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# 1. Executive Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country of intervention** | *Ethiopia* | | | | | | |
| **Type of Emergency** | Displacement | | | | | | |
| **Type of Crisis** | Sudden Onset | | | | | | |
| **Mandating Body/ Agency** | Ethiopia WASH Cluster | | | | | | |
| **Project Code** | NA | | | | | | |
| **Overall Research Timeframe** *(from research design to final outputs / M&E)* | 15/08/2018 to 15/10/2018 | | | | | | |
| **Research Timeframe** | 1. Start collecting data: 05/09/2018 | | | | 4. Data sent for validation: 20/09/2018 | | |
| *Add planned deadlines (for first cycle if more than 1)* | 2. Data collected: 15/09/2018 | | | | 5. Outputs sent for validation: 1/10/2018 | | |
| 3. Data analysed: 20/09/2018 | | | | 6. Outputs published: 15/10/2018 | | |
| **Number of assessments** | Single assessment | | | | | | |
| **Humanitarian milestones**  *Specify* ***what*** *will the assessment inform and* ***when***  *e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;* | **Milestone** | | | | **Deadline** | | |
| Cluster plan/strategy | | | | X | | |
| **Audience Type & Dissemination** *Specify* ***who*** *will the assessment inform and* ***how*** *you will disseminate to inform the audience* | **Audience type** | | | | **Dissemination** | | |
| * Programmatic [WASH cluster] * Operational [WASH operational partners] | | | | * Cluster mailing list * Presentation of findings at cluster meeting * Website Dissemination (Relief Web & Cluster) * Humanitarianresponse.info * Humanitarian Data Exchange | | |
| **Detailed dissemination plan required** | No | | | | | | |
| **General Objective** | To ensure that sanitation needs of IDPs populations living in host-communities in Gedeo are met through evidence-based humanitarian planning and response. | | | | | | |
| **Specific Objective(s)** | To identify needs, preferences and concerns of IDPs living in host-communities in Gedeo in order to design emergency sanitation interventions that are appropriate to the context. | | | | | | |
| **Research Questions** | *1. Current sanitation conditions*   * + What sanitation facilities do IDPs currently use?   + What difficulties do IDPs face regarding access to sanitation facilities?   + Do IDP face protection risks related to the use of sanitation facilities?   *2. Sanitation preferences*   * + What sanitation facilities would IDPs prefer and for what reason?   + What are the specific needs for vulnerable groups in terms of sanitation? | | | | | | |
| **Geographic Coverage** | 6-12 purposively sampled host communities and informal sites in Gedeo and West Gujj | | | | | | |
| **Secondary data sources** | DTM Gedeo Rapid Assessment Report | | | | | | |
| **Population(s)** | IDPs in host communities and informal sites | | | |  | | |
| *Select all that apply* |  | | | |  | | |
| **Stratification**  *Select type(s) and enter number of strata* | Geographical #: 2  Gender #: 2  Population size per strata is known? Not needed | | | | | | |
| **Data collection tool(s)** | X | Structured (Quantitative) | | | | | |
|  | **Sampling method** | | | | **Data collection method** | | |
| **Structured data collection tool # 1**  *Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews* | Purposive sampling | | | | X Focus Group Discussions: from 12 to 24 (based on data saturation), disaggregated by gender and host communities and informal sites | | |
| **Target level of precision if probability sampling** | NA | | | | NA | | |
| **Data management platform(s)** | □ | WASH Cluster | | | | | |
| **Expected output type(s)** | X | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: 1 |  | Report #: | |  | Factsheet #: |
|  | X | Cleaned dataset | | | | | |
| **Access** | X | Public (available on WASH Cluster website and other humanitarian platforms) | | | | | |
| **Visibility** *Specify which* ***logos*** *should be on outputs* | WASH Cluster | | | | | | |

# 2. Rationale

Violence along the border areas of Gedeo and West Guji zones has led to the displacement of over 800,000 IDPs. As of June 2018, according to OCHA, there are more than 642,152 IDPs in Gedeo zone 176,000 in West Guji. “The displaced people are mostly settled with already stretched host communities or residing in cramped public buildings without adequate water and substandard sanitation and hygiene facilities. Unless preventive, surveillance and case management capacity is urgently scaled-up, the overcrowded living condition creates a high risk for a major disease outbreak” [[1]](#footnote-1).

The WASH cluster has been responding to the crisis distributing household water treatment chemicals and WASH NFIs. This first response has been informed by partners data as well as a series of [DTM rapid assessments](C://Users/acome/Downloads/FINAL%20rapid%20response%20assessment%20West%20Guji.pdf) in informal sites. Based on this data the cluster has been able to prioritize assistance both geographically and in terms of sub-sector priorities. DTM is currently planning to scale up its site assessments to host communities using a tool that is comparable with what is being used in the informal sites.

Still, in order to better tailor its response in terms of sanitation, the WASH cluster in Ethiopia requires more qualitative data concerning preference of the displaced population and concerns that IDPs may have in regards to sanitation intervention options that the cluster may implement. In order to fulfil this information gap the cluster will implement a qualitative assessment focus on the following research questions:

*1. Current sanitation conditions*

* + What sanitation facilities do IDPs currently use?
  + What difficulties do IDPs face regarding access to sanitation facilities?
  + Do IDP face protection risks related to the use of sanitation facilities?

*2. Sanitation preferences*

* + What sanitation facilities would IDPs prefer and for what reason?
  + What are the specific needs for vulnerable groups in terms of sanitation?

# 2. Methodology

##### 2.1. Methodology overview

This assessment will use a qualitative approach to evaluate current conditions and preferences in regards to sanitation of IDP populations. Data will be collected through a series of 12-24 FGD with IDPs, disaggregated by a) gender and b) setting.

##### 2.2. Population of interest

The target population consists of internally displaced people in Gedeo and in West Guji areas living in both host communities and informal settlements.

##### 2.3. Secondary data review

The assessment will rely on the following secondary data sources:

* DTM assessments (informal sites), July 2018
* DTM assessments (host communities), ongoing
* DHS survey 2016 and JMP survey 2015

##### 2.4. Primary Data Collection

This assessment will use a qualitative approach and collect data through a series of FGDs involving 6-10 IDPs recently displaced in Gedeo and West Guji. FGD participants will be selected through purposive sampling to fulfil the following criteria:

* Demographics: participants will be required to be at least 18 years old.
* Displacement status: participants will be required to be recently displaced (arrived at in Gedeo and West Guji no more than 2 months prior to the FGD).
* Gender: FGDs with female and male will take place separately, to collect gender-disaggregated data.
* Setting: FGDs with IDPs living in informal settings and with host communities will take place separately, to collect setting-disaggregated data,

It is expected that 3 to 6 FGDs will be run per stratum (gender and setting), for a total number of FGDs ranging from 12 to 24. The exact number of FGDs will be decided based on data situation that is measured through a saturation grid helping to understand when all data required for the purpose of the FGD has been collected. This saturation grid will contain on the left the complete list of ideas / topics that need to be discussed, and on the right the number of times that have been mentioned in the FGDs.

Table 1. Number of FGDs by gender and setting

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Male (informal sites)** | **Female (informal sites)** | **Male (host communities)** | **Female (host communities)** |
|  |
| Number of FGD | 3-6 | 3-6 | 3-6 | 3-6 |
| Total | 12-24 (depending on data saturation) | | | |

The location where FGDs will be implemented will be also purposively sampled, based on capacity of WASH cluster partners that will support the exercise, by identifying FGD participants, arranging logistics, and run the FGDs. Depending on the final number of FGDs, it is expected that the exercise will be run in 6-12 locations (2 FGDs – male/female in each location).

The FGD form will be designed in close coordination with the WASH Cluster to address the information needs formulated in the research questions. The FGD guide will be piloted 10 days ahead of data collection to make sure that all potential issues arise before the rolled out. In order to limit the burden on the participants that will voluntarily dedicate their time to the exercise, the form will be conceived to last no more 90 minutes.

Once the tool is finalized, a one-day training session will be conducted for team leaders and enumerators. The training will include modules on: details of tasks and logistics, FGD facilitation techniques, the role of the note taker, as well as a specific seciton on the FGD guide.

##### 2.5. Data Processing and Analysis

The analysis of data collected in qualitative text notes will rely on field notes taken by monitors during the discussions, as well as on the monitors’ post-FGD debriefing. All notes will be manually coded. Notes will be split into sentences then divided according to the key indicators that the research intends to address. At this stage, the analysis started by identifying key issues in each indicator and defining brief summaries accordingly. The analysis will focus on:

* *Frequency***:** the analysis takes into account how many times issues were reported by FGD participants. However, as per best practice in qualitative research, frequency has not been associated with higher or lower importance. Frequency will inform the analysis on how much these specific issues are spread amongst the research target groups.
* *Specificity*: more emphasis will be given to specific, detailed issues that were reported, always taking into account bias of the respondents
* *Emotion and behaviours*: more weight will be assigned to themes and comments that participants reported that showed enthusiasm, passion or intensity, as well as to the ones that they seem to appear indifferent to.
* *Extensiveness:* extensiveness of comments will be linked to how many different participants have reported a specific comment or issue.

The following analytical framework will be used during the analysis[[2]](#footnote-2):

Constant comparisonwill be used to identify patterns and discover relationship between ideas and concepts and to understand the different trends and to identify common opinions. In order to do that, that analysis will be processed through three major stages:

* *Open Coding:* all collected data will be consolidated into small units and a code, or description will be attached to each small unit.
* *Axial Coding:* small units will be aggregated into categories according to their codes.
* *Selective Coding:* one or more thematic will be identified by grouping categories.

*Table 2: Constant Comparison analysis steps*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps** | **Action** | **Description** | **Purpose** |
| S1 | Open Coding | Data is consolidated into small units and labeled with a code | Re-organize large amount of qualitative data |
| S2 | Axial Coding | Small units are aggregated into categories according to their codes | Aggregate the different pieces of data into larger categories |
| S3 | Selective Coding | Themes are identified by groups of categories | Identify larger thematic areas to which the different categories are related to |

This analysis approach will help identifying if themes that emerged from a specific groups or individual and that are relevant to other groups or individuals. This approach also assists analysis to quickly reach data saturation, therefore saving time and resources. For this purpose, the FGD analysis will be done just after each day of data collection to track data saturation. Once enough data is obtained, the FGD’s will be re-oriented in order to collect data that may still missing.

Even though data will be heavily coded for analysis purposes, the report will contain the most significant participants’ statements when possible and relevant. Quoting the verbatim will be used to illustrate the main themes emerged from the analysis as well as to enhance readability of the report.

Data will be analysed in Excel, or in with other relevant software such as NVivo or Atlas TI.

# 3. Roles and responsibilities

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Description** | **Responsible** | **Accountable** | **Consulted** |
| Research design | *GWC Assessment Specialist* | *WASH NCC* | *REACH HQ, WASH partners* |
| Supervising data collection | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *WASH partners* |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *GWC Assessment Specialist* |
| Data analysis | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *GWC Assessment Specialist* |
| Output production | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *GWC Assessment Specialist* |
| Dissemination | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *GWC Assessment Specialist* |
| Lessons learned | *WASH IMO* | *WASH NCC* | *GWC Assessment Specialist* |

***Responsible:*** *the person(s) who executes the task*

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

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

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

***NB: Only one person can be Accountable; the only scenario when the same person is listed twice for a task is when the same person is both Responsible and Accountable.***

# Data Analysis Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Research question** | **Questionnaire Question** | **Probes** | **Data collection method** | **Key disaggregations (Group types)** |
| What sanitation facilities do IDPs currently use? | What sanitation facilities do you and other men/ women living in informal settlements/host communities use the most since you arrived in this location? | * Show pictorials of different sanitation facilities * Can you rank the different sanitation facilities from the most used to the least used? * Is there anybody that disagree with the ranking? If yes, why? * Are there other sanitation facilities available but that are not used? If yes, why? * Enquire about open defecation | FGD | Gender and setting |
| What difficulties do IDPs face regarding access to sanitation facilities? | Do you and other men/ women living in informal settlements/host communities face problems linked with sanitation facilities? If yes, can you give some examples? | * If the discussion does not take off, try to suggest some of the following issues, asking if this is a problem: Lack of latrines / latrines too crowded; Latrines are not functioning or full; Latrines are unclean/unhygienic; Latrines are not private (no locks/door/walls etc.); Latrines are not segregated between men and women; Latrines are too far; Going to the latrine is dangerous; Some groups do not have access to latrines * How do you adapt to those issues? If the discussion doesn’t take off suggest the following coping strategies: Rely on less preferred and unimproved latrines; Rely on communal latrines; Defecate in a plastic bag; Defecate in the open; Going to a latrine further than the usual one; Going to the latrine in a dangerous place; Going to the latrine at night * Do you think that those issues are common to both men and women? If not what is specific to men and what is specific to women? | FGD | Gender and setting |
| Do IDP face protection risks related to the use of sanitation facilities? | Do you and other men/ women living in informal settlements/host communities feel safe when using sanitation facilities? If not, why? Can you give some examples? | * Have you heard of people that got harassed, sexually assaulted and/or raped while being at a sanitation facility or while going to/from a sanitation facility? * Is any of the following groups more exposed to those issues (Female children, girls, female adults and female elderly / male children, boys, male adults and male elderly). If yes, why? | FGD | Gender and setting |
| What sanitation facilities would IDPs prefer and for what reason? | Humanitarian agencies are discussing the opportunity of implementing sanitation interventions for IDPs living in informal settlements/host communities. Those are the option that are currently available (show pictorials and explain the different types of sanitation technologies). Can you classify them from the most preferred to the least preferred? | * Can you give the reason for this classification, explaining the pros and cons of each option? * Is there anyone who has strong concerns on some of those sanitation technologies? If yes, could you please explain why? * Is there someone who disagree with the classification? If yes, for what reasons? | FGD | Gender and setting |
| What are the specific needs for vulnerable groups in terms of sanitation? | Different groups may have specific requirements in terms of sanitation. Could you please discuss among you and identify what are specific requirements of the following groups? Groups we are interested in are female children, girls, female adults and female elderly / male children, boys, male adults and male elderly. Apart from age groups, what are the specific requirements for people with disabilities? | * What are the dimensions that are specific to those age groups that should be taken into account when designing a sanitation facility? | FGD | Gender and setting |

# 5. Data Management Plan

*Please complete the Data Management Plan below*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Administrative Data** | |
| Research Cycle name | *Sanitation Assessment in Gedeo and West Guji Host Communities* |
| Project Code | *NA* |
| Donor | *NA* |
| Project partners | *Ethiopia WASH Cluster, GWC, REACH Initiative* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Research Contacts | *Adane Bekele - adbekele@unicef.org*  *Augusto Comé – acome@unicef.org* | |
| Data Management Plan Version | *Date: 20/08/2018* | *Version: 1.0* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Related Policies | *NA* | | | |
| **Documentation and Metadata** | | | | |
| What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?  *Select all that apply* | x | Data analysis plan | x | Data Cleaning Log, including:  x Deletion Log  x Value Change Log |
| x | Code book | □ | Data Dictionary |
| x | Metadata based on HDX Standards | □ | [Other, Specify] |
| **Ethics and Legal Compliance** | | | | |
| Which ethical and legal measures will be taken? | x | Consent of participants to participate | □ | Consent of participants to share personal information with other agencies |
| x | No collection of personally identifiable data will take place | □ | Gender, child protection and other protection issues are taken into account |
| x | All participants reached age of majority |  | [Other, Specify] |
| Who will own the copyright and Intellectual Property Rights for the data that is collected? | *Ethiopia WASH Cluster* | | | |
| **Storage and Backup** | | | | |
| Where will data be stored and backed up during the research? | □ | IMPACT/REACH Kobo Server | □ | Other Kobo Server: *[specify]* |
| □ | IMPACT Global Physical / Cloud Server | x | Ethiopia WASH Cluster server |
| □ | On devices held by REACH staff | □ | Physical location *[specify]* |
| □ | [Other, Specify] | | |
| Which data access and security measures have been taken? | x | Password protection on devices/servers | □ | Data access is limited to *[specify, e.g. REACH staff]* |
| □ | Form and data encryption on data collection server |  |  |
| □ | [Other, Specify] | | |
| **Preservation** | | | | |
| Where will data be stored for long-term preservation? | □ | IMPACT / REACH Global Cloud / Physical Server | x | OCHA HDX |
| □ | REACH Country Server | x | Ethiopia WASH Cluster webpage |
| **Data Sharing** | | | | |
| Will the data be shared publically? | x | Yes | □ | No, only with mandating agency / body |
| Will all data be shared? | □ | Yes | x | No, only anonymized/ cleaned/ consolidated data will be shared |
| □ | No, [Other, Specify] | | |
| Where will you share the data? | □ | REACH Resource Centre | x | OCHA HDX |
| □ | HumanitarianResponse | x | Ethiopia WASH Cluster webpage |
| **Responsibilities** | | | | |
| Data collection | *Adane Bekele -* [adbekele@unicef.org](mailto:adbekele@unicef.org) | | | |
| Data cleaning | *Adane Bekele -* [adbekele@unicef.org](mailto:adbekele@unicef.org) | | | |
| Data analysis | *Adane Bekele -* [adbekele@unicef.org](mailto:adbekele@unicef.org) | | | |
| Data sharing/uploading | *Adane Bekele -* [adbekele@unicef.org](mailto:adbekele@unicef.org) | | | |

1. [OCHA, West Guji-Gedeo Conflict Displacement Flash Update #5, 29 June 2018](https://reliefweb.int/report/ethiopia/ethiopia-west-guji-gedeo-conflict-displacement-flash-update-5-29-june-2018) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The analysis framework is adapted from Krueger–Casey,Focus Group Discussions, 2009, Sage Publications [↑](#footnote-ref-2)