



**GROUND TRUTH  
SOLUTIONS**

WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT

# **FIELD SURVEY AND ANALYSIS**

SURVEY OF LOCAL PARTNER ORGANISATIONS  
PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN AID IN IRAQ

31 OCTOBER 2017





# CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW</b>	<b>3</b>
INTRODUCTION	3
SUMMARY FINDINGS	3
READING THIS REPORT	4
<b>SURVEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
Q1. NON-FINANCIAL SUPPORT	5
A. MANAGEMENT SKILLS	5
B. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	5
C. TECHNICAL ABILITIES	6
D. PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES	6
E. MONITORING & EVALUATION SKILLS	6
F. LONG-TERM PLANNING	7
G. STRATEGIES	7
H. COMMUNICATIONS	7
Q2. ADAPTABLE FINANCING	8
Q3. RESPONSIVENESS	8
Q4. CORE FUNDING SUPPORT	9
Q5. CONTEXTUAL UNDERSTANDING	9
Q6. RESPECT	10
<b>DEMOGRAPHICS</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>NOTE ON METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>11</b>
BACKGROUND	11
NET PROMOTER SCORE	11
BENCHMARKING THE DATA	11
SURVEY DEVELOPMENT	11
SAMPLE SIZE	11
SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	11
LANGUAGE OF THE SURVEY	11



# OVERVIEW

## Introduction

This report presents the findings of several surveys completed by 83 local partners of four international organisations and eight United Nations agencies operating in Iraq. In addition to strengthening collaboration between these agencies, the survey results help to track progress in improving the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian assistance, especially at the local level, as set out in the Grand Bargain. Questions are adapted from the Partnership Survey developed by Keystone Accountability.<sup>1</sup> The online survey was shared by the international agencies with their local partners. Completed surveys went straight to Ground Truth for analysis.

The data presented in this report is aggregated from the responses of all participating organisations. When drawing inferences from the findings, bear in mind that responses differ significantly from one organisation to another. It is also important to mention here that some of the local partners provided feedback to more than one international organisation, and therefore the number of total survey responses equals 94. In addition to strengthening collaboration between international and local partners, the data serves to inform progress towards the Grand Bargain’s second goal: support for the successful localisation of humanitarian assistance.

## Summary findings

The main findings suggest that local partners are:

### Relationship quality

- Very satisfied with the way in which international partners treat them with respect and their understanding of the local context in which they operate.
- Complimentary about the efforts made by their international counterparts to listen and respond to their questions and concerns.

### Capacity building

- Positive – although less so than on the questions about relationships – about the help they get improving their management and financial skills, technical abilities, and


participatory approaches.

- Less satisfied with the support they receive to strengthen their long-term planning, improve their strategic and practical approaches, and build up their communications strategies.

### Financial support

- Positive about the flexibility of the funding received from international partners when confronting changing circumstances.
- Slightly less positive when rating how well they can cover core costs with the financial support provided by international partners.

### OVERVIEW OF MEAN SCORES PER QUESTION



<sup>1</sup>Keystone Accountability International Non-Governmental Organization Survey. For more see: <https://keystoneaccountability.org/international-non-governmental-organization-survey/>



## Reading this report

The responses to the survey questions are illustrated in two graphs. The bar charts show the frequency of each chosen answer option from 0 to 10. In addition to the frequencies, the mean score is shown to allow for easy comparison of results across each question.

To add another layer of analysis, the bar charts are colour-coded according to the Net Promoter Analysis<sup>2</sup>: Detractors are on the left in red (i.e. rating of 0 to 6), passives are in the in yellow (i.e. rating of 7 or 8), and promoters are found on the right in green (i.e. rating of 9 or 10).

For benchmarking purposes, we use the net promoter score (NP score). The respondents' NP scores are compared to the benchmark data, which is an aggregated score of 31 international NGOs operating across the Middle East that were included in the Keystone Accountability partnership survey. We provide scatter charts which fall along an axis that spans from an NP score value of -100 to 100.

For more information on the Net Promoter Analysis and the benchmarking of the data, please refer to our methodology section on page 11.

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Net Promoter' is a registered trademark of Fred Reichheld, Bain & Company and Satmetrix. For more see: [www.netpromotersystem.com](http://www.netpromotersystem.com), as well as the open source net promoter community at [www.netpromoter.com](http://www.netpromoter.com)



# SURVEY QUESTIONS


◇ COHORT NP SCORE	DETRACTORS
○ KEYSTONE NP SCORE	PASSIVES
	PROMOTERS

## Q1. Non-financial support

Please rate the different types of non-financial support you received:

### a. Strengthening our management and leadership skills

Distribution of responses Mean: 7.0




Over two-thirds of respondents rate the support from partners that strengthens their management and leadership skills with a score of 9 or 10. The NP score is higher than the Keystone benchmark for the region (7 vs. -8).

Net promoter score




### b. Strengthening our financial management skills

Distribution of responses Mean: 7.1



While 45% of local organisations rate the support they receive from partners that strengthens their financial management skills with a score of 9 or 10, 38% give a score of 6 and below. The NP score is substantially higher than the Keystone benchmark for the region (7 vs -26).

Net promoter score






# SURVEY QUESTIONS


◇ COHORT NP SCORE	DETRACTORS
○ KEYSTONE NP SCORE	PASSIVES
	PROMOTERS

## c. Strengthening our technical abilities to deliver services

Distribution of responses Mean: 7.1




Net promoter score



Responses are mixed regarding the support local and national organisations receive from their partners to strengthen their technical abilities to deliver services. The NP score lies above the Keystone benchmark (6 vs -19).

## d. Strengthening our participatory approaches

Distribution of responses Mean: 7.0




Net promoter score



Over two-thirds of respondents are split between rating the assistance of their international partners to strengthen their participatory approaches with scores between 0 and 6 and above 9. The NP score is just above the Keystone benchmark (3 vs -9).

## e. Strengthening our monitoring and evaluation skills


Distribution of responses Mean: 6.9



Net promoter score




Almost an equal proportion of local organisations are split between rating support for strengthening their monitoring and evaluation skills between a 0 and 6 or 9 and 10. The NP score is just above the Keystone benchmark (-2 vs -8).




## f. Strengthening our long-term planning

Distribution of responses Mean: 6.5




Forty-five percent of participating local organisations rate the international partners' support for their long-term planning with a score between 0 and 6. The NP score is just above the Keystone benchmark (-15 vs -21).



## g. Improving our strategic and practical approaches

Distribution of responses Mean: 6.8



Forty-four percent of participating organisations rate the support they receive from international organisations to improve their strategic and practical approaches with a score between 0 and 6. The NP score is above the Keystone benchmark scores (-9 vs -18).





## h. Communicating and publicising our work

Distribution of responses Mean: 6.9



An almost equal proportion of local organisations rate the support for communications and publication of work between 0 and 6 and 9 or 10, 38% and 34% respectively. The aggregate NP score is above the Keystone benchmark (-5 vs -23).






### Q2. Adaptable financing


## Flexibility in adapting the terms of financial support so we can adjust our programmes to changing needs.

Distribution of responses Mean: 7.2



Over two-thirds of respondents are split between rating the assistance of their international partners to strengthen their participatory approaches with scores between 0 and 6 and above 9. The NP score is below the Keystone benchmark (5 vs 26).


Net promoter score



### Q3. Responsiveness

## [Name of organisation] listens and responds appropriately to our questions and concerns.


Distribution of responses Mean: 7.7



Over half of the local organisations rate the responsiveness of their international partner with a score of 9 or 10. Despite these positive ratings, the NP scores falls below the Keystone benchmark (26 vs. 47).

Net promoter score






### Q4. Core funding support


The funding we receive from [name of organisation] makes an appropriate contribution to my organisation’s core costs.

Distribution of responses Mean: 6.8



An equal proportion of the total number of local organisations rate the financial support they receive to cover their core costs with a score between 0 and 6 and 9 and above, 35% and 35% respectively. The NP score is above the Keystone benchmark (0 vs. -23).


Net promoter score



### Q5. Contextual understanding

[Name of organisation] understands the context in which we work.

Distribution of responses Mean: 8.3



Sixty-one percent of local organisation believe their international partner understands the local context in which they work. The NP score falls just below the Keystone benchmark (45 vs. 48).

Net promoter score






### Q6. Respect

## [Name of organisation] treats us with respect.

Distribution of responses

Mean: 8.7




Seventy-five percent of local organisations give high ratings to whether their partners treat them with respect. The mean score of 8.7 is the highest among the survey questions. The NP score for this question is well above the Keystone benchmark (63 vs. 18).

Net promoter score




## DEMOGRAPHICS

### Gender\*



\* The frequency (135) of the total number of respondents is higher than the total number of participating local organisations (83), as some organisations had multiple focal points responding to the survey on their behalf. In these cases, the organisation's scores were averaged.

### Services provided by local partners\*



\* Respondents were given the option to select multiple services.

\*\* 'Other' includes services such as community centres, hotels, registration, translation, and analysis.



# NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

## Background

OECD donors and humanitarian actors made a series of commitments at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian aid. The OECD secretariat seeks to assess the policy changes in the global humanitarian landscape as well as whether the commitments made in the Grand Bargain are having the intended impact. As part of this exercise, Ground Truth Solutions has been commissioned to track the way people affected by humanitarian crises and field staff experience reforms set out in the Grand Bargain. The partner survey investigates the second commitment under the Grand Bargain that calls for “more support and funding tools for local and national responders.”

## Net Promoter Score

The NP score distinguishes between three constituent profiles: promoters, passives, and detractors. The NP score is widely accepted as a key performance indicator within the private sector capable of helping to understand customer loyalty to products or services. In the humanitarian context, the support provided by international agencies to national responders can be seen as surveyable services. This analysis provides the basis for the development of distinct strategies to work with each of the constituent profiles.



**Promoters** are people who rate a question as 9 and 10 on a 0 to 10 point scale. These are the champions. They are likely to be wholehearted and active enthusiasts who recommend services or, in this case, organisations, to their friends and colleagues.

**Passives** are those who give ratings of 7 and 8. They do not have major concerns, but they are not particularly enthusiastic about the specific aspects of the collaboration. However, with the right incentives, they could well become promoters.

**Detractors** are people who rate the questions from 0-6. They have fairly negative or mediocre perceptions on the question and their views are likely to negatively affect the collaboration and even the reputation of the international partner.

The NP score is calculated by subtracting the detractors from the promoters while ignoring the passives. A positive NP score indicates that among the respondents to a specific question, there are more promoters than detractors. Alternatively, a negative score indicates more detractors than promoters among those who answered a question.

## Benchmarking the data

As the survey’s questions are adapted from the Keystone Accountability Partnership Survey, the results of this report have been compared to two benchmarks. The Keystone benchmark is composed of 31 international NGOs operating across the Middle East that have also answered the questions posed to the current respondents. While these organisations have different goals and structures, the benchmarks offer a point of comparison based on the views of the partners of other international organisations in the region. The data should be interpreted with care, considering each organisation’s specific context, goals, and activities.

## Survey development

Ground Truth developed a survey tailored to gauge the experiences of local and national responders who administer humanitarian assistance in collaboration with INGOs and UN agencies. Closed questions use a 0-10 Likert scale to quantify answers, which have been analysed by comparing means, response patterns, as well as comparing their NP score with benchmark data.

## Sample size

Participation was voluntary and the sample consists of local partners contacted to participate in the survey. Eighty-three local and national partners in Iraq of four international organisations and eight UN agencies provided feedback. Since some local and national organisations provided to more than one international organisation, the total number of survey responses equals 94.

## Sampling methodology

The partner survey was commissioned by the OECD and managed by Ground Truth Solutions. The questionnaire was built on an online platform and was administered to frontline partners in Iraq via email by the INGOs and UN agencies. Focal points were chosen to complete the survey on behalf of local partner organisations. Focal points are those who regularly manage donor relations on behalf of the organisation. Data was collected between 31 July 2017 and 31 August 2017.

## Language of the survey

The survey was conducted in Kurdish, Arabic, and English.

**For more information about Ground Truth surveys in Iraq, please contact Nick van Praag (Director - [nick@groundtruthsolutions.org](mailto:nick@groundtruthsolutions.org)) or Andrew Hassan (Programme Analyst - [andrew@groundtruthsolutions.org](mailto:andrew@groundtruthsolutions.org)).**