

FSAC YEMEN

Food Security and Agriculture Cluster

AAP QUARTERLY LEARNING BRIEF

Feedback and Complaints Trends | Programme Adaptations | Key Lessons
FSAC Yemen — Annex D | Template Version 1.0 | June 2026

Field	Details
Reporting Period	Q___ / Year ___ (e.g., Q1 2026: January–March 2026)
Prepared By	Name / Role
Organization / Cluster Level	☐ Partner-level report ☐ FSAC Sub-National Cluster ☐ FSAC National Cluster
Date Completed	
Distribution	Programme Management FSAC Cluster AAP TWG
Confidentiality	Aggregated data — no individual identifiers. Restricted distribution.

Purpose of This Brief

This quarterly learning brief serves three functions:

- 1. ACCOUNTABILITY:** Documents how community feedback was received, processed, and acted upon during the reporting period.
- 2. LEARNING:** Identifies patterns, successes, and recurring challenges across AAP implementation.
- 3. ADAPTATION:** Provides evidence for programme managers and cluster coordinators to make informed decisions about programme adjustments.

Partners: Complete Sections 1–5 for partner-level briefs.

Sub-national clusters: Aggregate partner data and complete all sections for sub-national cluster briefs.

1

CFM SNAPSHOT — REPORTING PERIOD OVERVIEW

Complete the statistics below for the reporting period. All data must be drawn from the CFM log. Disaggregate by sex where identifiable.

Total Feedback Items Received	% Acknowledged Within 3 Days			% Resolved Within 15 Days
Metric	Female	Male	Unknown / Anonymous	TOTAL
Total feedback / complaints received				
CAT-A: Information requests				
CAT-B: Programme complaints				
CAT-C: Staff conduct complaints (non-SEAH)				
CAT-D: SEAH referrals (count only)	—	—	—	
CAT-E: Suggestions / positive feedback				
CAT-F: Referred to other actor				
Cases acknowledged within 3 working days				
Cases resolved within 15 working days				
Cases pending / overdue at end of period				

1.1 Feedback by Channel

Channel	Number Received	% of Total	Functioning Throughout Period?	Notes
Toll-free hotline			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
WhatsApp			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
Community help desk			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
Suggestion boxes			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
Home visit protocol			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
Community focal points			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
Other: _____			☐ Yes ☐ Partial ☐ No	
TOTAL		100%		

1.2 Feedback by Location

Governorate / District	Number Received	Top Complaint Category	Key Issue(s)

Governorate / District	Number Received	Top Complaint Category	Key Issue(s)
TOTAL			

2

TRENDS AND ANALYTICAL FINDINGS
2.1 Recurring Issues — Top 5 by Volume

Identify the 5 most frequently raised issues in the reporting period. These must be drawn from CFM log analysis, not qualitative impressions.

Rank	Issue Description	Number of Times Raised	% Female Complainants	Location(s)	Category	Root Cause (if known)
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

2.2 Trend Analysis

 Issues INCREASING this quarter • [Issue 1] — describe trend and evidence • [Issue 2] — describe trend and evidence • [Issue 3] — describe trend and evidence	 Issues DECREASING or RESOLVED • [Issue 1] — what action led to improvement • [Issue 2] — what action led to improvement • [Issue 3] — what action led to improvement
---	---

Comparison with previous quarter (Q___):
Note any significant changes in volume, category, or location patterns
Groups disproportionately represented in complaints (by sex, age, disability, displacement status):
Identify if women, PWDs, IDPs, or other groups are raising specific concerns

3
PROGRAMME ADAPTATIONS MADE BASED ON FEEDBACK

This is the most critical section of the Learning Brief. It documents how community feedback has led to concrete programme changes — demonstrating that the CFM is an accountability system, not just a complaint log.

Minimum Standard

A minimum of 3 documented programme adaptations per project cycle is required per FSAC AAP Indicator IM-06. Adaptations must be causally linked to specific feedback items or trends — not coincidental programme improvements. If fewer than 3 adaptations were made this quarter, explain why and describe planned actions.

#	Feedback / Complaint That Triggered Adaptation	Number of Similar Complaints	Programme Change Made	Date Implemented	Was Community Informed? (How?)	Impact Observed
1					☐ Yes ☐ No	
2					☐ Yes ☐ No	
3					☐ Yes ☐ No	
4					☐ Yes ☐ No	
5					☐ Yes ☐ No	

Feedback that was reviewed but NOT acted upon — and the reason:
Transparency on non-action is equally important for accountability

4
AAP PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DASHBOARD

Report against FSAC mandatory AAP indicators for the reporting period. Use PDM data, CFM logs, and field reports.

Indicator	Target	This Quarter Actual	Trend vs. Last Quarter	Status	Action Required
% beneficiaries aware of CFM channels (PDM)	90%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
% beneficiaries confident in CFM (PDM)	75%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
% complaints acknowledged within 3 days	90%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
% complaints resolved within 15 days	85%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
PDM conducted per distribution	1 per dist.		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
Programme adaptations (cumulative)	≥3/cycle		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
Pre-distribution orientation conducted	100%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
SEA referrals actioned same day	100%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	
Female staff % in field teams	≥30%		↑ / → / ↓	☐ On track ☐ At risk ☐ Off track	

5

LESSONS LEARNED AND FORWARD RECOMMENDATIONS
5.1 What Worked Well This Quarter

Describe AAP practices, approaches, or tools that demonstrated positive results:
Be specific — include evidence or examples where possible

5.2 What Did Not Work — Challenges and Gaps

Challenge / Gap	Root Cause Analysis	Recommended Action	Owner	Timeline

5.3 Key Recommendations for Next Quarter

Recommendations for this organization's programme team:

Recommendations for FSAC cluster / sub-national cluster:

Issues requiring cluster-level advocacy, coordination, or guidance

Recommendations for FSAC AAP TWG (tools, training, guidance gaps):

5.4 Innovations and Practices Worth Sharing

Describe any innovative AAP approaches used this quarter that other partners could replicate:
This feeds into FSAC collective learning

6	SIGN-OFF AND SUBMISSION
----------	--------------------------------

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Prepared By (MEAL/AAP Focal Point)			
Reviewed By (Programme Manager)			
Approved for Submission (Country Director / equivalent)			

Submission Requirements
PARTNER LEVEL: Submit to FSAC Sub-National Cluster Coordinator within 15 days of quarter-end. SUB-NATIONAL CLUSTER: Aggregate partner data and submit compiled brief to FSAC National Cluster within 20 days of quarter-end. NATIONAL CLUSTER / AAP TWG: Publish anonymized compilation brief to all FSAC partners within 30 days of quarter-end. Questions? Contact the FSAC AAP TWG: [Insert contact details]