | **Example Considerations** | **Example Questions - IMO** | **Example Questions - Users/SAG** |
| **Objectives/ Indicators and Analysis Plan** | * Does the system achieve its purpose?
 | * What is the purpose of the system?
* What …
* What analyses should the system facilitate? What stratifiers are needed?
* What should be the system outputs? In what formats?
 | * What is the purpose of the system?
* What …
* What analyses should the system facilitate? What stratifiers are needed?
* What should be the system outputs? In what formats?
 |
| **Data sources/Quality and data collection tool** | * Fit for purpose in light of Objectives (resolution, coverage, date, frequency, etc)?
* Are there specific geographic areas or specific organisations with low reporting rates, or high entry-error rates, and that can be targeted?
* Are reference materials available e.g. user-manual, youtube video, periodic refreshers, etc.
 | * Is the tool easy to use? What could be improved/changed?
* *If external:* possible to alter the format / indicator / categories / etc.?
* How reliable / complete is the dataset?
 | * Is the tool easy to use? What could be improved/changed?
* Have you been briefed on completing the tool?
* What support would you need? What would make things easier?
 |
| **Data Flows for Collection** | * Are data flows / frequencies from partner to (sub-) cluster clear?
* From sub-cluster to national?
 | * Do you know to whom you should submit your data? And in what format?
* Do you know when you are expected to submit your data? And how to submit it?
* Is the mechanism of transferring data efficient?
 | * Detail your internal process in filling the tool (i.e. how do you get the data)?
* Do you know to whom you should submit your data? And in what format?
* Do you know when you are expected to submit your data? And how to submit it?
* Is the mechanism of transferring data efficient?
 |
| **Data Cleaning, Checking, Validating processes** | * How best to ensure the quality of the data used
 | * How is data ‘cleaned’?
 |  |
| **Compilation/Analysis and standard calculations** | * Automatizing repeat tasks minimises errors and saves time.
* This does NOT replace the need for data cleaning and spot checks for errors in compilation / aggregation / calculation.
 | * How much time is spent on data compilation?
* Have errors been introduced due to data compilation?
 |  |
| **Information Products, timeliness, consistency** | * Do the products respond to the system Objectives?
* Are the products able to provide explanatory analysis of key response indicators?
* Do products respond to the Humanitarian Information Exchange Principles?
* How reliable/complete are your analyses? E.g. reporting rates? How reliable are the external datasets used? Is this portrayed in products? i.e. are figures explained?
* Automatizing repeat tasks minimises errors and saves time - Timeliness of products enhances credibility and buy-in.
 | * Are the output products useful? What could be improved?
 | * Are the output products useful? What could be improved?
 |
| **Use and Dissemination** | * Do you have google analytics (or equivalent) to track download/usage.
* Are products available in a variety of formats via known sources e.g. promoted website
 | * Do you use the product / dataset? If not, why not?
* How do you use the product / dataset?
 | * Do you use the product / dataset? If not, why not?
* How do you use the product / dataset?
* Where do you access the product / dataset?
* What format is most useful to you?
 |

## Annex VI: Analytical frameworks

Two analytical models may be useful to bear in mind in adapting questions; PEST and SWOT. Extensive resources on these models are available through a websearch.

|  |
| --- |
| PEST |
| IM does not happen in a vacuum – consideration of contextual factors and requirements within our system / product design is essential. The following outlines some key elements to consider throughout our stakeholder/partner interviews, and will frame / inform our system design.  |
| ***Political Factors*** | ***Economic Factors*** |
| e.g. emergency / WASH coordination architecture, structures and institutions, and legal framework.  | e.g. available budget and duration, potential avenues for resource mobilisation |
| ***Social Factors*** | ***Technological Factors*** |
| e.g. Attitudes towards IT / Common communication media / Smartphone culture | e.g. Internet connectivity |

|  |
| --- |
| SWOT |
| The purpose of a SWOT analysis is to consider factors that could impact positively/negatively on IM initiatives / systems, and to better understand the relative strengths / weaknesses and interests of the partners / stakeholders with regards the IM function.  |
| ***Strengths*** | ***Opportunities*** |
| e.g. what does your organisation do better than others?What are the strengths in your programme? In your team? | e.g. would you be willing to contribute in your areas of expertise [cf. Strengths]? What would be required? |
| ***Weaknesses*** | ***Threats*** |
| e.g. what do other organisations do better than yours? What do you find most challenging in implementing your programme? | e.g. If inputs are needed from yourself, will you contribute? What would be required? What don’t you want to see from the cluster?  |

## Annex vII: consultation & workplanning

ALWAYS hold a specific meeting / half-day workshop to present the findings of a strategic diagnostic for discussion. You are laying out a framework and road map for the Cluster’s IM; it will be critical to ensure buy-in and respect the principles of humanitarian information exchange in your setup. Ideally you will seek to:

1. Outline the approach and actors covered
2. Present / highlight findings
3. Present / discuss potential corrective actions, and their requirements
4. Prioritise actions, and identify leads and contributors
5. Agree on initial outputs, workplan, deadlines, and respective roles and responsibilities.
	1. While the framework might be broad, any working groups should aim for max. 6 month workplans / deliverables. Step-by-step.

As such, an IM-specific diagnostic can complement and add depth to a concurrent Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring exercise.

RACI Matrix

The RACI Matrix is a powerful tool in identifying roles and responsibilities across contributing cluster members:

* R – Responsible (person or role responsible for ensuring that the item is completed),
* A – Accountable (person or role responsible for actually doing or completing the item),
* C – Consulted (person or role whose subject matter expertise is required in order to complete the item), and
* I – Informed (person or role that needs to be kept informed of the status of item completion).

## Annex vIII: in-depth diagnostic report outline

The following provides a potential report outline structure. It can and should be adapted according to need and context:

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2. CONTENTS
	1. LIST OF ACRONYMS
	2. GEOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATION
	3. LIST OF FIGURES & TABLES
3. INTRODUCTION
	1. Background
	2. Objectives and assumptions
	3. Methodology
4. FINDINGS
	1. Humanitarian Needs & Hazard Trends
	2. WASH Sector Institutional Structures & Regulatory Framework
	3. WASH Sector Financial Investment Trends
	4. Disaster Management & Disaster Risk Reduction Institutional Structures
	5. Sector & cluster Coordination Activity Status
		1. Inter-cluster/Sector Coordination
		2. WASH Coordination
		3. WASH Cluster partners
		4. Other relevant Coordination platforms
	6. Cluster/Sector Information Management Practice
		1. Disaster Management IM
		2. Inter-Sectoral/cluster IM
		3. Sectoral IM
		4. WASH Cluster IM
		5. WASH Cluster partners
	7. Human Resource Capacity for Cluster/Sector Coordination/IM
5. *(optional/separate)* ANALYSIS & WORKPLANNING
	1. Analysis: obstacles and potential actions
	2. Workplanning workshop results: validation of analysis and key priority actions for the WASH cluster
6. RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION
7. ANNEXES