Introduction


More specifically, the objectives of the August 2016 survey were:

1. To assess current sector leadership and representation, with a focus on the effectiveness of sector delivery.
2. To collect suggestions on how to strengthen coordination and participation across sectors.
3. To analyse feedback on the level of improvement in sector coordination performance since the previous review.

The survey was structured into 8 comprehensive question groups with 30 quantitative questions. 25 of the questions were mandatory and quantitative and 5 were optional, short answer responses.

The question groups covered:

1. Sector and Organization Survey
2. Sector Meeting Organization
3. Management of sector meetings (quality of chairing, selection of content)
4. Respondents’ participation in sector meetings
5. Sector leadership and representation
6. Overall Sector performance
7. Information Management
8. Inter-Sector Coordination
Presentation and Application of the Results

Improving Inter-Sector and Sector Performance
- All answers are linked to particular sectors at national, urban or camp levels. Responses on each sector have been shared with the concerned chairs to inform their own efforts to improve their performance as coordinators.

Strengthening Coordination Capacity
- Results from previous surveys have fed into the Coordination Capacity training, organized by UNHCR for sector, urban and camp coordinators in July 2016.

Building on Inter-Sector, Information Management
- Data and recommendations on how to improve Inter-Sector Coordination, Syrianrefugeeresponse.org and the refugee response portal are feeding directly into work-plans for the ISWG and the UNHCR Coordination unit. Findings in regards to Information Management will be taken into account with the developers of the various information sharing platforms and further sensitization of the partners in utilizing the available information management tools.

Background to the Refugee Sector System

The main strategic framework in Jordan is the Jordan Response Plan (JRP). The 2016, JRP plan, is coordinated by twelve task forces, each of which is led by a Government line ministry. The task forces oversee programming that assists the refugees, as well as resilience-based programming that benefits Jordanian communities and institutions. The JRP is facilitated by the Ministry of the Planning and International Cooperation (MoPIC).

The 2016 Task Force effort has been complemented by eight refugee/humanitarian sectors. These sectors coordinate the day-to-day operational delivery of the refugee response. This survey focuses specifically on those sectors together with camp and urban fora.

The refugee sectors include: Basic Needs, Education, Food Security, Health, Protection, Livelihoods, Shelter, and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH). Protection is further divided into sub-sectors for Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV), Child Protection (CP) and Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS), which is included in the Health Sector. The Health Sector is divided into three sub-sectors; MHPSS, Reproductive Health (RH) and Nutrition.

Multi-sector urban coordination groups are currently established in four locations, Irbid, Mafrak, Amman and the South. Additionally, main inter-sector meetings assist in the well-established camp coordination presently overseeing sector specific fora in Azraq and Zaatari.

The Inter-Agency Task Force

The work of the refugee sectors is overseen by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF). This task force is chaired by the UNHCR Representative and composed of humanitarian UN agencies and NGOs, all contributing to the response. The IATF is the ‘Steering Committee’ for the refugee response architecture. The system of Sector Working Groups (SWGs), through the Inter-Sector Working Groups, cooperate and develop related strategic advocacy and funding. The IATF ensures effective consultation and communication with the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and the UN Country Team (UNCT). Furthermore, the IATF meets on a monthly basis with MoPIC and the Syrian Refugee Affairs Directorate (SRAD) of the Ministry of Interior to further coordinate on the refugee response. Through the UNHCR representative, the IATF reports to the Regional Refugee Coordinator and the 3RP Technical Committee. NGO representatives are elected to the IATF through the International NGO Forum (INGO Forum).
The Inter-Sector Working Group
August 2013, the Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG) was formed - a meeting of the sector chairs – The working group is currently functioning to encourage synergies between refugee sectors, avoid duplication, and work on common processes. The ISWG is the main bridge between the Sector Working Groups. It meets monthly, with membership of the Sector chairs and representatives of the INGO Forum. The ISWG also links the Sectors to the IATF.

The main purposes of the ISWG is to:

• Coordinate, identify, process and elevate relevant topics/issues to the IATF, referring to IATF for policy decisions and guidance at the heads of agency level.
• Facilitate the flow of information between Sectors, and other fora.
• Optimize complementarity between Sector activities by building on a series of common processes.
• Promote consistency in coordination standards and capacity between sectors.
• Ensuring that cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality programming, are properly reflected in Sector activities.

The full ISWG ToRs are available at [http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=10554](http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=10554)
ISWG web-page: [http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/working_group.php?Page=Country&LocationId=107&Id=60](http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/working_group.php?Page=Country&LocationId=107&Id=60)
Summary of Key Survey Results

Question Group One: Sector and Organization Survey

A total of 183 respondents answered the 2016 survey online. Of these, 53% worked for an international NGO, 31% for an UN agency, 12% for a national NGO. This is comparable to the 2015 survey, where 69% of respondents worked for an international NGO, 18% for a UN agency, and 10% for a national NGO. The breakdown of responses by sector was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/Working Group</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education sector</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sector</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection sector</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Sector coordination</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH sector</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods sector</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (taskforces)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Gender Focal Points Network</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV sub-sector</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs sector</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security sector</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Coordination (Zaatari) sector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Coordination (Azraq) sector</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection sub-sector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irbid (urban) sector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Psychosocial Support sub-sector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Health sub-sector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter sector</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amman and South (urban) sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafraq (urban) sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition sub-sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Group Two: Sector Meeting Organization

The survey indicated a timely distribution of minutes, an overwhelming percent of sector members (90%) were recorded to be receiving accurate minutes either sometimes (2%), most of the time (45%), or all of the time (43%).

Type of Organization

- INGO: 53%
- UN: 12%
- National NGO: 31%
- Other: 4%

60 more surveys were received this year than in 2015, creating the most accurate representation of sector performances to date. The highest percentage of respondents came from INGOs (53%).

Q. How often do you receive accurate Minutes?

- Never: 8%
- Rarely: 5%
- Sometimes: 2%
- Most of the time: 45%
- Always: 42%
Furthermore, when asked about preferred regularity for meetings, sector members were in favor of staying with the current frequency of meetings. The greatest percentage (69%) chose once a month while a notable amount (16%) selected once every two weeks, consistent with the

Question Group Three: Meeting Management and Content

Q. Do the TOR reflect the sector adequately?

- Yes 86%
- No 14%

Q. How often is your sector or area-based meeting held?

- Once a week: 5%
- Once every two weeks: 14%
- Once every three weeks: 1%
- Once every month: 77%
- Less frequently than once a month: 3%

Q. Are action points followed up by members and coordinators between meetings?

- Never: 1%
- Rarely: 3%
- Sometimes: 18%
- Most of the time: 50%
- Always: 28%

Q. Have meeting management, organization and content improved in your sector or area-based coordination mechanism in the past year?

- Improved to a large extent: 38%
- Improved to a moderate extent: 22%
- Improved to a small extent: 12%
- No change: 26%
- Has become worse: 2%

Sector members expressed improvement while also conveying a need to further strengthen coordination and avoid duplication.

Additionally, respondents requested a greater clarification of chair and co-chair roles in terms of responsibilities and labour division.
Question Group Four: Respondents’ Participation in Sector Meetings

Q. What are the advantages of being a member of the sector or area-based coordination mechanism?

- Provides an opportunity for fundraising
- Allows the development of mechanisms to reduce duplication of service delivery
- Provides access to needs assessments and gap analyses which inform prioritisation
- Supports the application of and adherence to standards and guidelines
- Promotes individual agency’s visibility and mandate
- Provides an opportunity for fundraising

Information sharing on operational context or agency activities: 74%
Discussion of common operational themes, leading to joint strategy development: 68%
Presentation of guidelines relevant to that sector: 60%
Division of responsibilities between agencies and avoiding duplication or overlap: 59%
Development of common or joint assessments: 42%
Regional response planning fundraising: 35%

Q. Does your sector or area-based coordination mechanism have a work-plan or strategy?

- Yes: 25%
- No: 9%
- I do not know: 16%

Sector members expressed an enthusiastic interest in greater information sharing on operational context or agency activities. Additionally, numerous write-in suggestions indicated an interest in more advocacy engagement with the government.

In the short answer portion, numerous respondents commented that there was a successful strategy, an answer consistent with this survey question results. However, Sector members expressed the need to set a work-plan based on this strategy. Indicating that while this question’s results are overwhelmingly positive, there is a desire to push strategies into the next phase.
Respondents indicated that information collection and sharing is an essential component in avoiding information duplication. Responses suggested that there is a willingness and desire to further improve information sharing.

Important topics are given the appropriate discussion time. Meetings are welcoming and attendance is normally high, however it was expressed that high attendance sometimes makes participation difficult.

Question Group Five: Sector Leadership and Representation

Q. What changes in sector leadership or representation could improve the effectiveness of sector delivery?

- Better understanding of chair/co-chair responsibilities as well as empowering co-chairs to take on more responsibility, currently it is unclear who should take the lead
- Strengthening representation of national organizations, and refugee vantage points. Greater collaboration with the government with an emphasis on the advocacy approach
- Increasing access to country level information/data bases
- Reinforcing coordination within sectors

Q. Is there a co-chair with a clearly defined role in your sector or area-based coordination?

Q. How satisfied are you with the leadership by the agency in charge of your sector or area-based coordination (in general, not just in relation to meeting management)?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
Question Group Six: Overall Sector Performance

Q. What has been the main success/positive area for your sector or area-based coordination, and how should we build on this?

Short answer responses were all evaluated and an assessment of the most common responses were recorded in this survey:

- Coordination was strengthened through regular meetings in various locations; sharing of material and information assisted in further cooperation.
- The development of sector strategy was seen as a success, moving forward the use of the strategy needs to be implemented into activities and a work plan.
- Collaboration with relevant authorities and country partners will assist in better understanding of regulations and laws, building and strengthening current strategy.

Q. Is your sector or area-based coordination effective overall? Please consider leadership, management, representation, participation, and delivery of concrete results for refugees?

Q. Were results of the 2015 survey used to improve your sector or area-based coordination?

Question Group Seven: Information Management

Q. Sector coordination is facilitated by a number of Information Management platforms and products. Which of the below do you usually use?

Further expanding on Information Management tools, particularly Services Advisor, Needs Assessment Registry, and Funding Information, will aid in productivity management. These tools are services available to assist in implementation of programs. They contribute to avoiding duplication of activities and assessments and also assist in financial tracking.
Question Group Eight: Inter-Sector Coordination

Q. How can inter-sector coordination be improved?
Short answer responses were all evaluated and an assessment of the most common responses were recorded in this survey
- Strengthen and increase agency participation and enhance commitment from all members
- Build member capacity by facilitating experience sharing practices with other operations both nationally and internationally
- Improve the development of Urban Coordination
- Enhance the Inter-Sector linkage component within the work plans
- Designate sector focal points to better assist in information flow between sectors

Q. Has Inter-Sector coordination improved this year?

- No change: 28%
- Improved to a small extent: 13%
- Improved to a moderate extent: 36%
- Improved to a large extent: 20%
- Has become worse: 1%

Q. How can overall coordination of the refugee response in Jordan be improved?
Short answer responses were all evaluated and an assessment of the most common responses were recorded in this survey
- Strengthen coordination with relevant government ministries is crucial during the JRP development period
- Further surveying and utilizing the refugee point of view in action plans
- Reinforce greater cooperation and a better working relationship between chairs and co-chairs
- Support stronger collaboration of coordinators across all sectors

For more information please contact:
Yukiko Koyama; Senior Inter-Agency Coordinator: koyama@unhcr.org ; (+962) 7 9614 5634
ISWG page http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/working_group.php?Page=Country&LocationId=107&Id=60