

FSAC YEMEN
Food Security and Agriculture Cluster
COMMUNITY PROFILE TEMPLATE
Mapping Communication Preferences, Key Community Structures,
AAP Access Points, and Vulnerability Profiles
FSAC Yemen — Annex C | June 2026
Instructions for Use

This template should be completed for each distinct community or settlement in your operational area BEFORE programme implementation begins.

It should be updated at minimum every 6 months, or after significant population movements or changes in community composition.

Data collection requires: a minimum of 2 gender-separate FGDs (one with women, one with men); KIIs with key informants from diverse groups including PWDs, elderly, and IDPs; and direct observation.

All data must be disaggregated by sex, age, and displacement status where possible.

This profile is **CONFIDENTIAL** — do not share with authorities without explicit senior management approval.

Store securely. Password-protect digital versions. Restrict access to MEAL and programme staff.

1
BASIC LOCATION INFORMATION

Community / Settlement Name	Alternative Names / Local Name

Governorate	District	Sub-district / Village

GPS Coordinates (if known) Lat: ____ Long: ____	Authority Area ☐ IRG ☐ SBA ☐ Contested

Date Profile Completed DD/MM/YYYY	Profile Completed By Name and organization

Date of Last Update DD/MM/YYYY	Approved By (MEAL/AAP Focal Point)

2

POPULATION PROFILE
2.1 Population Estimates

Population Group	Estimated Number	% of Total	Source of Data	Date of Data
Total population		100%		
Female				
Male				
Children under 5				
Children 5–17				
Adults 18–59				
Elderly 60+				
IDPs (newly displaced — within last 6 months)				
IDPs (protracted — displaced more than 6 months)				
Returnees				
Host community members				
Persons with disabilities (estimated)				
Female-headed households				

2.2 Disability Profile

Using the Washington Group Short Set questions, note estimated prevalence of the following functional limitations:

Functional Domain	Some Difficulty (estimate)	A Lot of Difficulty / Cannot Do (estimate)	Notes
Seeing (even with glasses)			
Hearing (even with hearing aid)			
Walking or climbing steps			
Remembering or concentrating			
Self-care (washing, dressing)			
Communicating (being understood)			

Key notes on disability in this community:
Any specific groups, causes (conflict injury), or existing support structures

3
COMMUNITY STRUCTURES AND KEY INFORMANTS
3.1 Key Community Structures

Structure	Name(s) of Leader(s)	Role / Relevance to AAP	Contact (if safe to record)	Notes
Community / Tribal Leader (Sheikh)				
Village / Neighbourhood Council				
Women's Group / Committee				
Youth Group				
Religious Leader (Imam / Sheikh)				
Local NGO / CBO				
Organization of Persons with Disabilities (OPD)				
School / Parent Committee				
Health Facility / Community Health Worker				
Local Authority Representative				
Other (specify):				

Which community structures have the highest trust among women?
Based on FGD findings with women's group
Which community structures have the highest trust among PWDs?
Based on KII with OPD or PWD representatives

4

COMMUNICATION PREFERENCES AND INFORMATION LANDSCAPE
4.1 Preferred Information Sources — By Community Group

Based on FGDs, mark the 2–3 most trusted and accessible information sources for each group. Ask communities directly — do not assume.

	Community meeting	Religious leader	Radio	TV	Mobile phone	Trusted neighbour	Female enumerator	Community notice board	Other:
Women (general)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Men (general)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Youth (female)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Youth (male)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Elderly women	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Elderly men	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
PWDs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
IDPs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Female-headed HHs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Notes on information source preferences:

Describe any context-specific findings not captured in the grid above

4.2 Mobile Phone and Digital Access

Question	Finding / Estimate
Estimated % of HHs with at least one mobile phone	
Estimated % of women with personal mobile phone access	
Predominant network provider(s) in this area	
Network reliability (signal quality / outages)	☐ Good ☐ Moderate ☐ Poor ☐ Very Poor
Internet / data access availability	☐ Widespread ☐ Limited ☐ Unavailable
WhatsApp usage	☐ Common ☐ Limited ☐ Rare
Literacy rate (estimated) — female	
Literacy rate (estimated) — male	
Primary language(s) / dialect spoken	

Notes on digital access and communication barriers specific to this community:

4.3 Radio Access

Is community radio available in this area? ☐ <i>Yes</i> ☐ <i>No</i> ☐ <i>Partially</i>	Most listened-to station(s):

Broadcast language / dialect:	Prime listening time(s):

5

FEEDBACK AND CFM CHANNEL SUITABILITY

Based on the communication profile above, assess the suitability of each CFM channel for this specific community. Check all that apply.

CFM Channel	Suitable for this community?	Accessible to women?	Accessible to PWDs?	Notes / Adaptations needed
Toll-free hotline	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
WhatsApp	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
SMS	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Community help desk	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Suggestion box	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Home visits (female staff)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Community focal point	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Community radio	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ With adaptation	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	

Recommended primary CFM channel(s) for this community (minimum 2):
Select based on accessibility, trust, and practical feasibility

Recommended dedicated channel for women:
Must be safe, confidential, and culturally appropriate

Recommended channel for PWDs:
Adapted as needed for specific disability types present

6

VULNERABILITY, ACCESS BARRIERS, AND RISK PROFILE
⚠ Data Sensitivity Warning

Section 6 contains sensitive data about community vulnerabilities. This section must NOT be shared outside the MEAL and programme team. Do not include identifying information about individuals. Report in general terms only.

6.1 Most Vulnerable Groups in This Community

Group	Estimated Prevalence	Primary Vulnerability Factors	Main Access Barriers to Assistance	Recommended Engagement Approach
Female-headed households				
Widows				
Unaccompanied minors				
Elderly persons (especially women)				
Persons with physical disabilities				
Persons with visual impairments				
Persons with hearing impairments				
Persons with intellectual disabilities				
Newly displaced IDPs				
Ethnic / religious minorities				
Households with no male member				
Households with chronically ill member				

6.2 Access and Security Considerations

Factor	Current Situation	Impact on AAP Implementation
Physical access to community (road quality, distance)	☐ Good ☐ Moderate ☐ Poor ☐ Seasonal	
Active conflict / hostilities in area	☐ None ☐ Occasional ☐ Frequent ☐ Ongoing	
Presence of landmines or UXOs	☐ None ☐ Suspected ☐ Confirmed	
Checkpoint / bureaucratic barriers	☐ None ☐ Occasional ☐ Regular ☐ Severe	
Community tension or inter-group conflict	☐ None ☐ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High	
Risk to female staff / community members from engagement	☐ None ☐ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High	

Factor	Current Situation	Impact on AAP Implementation
Restrictions on female mobility	☐ None ☐ Some ☐ Significant ☐ Severe	
Presence of armed actors who may interfere with programme	☐ None ☐ Some risk ☐ Confirmed risk	

Do No Harm considerations for this community: <i>Identify any specific risks that programme presence or activities could exacerbate</i>

7

EXISTING HUMANITARIAN PRESENCE AND AAP LANDSCAPE
7.1 Other Organizations Currently Active in This Community

Organization	Sector(s)	CFM/Feedback Mechanism Available?	Contact for Coordination
		☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	
		☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	
		☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	
		☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	

Are there opportunities for coordinated or harmonized CFM channels with other organizations?
Describe any existing coordination mechanisms

Have community members previously used feedback/complaint mechanisms with other organizations? What was their experience?
Critical for understanding community trust in CFMs

8
COMMUNITY PREFERENCES FOR PROGRAMME DESIGN

This section captures community preferences that should directly inform programme design decisions. All entries must be drawn from direct community consultation, not staff assumptions.

What assistance does the community consider most critical at this time?
Record the community's own words as closely as possible. Separate responses from women's FGD and men's FGD.
Women's FGD priority response:
Top priorities as stated by women
Men's FGD priority response:
Top priorities as stated by men
What delivery modality does the community prefer (cash / voucher / in-kind / other)?
Note any differences between women and men, or between IDPs and host community
What distribution schedule is most practical for the community?
Consider market days, religious observances, agricultural seasons, school calendars
What location for distribution/service delivery is most accessible to the community, including for women, elderly, and PWDs?
Note any specific locations that are accessible or inaccessible for specific groups
Are there cultural practices, religious observances, or seasonal factors the programme must account for?
What concerns does the community have about participating in this programme?
Community concerns must be addressed in programme design and communication strategy

9

SUMMARY: KEY AAP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAMME DESIGN

Complete this summary after all sections have been filled in. This summary should be read by all programme staff before implementation and shared with the MEAL team and programme manager.

Top 3 AAP actions required for this community (from profile findings):
E.g., 'Establish female-only home visit CFM channel because women cannot access community meetings'
Key communication adaptations required:
E.g., 'All IEC materials must be pictorial — 65% of women are non-literate'
Key access/security adaptations required:
E.g., 'Physical access impossible in rainy season — pre-position remote engagement via community focal points'
Recommended CFM channels for this community (minimum 2):
Selected based on this profile's findings
Groups requiring dedicated engagement strategies (and recommended approaches):
List each group and the specific approach
Do No Harm / conflict sensitivity actions to take before programme launch:

Signature	Name	Role	Date
Profile Completed By:		MEAL / AAP Staff	
Verified By:		MEAL Coordinator	
Approved For Use By:		Programme Manager	

