

**Programme Evaluation Series**

# **Evaluation of the FAO response to the crisis in the Lake Chad Basin**

**2015–2018**

**Annex 4. Methodological note**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**  
Rome, 2021

## Introduction

The decision to carry out this evaluation arises from interest within FAO to learn from the implementation of the FAO regional strategy for the Lake Chad Basin Crisis and assess the quality of FAO interventions in the areas affected by the crisis within the four countries Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria.

The purpose of this exercise is to provide FAO's management and programme teams with evidence-based lessons learnt and best practices to inform future strategic decisions, and improve FAO's support to emergency response and building resilience in the Lake Chad basin, in particular with regards to agriculture and food security.

Following the evaluation's terms of reference, which present the context and background as well as the scope and key evaluation questions of the evaluation, this methodological note provides more details about the steps that will need to be taken to evaluate the FAO response to the Lake Chad Basin Crisis.

Therefore, this methodological note should be read in conjunction with the evaluation TORs, and seeks to clarify:

- The scope of the evaluation
- The evaluation questions and inquiries
- The methodology, the constraints and the phases of the evaluation process
- Data collection planning
- The distribution of roles and responsibilities among the team

This current note was developed based on KIIs interviews held in Rome and remotely during the inception phase and comments and propositions received from the four concerned FAO country offices. This methodological note will be shared and finalized before the field visit. The aim of this note is to build a consensus on the main objectives, the scope, the methodology and processes used.

## Scope of investigation

The evaluation proposes to focus on the FAO response to the Lake Chad basin crisis including all **interventions conducted over the period 2015-2018** in the areas affected by the crisis (North East Nigeria, Western Chad, North Cameroon, Eastern Niger)<sup>1</sup>, both prior and during the regional strategy timeframe (March 2017-2019). The evaluation will assess the achievements of FAO's interventions on the one hand, and the effects of the **FAO regional strategy** on the other hand. It will thereby combine both operational and strategic perspectives, and will aim to serve the mutually reinforcing objectives of i) accounting on results and ii) learning from experience for ongoing operations in the Lake Chad Basin and future FAO regional strategies elsewhere worldwide.

Moreover, as both the regional strategy and the operations focus on **emergency response and resilience building**, the evaluation will analyse those two fields of inquiries at both operational and strategic levels.

The exercise will also pay attention to the consequences on FAO's operational capacity following an **L3 declaration** at a country level (as it was in the case of Nigeria), by comparing the working context in Nigeria before and after the L3 declaration as well as the differences with countries where no L3 was declared (Niger, Chad and Cameroon).

Given the high number of projects implemented during the considered period (28 projects in Nigeria, 5 in Niger, 9 in Chad and 10 in Cameroon / 1 global and 1 regional project) and the consequent challenges related to attributing results to each one of them, the evaluation scope will be limited to the **most**

---

<sup>1</sup> North East Nigeria (Borno, Adamawa, Yobe states) ; Western Chad (Lake and Kanem regions) ; North Republic of Cameroon (Far North region) ; Eastern Niger (Diffa region).

**significant activities and approaches** that can realistically be assessed during the limited time available for data collection.

In particular, the evaluation aims at specifically assess changes in the four outcomes of the Regional Strategy:

- Productive capacities (related to farming and livestock support, in urban and rural areas, with a view on gender and nutrition) contributing to increased availability of and access to food – as of Regional Strategy Outcome 1
- Income, job and livelihood diversification (considering access to financial services; food conservation, transformation, commercialization; and integration of IDPs, refugees, demobilized youth) – Regional Strategy Outcome 2
- Resource-based conflict reduction including sustainable peace and natural resource management - Regional Strategy Outcome 3
- Food security analysis, coordination and information – Regional Strategy Outcome 4

Cross-cutting issues will be incorporated throughout the evaluation matrix.

The evaluation team has tried to reconstruct a theory of change that could help identify plausible links between results observed and causes / contributing factors a link between. The evaluation team (ET) will also review any country level or projects' TOC where available.

## Evaluation questions

The assessment of results at community level will be guided by the key evaluation questions and inquiries presented below:

### **1) How relevant and appropriate were the FAO Regional Strategy (RS) and FAO interventions in the Lake Chad Basin region?**

1.1 How relevant were FAO regional strategy and interventions, to meeting regional, national and beneficiary needs?

1.2 How appropriate were the design of the regional strategy and of the interventions?

### **2) What were the results of the FAO interventions in tackling short-term food security and nutrition, and in building resilience in the region?**

2.1 To what extent did FAO interventions contribute to improving short-term food security and nutrition and achieving programmatic outcomes?

2.2 To what extent did FAO interventions contribute to proved resilience capacities?

2.3 To what extend did the FAO response effectively integrate the cross-cutting principles of natural resource management; peace-building; gender; youth and accountability to affected population?

### **3) How did FAO operational or organisational functionality affect the result of the response?**

3.1 To what extent and in what way did the RS enable or improve the FAO interventions in the region?

3.2 To what extent did the FAO internal organisational set-up match the needs of the interventions and, as of 2017, of the new regional strategy?

3.3 To what extent did external operational arrangements support the quality of the FAO response?

The evaluation's key questions are detailed into an **evaluation matrix (EM)** presented in Annex, which also presents the detailed evaluation sub-questions. The EM shows the key indicators that will be used to measure progress and identifies information sources and tools to be used to obtain the information. The evaluation matrix is the "backbone" of the evaluation for the evaluation team as it captures in a

summarized manner all issues that the evaluation should address, as well as, all methods and tools that evaluators will use.

## Methods and constraints

The evaluation will be **participatory** and will involve both internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. It will search for **qualitative and quantitative data**.

The evaluation will use a **combination of methods (mostly qualitative yet with an effort to quantify them)** to generate the information needed to address the evaluation questions. Findings will be based on the analysis of both primary and secondary data: while **primary data** will be collected through discussions with FAO beneficiary households<sup>2</sup> in the field (that will enable when possible a comparison between their current situation and the one before the intervention took place<sup>3</sup>), and key informant interviews at international, national and local levels, **secondary data** will be collected through desk reviews and research (projects' documents, evaluations and external documentation).

**The evaluation questions and sub-questions** have been refined by the evaluation team and validated with FAO staff working in the different relevant offices (HQ, Regional, Sub-regional and countries) after a first round of key informants interviews (KIIs) was conducted in Rome during the inception phase.

The evaluation will ensure that the **reliability and validity** of data is monitored at all times. This will be ensured by: i) a well designed and tested set of data collection tools; ii) a sampling strategy for selecting the communities and informants the evaluation team will meet; iii) a systematic approach for data collection and analysis to be followed; and iv) the triangulation of data and information collected.

This methodological note in itself will provide guidance and tools to ensure that the evaluators keep focused on answering the evaluation questions. Evaluators, however, will nonetheless be required to continuously adapt these methods and tools to emerging important issues in their on-going exercise, based on the recognition that **flexibility** is a key principle of qualitative analysis.

### Data collection methods

The following methods will be used to gather evidence on which the evaluation findings will be based:

1. **Desk review:** the evaluation will make the most of existing reports and relevant documents; such secondary data will be collected all along the evaluation process, to complement the primary data gathered. Sources of documentation will be sought both internally and externally from stakeholders at central and decentralised levels. In particular, FAO project documents and implementation reports, strategies, guidelines, monitoring and evaluation reports, food security assessments, as well as external documentation, such as OCHA reports, UN regional response plans, in country situation reports, research publications etc., will be examined as much as possible during the inception phase and continued throughout the mission as new documentations are identified and shared by stakeholders.

2. **Data collection in countries:**

**Communities:** Primary data collection will include focus group discussions (FGD) at community level in the four countries, under the responsibility of the two regional consultants (supported by the FAO Evaluation Manager – EM and the Lead Consultant – LC). These focus group discussions will be conducted by a number of enumerators (four in Niger, six in Chad, 6 in Nigeria, 1 in Cameroon) who will be trained and monitored by two regional consultants (one English speaker responsible for Nigeria and one French speaker responsible for Cameroon, Chad and Niger) in the countries of their

---

<sup>2</sup> The evaluation team will also try to interview non-beneficiaries where and when possible.

<sup>3</sup> The evaluation team will make use of all baseline data available at the time of the evaluation. Where such data are not available, the team will try to reconstruct the situation during focus group discussions with beneficiaries directly.

responsibility respectively. The aim of the focus group discussions with communities is to collect information regarding the needs of interviewees, the quality of FAO interventions they have received and detailed stories of if and how the activities conducted by FAO may have affected their livelihoods. This information will also be used to find gaps and lessons learnt in programming that could guide future programmatic activity.

Wherever possible, the field teams will interview non-beneficiary communities to assess the efficiency of targeting activities and criteria. Most of the projects that the evaluation team will be visiting are already closed, and can be distinguished in two categories: i) projects that finished in 2015/2016, for which the evaluation will try to assess the sustainability of the implemented activities; and ii) projects that are about to end or ended more recently (2017/2018), for which the focus will be on their effectiveness and results. For projects that have just started, it may be hard to find results thus the evaluation will rather look at their relevance and operational performance.

FGD may be recorded if this is acceptable for interviewees and not contraindicated by local key resources persons. Enumerators should have the guarantee by participants that the recording would not affect the level of information shared, and need the authorisation from every single participant before starting any recording. Enumerators should inform participants and stress that any recorded material this will only be used internally among the evaluation team. Some video can also be taken by enumerators if it is as well acceptable for communities.

Local authorities and partners: The regional consultants will meet with all local key informants such as local authorities, implementing partners and other implementing actors within the local context.

The LC and the FAO EM will also conduct key informant interviews (KIIs) with local and regional FAO office staff, and in-country interviews with, donors, other UN agencies, implementing partners, and Government ministries related to the activities implemented. They will also take the opportunity to further collect secondary data.

All field visits (enumerators, regional consultants, EM, LC) will be based on cross-checked security information and permitting collected from dedicated organisations.

Information gathered will be triangulated by the team as initial findings appear both in the field and during the data analysis phase. When required additional interviews will be conducted to confirm findings from additional sources.

### **Evaluation constraints and suggested mitigation strategies:**

- **The evaluation will look both at the strategic and the operational level at the same time, which could lead to a lack of emphasis on one aspect than the other.**
  - ➔ Mitigation strategy: Macro-level questions were identified for both focal areas and drilled down further into relevant levels of inquiry and sub questions. An evaluation matrix incorporates both aspects of the evaluation, highlighting which indicators will be used to measure changes in circumstances.
- **A highly complex operational environment across four countries is not compatible with generalized simplified overarching findings and conclusions.**
  - ➔ Mitigation strategy: Country level response plans, projects and programmes will be analysed both individually and collectively, whereby findings and conclusions specific to each country will be identified, and then compared and consolidated, as to generate regional level findings. Where necessary, country level recommendations will be given. Lessons learnt will also be identified on an individual country basis, once more consolidated without, however, losing the need for localized feedback and recommendations.
- **Poor security and inaccessibility in the majority of affected areas in each country will hinder data collection:**
  - ➔ Mitigation strategy: As previously mentioned, the evaluation team is composed of two regional consultants, an Anglophone one covering Nigeria, and a Francophone one to cover Niger, Chad

and Cameroon, who will oversee local primary data collection. The two regional consultants will recruit and train enumerators from the affected regions, and speaking the relevant language, to meet with local communities and beneficiaries in the identified locations to carry out focus group discussions. In order to ensure the security of all team members, including enumerators, information from UNDSS, FAO country, sub-country offices, and, most importantly, the security officer will be cross-checked to decide up to the last moment whether areas and localities should be visited or not. Following UNDSS rules and obligations, security equipment's will be organized before any field visit at community level. This will be to the responsibility of the regional consultant with the support of the FAO country office, the LC and the EM.

- **The lack of “baseline” or benchmarking data will limit possibilities of comparing acquired recent data with prior indicator levels.**
  - ➔ Mitigation strategy: Currently there is no available consolidated data over time on indicators related to the changes interventions are hoping to trigger. However, the evaluation team will try to gather all possible data during the evaluation and during the field mission. The evaluation team will collate country and project based monitoring reports, mixed with national level reporting dating back to 2014 or 2015, as well as assessment mission reports on which the interventions have, one assumes, been based.
- **The volume of projects implemented during the selected period (2015-2108), particularly in Nigeria, will make it difficult to establish a sampling process to decide which projects to be visited by the evaluation that will properly reflect a cross section of the activities undertaken.**
  - ➔ Mitigation strategy: The evaluation team will analyse secondary resources available, M&E reports, and final project reports, to extract beneficiary numbers, activities undertaken, and project costs, to establish a comparative matrix of all projects so as to facilitate site visit selection. This will further facilitate the adaption of semi structured questionnaires and FGDs to the programmatic context.

## Sampling procedures for primary data collection

In order to mitigate the important constraints, and especially the numerous projects spread in four countries in highly insecure areas to be evaluated in a short period of time, the sampling procedures need to be clearly defined to ensure good representation of activities conducted and approaches adopted by FAO as well as outputs and outcomes achieved. Localities and type of key informants need to be purposely identified, to ensure they represent the population of interest reasonably well, and that inferences about the wider population can be made on the basis of perspectives, opinions, and insights of the informants met.

In the effort of ensuring a representative sampling of those locations and communities, the evaluation team will apply a mix of approaches:

- Criteria-based purposive sampling: in order to select localities with representative and diversified activities and specific pre-defined characteristics (IDPs vs. host communities, etc.);
- Random sampling: to select communities amongst the localities purposely selected for their representativeness within a given group of people;
- Successful / unsuccessful case sampling: to assess the particular situation of communities who attests a particularly successful or unsuccessful situation in order to share lessons learnt for future projects.

The definition of the field mission's itinerary will also put an emphasis on themes or areas of work on which FAO stakeholders are interested and on which the evaluation could provide constructive inputs (i.e. the revision of the regional strategy currently ongoing may benefit from the evaluation findings and analysis).

## Geographical selection

Concerning the selection of sample sites to be covered by the data collection, a purposive sample of recipient communities will be chosen from those targeted, which allow the entire sample to adequately illustrate the diversity of situations encompassed by the 52 projects spread in 7 provinces within the 4 countries covered by the evaluation.

**Areas to be visited** should encompass an illustrative diversity of the following major parameters:

- Security and geographical access
- Transport time between areas
- Agro-ecological features of agricultural, livestock, fishing activities
- Diversity of population targeted (host, IDPs, refugees, returnees communities)
- Regions where a wide enough panel of activities have been implemented since 2015
- Seasonal considerations (what data will be available? will respondents be available?)

**The selection of localities and communities** to be visited will be based on the following elements:

- ✓ **Security:** localities where access would not be possible due to insecurity will be taken out;
- ✓ **Operational density and diversity:**
  - a. High probability for encountering large number of communities targeted through representative and diversified activities;
  - b. Localities and communities where several activities have been implemented to provide an assorted picture of many intervention types;
  - c. Localities and communities supported on main activities and approaches implemented by FAO in country;
  - d. Localities and communities where less representative activities have been implemented (to be targeted at least a few times per country);
  - e. Interventions planned to be strengthened in the redefined regional strategy (pastoralism, natural resources managements, peace building).
- ✓ **Focus on most significant budget projects:** choose localities targeted by projects with higher budget as a priority;
- ✓ **Target recent and older projects:** older projects (implemented in 2015, 2016) will enable to look at sustainability of activities implemented and approaches undertaken; while more recent projects will enable to stick more with recent activities and context evolution;
- ✓ **Typology of Implementing Partners (IP) :** IPs include both national and international organizations, the evaluation should ensure that amongst each region and locality selected, a good balance between the various types of IPS through which FAO implements its projects is interviewed;
- ✓ **Access conditions:** ensure an efficient use of time of teams in the field seeking to minimise travel time (and cost) so as to maximise time spent with informants.

In addition, though not considered as sampling criteria per se, the **proximity to a locality capital or any other strategic location** to meet with key informants (NGO, local authority, associations' leaders...) is another element that will be taken into account in the selection of the communities to prioritize. Indeed, the regional consultants will meet key informants stakeholders while monitoring enumerators, thus he needs to be in the same area alternatively to follow them closely.

## Selection of communities and Key Informants

Last, the evaluation will select people with whom the team will meet to gather information, at each level where deemed appropriate.

**Selecting Focus Group Discussion** participants within each community will use a stratified random sampling strategy, whereby a set of criteria will be established to identify the types of informants required: beneficiaries supported on a same activity or approach will be interviewed together through one FGD; non beneficiaries will be interviewed if possible to integrate their perspective notably regarding targeting; groups of youth, women, girls will also be interviewed rather through a FGD if they have specifically been targeted or through other FGD organized within the community.

**Selecting key informants:** At Central, State, Locality and Community level, the evaluation will seek to identify people who, by their function or by the role they have had in supporting the delivery of FAO interventions, are considered as withholding key knowledge and perceptions that the evaluation should capture. Possible key informants to be met at locality and community level include: local authorities; traditional authorities; community based organizations (association of youth, women, girls, farmers, breeders, fishermen, etc. - whole group, board member or supervisor); NGOs (IPs of FAO or not) operating in the community / area; community workers.

Ensure that findings are based on a critical mass of interviewees will be key to the evaluation credibility. The selection of these will in large part rely on the team supervisor's best judgment, and a snowball approach may be appropriate, such that unforeseen key informants emerging as providers of relevant and quality insights may be added, or on the contrary less insightful interviews may be shortened, if for instance repeating well-known information. Here again the approach need to be flexible and expected initiatives from the regional consultant in coordination with EM and LC will be critical.

## **Phases of the evaluation process**

### **Preparatory phase**

The preparatory phase has included the following steps:

- Identifying and contracting the team members;
- Co-ordination with relevant FAO key stakeholders;
- Evaluation scoping;
- Country specific portfolio analysis;
- Desk review of available documentation;
- Briefing of LC (Lead Consultant) and EA (Evaluation Advisor) in Rome;
- Meetings with key evaluation partners in Rome (TCE, SP5) and through remote interviews (RAF, REOWA, country offices);
- Developing the evaluation tools;
- Developing the methodological note.

### **Pre-testing – FGD and SSQ**

Prior to the main field mission, a short pre-testing of data collection tool for FGD (Focus Group Discussion) will be undertaken. The aim is to identify any initial gaps in these tools and partly refine them if need be. The evaluation team (ET) will then be able to amend the evaluation tools prior to the main field evaluation mission. This will also ensure that the two regional consultants have a better understanding of these tools and are well prepared to train enumerators on FGD format.

### **Field mission**

The main evaluation mission will take place in March/April and further amendments to the methodological tools are expected to occur during that phase. During this period the EM together with the LC will undertake a field mission to Niger, Nigeria and Chad to work alongside the regional consultants, conduct interviews, collect primary and secondary data and support the regional consultant in data collection. The



Anglophone regional consultant will work in Nigeria, while the Francophone regional consultant will work in Niger, Chad and Cameroon. The regional consultants will continue with the primary data collection together with the enumerators once the EM and LC have left. Constant communication among the evaluation team is a necessity at all time to avoid incomplete field data, which is the greatest risk of the evaluation.

During the field mission, a number of interviews will be conducted by the evaluation team to key informants in capitals as well as in some strategic areas of interventions.

Whilst the field mission is ongoing the evaluation team will conduct remote KIIs (Key Informants Interviews) using the established SSQ with those identified key informants that will not be visited during the field mission. This will include REOWA and RAF offices as well as key members of the FAO headquarter and any other key stakeholders not as yet interviewed.

At the end of each country visit, the evaluation team will organise a debriefing session with the respective FAO country team to share information gathered and first step analysis; and collect complementary data and analysis to feed into overall evaluation process. This will help ensure evaluation transparency and support the learning process.

### **Data analysis**

Once the field mission is completed, all primary and secondary data collected will be consolidated in the evaluation matrix and analysed within the evaluation team together. The ET will identify and formalize findings, recommendations and conclusions based on data collected through an iterative process.

### **Workshop in Rome**

A workshop will take place during the data analysis phase. It will gather key stakeholders from FAO at central and decentralised level (TCE, REOWA, RAF and Country Offices as appropriate) to contribute to the analysis of the performance of the regional strategy and on the enhancement of the operations in the area, reflecting on the information collected during field visits. Moreover the discussion will create ownership amongst key FAO staff so as to increase the possibility of recommendations being accepted and therefore acted upon. The workshop could also be an opportunity to support and inform the current revision of the regional strategy carried out by REOWA.

### **Report writing**

After the data collected during the field mission will be analysed and cross-checked, and the strategic aspects discussed and verified during the workshop in Rome, all information and analysis' results will be consolidated and synthesized by the LC with the support of the two regional consultants and the EA. Based on all these inputs, the FAO EM will be in charge of writing the narrative evaluation report.

The evaluation report will follow the standard FAO report template and will generate a comprehensive report inclusive of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons for the future. The zero draft report will be submitted to the team members for comments, which once received will be collected into a consolidated format and addressed by the EM; an advanced version of the draft report will be then submitted to the ET before sharing it with the stakeholders. Once cleared by the evaluation team as well as by the Office of Evaluation (following OED's rules for quality assurance) the preliminary draft report will be sent to internal FAO stakeholders for comments, inputs and feedbacks. Only after FAO comments will be integrated by the EM the report will be shared by external stakeholders during the evaluation process for their feedback. After the second round of comments, the report will be considered final and FAO stakeholders will be requested to prepare the management response the evaluation recommendations.

## Roles and responsibilities in the evaluation team

The Evaluation team is composed of:

- Evaluation Advisor (EA): specialised evaluator in the humanitarian aid sector who will take a lead role in evaluating whether the regional strategy supported a strategic positioning and improved effectiveness of FAO in the region, as well as the performance of FAO's regional strategy in terms of organising FAO's intervention within a regional approach. The EA will also support the formulation of the evaluation methodologies and advise, where necessary, on all aspects of the evaluation process.
- Lead Evaluation Consultant (LC): an agronomist with extensive experience in evaluating agriculture-based programmes in conflict and humanitarian settings who will take a lead role in relation to evaluating the resilience outcomes of the relevant interventions in the four countries, with a particular focus on Nigeria, where the bulk of activities took place. The Lead Consultant will undertake a three week field mission alongside the EM to undertake KIIs and support the regional consultants in their field level data collection activities.
- Regional Evaluator (RE), expert in livelihoods and emergency assistance in Nigeria: will evaluate FAO's emergency interventions in Nigeria at a community level with regards to livelihoods recovery and support, agriculture, nutrition and gender in Nigeria. Also responsible for the training of field enumerators who whom he will undertake field level FGDs. He is in charge of identifying and interviewing key informants stakeholders at local level. Will be expected to contribute towards the analysis of the qualitative field work.
- Regional Evaluator (RE), expert in evaluation of humanitarian interventions and gender in Niger, Chad and Cameroon: will contribute to evaluate the relevant interventions at a community level in the three French-speaking countries. Also responsible for the training of field enumerators who whom he will undertake field level FGDs. He is in charge of identifying and interviewing key informants stakeholders at local level. Will be expected to contribute towards the analysis of the qualitative field work.

Both REs will be expected to:

- i) provide feedback to the lead consultant regarding the methodology and tools developed during the inception phase, with a particular attention to ensuring its realism with regards to the situation in the field;
- ii) pre-test the FDG format with communities and the SSQ for local authorities and propose evolution of those tools to ensure they are well adapted;
- iii) support the enumerators on a daily frequency in their task of collecting data to ensure the best possible data quality in view of needs;
- iv) conduct all KIIs and identify best stakeholders to be interviewed at local level;
- v) ensure a constant liaison with the EM and the LC throughout the evaluation process.
- vi) compile data collected by enumerators and share them on time with the rest of the team;
- vii) assist the ET in extracting insightful analytical findings based on the data collected in the field and
- viii) provide written analytical contributions to the evaluation report.

## **Communication**

The proposed evaluation setting will imply for the each team member to maintain a good communication with the rest of the team:

### **Communication between the EM, LC and regional consultants**

Periodic discussions within the evaluation team before the field mission, to prepare the data collection phase.

The first day in-country, a special time will be dedicated by the EM, the LC and the regional consultant concerned, to work together, share information recently collected, finalized logistics issues, act on enumerators' training and selection, validate security challenges and protocols.

Team members will be out in different locations at the same time. A discussion once every two days (at least) has to be organized between the regional consultant, the EM and the LC to promote exchange of experiences and feedbacks and to favour the most efficient use of one's problem solving skills for the benefit of the wider team. Any adaptation of evaluation tools should also be previously discussed between the team.

### **Communication between the regional consultant and the enumerators**

The regional consultant will be in charge of a daily monitoring of enumerators, to ensure quality of data collected and any flexibility in the programme, if need be.

### **Communication between EM, LC and EA**

A remote discussion will be planned at least once a week between the EM, the LC and the EA while travelling in-countries to share information collected, results gathered, analysis process, potential reorientation, if need be.

Some remote interviews can be planned between the EA and any key stakeholders to interviews from other countries (RAF, REOWA, HQ, etc.) during the in-country phase. The EM and the LC will take part to these discussions according to their availability.