Indicators and guidance note for monitoring AAP

This menu of indicators and guidance note focus on data that serves UNICEF Country Office leadership and programme managers, as well as partners, in monitoring and tracking of how well AAP commitments are being implemented. The tool also highlights the relationship between indicator choices and reporting to ROs/headquarters and UNICEF Executive Board.

This is a draft version for field testing and adaptation in country contexts and will be refined based on feedback.

How to use this tool

The menu of indicators and guidance note provides model indicators addressing Communication & Information, Participation, Complaints & Feedback Mechanisms and Evidence-based decision making.

It references the results hierarchy (i.e. from inputs to outcomes) and a range of most likely methods/processes for data collection. The choice of indicators will depend on the CO and partners assessment of the existing monitoring capacities, constraints and planned data investments in country.

This document supports standardization of measurement across partners and countries, while at the same time allowing for adaptation by COs. Adaptation is necessary to reflect to reflect the context -- the humanitarian situation, the response and the evolution of the implementation of AAP in the context, and the corresponding adaptation of global good practice standards in AAP.

For each model indicator, guidance is provided on which terms or dimensions of measurement need to be defined and tested in country with partners and ultimately locally field tested with affected populations.

Choosing data collection methods/processes and indicators

- Balance your monitoring investment – Investment in monitoring the implementation of AAP commitments should not outweigh or be confused with the needed of investment in the actual pillars of AAP; this can be confusing since one of the pillars of AAP is the routine collection, processing, analysis and use of feedback from affected people. The stream of information from complaints and feedback mechanisms is a critical added value of AAP and should be a key stream of information that COs and partners use in making programming more accountable to affected populations.

- Evolution of AAP efforts – As the implementation of AAP commitments matures, the focus of implementation monitoring should shift higher up the results chain, i.e. moving from monitoring inputs to outputs and outcomes.

- Balance across the measurement domains – AAP is a holistic endeavour: the objectives of AAP are not achieved without pursuing all of the complementary pillars. Similarly, implementation monitoring efforts need to be balanced and track progress across the pillars.

- Focus on country level performance management needs – Focus on indicators that help inform programme and partnership management with IPs and overall CO performance management. Monitoring should help answer the management questions: Are we implementing AAP as planned (and according to good practice guidance)?; Are we getting the desired results under the key pillars of AAP? If these questions are well covered, then the data needed to feed into CO annual reporting will be well covered.

- Select appropriate monitoring methods/processes building on what already exists – the choice of indicators will be based on assessment of existing monitoring capacities and constraints. The

unicef | for every child

investment in primary data collection and analysis at community level (from and with affected populations) will vary depending on the evolution of the IPs own implementation of AAP commitments, but some minimum options are indicated. The range of methods/processes considered as a base are as follows:

Partner reporting	The minimum approach to tracking implementation of AAP commitments is through IPs reporting, the parameters of which (including indicators and frequency) are established in the Programme Document.
	For UNICEF, this is secondary quantitative data collection and analysis (IPs may include narrative analysis but only within the structure of our streamlined reporting requirements for IPs, consistent with Grand Bargain commitments on streamlined partner reporting). For the IPs, the indicators reported are ideally coming from their administrative data systems, i.e. data collected as an essential component of routine service delivery or programme activities.
	The more the AAP-related indicators (and related definitions and quality standards) are aligned with indicators in the IP's admin data systems, the more the partner reporting is serving to reinforce a collective approach to implementing AAP. This should ideally build on a collective discussion across IPs in country on common minimum indicators, definitions and quality standards and wherever possible UNICEF should be promoting this as a humanitarian cluster partner and Cluster Lead Agency.
Systematic qualitative field monitoring	Field Monitoring is an essential input to wider programme and partnership management (including HACT). It is mainly concerned with assessing and validating implementation (inputs, activities), and outputs which can be assessed at community and service point levels; identifying bottlenecks and barriers in implementation; triggering solutions and corrective actions; and supporting accountability to primary stakeholders; that is to systematically gather, analyse and trigger programme responsiveness to the perspectives of children, women and their families, especially those from most vulnerable groups.
	UNICEF guidance promotes that field monitoring be undertaken as much as possible in collaboration with implementing partners, to build shared understanding of progress and ownership of corrective actions where warranted. Where field monitoring is scaled up with a systematic number of site visits per month and sampling across programmes, this monitoring system can yield a powerful regular flow of data.
	Where UNICEF field monitoring includes systematic use of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), this represents a critical routine feedback. FGDs also allow creating feedback spaces for specific vulnerable population groups taking into consideration: gender; age, disability and other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups. Field monitoring with FGDs is a mechanism for both data collection relevant to the implementation of AAP as well as the wider humanitarian programme implementation.
	Since field monitoring with FGDs is relied upon so heavily for feedback across the spectrum of programmes, it is likely that the thematic focus of checklists needs to be rotated, e.g. on a monthly basis. Good FGDs checklists need to be kept manageable and short. In such a field monitoring system, focusing FGDs on implementing AAP (a checklist addressing the various pillars) for one month every three months will generate powerful feedback, while keeping the balance of FGDs focused on feedback on the programmatic elements of the humanitarian response.
	The introduction of indicators on implementation of AAP in field monitoring systems requires:
	a) Including specific checklist prompts in tools for FGDs;
	b) Systematic tracking of action points for follow-up (including identifying those based on feedback from affected people in FGDs);
	c) Regular aggregation of data from those FGDs feeding into both partnership management discussions with IPs and overall programme management discussions and follow up action for corrective action as needed; and
	d) Both (b) and (c) require strong IM for field monitoring data where data from FGDs is clearly distinguished as representing the voice of affected people.

	It is important to clarify that the framing of indicators for field monitoring systems assumes that they include a simple FGD methodology where a thematic prompt is used to trigger group discussion and the presence/absence of FGD member responses is then assessed, for example, based on non-leading prompts, the frequent correct mention of key info on what programmes are available in a community, what the related entitlements are, and how people can access or participate, can be equated with positive awareness; the incorrect mentions provide feedback on misunderstandings; the frequency and intensity of mentions, both positive and negative, can also provide insight; and the nature/composition of the specific FGD provides insight into how understandings are different for different groups. This approach does not give high precision of measurement but provides both high frequency feedback on broad patterns and qualitative context for greater understanding. More details on translating each of the indicators for field monitoring systems into checklist prompts are included below.
	The quantitative indicators associated with field monitoring are then intended to help translate the findings from each FGD into a broader picture of trends, i.e. in the total of FGDs undertaken in a given month, how often does a FGD reveal a positive or negative response in relation to a specific checklist item. It is important to take care in interpreting this quantitative tracking of the % of FGDs where certain issues are noted or not; there are no absolute benchmarks and the patterns will be more important than the specific % measure.
	Good practice is using FGDs in monitoring the implementation of AAP commitments and overall programmes includes specifically targeting those geographic areas, those programme activities and those populations groups where we are more likely to see difficulties.
	All data from FGDs, including the quantitative indicators, must be interpreted and communicated with care with partners and field staff to support an open positive dialogue on programme improvements and ensure protection of participants.
Household (HH) surveys	Good practice household surveys fill a critical gap in providing representative data on populations who might be outside the reach of ongoing humanitarian response – both mid-level outcomes and higher-level outcomes/impacts. Use of HH surveys is however limited to where populations movements are somewhat stabilized. Different HH survey adaptations are appropriate for different humanitarian situations, with shorter or longer horizons of stabilization. The adaptations include both methodological and technical/operational and build on and marry the expertise on options ranging from gold standard DHS and MICS, to KAP, to more minimal SMART and Lot Quality Assurance surveys. The investments required (financial, human, logistical resources and time) depend on the different options. Because good representative HH surveys all require significant investment including technical capacity, they are not undertaken at a high frequency. It is therefore generally recommended that they are undertaken as multi-sector and multi-stakeholder/inter-cluster exercises.
	Following the same logic, it is generally recommended that use of HH surveys to track implementation of AAP should be undertaken as one element in a broader multi-sector and multi- stakeholder exercise – this is both for efficiency of data collection investments and allows better programmatic contextualization of the findings on implementation of AAP. Even better practice will combine HH surveys with FGDs to provide better context and direction of corrective actions.
	The model indicators for HH surveys will, as with any HH survey indicator, require contextual definition of indicators and terms, translation and testing. As a reference, see guidance on the planning and implementation for [Multiple-Indicator Cluster Surveys](#) and [SMART surveys](#).
Non-statistical mass surveys (including SMS-based two-way comms platforms such as U-Report)	As with HH surveys, where investments are already in place for SMS-based surveys or two-way communication platforms, indicators on implementation of AAP can be integrated on a periodic basis. Investment is still required in refining and testing model indicators. The data will not be representative of the full population or of the populations surveyed, but will provide large amounts of data and so can provide insights into general proportions and trends in terms of affected pepole's awareness, engagement and concerns related to different pillars of AAP.

Disaggregation: All the above methods/sources allow for some disaggregation. The disaggregations that are relevant for monitoring implementation of AAP are:

- Outputs, outcomes by population group – at least gender, age, disability and other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups;
- Inputs, outputs and outcomes by geographic reference: admin level/location and/or service point;
- Inputs, outputs and outcomes by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, and other as relevant to context;
- Inputs, outputs by implementing partner.

Quality dimensions: For each indicator as relevant, specific definition of terms and/or measurement scales are provided. These should wherever possible be agreed upon collectively across IPs in country and UNICEF should be promoting the same at cluster/inter-cluster level both as a humanitarian cluster partner and Cluster Lead Agency.

UNICEF | for every child

Overview of model indicators (indicator short name) by data collection method/process

	Communication & information	Participation	Feedback & Complaints Mechanisms & Evidence-based decision-making
HH survey & non-statistical surveys	CI (1) *[Outcome]* % of AP surveyed able to identify: (a) key info on expected services/benefits and how to access/participate in these b) key info on life enhancing/saving behaviours (c) expected behaviour of staff *(under development)*	*(under development)*	CFM (1) *[Output]* % of affected people surveyed that have provided a suggestion or a complaint through any CFMS or participation mechanism CFM (2) *[Output]* % of affected people surveyed that feel confident to give feedback or complaints Optional addition CFM (3) [Output] % of AP surveyed who (a) feel aid providers take their opinion into account, and (b) trust aid providers to act in their best interest
Qualitative Field Monitoring	CI (2) *[Outcome]* % of FGDs where participants were able to identify key info related to (a), (b), (c); *and qualitative nature of misunderstanding disaggregated by type of FGDs*	P (1) *[Output]* % of FGDs where challenges to (a) accessing and (b) participating in programmes/services were identified; *and qualitative data on nature of challenges disaggregated by type of FGDs*	CFM (4) *[Output]* – *where IPs have one or more CFMs in place* -- % of FGDs where participants: *(a)* were aware of CFMs *(other than the FGDs they are participating in)* (b) understood how to access CFMs *(c)* are confident to give feedback/ complaints; *and qualitative nature of misunderstanding disaggregated by type of FGDs*
	▼ *aggregating above indicators* ▼	▼ *aggregating above indicators* ▼	
Implementing Partner reporting	*Where partners have processes in place to collect data aligned to CI (1) or (2) above, this data should be included in reporting*	*Where partners have processes in place to collect data aligned to P (1) above, this data should be included in reporting* P (2) *[Input]* # and % of humanitarian response service points/programme sites with participatory processes functioning as per plan	CFM (5) *[Input]* % of partner or service point CMF meeting prioritized standards (see guidance)
	▼ *aggregating above indicators* ▼	▼ *aggregating above indicators* ▼	▼ *aggregating above indicators* ▼
CO performance management (CMT/PMT)	CI (2) CI (3) *[Input]* % of humanitarian CSO IPs providing "key info" by type of info (a), (b), (c) (with/ without two-way communication mechanisms) *(CI (1) will not be high frequency but would be triangulated CO performance management analysis when available)*	P (1) & (2) P (4) *[Input]* # and % of IPs supporting UNICEF humanitarian response with participatory processes defined in current work plans	CFM (4) & (5) DM (1) *[Output]* % of issues identified in UNICEF feedback processes for which solution is in process or closed DM (2) *[Output]* % of CO and/or IP review meetings that use feedback alongside other evidence to inform strategic decisions *(CFM (1) & (2) will not be high frequency but would be triangulated CO performance management analysis when available)*
Global reporting: annual reporting SMQs	During the reporting period, does the CO support to communications, community engagement and/or Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) meet the following core good practice standards: (a) UNICEF and implementing partners (IP), and government as relevant, provide information to affected and at-risk people, including the most marginalized groups, on life enhancing/saving actions that they can take (b) UNICEF and implementing partners (IP), and government as relevant, provide information to affected and at-risk people, including the most marginalized groups, to make them better informed about their entitlements, the programming available and how to access it. (c) UNICEF and implementing partners (IP), and government as relevant, have systematic feedback and complaint mechanisms which are designed in a way that reaches the most marginalized and vulnerable groups, and inform decisions about programme design and course correction (d) UNICEF, implementing partners (IP), and government as relevant, have approaches to support participation and community engagement across the programme cycle (assessment, service design, implementation and M&E)		
Global reporting: Strategic Plan indicators	H1.d.1. Percentage of county offices that meet organizational benchmarks on communication for development (C4D) programmes for community engagement and behaviour change, including adaptation for humanitarian response H1.c.3. % of humanitarian funding provided to local and national actors H7.a.1. Percentage of countries implementing proven real-time information innovations at scale, including adaptation for humanitarian response		

Model indicators

COMMUNICATION & INFORMATION	
Outcome Indicator CI (1) **% of AP surveyed able to identify (a), (b), (c)** **a) key info on expected services/benefits of UNICEF/IPs programmes and how to access/ participate in these (including complaints and feedback mechanisms)** **b) key info on life enhancing/saving behaviours that affected populations can take** **c) expected behaviour by staff to affected populations (guidance specifying priority elements for measurement are still under development)**	*Method:* Integrated in household surveys (can be adapted for non-representative SMS-based surveys but see also notes on denominator). *Denominator:* # affected people surveyed (for non-representative SMS-based surveys, denominator will be "# of respondents") *Frequency:* low frequency *Quality dimensions:* Agreed "key info" for (a), (b) and (c) should be defined at country level. Key info for (a) may be location specific whereas key info for (b) and (c) should ideally be agreed at cluster/sector or inter-cluster/sector levels as appropriate. Defining key info on (c) should acknowledge that affected populations will not easily differentiate organizations and should be able to expect the same basic standards of behaviour across organizations. *Disaggregation:* - by type of key info (a), (b) and (c) above - FGD population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable/ marginalized groups - by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point - by sector (a) and (b) – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context *Notes:* Ideally surveys are accompanied by some FGDs for qualitative probing. *Source: adapted from draft Community Engagement standards (ref indicator A.4.3)*
Output indicator CI (2) **% of FGDs where participants were able to identify key info related to (a), (b), (c) as for CI (1)** ***and qualitative nature of misunderstanding disaggregated by type of FGDs***	*Method:* qualitative field monitoring including FGDs *Denominator:* # of FGDs probing knowledge of (a), (b), (c) *Frequency*: medium/higher frequency (monthly, quarterly) depending on scale of FM and competing priorities for FGDs *Quality dimensions:* See specifications for CI (1) above on defining agreed "key info" for (a), (b), (c). *Disaggregation:* See above specifications for CI (1) *Notes:* Qualitative probing should include: what are the gaps in information (what questions do FGD participants have), what it the nature of misunderstandings, and what are the preferences for improving information provided. CI (2) also should feed into monthly internal CO performance management reviews *Source: adapted from draft Community Engagement standards (ref indicator A.4.3)*
Input indicator CI (3) **% of humanitarian CSO IPs providing "key info" by type of info (a), (b), (c) (with/ without two-way communication mechanisms)**	*Method:* CO internal tracking of qualitative dimensions of programme design in Programme Documents with CSO partners *Denominator:* # of CSO IPs engaged in humanitarian response *Quality dimensions:* as above *Disaggregation:* by sector/section

PARTICIPATION[1]	
Output indicator P (1a) **% of FGDs where challenges to accessing programmes/services were identified**; ***and qualitative data on nature of challenges for different vulnerable population groups***	*Method:* qualitative field monitoring including Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). *Denominator*: # of FGDs probing access *Frequency:* medium/higher frequency (monthly, quarterly) depending on scale of FM and competing priorities for FGDs *Quality dimensions:* Access to programmes/services here is intended to explore the physical and socio- economic factors that shape who is benefitting from a service or programme and who is not and why; it contributes in turn to shape the nature of who is participating to what degree. *Disaggregation:* In tracking percent of FGDs, it will be useful to disaggregate by: - FGD population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups - population group with access challenges – same break down as above - by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point - by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context. *Notes:* Probing should explore access/inclusion of the following subgroups: gender; age (this will depend on what is relevant to the programme target group, e.g. education programmes will have a defined age target), disability and other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups. To effectively explore access in FGDs, it requires not only a systematic probing of access by vulnerable subgroups, but also that FGDs include specific vulnerable population sub-groups.
Output indicator P (1b) **% of FGDs where challenges to participating in programmes/services were identified**; ***and qualitative data on nature of challenges disaggregated by level of participation and type of FGDs***	*Method:* qualitative field monitoring including FGDs. *Denominator:* # of FGDs probing access/participation *Frequency:* medium/higher frequency (monthly, quarterly) depending on scale of FM and competing priorities for FGDs *Quality dimensions:* This indicator addresses level of participation in programmes. *Disaggregation:* - FGD population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups - population group with access challenges – same break down as above - by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point - by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context - by implementing partners involved *Notes:* Qualitative probing should include: in what way was participation less satisfactory; in what specific participation processes or programmes, and for whom. The expected % of FGDs where challenges to participation must be put into context, both considering the maturity of participation processes as well as contextual constraints to participation which are external factors.
Input indicator P(2) **# and % of humanitarian response service points/programme sites with participatory processes functioning by level of participation**	*Method:* CSO IPs self-reporting based on internal admin data *Denominator:* # of planned participatory processes or mechanisms by level of participation, as linked to regular service points/local programme sites OR as linked to one-off or low-frequency humanitarian response interventions. *Frequency:* higher frequency (monthly depending on reporting frequency agreed with CSO IP) *Quality dimensions:*

---

[1] Note: indicators on participation suitable for HH surveys are to be developed, building on ongoing work on Measurement of Adolescent Participation in Decision-Making.

- Define in work plans with government partners or CSO IP Programme Documents the "expected" participatory processes or mechanisms and the level of participation anticipated. The participatory processes may be planned for each regular service points/local programme site or as a part of a one-off or low-frequency intervention as appropriate to context. The definition of 'expected' mechanisms should also include definition of:

  • Purpose of participation – e.g. to support C4D (supporting life enhancing/saving behaviours); or to contribute to wider response design/implementation/M&E as part of AAP;

  • by key decision processes: (a) risk assessment/ needs assessment; (b) planning/design; (c) ongoing implementation; (d) monitoring and/or evaluation); (e) multiple of the above combined;

  • by specific population group(s) targeted for participation – gender, age, disability and other parameters relevant to locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups.

  Such definitions require discussion between the CO and IPs and will depend not only on the nature of the programme, but also on the capacity of the IP (to manage effective and safe participatory processes), and the existence of other complementary systematic cross-cutting participatory processes. With regard to complaints and feedback mechanisms, it is also important for COs to assess with regard to standards for complaints and feedback (see CFM (4)). In addition, the CO humanitarian response strategy should include clarifying how the CO plans to support and promote participation, including capacity development to strengthen these mechanisms.

- "Regular service points/local programme site" refer to a service or programme that is ongoing (daily or weekly service or engagement) in a specific "site" which corresponds to a community or low level administrative boundary as relevant to context which represents the catchment area of intended ongoing beneficiaries. e.g. a PHC, a temporary learning center. It is expected that in these service points/programme sites that participatory mechanisms could potentially be designed with greater continuity and intensity of participation.

- "One-off or low-frequency humanitarian response interventions" refer to those programme interventions/activities that in and of themselves are less conducive to a sustained engagement with or participation by individuals in an intended beneficiary population, e.g. a twice annual vaccination campaign; a three-monthly cash-transfer programme, or a one-off needs assessment exercise.

Disaggregation:
- by level of participation
- by purpose
- by key decision process
- by geographic reference: admin level/location &/or service point
- by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context
- by IP

Notes: The value of this indicator tracked by multiple IPs is to provide a lens on both coverage of participation processes and assessment on the qualitative dimensions of participatory mechanisms (level of participation, purpose, key decision processes).
For performance management, it is important to track both the % and the actual # of mechanisms for each IP as compared to planned; it also important to assess this indicator with reference to the relative significance of the IP in question, ranked by the $ value of UNICEF partnership.
It is NOT recommended to track the number of individuals participating in any given participatory mechanism, as the significance of this number can be very misleading (dependent on the level of participation) and there is a high risk of double counting individual participants.

UNICEF | for every child

Input indicator P(3)	Method: manual through CO work plan monitoring, eTools PMP
# and % of UNICEF IPs with strategies to sustain or increase participation defined in current humanitarian response related work plans	Denominator: Total # IPs supporting humanitarian response
	Frequency: useful monthly in scale up of new crisis; otherwise low frequency aligned to peak CSO planning periods and planning reviews
	Quality dimensions: - "IPs" refers to both Government partner with whom there there are signed work plans or CSO partners for which Programme Document represent a 'work plan'. - The strategies to sustain or increase participation include feedback and complaint mechanisms; the distinctions between these may be challenging in some contexts. - Additionally 'strategies' can be further assessed and categorized according to level of participation expected to be attained, and whether or not the strategies include specific approaches to support the participation of more vulnerable population groups and which ones (women, adolescents, people with disabilities, and/or other socio-economic sub-groups).
	Disaggregation: - by level of participation expected - by specific vulnerable groups targeted - by relative significance of IPs with and without strategies for participation, including $ value of UNICEF partnership and the potential geographic/population coverage - by geographic reference: admin level/location &/or service point - by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context
	Notes: This indicator is useful primarily in a planning, scale up phase in a new humanitarian situation and thereafter, as for protracted crises, is only of value as a low frequency indicator, e.g. mid- and end- year in protracted crises. Other reference milestone indicators for COs in a very initial phase of working to strengthen AAP include: - Whether or not the CO humanitarian response strategy includes specific articulation of plans to support participation by affected people, across sectors, IPs, through what approaches, to achieve what levels of participation and targeting which vulnerable and marginalized groups, as well as the capacity development support to IPs to strengthen participatory mechanisms and AAP. - Whether or not CO and IPs have access to/are using an assessment of barriers to participation and community engagement.
	Sources: includes reference to draft UNICEF Community Engagement Standards (ref indicators A.1.5, A.3.1)
COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS (CFMs)	
Output indicator CFM (1)	Method: Integrated in HH surveys (can be adapted for non-representative SMS-based surveys but see also notes on denominator)
% of affected people surveyed that have provided a suggestion or a complaint through any complaints and feedback or participation mechanism	Denominator: # affected people surveyed (for non-representative SMS-based surveys, denominator will be "# of respondents")
	Frequency: low frequency
	Quality dimensions: It is important to clarify that feedback and complaint mechanisms are defined openly here, i.e. the focus of the question includes structured processes or mechanisms for taking in "complaints" as well as more broadly any inputs and feedback. This overlaps with and includes participation mechanisms/processes and two-way communications. From the user perspective making any further distinction is likely problematic in an environment where multiple such mechanisms exist. Affected people can be expected to assume that

	any structured process where their feedback or inputs are solicited is also an avenue for complaints. *Disaggregation:* -by population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups -by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point -by contexts – e.g. rural; urban; camp as relevant to situation -by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context *Notes:* Ideally HH surveys are accompanied by some FGDs for qualitative probing, to provide the necessary information trigger corrective action.
Output indicator CFM (2) **% of affected people surveyed that feel confident to give feedback or complaints**	*Method:* Integrated in HH surveys (can be adapted for non-representative SMS-based surveys but see also notes on denominator). *Denominator:* # affected people surveyed (for non-representative SMS-based surveys, denominator will be "# of respondents") *Frequency:* low frequency *Quality dimensions:* The concept of "feeling confident" needs some contextual testing; it will necessarily capture a combination of degree of awareness of mechanisms, the degree to which safety and protection of individuals has been addresses, and the general culture of openness to feedback by humanitarian staff. *Disaggregation:* -by population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups -by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point -by contexts – e.g. rural; urban; camp as relevant to situation -by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context *Notes:* Ideally HH surveys are accompanied by some FGDs for qualitative probing, to provide the necessary information trigger corrective action. *Source: Ground Truth Solutions https://groundtruthsolutions.org, e.g. Bangladesh surveys 2018; andfeeebackmechanisms.org*
Output indicator CFM (3) **% of affected people surveyed who: (a) feel aid providers take their opinion into account; (b) trust aid providers to act in their best interest**	*Method:* Integrated in HH surveys (can be adapted for non-representative SMS-based surveys but see also notes on denominator) *Denominator:* # affected people surveyed (for non-representative SMS-based surveys, denominator will be "# of respondents") *Frequency:* low frequency *Disaggregation:* - by population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups - by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point - by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context *Notes:* Ideally HH surveys are accompanied by some FGDs for qualitative probing, to provide the necessary information trigger corrective action. *Source: Ground Truth Solutions (This has been used in system-wide perception surveys to take an overall measure of AAP and CHS implementation); aligns also with draft UNICEF Community Engagement Standards (ref indicator A.1.4).*

Output indicator CFM (4)	*Method:* qualitative field monitoring including FGDs
% of FGDs where participants (a) were aware of complaints and feedback mechanisms (other than current FGD); (b) understood how to access complaints and feedback mechanisms; and (c) are were confident to give feedback or complaints; *and probing related gaps in understanding and concerns*	*Denominator:* # of FGDs probing awareness of CFMs *Frequency:* medium/higher frequency (monthly, quarterly depending on scale of FM and competing priorities for FGDs *Quality dimension:* -As with indicator CFM (1), feedback and complaint mechanisms and participation mechanisms are defined openly here. However, for this kind of FGD method, it may be possible to narrow this questioning to the specific local CFMs, naming them as possible, so that FGDs are giving more focus. -Define key information about accessing CFMs that participants should know, and any specific aspects of protection mechanisms in place associated with the CFMs. *Disaggregation:* -FGD population group – gender, age, disability, other locally defined vulnerable and marginalized groups -population group with access challenges – same break down as above -by geographic reference – admin level/location &/or service point -by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context -by implementing partners involved *Notes:* There is a potential confusion for FGD participants in that the FGD itself is a feedback mechanism; FGD facilitators must take care to frame questions in relation to other possible CFMs and opportunities for participation and two-way communication. Similarly, in analysis and presentation of results, it is important to clarify that the data on CFMs from this FGD process do not encompass the FGD itself. *Source: aligns in part to draft Community Engagement Standards (ref indicator A.1.2)*
Input indicator CFM (5)	*Method:* CSO IP self-reporting based on internal admin data
% of partner or service point complaints and feedback mechanism meeting prioritized standards	*Denominator:* # of IPs with planned CFMs *Frequency:* higher frequency (monthly, depending on reporting frequency agreed with CSO IP) *Quality dimension:* The CFM may include a multi-dimensional approach, e.g. localized stakeholder meetings as well as call in service with a wide geographic reach. Regardless, the overall combination of approaches by the IP should at least meet the following prioritized CHS standards; that the CFM is: - designed with consultation and/or data on affected people's preferences taken into consideration - includes provisions for safety and security of users -addresses protection of info - includes an SOP for complaints related to SEA and other abuses of power - includes specific mechanism or adaptation to reach vulnerable groups, especially women, adolescents, persons with disabilities. *Disaggregation:* -by specific standards met/not met -by specific vulnerable groups targeted -by relative significance of IPs with and without CFM, including $ value of UNICEF partnership and the potential geographic/population coverage -by geographic reference: admin level/location &/or service point -by sector – Nutrition, Health, WASH, Education, CP, multi-sector/cross-cutting, other as relevant to context

	Notes: this Y/N assessment should then be the basis for agreed support to the IP to strengthen either dedicated CFM or use of collective complaints and feedback mechanism
EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING	
Output Indicator DM (1) **% of issues identified in UNICEF-led/co-led feedback processes for which solution is in process or closed** (% new in current reporting period & % cumulative)	*Method*: through eTools action point system OR other CO action point tracker *Denominator:* # of action points triggered through CFMs, FGDs and other feedback mechanism identified in current reporting period and cumulative *Frequency:* higher frequency (e.g. monthly EMT/CMT) *Quality dimensions*: UNICEF-led or co-led feedback processes is defined openly here to include field monitoring with FGDs plus any other mechanisms established by CO with partners. Action points can be triggers from complaints/issues coming out of an individual beneficiary's input as well as those that are identified through a group process (e.g. an FGD or a committee meeting). -Solutions in process or closed include either localized corrective action or corrective action at the level of wider programme strategy and operations. Similarly, complaints/issues triggering action points need not have been identified through a specific dedicated Feedback and Complaint mechanism -"Solution in process" needs to be defined in line with UNICEF action point tracked. It should not include the delegation of responsibility for a solution. *Notes:* This is only possible when CO has reached milestone of establishing action points tracking system
Output Indicator DM(2) **% of CO and/or IP review meetings that use feedback alongside other evidence to inform strategic decisions and/or corrective actions**	*Method:* manual tracking by CMT and IP managers *Denominator*: # of CO/IP review meetings *Quality dimensions:* "Use feedback" should be limited to review meetings where (a) analysis products reference findings from feedback/inputs from AP through feedback and complaint mechanisms, participatory processes and/or two-way communications are shared (presented and/or shared in hard copy) and (b) they are reviewed/discussed (as a standalone item or as input to a key decision/discussion point, (c) they are referenced in decision-making regarding corrective actions or strategic directions. This should be documented in meeting minutes (i.e. the decision/action point, and the reference information used). *Note:* This requires a light tracking on CMT and partnership management meetings with IPs; both the expected Minutes or Notes for the Record of such meetings, and an overview excel tracking use of feedback.