

**Report on visit to UP for Orientation of Team
16th October to 20th October, 2006
Manila, Philippines**

This is the report on the work carried out during the period by Dr. Sita Sekhar of Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore. This orientation workshop was held with the following objectives:

1. Orientation of the University of Philippines team on the two toolkits – CRC and CIB.
2. Defining roles and responsibilities for the UP team, PAC, ACIG and the ADB project team.
3. Setting timelines for the different activities at different stages in the project.
4. Meeting with Officials from the Project sites.

While objectives one to three were achieved as described later, objective four was achieved only partially. It was earlier decided through discussions by the ADB team with the Mayor of Makati city and conveyed to PAC and ACIG that Makati City would be one of the project sites. However, due to the political situation in the city, the meeting with the officials of Makati city could not be held. It is still hoped that things will settle down soon and Makati will be retained. In case this does not happen, there would be a substitution with another site.

The workshop – Day 1 – 16th October, 2006

The day began with an introduction of the project and its broader goals to the team by Dr. Joel Mangahas. This was followed by two sessions on the ACIG toolkit and the CRC toolkit and the methodologies thereof conducted by Bryn Campbell of ACIG and Sita Sekhar of PAC. The UP team was divided into two teams – it was proposed that each team of 4 members work on one CIB and one CRC project. The division of the team was as follows. –

Team 1 – Rami, Erwin, Mary Lou, and Isa

Team 2 – Emalyn, Ebie, Sammy and Bootes.

The sessions continued up to 5pm. After that there was a discussion with Raza Ahmad of ADB on the plans for the project. In this meeting ACIG and PAC were informed about the visits made by the ADB team to Malaysia, Naawan and Makati in Philippines and the proposed visit to Pakistan in November.

Day2 - - 17th October, 2006

The day began with the CRC film being shown to the teams. The teams were designated into CRC and CIB teams and it was agreed that each team use the toolkit twice to get better equipped to use it in the future. Team 1 chose to do the CIB and team 2 the CRC. The rest of the day was spent working out a workplan for the two sites – Naawan and Makati for both teams.

Day3 – 18th October 27, 2006

The first half of the day was spent in a meeting with other stakeholders in the project – DILG, Naawan water supply officials, HUDCC etc. They were given an overview of the toolkits and told about the project plans. The representatives gave good inputs for both the toolkits. There was general agreement on the usefulness of the toolkits for service delivery improvements. The two teams collected required information from the water supply board officials of Naawan.

In the afternoon, the two teams spent time with the facilitators making plans for the Naawan part of the project. The CRC team was instructed to prepare a checklist for the FGD and fieldplan and send to the facilitator the next day.

The deliberations over the week led to required outputs, approach and methodology, implementation arrangements, being generated. These can be summarized and translated as follows.

Required Outputs

Broadly there are three outputs expected out of the project.

1. Implementation of the CRC approach in two sites.
2. Development of version 2 of the toolkit.
3. Incorporation of the toolkit into the curriculum of the training institute.

I. Implementation of the CRC in two sites

Outputs: It was agreed upon that the CRC team would use the toolkit to implement service delivery improvements in two sites in the Philippines – Naawan and Makati. This would lead to the following specific outputs for each of the sites.

1. Assessment report
2. FGD report
3. formation of consortium
4. Questionnaire
5. Sampling design
6. fieldwork implementation and monitoring plan
7. CRC survey
8. data entry and analysis
9. report of the CRC findings
10. dissemination strategy plan
11. advocacy plan
- 12. process audit report**

Approach and methodology

The approach and methodology to be used for each of these outputs is as follows. These would have to be adapted for each site according to the requirement.

1. The CRC team would need to use the rapid assessment scorecard given in the toolkit to do the assessment.
2. Preparation of the FGD report would require a visit to the site to carry out the FGD using a checklist. The proceedings of the FGD should be recorded into the report.
3. Consortium of stakeholders has to be formed at the site, roles decided and plans made for consultations among the members.
4. Based on the FGD report and secondary data collected, the questionnaire would need to be designed. The draft questionnaire has to be tested in the field through the pilot fieldwork. Subsequent to the pilot and the comments received from the facilitators, investigators or field staff after their briefing, the questionnaire will be finalized.
5. the sampling design has to be prepared using secondary data and keeping in mind the budget and time constraints.
6. depending on the sample size determined in the sampling design, the fieldwork plans would be made to decide whether to recruit investigators directly, or a research agency, who to recruit, whether to use volunteers, what size team to recruit for the survey, the time frame for the fieldwork, reporting pattern – frequency and modality, timelines for the briefing of the team, the survey, monitoring of the fieldwork.
7. the survey would be carried out and monitored as per the plan.
8. data entry and analysis plan is to be prepared. Decisions on who does the data entry and analysis, how, where it would be done and the time frame in which to do it are to be prepared and followed.
9. the CRC presentations in power point would be prepared based on the findings and then the report. The format for the report is to be as given in the toolkit. Plans need to be made on what chapters to include and what findings to highlight and how to present the findings.
10. a plan on dissemination has to be prepared to decide what is to be presented, who it is to be presented to and when.
11. advocacy plan is to be prepared to discuss reform measures and actions to be taken by service providers as well as civil society organizations and citizens.

Implementation arrangements

1. assessment score card to be completed and sent to PAC by the CRC UP team. PAC sends comments and assessment is finalized.
2. FGD to be conducted by UP CRC team on site and report sent to PAC. Report to be finalized by team after comments are received.

3. CRC UP team to visit site to make enquiries and meet likely members for joining the consortium. Likely people to meet would be local NGOs, CBOs, Religious organizations, prominent citizens and senior officials from service provider agencies. Once they get assent from a certain number of people the team holds a meeting to discuss further plans. Ideally the number of members in the consortium should be around 12 -15 and equal representation should be given to all stakeholders.
4. the first draft of the questionnaire should be prepared by the team based on data collected from the FGD. This should be sent to PAC and the service provider and consortium members for comments. All comments are to be incorporated before the pilot and briefing take place. Fine tuning would be done following the pilot and briefing. PAC would provide support in terms of revising and improving the questionnaire off site first and then on site.
5. the sampling design will be prepared by the team and then passed on to PAC for advice. PAC will provide advice on any modifications required.
6. the team would need to hire a team of investigators depending on the sample size. This can either be people who have been hired for a fee or volunteers – professionals or employees of NGOs etc. However the team needs to keep in mind the fact that the quality of investigators should not be compromised and no bias should be introduced. PAC will provide guidance once the initial groundwork is done by the team. PAC will also provide an assessment of the field team on site. The toolkit should be referred to extensively at this stage for tools that can be used, decisions to be taken and strategies to be adopted.
7. the fieldwork has to be closely monitored by the team. A field check plan should be prepared by the team with different team members monitoring the fieldwork at different times. The toolkit provides extensive advice on the care to be taken during the fieldwork. PAC will provide guidance on site at the beginning of the fieldwork.
8. while one half of the team is monitoring the fieldwork, the other half would prepare the data entry and analysis plan. This would be sent to PAC and PAC would provide their comments. PAC staff would also be involved in the discussions on what kind of analysis to do both offsite and onsite.
9. though the primary responsibility for the preparation of the presentations and report would lie with the UP CRC team, PAC would be closely involved at this stage – mostly on site.
10. the dissemination plan has to be prepared in consultation with the consortium members by the team. PAC would provide inputs primarily off site.
11. for the advocacy plan to be developed PAC would provide guidance through a 5day workshop on site. The team would be required to brainstorm with consortium members and among themselves to come up with a tentative plan.

Issues

1. one major issue is the reconciliation of the project budget with the workplan. For example the CRC approach requires the team to be onsite at critical stages such as the FGD, Consortium formation, fieldwork, presentation of findings and

- advocacy. The team needs to make plans to fit the budget and the workplan requirements.
2. PAC needs to be informed about the budget and workplan of the UP team to advise suitably.
 3. For the team to be trained efficiently, PAC has come up with the specified number of visits and the duration of the visits is tightly designed. Any modification would affect the quality of support provided.
 4. the timelines for the project were prepared at the preparatory workshop with the time frame of the RETA clearly in mind.
 5. communication among the key organizations of the project ie PAC, ADB secretariat, UP CRC team has been irregular, and not clear. Sometimes, information is not shared equally.

Recommendations

1. Adherence to schedules is critical to the completion of the project. Therefore all parties should do their best to stick to schedules.
2. Communication between and among – PAC, CRC team and the ADB Secretariat, should be clear, regular, and transparent.
3. to the extent possible the CRC team should look at the most cost effective options at all stages. However, the critical aspects of the CRC approach should not be compromised. for example while costs such as those for the venue for FGDs can be cut, the presence of the team at the initial stages, during the fieldwork and the final stages cannot be avoided. The team can discuss matters and come up with options such as longer stay as compared to more visits, and members taking turns to visit the site rather than going all at a time.
4. PAC strongly recommends an augmentation to the travel component of the budget to ensure effective training of the team to equip it to a) carry out CRCs independently in the region (with probably only offsite support from PAC) and b) to internalize the approach so as to incorporate it into their curriculum and disseminate their knowledge effectively.

There were no discussions held on the other two broad outputs namely the development of version 2 of the toolkit (output 2) and the incorporation of the toolkit into the curriculum at UP(output 3) during the workshop.

However, once the implementation of the CRC toolkit has been completed in the two DMCs one after the other, reports are received from the respective training institutes, PAC would be in a position to work on the revised version of the toolkit.

For Output 3, PAC would need further discussions with the UP Team in Philippines and the selected training institute in Pakistan to be able to come up with finer details.