Date: 25th April, 0930-1600 | 26th April, 09:30-1430 CEST
Location: Solidarités International, 89 Rue de Paris, 92110 Clichy, France

Attendees:
- Oxfam: Eva Niederberger, James Brown
- SI: Aude Lazzarini, Laurene Barlet
- GWC: Franck Bouvet
- UNICEF: Carla Daher, Masumi Yamashita
- Groupe URD: Lisa Daoud
- ACF: Tom Heath

Objectives:
- Review progress made to date, identify challenges and ways forward
- Discuss conceptual models and agree how they should be applied in practice
- Agree how the project can be communicated to external stakeholders
- Develop project roadmap based on new timescale
- Agree planning for South Sudan, Colombia and key outputs

Day 1:
For overview, see p.3

Day 2: Project planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GBV Stocktaking Workshop</th>
<th>South Sudan Visit 1</th>
<th>Guidance note table of contents</th>
<th>Literature review final draft</th>
<th>Colombia visit</th>
<th>Guidance note draft 1</th>
<th>Phase II concept note</th>
<th>Guidance note draft 2</th>
<th>Communications strategy</th>
<th>Guidance final draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First round of country visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GBV Stocktaking workshop:

The QAAP will be presented at the Stocktaking workshop: Lessons on promoting the dignity, safety, health and privacy in humanitarian action organised by the GBV AoR, the IASC GBV Guidelines Implementation Team, IOM and UNICEF. This will be an opportunity to raise awareness of the QAAP project amongst participants (including shelter, CCCM and WASH sector coordinators in Bangladesh, Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan) and to learn from existing GBV risk mitigation projects and good practice.

South Sudan Visit 1:

The visit to South Sudan will be conducted by James and Helen from 20-31st May. The team will visit field locations in Malakal, Mingkaman and Mangateen and further develop the quality analytical framework.

Guidance note:

The QAAP Guidance note is a key output of the project and will be drafted progressively between May and December 2019. An initial table of contents (ToC) will be proposed at the end of May, followed by a first draft in August, a second draft in October and a final draft in December. The QAAP TWG will have the opportunity to review and comment on these drafts as they are developed.

Colombia visit:

The Colombia visit will take place between 2-9 June.

Literature review:

The literature review will be circulated to the QAAP Team and TWG in mid-June for comment.

Phase II concept note:

Achieving the long-term behaviour change amongst NHWCPs and partners to ensure that quality is routinely and systematically monitored and improved will require ongoing efforts. In order to secure funding to continue the QAAP beyond 2019, a concept note setting the direction and objectives for a QAAP Phase 2 will be drafted in September.

Communications strategy:

Ensuring that the findings, guidance and recommendations of the QAAP are effectively disseminated to different stakeholders will be an important driver of the overall project impact. The communications strategy developed by October will map key stakeholders and identify communications and engagement channels for each. The communications strategy will be used to plan dissemination and engagement opportunities over the final quarter of the project. The QAAP TWG will be engaged through monthly calls and updates from June.
# PARIS MEETING PRESENTATION

## QUALITY ASSURANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

REVIEW MEETING: PARIS
25th April 2019

### SESSION PLAN: THURSDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MORNING</th>
<th>AFTERNOON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Introduction:</td>
<td>1330 Presentation and review of quality frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Objectives setting</td>
<td>• Outcome monitoring (Myanmar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progress overview</td>
<td>1430 Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Conceptual models of quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of literature review</td>
<td>1500 Communication, dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion around different models</td>
<td>• Engagement of TWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>• Working with other initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1130 Presentation and discussion of the two field visits</td>
<td>• Wider communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSION PLAN: FRIDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MORNING</th>
<th>AFTERNOON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Day 1 review</td>
<td>1330 Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Project road map</td>
<td>1430 Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidance and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Second round of visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remote support to countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>1500 Flexible time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Planning for South Sudan, Colombia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVES

THURSDAY
- Review progress made to date, identify challenges and ways forward
- Discuss conceptual models and agree how they can be applied in practice
- Review quality analytical frameworks and agree way forward
- Agree how the project can be communicated to external stakeholders

FRIDAY
- Project roadmap
- Planning next steps

PROGRESS REVIEW

DESK REVIEW
- Draft to be shared after this meeting

FIELD VISITS
- Bangladesh, Myanmar completed
- South Sudan (May)
- Colombia (June)

QUALITY FRAMEWORK
- 2 approaches developed

ACTIVITY REVIEW

Pre-visit phase
- Inception meeting
- Literature review
- Develop concept sketch protocol
- Pre-visit preparation

Visit each country – Visit 1
- Initial meetings
- Make protocol specific
- Perhaps do an assessment

Between visits
- Provide external support on quality monitoring process in contexts
- Provide tools for the contexts to monitor the process

Visit each country – Visit 2
- Review activities and monitoring data
- Continue to support protocol for quality monitoring
- Do assessment (if not completed during first visit)

Post-visit phase
- Final meeting
- Reports, guidance and Advocacy
The Define – Measure – Analyse – Improve – Control (DMAIC) methodology is a structured problem-solving technique that builds upon the PDCA cycle. It is one of the core tools used in the Six Sigma quality management approach developed by Motorola in 1980 and widely used in manufacturing and business processes. The slide shows how this process could be adapted to the humanitarian WASH sector as the basis of a Quality Assurance System.
Avedis Donabedian was a physician and founder of the study of quality in health care and medical outcomes research. His approach for evaluating the quality of care is widely used and conceptualises the measurement of quality into three components: **structure**, **process** and **outcomes**. In this model, outcome measures are the **ultimate validators** of quality, however they are affected by both process factors and structural factors in a causal chain (examples given in the slide are not exhaustive).

The SERVQUAL Model is an approach to measuring quality in the service sector, from the perspective of customers or service users. The model comprises of a conceptual model and a questionnaire which is administered to users to quantify their expectations and experience of a service along different dimensions. The model has been applied and adapted widely in a variety of contexts to measure the quality of services.

The five dimensions of service quality were derived from a systematic analysis of over 100 aspects of quality initially proposed in literature. The model was eventually reduced to five dimensions found to be independent, stable and robust. They are defined as:
Reliability: the firm’s ability to perform the promise service accurately and dependably
Assurance: knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence
Tangibles: physical facilities, equipment and appearance of personnel
Empathy: caring and individualized attention paid to customers
Responsiveness: the firm’s willingness to help customer and provide prompt service

The quality chain can be proposed as a way to link ‘quality of process’ with ‘quality of results’ and shows that outcomes are somewhat dependant on the quality of assessment, analysis, design and implementation.

If impact is the ultimate measure of quality, the further down the quality chain we can measure the more confident we can be in our understanding, because there are fewer assumptions needed (the measure is more direct). Monitoring results further down the quality chain, however, becomes more challenging as output-level results typically rely on
making measurements of behaviours and perceptions. Attribution of outcomes to response activities may also be difficult to demonstrate.

![Diagram](image)

The above diagram illustrates how the enabling environment, project cycle and results causal chain are related, and how measuring of processes and measuring of results fit into the system. Process monitoring of the project cycle (right hand side) can be carried out through the use of checklists as proposed by URD 2018 in the COMPAS handbook (other process checklists have been developed for example ACF’s Project Quality Management Tool). These checklists measure to what degree each process in the project cycle has followed a list of important actions or considerations.

Results are monitored at different stages along the causal chain, from activity monitoring (e.g. construction supervision) through to impact evaluations.

Information from each level of monitoring should be fed-back to inform and improve different stages in the project cycle. For example:

Supervision of activities, quality control and output monitoring is fed back to improve implementation and provide progress updates *e.g. if latrines are being constructed poorly, additional capacity building of daily labour may be required*

Outcome monitoring feeds back to inform changes in project design *e.g. if latrines constructed are not being used, changes may need to be made to the siting or design of superstructures.*

Impact monitoring feeds back to inform an understanding of needs *e.g. increasing incidence of diarrhoea may change our prioritisation of public health risks in a particular location*

Monitoring of results alone does not necessarily provide sufficient information to design corrective action but combined with process monitoring using agreed checklists they can guide the first steps in diagnosing problems.
FIELD VISITS

BANGLADESH: COX’S BAZAR

• Visited 9 camps in Kutupalong
• Interviewed 26 KIs (16 orgs)
• Workshop with 40 participants (25 orgs)
  → DRAFT ACTION PLAN
  → ADAPTED QUALITY FRAMEWORK

• Limited follow-up from country
During the Myanmar mission an action plan was developed jointly with the Myanmar WASH Cluster to begin using the framework for Rakhine level reporting from the beginning of the Q3 period. Remote support will be provided to enable the cluster to achieve this.
During the Myanmar visit an alternative framework was developed to reduce the number of indicators and to focus measurements on core outcomes. The objective of this framework is to:

- SIMPLIFY getting key information from the field level to coordination
- FOCUS on tracking the most important indicators of success
- CLARIFY the minimum expectations for each stage of the programme cycle

This framework will be tested and further developed during the South Sudan and Colombia missions.

- Focus area objective
- Key Performance Indicators (KPI):
  - What are the most important measures of success?
  - What information do we need to design programmes, trigger alerts, take corrective actions?
  - What is useful to track over time?
FRAMEWORK COMPONENTS

• Expectations for “good quality” processes, actions:
  • Programme phase Assessment → Planning → Implementation → Monitoring
  • Based on existing guidance
  • Aim to be practical to carry out
  • Critical questions to support the KPIs

GENERAL FINDINGS

• ‘Quality’ is already being measured to some degree
• Limited harmonisation of approaches
• Limited sharing response-level analysis
• Call for strengthened compliance role for cluster / sector
• Different levels of engagement with coordination platform
• Good knowledge of standards, but limited use in monitoring