

Guidance to Present, Interpret and Respond to Client Feedback

Annex 2: Strengths and Weaknesses of the Different Channels and Contextual/Operational Considerations

Response channels	Features	Strengths of Channel	Weaknesses of Channel	Contextual Considerations	Operational Considerations
<p>Community meetings Convening community members in order to respond publicly through a formal and regular meeting. Can also include existing meetings where a sub-group meets regularly (e.g. if the feedback comes primarily from one particular group, this offers more 'privacy' for the interested group).</p>	<p>Formal, face-to-face, public, verbal, low tech</p>	<p>Response reaches a large group, and helps to ensure that many people are informed. Can allow for follow-up clarifying questions. Public demonstration of IRC's commitment to transparency and responding. Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p>	<p>Public setting makes it difficult to respond to feedback of a sensitive nature. Some people might feel uncomfortable asking questions in this environment. Some people will be unable to attend the meeting. Risk of only hearing only dominant voices.</p>	<p>Location of the meeting can restrict access by vulnerable populations. Sometimes it is not possible to convene community meetings that include all genders and all ages. Some people may not feel comfortable attending a meeting or will not feel comfortable asking follow-up questions in a large group setting. Some people might not be able to attend (access, livelihood, or family activity). Language barriers could inhibit everyone from receiving the information. Access to the community could be challenging in insecure or remote environments.</p>	<p>Security risks might restrict staff from convening a group regularly. Security risks might hinder regular access to the community. Requires staff to have good facilitation skills. May require staff to be knowledgeable about the topic being discussed and any other issues that might be raised. Clients often prefer to have staff from IRC who can make decisions the meeting when significant issues are raised.</p>
<p>Individual meetings One-on-one conversations between staff and the client who provided the feedback.</p>	<p>Informal, face-to-face, verbal, low tech</p>	<p>Response can be directed to the individual who provided the feedback. Good for discussing sensitive topics. Allows for a more in-depth discussion on a one-on-one basis. Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p>	<p>Only used when the feedback provider is known. Limits ability to share information with a larger group of clients (if feedback is non-sensitive). Requires a lot of staff time in the field with clients.</p>	<p>Staff gender might restrict their ability to convene individual meetings. Potential language barriers between staff and clients. Access to the client could be challenging in insecure or remote environments.</p>	<p>Requires large amount of staff time. Limited access to individuals might restrict the ability to reach clients regularly. May require staff to be knowledgeable about other issues that might be raised Clients often prefer to have staff with some level of authority in the meeting when significant issues are raised. Requires a strong collection, documentation, and internal referral system to ensure information is not lost.</p>

<p>Stakeholder Reference Group</p> <p>Responding by sharing responses to feedback with community leaders or groups, which is then shared with clients.</p>	<p>Informal, face-to-face, verbal, low tech</p>	<p>Sharing information through local leaders might be an expected part of relationship-building; bypassing leaders could damage IRC's perception.</p> <p>Often a traditional source of information for the community.</p> <p>Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p>	<p>Local leaders could become gatekeepers of information.</p> <p>Leaders may misrepresent the IRC's response to the community.</p> <p>Often not an appropriate channel for responding to sensitive feedback.</p> <p>Leaders may lack the skills to respond to questions that arise from the wider community in response to the information passed on.</p>	<p>Traditional structures for community representation may systematically exclude certain groups.</p> <p>Perceptions related to political parties could hinder IRC's ability to be seen as impartial.</p> <p>If leaders are seen as linked to the conflict it could hinder IRC's ability to be seen as impartial.</p>	<p>In a high-risk security context, reaching leaders on a regular basis could pose security risks for staff.</p> <p>Risk that leaders could use the channel for personal/group gain.</p> <p>Clients often prefer to communicate with IRC staff from IRC, ideally staff who make decisions or can ensure that necessary follow-up process is followed when significant issues are raised.</p>
<p>IRC community volunteers</p> <p>Responding by sharing information with IRC's community volunteers, which is shared with clients.</p>	<p>Informal, face-to-face, verbal, low tech</p>	<p>Often a natural and trusted bridge between the community and IRC.</p> <p>As community members, they have deep knowledge of the context and local needs.</p> <p>Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p>	<p>Could challenge the volunteers' credibility if they are unable or not equipped to respond appropriately.</p> <p>Volunteers could become gatekeepers of information.</p> <p>Risk that volunteers could use the information for personal/group gain.</p> <p>May lack skills to respond to questions that arise from responses.</p> <p>Often not an appropriate channel for responding to sensitive feedback.</p>	<p>Power dynamics may limit their ability to be effective communication channels.</p> <p>Gender or age barriers might inhibit their access or reliability.</p> <p>Unintended negative impacts related to empowering one group with more information over another.</p> <p>Language barriers in multi-lingual contexts.</p>	<p>Can require strong communication skills.</p> <p>Risk of the group using the channel for personal/group gain.</p> <p>Clients often prefer to speak directly to IRC staff.</p>
<p>Local radio</p> <p>Communicating responses via a local radio program</p> <p>Billboard</p> <p>very similar pros and cons – can use icons to explain but still requires some skill to read, know where it is etc.</p>	<p>Formal, public, ICT, verbal</p>	<p>Often ideal for combining information provision, public service announcements, and responses to recurring inquiries.</p> <p>Provides the opportunity to access a large population.</p> <p>Allows IRC to reach populations in more remote or insecure locations (where staff presence may be limited).</p> <p>Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p>	<p>One-way communication channel, where clients cannot ask additional questions (unless the channel provides for call-ins from clients).</p> <p>Radio is not always accessible to everyone.</p> <p>Not appropriate channel to respond to sensitive feedback.</p> <p>Language barriers between the radio presenters and client population.</p>	<p>Risk of perceived bias, depending on the reputation of the station.</p> <p>Gender, age, and power dynamics related to accessibility to the radio.</p> <p>If two-way, only allows clients with access to phone to reach the station.</p> <p>If two-way, reputational risks when criticisms or allegations are raised publicly.</p>	<p>Cost implications: high fee for hosting the radio show, especially if the station is very popular and has large coverage/subscription.</p> <p>Staff time will be needed to develop content.</p> <p>Useful in contexts where staff are unable to travel regularly to communities due to security risks.</p>
<p>Callbacks</p> <p>Staff, volunteers, or a third-party service provides a response by calling back clients who have provided feedback</p>	<p>Formal, ICT, verbal</p>	<p>Verbal communication avoids barriers related to illiteracy.</p> <p>Often a good channel for responding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sensitive feedback (if administered by staff with appropriate levels of authority) <p>Can allow for follow-up clarifying questions.</p>	<p>Limited to only clients who can access a phone.</p> <p>Language barriers between the person calling back and the client.</p> <p>Can be time-intensive for staff.</p>	<p>Good for remote areas and restricted areas where mobile coverage is high</p> <p>Gender, power, and age dynamics may determine who has access to phones and who does not</p>	<p>Can require large amount of staff time.</p>

<p>Social media Responses provided via Facebook, Twitter, organizational webpage, WhatsApp, Instagram, etc.</p>	<p>ICT, informal, public, written</p>	<p>Provides the opportunity to access a large population</p> <p>Often a good channel for responding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth • Urban contexts that may be spread out <p>Can allow for follow-up clarifying questions</p>	<p>Requires access to a smartphone/computer and the internet.</p> <p>Often not a good channel to respond to sensitive information.</p> <p>Language barriers between clients and content providers.</p>	<p>Risks excluding a large portion of the population based on age or gender due to lack of technical challenges or access to the necessary technology.</p> <p>Illiteracy may limit access for certain populations.</p> <p>Can be cost prohibitive for people to access smartphones / internet.</p> <p>Requires high levels of ongoing internet connectivity and electricity to keep phone charged.</p>	<p>Requires staff time and ability to monitor and manage responses.</p> <p>Staff required to have strong written communication skills.</p>
<p>Emails Responding directly to clients via email</p>	<p>ICT, written, informal</p>	<p>Often a good channel for responding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive feedback • Urban contexts that may be spread out <p>Can allow for follow-up clarifying questions</p>	<p>Language barriers between staff and clients.</p> <p>Requires knowledge of the person's email address.</p> <p>Limits accessibility to clients who have access to email.</p>	<p>May exclude large portions of the population based on: illiteracy, age, and gender.</p> <p>Requires access to the internet and smartphone / computer.</p>	<p>Requires staff time and ability to monitor and manage responses.</p> <p>Staff required to have strong written communication skills.</p>
<p>SMS or Whatsapp Responding directly to clients individually or in group via SMS</p>	<p>ICT, written, informal</p>	<p>Often a good channel for responding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sensitive feedback (direct message) • Youth • Urban contexts that may be spread out <p>Can allow for follow-up clarifying questions.</p>	<p>Language barriers.</p> <p>Requires access to a smartphone/computer and the internet.</p>	<p>May exclude large portions of the population based on: illiteracy, age, and gender.</p> <p>Can be cost prohibitive for people as they need mobile phone credit to text back if they have questions (unless this cost is covered by IRC).</p> <p>Requires regular access to a mobile telephone network and electricity to keep phone charged.</p>	<p>Requires staff time and ability to monitor and manage responses.</p> <p>Staff required to have strong written communication skills.</p>