

# HUMANITARIAN INFORMAL FEEDBACK PROJECT

Za'atari Refugee Camp, Jordan

Evaluation report 2015/16

**CARLY SHEEHAN** Humanitarian Coordinator, Oxfam Australia



Training at Za'atari Refugee Camp. Photo: Grace Higdon/Oxfam

# CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3 How the feedback tool is used in Za’atari</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4 How the technology is working</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5 Attitudes, perceptions and usage of the feedback tool</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6 Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>12</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluator would like to thank the Jordan MEAL team; particularly the Za'atari based MEAL officer and assistants, for their support in organising the evaluation.

Humanitarian Informal Feedback project is supported by Elrha's Humanitarian Innovation Fund (the HIF) - a grant making facility supporting organisations and individuals to identify, nurture and share innovative and scalable solutions to the most pressing challenges facing effective humanitarian assistance.

The HIF is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Visit [www.elrha.org/hif](http://www.elrha.org/hif).

For more information about Elrha's work to improve humanitarian outcomes through research, innovation, and partnership, visit [www.elrha.org](http://www.elrha.org).

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The pilot of the Humanitarian Innovation Fund (HIF) tool project has been a useful way to increase and improve the accountability Oxfam provides to refugees in Za'atari Camp in Jordan. There are several technological improvements that can, and should, be made to the tool, as well as internal improvements to the culture of accountability within Oxfam in Za'atari Camp. The pilot period has not been long enough to delve deeply enough into how data analysis could be used to improve programming; however, the results of this evaluation are clear that the tool should continue to be developed and improved, and tested in other contexts. The potential for the feedback tool is greater than could be trialled during the short pilot period, and increasing the concentration on informal feedback, as was initially conceived prior to the pilot, should be prioritized in future trials.

# 1 METHODOLOGY

The objective of the evaluation was to determine whether the tool developed under the Humanitarian Innovation Fund funded project is a suitable and effective way of gathering informal feedback, and whether it is an appropriate accountability mechanism to scale up and trial further in other countries and contexts. Key areas of interest to the evaluator included the user-friendliness and acceptance of the tool, and how practical usage in Za'atari camp had differed from the way the project was conceived.

The evaluation included a document review (including the proposal, progress reports and a selection of feedback), semi-structured interviews, and a quantitative survey. Gender considerations included the number of men and women interviewed/surveyed, and gender-sensitive questioning.

## 2 BACKGROUND

*'If it gets written down, it might end up on someone's to do list, it may get put into Excel – but the workflow isn't formalised under people's roles and responsibilities. Automatically digitising this hasn't been done before.'*

Project Manager

The Humanitarian Informal Feedback project was conceived to provide a mechanism to electronically capture, refer, and resolve informal/qualitative feedback, and to add value to Oxfam's existing formal feedback mechanisms. Originally it was envisaged that photographs, voice recordings and text could be input by staff in the field to immediately capture any feedback or complaints/queries raised by community members. (Features including the voice recording were not used during the pilot due to technical difficulties.) The project was developed in Oxford, with an initial plan to pilot in South Sudan. When this became impossible due to the security situation, the pilot was moved to Za'atari Camp in Jordan, and the country team was consulted on the design. Note that the three main staff consulted in Jordan all left the country programme during implementation and before the evaluation took place. The pilot project in Za'atari Camp Jordan began in July 2016.

The design of the project borrowed ideas from healthcare case-management systems to move away from static recording of feedback in a paper based/Excel spreadsheet data-entry system, towards tracking issues from the person raising it, through the internal referral process, to solving the problem, to reporting back to the original person. It was envisaged that a computerised system would also reduce data-collection and data-entry times, reduce the likelihood of feedback being lost or misplaced, and could be used to track the progress of how feedback is handled. How the feedback tool has evolved in Za'atari camp is a product of its environment.

## 3 HOW THE FEEDBACK TOOL IS USED IN ZA'ATARI

Feedback and complaints/queries are sourced from multiple formal channels in Za'atari camp, including feedback boxes, a hotline, and the feedback tool, as well as more informal channels, such as staff giving out their work phone numbers. The tool itself is used by community volunteers (Cash for Work participants) in Oxfam's community centres in three districts. These community centres are central hubs where camp residents can come to share their feedback/raise queries. Each day, two volunteers (a

man and a woman) staff the community centre. All people on the volunteer roster have been trained in using the tool. When feedback and complaints/queries are made, the volunteers enter the data on smartphones into the feedback tool. At the end of the day, the smartphones are collected and data is uploaded to the database at the Oxfam camp office. The MEAL team also enters any issues that are raised through the hotline into the database to provide the programme teams with a single, comprehensive list of issues.

Within each Oxfam programme team is someone who acts as the feedback Focal Point who checks the database (usually on a daily basis) for the issues that have been raised. The team then either resolves the issue or, if necessary, talks to the MEAL team to refer the query on to another team. Each week, a MEAL assistant monitors how many issues are still unresolved, and these are discussed with the Focal Points. The evaluator recommends that spot checks are done on a monthly basis, to see if complainants are happy with the way their issue was followed up/resolved.

The three technical teams: Public Health Engineering (PHE), Community Mobilisation (CM), and Solid Waste Management, Recycling, Cash for Work and Livelihoods, have a range of different accountability systems. For example, the PHE Operations and Maintenance (O&M) team has district Focal Points as well as some staff providing work mobile numbers, and the hotline and the feedback tool – so there is feedback coming in from a range of different avenues (formal and informal), all of which require attention. While it is excellent to see a project so open to receiving feedback from the community, having this many avenues does make it harder to keep on top of everything (particularly when it's likely that some people use more than one of these avenues to report the same issue). To an extent, the feedback tool has been perceived as an added burden to this team – even though they are very positive about the tool in theory.

The HIF proposal stated that it would seek key 'change makers' at senior levels to get maximum buy-in to help support behaviour change from both the 'bottom-up' and the 'top-down'. There have been changes in leadership at different levels throughout the pilot period. The Community Mobilisation team was led by a staff member who was really engaged with the tool and disseminated this enthusiasm and commitment throughout the team, designating a senior officer to be the Focal Point. The PHE team's previous leadership was less enthusiastic, and the Focal-Point role was delegated to an assistant. Management commitment to, and oversight of, accountability as a key part of Oxfam's work is necessary in creating a culture of accountability at all staff levels – it can't rest just in the hands of interested and engaged staff members.

The situation of the Cash for Work team is more complicated than for other teams. All feedback about CFW must be provided in writing on a specific form to United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), in addition to recording the complaint in the new feedback system. The CFW team (currently two staff; one of whom is relatively new), is struggling to keep up with the level of complaints and queries coming in. To assist the new staff member, on two to three the MEAL team compiled the relevant issues into an Excel spreadsheet on a weekly basis for the team to use, rather than the feedback tool, as the staff member is more comfortable using Excel. The CFW staff member spends about 15 minutes per issue logged in to the Excel sheet. This adds up to a significant amount of time when it's only looked at once a week. There will always be a duplication of effort for the CFW team while the UNHCR paper-based system exists; however, this evaluation recommends that the CFW team use the feedback tool to monitor and record their feedback more frequently than once a week, as this will lighten the load on both the CFW and MEAL teams.

The pilot in Za'atari camp has resulted in a formal, rather than informal, feedback mechanism. The automatic referral element is what separates this from an Excel-based

mechanism. There are numerous possible reasons why the full capability of the tool (such as the voice-recording feature) has not been used in the pilot; the context, limited availability of resources to manage the data, and the short-time frame have all played a role in why the feedback tool is being used as a traditional feedback mechanism. For such a short trial period this is understandable, and further consideration should be given to what context would be necessary for this tool to be piloted as an informal feedback mechanism, as per the initial conception of the project.

## Facts and figures

The database was mined to identify how the feedback tool was being utilised in comparison to the hotline, the percentage of men and women using each tool, and how much feedback each team was receiving.

Month	# Hotline Calls	# Feedback Tool	Total #
July	45 (77% men, 23% women)	177 (76% men, 34% women)	222
August	39 (62% men, 38% women)	219 (73% men, 27% women)	258
September	22 (73% men, 27% women)	153 (77% men, 23% women)	175

Since the HIF project began, 263 complaints/queries have been issued to the Public Health Engineering team and 158 to the Community Mobilisation team. Water-related issues accounted for 133 (referred to both PHE and PHP), and 54 were about Cash for Work (total numbers differ from the table above as the team-based data were mined a week later than the data in the table).

The information in the table above is not quite as clear cut as it looks. For example, some women who raise an issue will put the contact details as their husband, therefore recording the issue as a male complainant. These numbers also do not factor in the duplications that come from people giving multiple feedback comments about the same issue, or that the number will depend on what programme activities are happening in a particular month. But it does demonstrate that the feedback tool has been an effective way to increase the capturing of feedback, that a significantly higher number of people are providing their feedback in person to over the phone, and that both men and women are using both mechanisms.

## 4 HOW THE TECHNOLOGY IS WORKING

There are several issues with the way the technology works, influenced by internal and external factors. Externally, there is no 3G connection available in Za'atari camp, which means the issues logged are not transmitted in real time from the community centres to the Oxfam office. Due to the internal IT issues mentioned below, the lack of 3G has had an impact on the project. It is recommended that in future there is a back-up system to Wi-Fi in places where the feedback tool is used.

Internal Oxfam IT factors have caused bigger issues with the use of the feedback tool. Due to the inappropriate use of the Wi-Fi system in the camp office (it is thought the network was being used by community members, not just staff), the regional IT department removed open access to the Wi-Fi network for mobile phones. As such, the devices for the HIF project could not be connected to the Wi-Fi network. At the time of the evaluation, there had been no internet access for the handsets for two weeks, so the feedback and complaints/queries collected during this time were unknown, and not

addressed. Unfortunately, the data collectors were not informed that feedback was not being monitored during this period, but when this was recognised, the data collectors were asked to note any urgent issues on paper and raise them directly with Oxfam until the system could be brought back online.

This period has demonstrated that systems using this particular software will face significant barriers if there is no internet connection. Using the tool in a place where there is 3G as a back-up, or being able to transfer the data using offline methods, would work as suitable contingency measures. Generally, Oxfam desktop and laptop computers will have internet access; therefore, as long as the data can be transmitted from the devices, the system can continue to be used by staff members on their computers. This is something that they prefer to do, as it is easier to use the software on a desktop than on a small smartphone screen.

## 5 ATTITUDES, PERCEPTIONS AND USAGE OF THE FEEDBACK TOOL

### Community Centre Volunteers use of, and attitudes towards the tool

Interviews were conducted with the community workers who collect feedback and inputted the data into the system in the three Oxfam districts of Za'atari Camp. When asked to rank the user friendliness of the application on a scale of 1–10 (1 being bad, 10 being good), the average response was 8. The data collectors generally responded that they found the application easy to use, with most saying it takes them between three and five minutes to enter feedback into the system.

*'People trust me more now, since they've seen me writing complaint into the handset. Before, if I wrote it on some paper, they thought I might throw it away.'*

(Male respondent).

#### Likes

In particular, respondents liked that the mechanism provided a quicker response to problems than the previous method of handling feedback (written down on a form, and collected by the MEAL team on a weekly basis). They also liked that it was easier to type issues directly into the device than write them down. Most importantly, they'd noticed an increase in trust from the community. All but one of the respondents said that they enter the information directly into the system in the presence of the complainant. The remaining respondent is inexperienced in the system and still prefers to take notes by hand first and then enter the details.

#### Dislikes

There were a number of issues the users did not like about the tool. Most of the respondents said that classification of issues was not always entirely clear, particularly for issues that are not the responsibility of Oxfam. The evaluator recommends that the MEAL Officer looks again at classifying complaints/feedback into more suitable categories, including consideration of adding a choice of: i) Oxfam mandate and ii) not Oxfam mandate. Training will be required to ensure categories are properly used.

In two districts, the data collectors requested a list of common questions and answers for issues that are outside of Oxfam's remit, so that they could immediately refer people on to the correct service provider. There was also concern about the use of the 'other' option, and whether they were using this correctly or not. The evaluator recommends



that at the end of the year each team should assess the feedback that has come in and produces a Q&A sheet on topics relevant to their technical area and referral agencies, in consultation with the appropriate agencies in Za'atari. Each team should also use this period to consider what is and what is not being registered on feedback tool (i.e. issues that come exclusively from other feedback mechanisms), and how these can be addressed. Additionally, an option of 'no response required' could be added to the tool if the data collectors are able to close the case immediately by referring people on to the correct agency.

### **Proactive vs reactive use**

The feedback tool itself is not necessarily being used proactively; the data collectors all said that people know they can come to the community centres to complain. Some said that after they have delivered a hygiene session they ensure that they tell the participants they can share feedback/complain at any time. One respondent said that he keeps an eye out around the camp, and if he spots any issues he raises a query/complaint in his own name. The respondents were asked whether people with disabilities, or other types of vulnerable people, were able to come to the community centre to complain. The majority said that relatives would come on their behalf. However, one respondent said there had been two or three times when he'd known of an issue affecting someone with a disability, so he'd gone to the caravan in person to log the issue.

### **Increases in feedback**

The respondents believe that feedback/complaints have increased because camp residents have more trust that their issue will be followed up, and that the follow-up is happening more quickly than before. Primarily, the perception is that more issues are being raised since the feedback tool was introduced, and that the devices make the data collectors more visible in the community. The data collectors were instructed to not make any promises as to when issues may be resolved, but make assurances that the issue would be considered, although not necessarily resolved, by Oxfam within one week. This was tested, and all respondents knew the protocol. The evaluator recommends that when the data allows, an internal assessment is done to determine the average length of time taken to close complaints, disaggregated by team.

### **Multiple complaints**

In order to gauge how consistently the mechanism is being used in regard to complaints, the respondents were asked about how they handle multiple complaints by the same person, and how the responses differed within and between districts. One male respondent said that he has had multiple complaints from the same person and that he creates a new entry each time. Another man responded that if the same person came back within the same week with the same complaint he would tell them to wait until the week was up, then if there had been no follow up from Oxfam he would create a new entry. One woman said there had been multiple complaints, but she only registers them once, while another said there had been no multiple complaints.

### **Categorization of feedback**

Incorrectly tagging a query as a complaint and vice versa was flagged as a problem by the Oxfam staff Focal Points interviewed. When the data collectors were asked how they determined whether an issue was a complaint or query, some respondents answered that they used their own judgement, others had a more systematic approach – for instance, *'if they ask "when" that's a query', 'if they ask a question it's a query', 'if they ask for a date it's a query, if it's requesting something new or to be fixed, it's a complaint.'* (male and female respondents). The lack of clarity on the difference



between complaints and queries has a number of implications for data analysis, particularly if the data is used to measure team performance. If the data show there are a lot of complaints about a particular issue, the response might be very different from if the majority of people simply had a query. This is further complicated by the way an issue is reported and/or interpreted, which could change whether an issue is a complaint or query.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, the data collectors were asked how they decide if an issue is urgent or not. Most responded that it was their judgement, based on their own logic, but if it was a problem that would endanger people, or if it's something that can't wait or is not usable, then they considered it urgent.

## Gender

Each community centre is staffed by two refugees who receive small payments through Cash for Work programming. There is a roster of trained men and women in each district, and each day, there is a man and a woman present in the community centre. The men and women interviewed for this evaluation were all asked whether they thought people of the opposite sex felt comfortable complaining to them and likewise if people of the same sex felt comfortable. All (100%) said that there were no problems in handling feedback from both men and women.

## Recommendations from data collectors for improvement

*'This tool is really better than the old way, I strongly recommend that we keep using it.'*

(Female respondent).

All data collectors interviewed said that Oxfam should continue using the mechanism to record feedback and complaints/queries, but that they would like to better understand the categories and have more guidance. The evaluator recommends clear Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are written and disseminated to the volunteers, along with further training support.

All the community centre volunteers have been trained in using the feedback tool, but some are more comfortable with it than others. More training should be delivered to all of the volunteers, and then attention paid to how they each use the tool to ensure that it's systematic across all users.

## Oxfam programme staff attitudes towards using the tool

*'The HIF is really useful, and it's increasing the trust between us and the community and the refugees since their complaint goes directly to the server.'*

(Oxfam Staff Member)

Each technical programme team has an appointed Focal Point for the feedback tool, who is responsible for monitoring and updating the database to ensure that feedback and complaints/queries are being addressed by the right team members, and that the issues are closed in the system when completed. The Focal Points reported spending between 15 minutes and one hour per day using the feedback tool. These Focal Points were interviewed in order to understand their impressions of using the mechanism, and other staff were engaged in informal discussions about their perceptions of the tool.

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g. In a situation where a distribution process is ongoing, a person due to receive the item next week could say, 'I did not receive the item' if they see other people have already received theirs. This would be logged as a complaint, which would require follow-up. Alternatively, if they asked 'When will I receive my item?' to which they would get the answer of 'Next week' it would be a simple query, which could be closed off immediately.

## Likes

Most Focal Point staff said that it was helpful to have a tool to check the issues on a daily basis and that it is a safer way to ensure that no feedback is lost. When the issue is submitted correctly, the Focal Points find it easier to manage the query/complaint as they have all the information they need. It was also mentioned that when the mechanism has been used for longer, it will be helpful to have the data to monitor trends in the issues being raised. The major outcome of the feedback tool mentioned by staff was that they believe the tool has helped to increase the trust felt by the community towards Oxfam.

## Dislikes

A problem identified by the Focal Points was incorrect data entry and the data collectors not properly understanding the categorisation process. Duplication of feedback (either from the same person complaining in person more than once, or also using the hotline) was also raised as an annoyance for some teams. The Focal Points also mentioned that it was easier for them to use the feedback tool on their desktop computers, as their smartphone screens are small and make it difficult to use.

## Recommendations from Oxfam programme staff for improvement

Several technical improvements were recommended by the Focal Points; these are included in Appendix A. One Focal Point suggested that if there were still issues with duplication after more training for the data collectors, with unclear or miscategorised entries coming through, the MEAL team could do a quick quality-control check when new issues are first registered. However, these extra checks would add an additional layer to the process, and the Za'atari team should instead consider spending more time training the data collectors.

## Senior Oxfam staff perceptions

The problem reported by team leaders is the number of feedback/complaints/queries coming through the system that are not related to their work. Either they come to the wrong team or, on a handful of occasions, to the wrong organisation. Each complaint/query needs to be investigated, which takes a lot of time, particularly when it is discovered that the issue is not relevant for that team, or for Oxfam. As part of the Core Humanitarian Standard, Oxfam is committed to referring issues to other agencies, and as discussed on page 5, a referral pathway/Q&A should be developed for the community centre volunteers to be better able to do this.

Different team leaders approach the *oversight* of feedback differently, with one checking the system directly on a fortnightly basis, and another getting a monthly report from the Focal Point on the complaints/queries handled by the team. Team Leaders agree that the use of this mechanism has increased Oxfam's accountability to refugees and that it is worthwhile to continue with an adjusted version of the tool, and with more support given to the data collectors.

It was also mentioned by some staff that they felt beneficiary attitudes towards Oxfam had generally become less positive over time before the HIF tool was piloted. With the feedback from the data collectors and the Focal Points that trust has been increased by the feedback tool, this project seems to be creating a more positive environment for Oxfam to operate in, which is incredibly valuable.

Senior staff reported that use of the feedback tool has changed the way staff work, and that programme staff are being held to higher standards now as any complaints or negative feedback received does reflect on them, or at least on the team in question, depending on the particular issue. There were concerns raised by staff about this at the beginning of the pilot, and while no staff member mentioned this to the evaluator, it could be expected that some staff would still be feeling concerned that any poor performance on their part will be more visible with the feedback tool in use. It is felt that a stronger focus was, and is, needed on the softer side of this project, so that when the technology is rolled out in other countries, it is accompanied by sessions to explain to staff that accountability is a core part of the way Oxfam works, and not just the remit of MEAL staff.

Oxfam management in Za'atari camp is happy with the tool and the results it has produced and will continue to produce, but is clear that the use of the feedback tool needs to be supported with more resources. One suggestion made by senior management is that funding for use of the feedback tool can be included in any and all future funding proposals, and the amount of staff time and resources to manage accountability appropriately needs to be properly costed.

## **Community perceptions and attitudes**

A survey was undertaken in Oxfam's three districts using a random sampling of camp residents to understand the awareness of feedback mechanisms and begin to understand how people might prefer to submit feedback/complaints to Oxfam.

Seventy-six people (37 women, 39 men) were interviewed by Oxfam staff; 86% of women, and 97% of men were aware that they could make a complaint to Oxfam, and were asked to list the ways they knew they could complain. The responses (and number of people who said them, naming more than one each) were the hotline (43), the feedback tool (58), complaint boxes (5), in person to Oxfam (65), Oxfam protection officer (2). When asked if they would choose a different feedback mechanism for different issues, 20% said they would use a different method depending on if it was a sensitive issue, a personal issue, or a general community issue.

Seventy-one percent of people said they were comfortable making complaints in person through the feedback tool at the community centres; 92% said they were happy to have their contact details recorded against their complaint in order to receive feedback on the issue if necessary. When asked to rate how important it was to receive feedback on a complaint, 34% said 'very important', 56% said 'somewhat important', and 9% said 'somewhat unimportant'.

In relation to the hotline, 55% of respondents said that the cost of the call was not a barrier to them using the hotline if necessary. Women were asked if they would feel comfortable giving their complaint over the phone to a man, and 81% answered that they would.

It can be extrapolated from the survey, and the semi-structured interviews with data collectors and Oxfam staff, that Oxfam's multi-pronged approach to accountability in Za'atari camp is providing people with enough choice as to how and when they can raise issues, and that these different forms of feedback processes are being adequately promoted.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A full list of recommendations is provided in Appendix A. The feedback tool has been well received by staff and has increased the trust of community members in Oxfam's ability to handle feedback appropriately. Its continued use in Jordan, and in other countries, is encouraged.

Given the short timeframe, this pilot has not been long enough to see any major changes in attitudes towards accountability across the Za'atari project. Early improvements can be seen in increased perceptions of trust from community members, and increased perception of improved response times to issues. More time and resources are required to enable the MEAL team to analyse the data collected and provide reports to inform managers on trends and problems. During this pilot period, there has not been sufficient time to analyse the issues being recorded, including, among others, how long various issues take to follow up, and how much time is lost to incorrect data entry.

The primary recommendation raised by management in Za'atari is for more investment in this project. There needs to be an investment in staff time and expertise and help for the team to work through issues of developing a stronger accountability culture. Human Resources should be involved to adjust Job Descriptions to include accountability as a standard line for all staff, and to include complaints handling and accountability in performance management – not just the funding of the technology access. There needs to be a softer package to accompany the rollout of the technology, and it is recommended that future pilots in other countries place a heavier focus on ensuring that a culture of accountability is fostered from the outset.

Going forward, the rollout of the feedback tool needs to be owned by an accountability specialist and supported by a technology specialist, who can provide a thorough induction and ongoing support for setting up the mechanism and using it to inform programme decision making.

There is a desire within the Jordan country office to expand the use of the tool to the Host Community Programme, but more resources would be required to roll this out, and a proper costing of this should be undertaken. The Jordan team should consider including cost recovery for MEAL staff in future proposals, to provide oversight and support to this, and other accountability mechanisms.

The use of such mobile technology is a valuable addition to Oxfam's accountability toolkit, and this evaluation strongly recommends its scale up. Throughout the course of the design and pilot period, the feedback tool has moved from being conceived as an informal feedback mechanism, to being used as a formal feedback mechanism. Whether the feedback tool ended up being used in this way is because it is a familiar way of working is not clear, and it is recommended that trials in other countries use different approaches (e.g. technical field staff, and MEAL staff being given phones to use during their normal interactions with communities) to test whether it can actually operate as an informal mechanism as initially conceived.

## APPENDIX A: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OXFAM STAFF

### **To improve the technology:**

1. The way complaints are presented could be better/clearer. On the desktop version each entry needs to be clicked open to get the full details (and this can take many tries to find the right complaint – the unique number has helped with this). One option would be to hover over (or press and hold on a phone) to have a preview pop up, so that you can easily see what the whole entry is.
2. A good search/filter function in the desktop version would improve efficiency and help manage duplications.
3. As a default, the display should be tailored to the team logged in, so they only see the information relative to their team.
4. Data extraction into Excel reports can be improved – currently it exports into different Excel sheets for the information entered, and the follow up actions taken by the team, which means that the entries need to be manually reconciled by the MEAL team to understand the full cycle of a complaint.
5. Having a Bluetooth or other offline transfer option when no Wi-Fi available is available is necessary.
6. Internal referrals. Currently, if a problem is categorised as a PHE complaint, but when the team looks at it and it's actually a CM reply, the PHE team has to report this to the MEAL team who reassigns it to the CM team in person. It would be easier if the PHE team could refer that issue directly to the CM team. Alternatively could there be a button in the system where the PHE team could flag it up to the MEAL team to be checked and referred on automatically?
7. Edits. It should be possible for an entry to be edited by a super user (MEAL team). For example, if there can't be a referral system as outlined above, the MEAL team will have to keep doing this manually. They tell the CM team that a particular issue is for them, not for PHE, but they cannot change the original record, so it is logged as a PHE problem, which throws off any data analysis.
8. An option of 'No response required' could be added to the tool if the data collectors are able to close the case immediately by referring people on to the correct agency.

### **To improve the use of the tool in Za'atari Camp (and other locations):**

1. Conduct spot checks on a monthly basis with complainants to see if they were happy with the way their issue was followed up/resolved.
2. The CFW team should switch to using the feedback tool to monitor and record their feedback more frequently than weekly, as this will lighten the load on both the CFW and MEAL teams.
3. The MEAL Officer should consider revising the classification of complaints/feedback into more suitable categories, including consideration of adding a choice of: i) Oxfam mandate and ii) not Oxfam mandate.
4. At the end of the year, in consultation with the appropriate agencies in Za'atari, each team should assess the feedback that has come in and produce a Q&A sheet on topics relevant to their technical area.
5. Each team should also use this period to consider what is being registered on the feedback tool and what isn't (i.e. issues that come exclusively from other feedback mechanisms), and how these can be addressed.
6. When the data allows, an internal assessment should be done to determine the average length of time taken to close complaints, disaggregated by team.

7. Clear SOPs should be written and disseminated to the volunteers, along with further training support.
8. The amount of staff time and resources required to manage accountability appropriately and include funding for the feedback tool in any and all future funding proposals should be costed.
9. Volunteers should have refresher training on what to include in a complaint and how to classify it properly.
10. Simple summary reports should be sent to team leaders on a weekly basis for their oversight.
11. Definition of urgent. Currently the data collectors use their best judgement as to what constitutes an urgent case, so more guidance should be provided on this.
12. External referrals. Data collectors are asking for a list of common questions and answers that they could provide to resolve non-Oxfam related issues on the spot.
13. Some analysis of the types of queries and complaints coming through should be done to better understand how the programme is working. For instance, receiving lots of questions about CFW rotations has led to the team doing more work to promote the lists in multiple locations around the districts so that refugees have better access to information.
14. The system needs to be owned and championed by the team leaders.

## APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Country Director	Overview briefing
Deputy Country Director	Background briefing
Za'atari Project Manager	Semi-structured interview
MEAL Coordinator	Semi-structured interview
Za'atari MEAL officer	Semi-structured interview
ICT in Programme Officer	Semi-structured interview (via Skype)
ICT in Programme Intern	Semi-structured interview (via Skype)
Male and female volunteers	Semi-structured interview
O&M Focal Point	Semi-structured interview
CM Focal Point	Semi-structured interview
O&M assistant	Semi-structured interview
O&M assistant	Semi-structured interview
CFW Focal Point	Semi-structured interview
MEAL assistant	Semi-structured interview
MEAL assistant	Semi-structured interview
CM Team Leader	Semi-structured interview
EFSVL Team Leader	Semi-structured interview
PHE Team Leader	Semi-structured interview

## APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY QUESTIONS

### Questions asked of Oxfam MEAL staff

1. What changes have been made to the tool, why, and what improvements have these seen?
2. How is the feedback loop monitored, and how is follow-up ensured? How much oversight is required?
3. How does the volume of complaints compare to the other feedback mechanisms?
4. Do you think that complaints are being **recorded** more efficiently and effectively now?
5. Do you think that complaints are being **handled** more efficiently and effectively now?
6. How much does it cost in terms of staff/volunteer time to input and manage the system?
7. Is a dedicated position needed to manage the whole accountability/feedback process?



8. For the cases that haven't been rectified, what percentage of these are because they simply haven't been closed off in the app, rather than because they haven't been solved?
9. Does the management of the complaint depend on how the complaint is worded?

#### **Questions asked of Oxfam staff feedback Focal Points**

1. Is it helpful for staff/volunteers to collect and manage feedback *systematically*?
2. Are more complaints being registered with the tool than were being registered previously?
3. What do you like about the tool?
4. What do you dislike about the tool?
5. How much time do you spend on checking, following up, and inputting data into the system? What could improve this (e.g. staff having smart phones with push notifications)?
6. What would make it better? Would users recommend that we continue its use? Why/why not?
7. How were complaints handled before you had the tool?
8. Have you had issues reported to you that haven't been processed with the system?
9. Who is collecting the feedback and what biases may exist that affect how the complaints are reported? How is this being considered?

#### **Questions asked of Team Leaders**

1. How much time do you think your staff spend on handling queries and complaints?
2. Of that time, how much time do you think staff spend on checking/inputting data into the tool?
3. Is this amount of time appropriate?
4. What oversight do you have of the tool? How do you manage the handling of complaints in your team? How often do you check that the complaints are being handled and inputted into the tool?
5. Has this tool improved the way your team is accountable to refugees? How?
6. What recommendations do you have for use of the tool moving forward?

#### **Questions asked of data collectors**

1. How user-friendly do you find the tool? (Scale 1–10)
2. What do you like about the tool?
3. What do you dislike about the tool?
4. What process do you follow when someone makes a complaint?
5. How long does it take you to record a complaint?
6. How do you decide which category to apply to the complaint?
7. How do you make a distinction between complaint and query? Urgent or not?
8. Do you proactively ask if there are any problems in the district?
9. Are vulnerable people (particularly people with disabilities) making complaints?
10. What would make the tool better? Would you recommend that it continues to be used?

11. Are you informing the complainant how long, according to the type of complaint submitted, it will take for Oxfam to get back to them with a response?
12. Do members of the opposite sex feel comfortable making a complaint to you?
13. Do people make multiple complaints on the same issue? How do you handle this?

#### **Survey questions asked to refugees**

1. Do you know that you can raise a complaint/issue with Oxfam?
2. If yes, in what ways do you know how you can complain?
3. Would you use a different method for a different type of issue (personal, community, sensitive issues)?
4. Would you feel comfortable reporting a complaint in person at the Oxfam Community Centre directly to an Oxfam volunteer?
5. How important is it to you to find out personally/directly how your complaint was addressed?
6. If you were given the option of having feedback provided to you about your complaint, would you be happy to have your contact details recorded with your complaint?
7. Are you aware of the hotline? (This question was changed by one of the interviewers so the data has not been used in this report).
8. Is there a cost barrier for you to call the hotline?
9. For women: Would they feel comfortable giving their complaint over the phone to a man?
10. Did you know you can leave a written complaint in a feedback box?
11. Would you be more inclined to complain over the hotline or in person?
12. Do you have any other suggestions or additions to the current feedback system?

## Oxfam Evaluation Report

For more information, or to comment on this report, email [opalenquiries@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:opalenquiries@oxfam.org.uk)

© Oxfam GB November 2016

This publication is copyright, but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail [policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk).

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

# OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 20 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit [www.oxfam.org](http://www.oxfam.org).

Oxfam America ([www.oxfamamerica.org](http://www.oxfamamerica.org))  
Oxfam Australia ([www.oxfam.org.au](http://www.oxfam.org.au))  
Oxfam-in-Belgium ([www.oxfamsol.be](http://www.oxfamsol.be))  
Oxfam Canada ([www.oxfam.ca](http://www.oxfam.ca))  
Oxfam France ([www.oxfamfrance.org](http://www.oxfamfrance.org))  
Oxfam Germany ([www.oxfam.de](http://www.oxfam.de))  
Oxfam GB ([www.oxfam.org.uk](http://www.oxfam.org.uk))  
Oxfam Hong Kong ([www.oxfam.org.hk](http://www.oxfam.org.hk))  
Oxfam IBIS (Denmark) (<http://oxfamibis.dk/>)  
Oxfam India ([www.oxfamindia.org](http://www.oxfamindia.org))  
Oxfam Intermón (Spain) ([www.intermonoxfam.org](http://www.intermonoxfam.org))  
Oxfam Ireland ([www.oxfamireland.org](http://www.oxfamireland.org))  
Oxfam Italy ([www.oxfamitalia.org](http://www.oxfamitalia.org))  
Oxfam Japan ([www.oxfam.jp](http://www.oxfam.jp))  
Oxfam Mexico ([www.oxfammexico.org](http://www.oxfammexico.org))  
Oxfam New Zealand ([www.oxfam.org.nz](http://www.oxfam.org.nz))  
Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) ([www.oxfamnovib.nl](http://www.oxfamnovib.nl))  
Oxfam Québec ([www.oxfam.qc.ca](http://www.oxfam.qc.ca))  
Oxfam South Africa

Observers:

Oxfam Brasil ([www.oxfam.org.br](http://www.oxfam.org.br))

