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### Types of Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Preterm Birth Rate</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Georges</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>98%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87%-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77%-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>67%-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%-59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>93%-97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90%-92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>83%-86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80%-82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>73%-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70%-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>63%-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60%-62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...but why give feedback?

...where is it coming from?

...where is it going?
Influencers of Change = Receivers of Feedback

Stakeholder Analysis

1) List stakeholders at every “level” of your system

2) Analyse their interface with the data
List stakeholders at every level. This is an example. Please come up with your own
International:  President  Donor Organisation
National:  IDSR Unit  Minister of Health  Minister of Finance  HMIS Manager
District:  M&E Officer  District Commissioner  Medical Officer  Finance Officer
Facility:  Information Officer  Clinic In-Charge  Supply Chain Manager  Clinician
Community: Chiefs  Mayors  Religious Leaders  PTA  Village Health Committee
Trust in feedback, trust in data

When use of data is minimal, its quality (accuracy, timeliness) is also poor. However, as data cycles continue, the increased speed of feedback to users of the data instills a greater sense of ownership of data, which also drives improvement of data quality and use of data to make real decisions.
Modalities
Case Study 1 - Humanitarian Informal Feedback

Supporting field staff to capture (currently undocumented) informal feedback which is received face-to-face by creatively using ICTs to enable responsive and accountable uses of information.
Za’atari Pilot - July 2016
# Referral

Please select the relevant team responsible for this feedback:

- PHP team
- Water Issues
- PHE team
- SWM and C4W team
- Livelihood team
- Recycling team
- MEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Sub categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHP</td>
<td>Queries on the water network / WWN / Private latrines / Safety issues / Problems not related to Oxfam services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Problems with water quality / water quantity / public water tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>Problems with private latrine / water network / WWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM &amp; CfW</td>
<td>SWM / CfW rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>Community gardens / Beneficiaries selection / IGAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Greenhouses / Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL</td>
<td>Other / Positive feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data

Complaint method used, by month

- August: 219 (HIF: 42%, Hotline: 23%)
- September: 151 (HIF: 23%)
- October: 193 (HIF: 13%)

Legend:
- Blue: HIF
- Red: Hotline
Value Add

No data entry required
Reduction in errors in the collected data
Provides a user friendly interface for data collectors
Aggregates feedback data
Problem solving time became faster
Main Challenges

- Accountability culture
- Limited resources & high staff turnover
- IT support
- Inclusivity
- Short project timeframe
- Data security
- Finding the right tool
**Successes**

Trust between community mobilisers vs community

Fast feedback process (referrals and responses)

Allow multiple feedback classifications to insure correct prioritisation

Dynamic & flexible to adapt to new programme updates and changes

Scalable

“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).
Next steps

Learning from the evaluation


Greece pilot in progress, Iraq next week!

Jordan to get back online

Scale up funding across 5 countries in the Middle East

Datahub creation
Questions?
Case Study 2 - Indoor Residual Spraying
Malaria and IRS background

212 million cases in 2015

429 000 deaths, 70% in children

Control and elimination

mSpray Purpose and Background

• Problem: High malaria prevalence

• Theoretical solution: High coverage of Indoor Residual Spraying

85%
What makes IRS Challenging?
IRS - Stakeholder Analysis

National Malaria Directorship
Funders/Partners
Provincial Leadership
District Leadership / District Surveillance Management
Spray Operators Teams – SOPs, TLs
Daily In-field Use
Implementation Details
2016 Achievements

1) Measurement
2) Impact
3) Change in Data Use Culture

Future expansion?
Questions?
Group Work

With your case study

Do your own stakeholder analysis

Decide on what information you want to get and to whom

Design your product

Present and Discuss