



UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS



INCEPTION REPORT FOR THE

Survey to Assess Beneficiary Participation and Accountability under LGDP II and the Baseline Survey for the LGMSDP

Uganda Bureau of Statistics
P.O. Box 7186
Kampala
Tel: 041 706000
Fax: 230370
E-mail: ubos@ubos.org
Website: www.ubos.org

September 2007

1.0 Introduction

The Constitution of Uganda and the Local Government Act 1997 with its amendments have transferred the responsibility for service delivery from the central Government to Local Governments. In support of the above, the second Local Government Development Program (LGDP II) was designed basing on the first LGDP (LGDP I) which was implemented from October 2000 to June 2003.

2.0 Objectives

The LGDP II aims to improve on Local Government (LGs) performance of their statutory service obligations through effective, efficient and participatory LG planning, budgeting, resource allocation, improved accountability and M & E procedures, and to enhance the capacity of Ministry of Local Government to support the LGs and ensure proper coordination of capacity building and further development of a coherent decentralization policy and implementation.

The design of the LGDP II is based on the following overall *principles*:

- support the Government's decentralization policy and coordination of various initiatives, including supporting the FDS implementation,
- ensure that investments are financially viable and that the operational and maintenance costs are adequately addressed in the planning, budgeting and budget execution procedures;
- provide enhanced discretionary power for LGs to plan, budget and allocate resources according to local priorities with incentives to address national targets, and strong downwards and up-wards accountability;
- build incentives for LGs to improve administrative performance, ensure sustainable development in own revenue sources and address the key basic service delivery areas;

- ensure ownership and participation and involvement of all levels of LGs,
- improve LG administrative capacity by a demand-driven approach, combined with improved overall national coordination and quality assurance;
- provide support to more future viable LGs by focusing on supporting own revenue sources (legal framework, administration and learning) and finally;
- to improve on the relationship between central and local governments by supporting the Ministry directly in charge of decentralization, i.e. MoLG.

3.0 The Local Government Baseline and Beneficiary Assessment Survey

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) has been identified as the institution to undertake the survey following a need from LGDP II to assess information of citizens and LG officials on their perception of participation, transparency and accountability under decentralized arrangements. UBOS commenced the assignment with the development of an inception report.

3.1 Geographical Scope

The survey will cover the entire country. The household based interviews will be spread countrywide. However, qualitative information will be collected from officials in higher local governments, CSOs and the Private sector engaged in the provision of services funded under LGDP, as well as selected communities across the country.

3.2 Purpose of the Survey

The survey aims to:

- (a) collect and establish a baseline information from LGDP II beneficiaries on their perception of participation, transparency and accountability, LG planning and budgeting and resource allocation in the Local Government Management and Service Delivery Project (LGMSD)

- (b) provide information for the assessment of the performance of LGDP II
- (c) provide guidance and specific recommendations on enhancing participation, transparency and accountability in LGs
- (d) design a sample of LGs and households that will form a panel of households and LGs in future.

3.3 Modules to be covered

Three modules will be covered in this survey; the socio-economic module, the community module and the qualitative module (comprising of Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions). The socio-economic module will cover the following areas:

- General personal and demographic characteristics of household members
- Awareness of LGDP activities
- Beneficiary participation in LGDP activities
- Facilitation and support

The community module will cover:

- Community characteristics
- Community history
- Community participation in LGDP II activities
- Community projects under LGDP II

The questionnaires for the survey will comprise specific questions on access and quality of services with regard to LGDP II projects in the various sectors of:

- Health
- Roads
- Education
- Water and Sanitation
- Production (agriculture and veterinary services)

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Survey Design

The survey has been conducted as a 'two-in-one' study, comprising an assessment of beneficiary participation and accountability under Local Government Development Project (LGDP II) and a baseline survey for the Local Government Management and Service Delivery Project (LGMSDP). Information from both studies is synonymous as the findings on LGDP II will form part of the baseline information for the LGMSDP.

4.2 Sampling Plan

Aspects that have been considered in designing an appropriate sampling plan;

1. The Higher local governments received disbursements under different tranches under the LGDP I and the LGDP II. In order to cater for the difference in stages of implementation due to the phasing, the HLGs have been grouped into 3 strata namely: Municipalities (13), Old districts (69) and new districts (11) where the new districts are those that were created after 2005.
2. The survey to assess beneficiary participation and accountability under LGDP II has been interpreted as a one time survey for which an appropriate sample size of 1500 households has been determined using the formula and sampling information presented in annex II.
3. The LGMSDP baseline study include a treatment and control approach and the appropriate sample size for each group has been determined as 500 households translating into a total of 1000 households (500 treatment and 500 control) for any follow-up survey. The formula and sampling information are contained in Annex II.

The categorization of control and treatment in this survey will be difficult given that all districts (both old and new) have at least benefited from LGDP II. The control-treatment classification would be most appropriate in the LDGP II successor programme and the proposed panel of households would provide useful information in future. Since the two surveys will take place concurrently, the larger sample size of 1500 households corresponding to the LGDP II assessment will be used with the assumption that this includes the 1000 households required for the LGMSDP follow-up surveys.

4.3 Sample allocation:

The sample has been distributed within the three strata in proportion to the number of Higher Local Governments that comprise each group as shown in the table below:

| Stratum | Number of HLGs | Percentage (%) | Sample | Number of EAs |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Municipalities | 14 | 14.0 | 300 | 30 |
| Old districts | 69 | 74.2 | 1000 | 100 |
| New districts | 11 | 11.8 | 200 | 20 |
| Overall | 94 | 100.0 | 1500 | 150 |

Considering that districts received funds under different tranches with LGDP I, the parent project to LGDP II, the sample was further distributed within the strata by the proportion of HLGs in each tranche to ensure fair representation of HLGs by the level of implementation of the programme.

In the last stage of the sampling, with the help of the LC I chairpersons of the selected LC I, all the households within the LC I will be listed. From the list, 10 households will be randomly selected for interviews.

4.4 Sample selection procedure

As a first step, a frame list of Enumeration Areas (EAs) comprising the lowest administrative units: 'Local Council 1' from the Uganda Population Census conducted in 2002 will be used as the Sampling Frame. It contains information on the population sizes and number of households in these EAs. The Sampling Frame had a total of 33,329 EAs. The list was not placed in any particular order but will be initially divided into three parts corresponding to the three strata: Municipalities, Old districts and new districts.

The allocation of EAs in each domain will be used to determine how many households are to be allocated to each area. The measure of size i.e. the number of households (or occupied housing units) at the time of the 2002 Census was cumulated in each of the domains. A sampling interval (k) equal to the cumulative number (N) of households in each domain divided by the number (n) of EAs allocated to the domain will be computed. A random number between 1 and the sampling interval (k) will be selected

as the random start. The EAs will then be selected using Systematic Sampling within each domain.

4.5 Data Collection Process

4.5.1 Quantitative Data Collection

The quantitative data will be collected at two levels (Community and Household) using questionnaires. A structured community questionnaire will be administered to each selected LC1. The respondents at community level will be the LC 1 leaders, and opinion leaders.

The household questionnaire will be administered in 10 selected households. In each selected household, the interview will be administered to the household head or a household member knowledgeable about the affairs of the household. If no eligible respondents in the household are available in the selected household, a call back visit will be arranged. Because of the limited time for data collection the maximum call back visits before a household is substituted will be two (2).

4.5.2 Qualitative Data Collection

Information will be collected through key informant interviews with key stakeholders in the LGDP II implementation including; the Chief Administrative Officers, Sub-county Chiefs, Private firms, and key civil society organizations.

In addition qualitative data will be collected for 20 randomly selected communities through Focus Group Discussions. The number of FGDs per district will be determined in proportion to the number of EAs the district contributes to the overall sample.

5. THE PLANNED NEXT STEPS IN THE EXECUTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The questionnaires presented are to be pre-tested and piloted before the actual survey takes place. This task and the subsequent activities are detailed out in the work plan. The survey is expected to start on October 1st 2007 with the recruitment and training of field staff to undertake the pretest. Thereafter, the activities that will lead to the main fieldwork include; revision of the questionnaires and manuals after pretest, recruitment

of additional field staff, printing of questionnaires, training and deployment of field workers.

5.1 Project organization

The Management team comprising of Mr. Mukulu Andrew, Mr. Muwonge James and Mr. Kagugube Johnson will be responsible for the assignment on behalf of UBOS and will work closely with the Project Coordination Office of LGDP II.

5.2 Field Survey Organization

A centralized approach to data collection comprising 10 field teams, will used. Fieldwork will be undertaken with the use of mobile field teams whereby field activities will be programmed from the headquarters. Each team will consist of one Supervisor, 4 Interviewers and one Driver.

There are four statistical regions, and the teams will be recruited basing on the languages commonly spoken in each region. In total, there were 10 Team leaders, 10 Editors, 40 Interviewers and 10 Drivers. For purposes of quality control and senior supervision, a team of 4 Regional Supervisors and 4 Senior Supervisors will be used.

5.3 Data Collection

Firstly, the Consultant will comprehensively review relevant documents to acquaint themselves with LGDP mission, goals, objectives, status, policy, products, procedures and practices. The review will be an effective way of obtaining operationally relevant information on factors affecting project success. This will enable the Consultants to acquaint themselves with baseline data on clientele, indicators of change, how changes were monitored and evaluated, and the institutional responsibility for monitoring and evaluation.

In addition, the Consultant will review the World Bank Logical frameworks and internalize the performance indicators that are used to measure progress of interventions attained against set targets. This is intended to inform the Consultant

about how the target beneficiaries, their households, and communities are expected to benefit in the long term as a result of the project.

A semi-structured questionnaire will be used to collect quantitative and qualitative data at household level while a participatory and consultative approach will be used through guided Focus group Discussions at community level. The scope of the consultations will also include;

- (a) Introductory consultations with the district political leadership, for example, LC V Chairpersons, and Secretaries for Education, Health, Production and Works.
- (b) Guided consultations with district level focus persons of LGDP II in each of the districts,
- (c) Technical Officers involved in LGDP II implementation.

5.4 Data Processing and analysis

To ensure good quality of data, questionnaires will be subjected to manual scrutiny by field editors to assess the consistency of the data collected. Data entry will be done by a team of 10 data entrants using an application designed in CS-PRO. A system of double entry will be used. A computer program (hot-deck scrutiny) for verification and validation will be included in the data-entry program to ensure Range and consistency checks.

More intensive and thorough batch edits will be carried out using MS-ACCESS by the processing team. A preliminary analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data obtained from the field survey will be done and the results reviewed in consultation with the field team for consistency and validation.

After data cleaning, the data set will be converted to STATA to enable generation of analytical tables and graphs.

Annex I: Proposed Survey Work Plan

| | Month / Week | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------|------|------|--------------|------|------|------|---------------|------|------|------|-----------|------|
| | September 2007 | | | | October 2007 | | | | November 2007 | | | | Dec. 2007 | |
| | Wk 1 | Wk 2 | Wk 3 | Wk 4 | Wk 1 | Wk 2 | Wk 3 | Wk 4 | Wk 1 | Wk 2 | Wk 3 | Wk 4 | Wk 1 | Wk 2 |
| Appoint Core Survey Team | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sample Design and Sample selection | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepare draft Questionnaires, Manuals | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pretest of Survey Instruments | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | |
| Finalization of Questionnaires, Manuals | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | |
| Translation of Questionnaires | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | |
| Recruitment and training of field staff | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | |
| Printing Final Questionnaires, Manuals | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | |
| Main Field Work | | | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | |
| Data entry, editing and cleaning | | | | | | | | | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | |
| Data analysis and preliminary report | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | |
| Production of final report | | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | ■ |

Annex II: Sample Size Determination

The sample size for LGDP II study

The key statistic used for estimation was the proportion of Higher Local Governments (HLGs) that have received LGDP II funds, which is about 81 per cent.

The formula below was used to compute the minimum size of the unrestricted simple random sample:

$$n = 1.96^2 pq / c^2$$

Where p is the proportion of higher Local Governments that have received LGDP II funds

$q=1-p$ c is the confidence interval

The sample size was multiplied by the number of strata (=3) to cater for further stratification below national level. It was further adjusted to account for the design effect and lastly for non-response assumed to be 10 percent. Table A.1 shows key information used to derive the unrestricted simple random sample size and finally the overall adjusted sample of approximately **1500** households.

Table A.1: Computation of sample size

| | Component | Estimate |
|----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Total Number of Households | 5208198 |
| 2 | Baseline sample proportion(p)= | 0.812 |
| 3 | z = | 1.96 |
| 4 | $q=(1-p)$ | 0.188 |
| 5 | pq = | 0.152656 |
| 6 | B = | 0.05 |
| 7 | B squared= | 0.0025 |
| 8 | $deff$ = | 2 |
| 10 | Number of Stratum | 3 |
| 11 | Unrestricted sample size | 234.6 |
| 12 | Implied sample size | 234.6 |
| 14 | Adj. for design effect | 469.1 |
| 13 | Adj. for proposed number of stratum | 1407.4 |
| 15 | Adj. for non-response | 1477.8 |
| | Overall adjusted sample size | 1500 |

The sample size for LGMSDP follow-up studies

The following formula (Basic Equation 1) has been used to for each survey round or each comparison group for follow-up studies to track and evaluate the LGMSDP

Basic Equation 1: Proportions

$$n = D [(Z_{\alpha} + Z_{\beta})^2 * (P_1 (1 - P_1) + P_2 (1 - P_2)) / (P_2 - P_1)^2]$$

KEY:

- n = required minimum sample size per survey round or comparison group
- D = design effect (assumed in the following equations to be the *default* value of 2 - see Section 3.4 below)
- P₁ = the estimated level of an indicator measured as a proportion at the time of the first survey or for the control area
- P₂ = the *expected* level of the indicator either at some future date or for the project area such that the quantity (P₂ - P₁) is the size of the magnitude of change it is desired to be able to detect
- Z_α = the Z-score corresponding to the degree of confidence with which it is desired to be able to conclude that an observed change of size (P₂ - P₁) would not have occurred by chance (α - the level of statistical significance), and
- Z_β = the z-score corresponding to the degree of confidence with which it is desired to be certain of detecting a change of size (P₂ - P₁) if one actually occurred (β - statistical power).

It was assumed that there will be an increase of 20 percentage points in the proportion of communities receiving LGMSDP funds by the time of the first follow-up survey. It is assumed further that at the time of the first survey, about 50 percent of communities will have received LGMSDP funds. In this case, P₁ = .50 and P₂ = .70. Using standard parameters of 95 percent level of significance (α) and 80 percent power (β), the z-scores were determined as Z_α = 1.645 and Z_β = 0.840. Table A.2 shows key information used to derive the unrestricted simple random sample size and finally the overall adjusted sample of approximately **500** households per comparison group for the follow-up survey.

Table A.2: Computation of sample size

| Component | | Estimate |
|--|-------|-----------------|
| Design effect | D | 2 |
| Z-score for statistical significance | Z_a | 1.645 |
| Z-score for statistical power | Z_b | 0.9 |
| Estimated level of indicator at time of baseline | P_1 | 0.5 |
| Estimated level of indicator at time of follow-up survey | P_2 | 0.7 |
| Ultimate Sampling Size per comparison group | n | 149 |
| Number of stratum | | 3 |
| Adj. for number of Stratum | | 446.9 |
| Adj. for Non-response | | 491.6 |
| Overall adjusted sample size per comparison group | | 500 |

Annex III: Beneficiary Assessment Question Checklist

The aim of the Qualitative Assessment is to generate information that will compliment the Quantitative findings. Information will be generated through; Key Informant Interviews; Case Studies; Focus Group Discussions; Rankings and Beneficiary Assessment Tools. Level of Assessment:

- *District*
- *Sub-county*
- *Community (LC 1)*
- *In addition, some key private firms and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) that participated in the implementation of LGDP II will be consulted.*

1. District Checklist

The purpose of this checklist is to seek learning points from a cross-section of development partners and stakeholders. The aim will be to ascertain the extent to which the LGDP II implementation and management process made progress, succeeded, and created social impact to beneficiaries, and how best it can be improved in future LGDPs.

Key informant interviews will be held with the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO).

Part A: LGDP II Investments

Governance

- I. How much money was received by the district (Consider duration of LGDP II)
- II. Record investments undertaken in the district by sub-county
- III. What investment projects did your local government/ department undertake under LGDP II? –Projects (could be water, roads etc, *Location and cost of the projects*)
- IV. How was the decision to invest in these projects arrived at?
- V. How are these projects managed (*probe whether there is a project management committee, how often the committee meet, are committee decisions adhered to*)?
- VI. How do the beneficiaries (users) of the project communicate their views to the committee?

- VII. Would you consider extending the management principles used in this project to other local governments' initiatives?
- VIII. Are the facilities functional? *(is it working, is it not working, when did it last stop working?)*
- IX. What major constraints/challenges did this local government/department face in executing LGDP II funded investments?
- X. How often does the council, District Executive Committee (DEC) and District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) meet *(probe what issues are discussed, quality of resolutions. Check minute books)?*
- XI. Have you experienced conflict between politicians and civil servants? If yes explain the circumstances and find out whether such cases are on the increase/decline.
- XII. Have they impacted on project implementation like halting construction of the road, well etc
- XIII. Have you witnessed cases of corruption in you council *(probe the trend, number of officials interdicted/arrested, also probe the role of district Public Accounts Committee -PAC)?*
- XIV. Do you consider the goods and services private firms provided to be of desired quality? How about the CSOs?

Part B: Capacity Building

- I. Has this local government/ department benefited from the training (*Capacity Building Grant*) sponsored by the LGDP II project *(probe numbers of staff, course title, duration of training and evaluation of the training)?*
- II. Was training generally accessed by “intended” beneficiaries?
- III. How has the capacity building activities affected staff performance in their respective councils/ department *(probe tasks i.e records keeping, reporting etc..)* which have improved?
- IV. What major challenges/ constraints in accessing and utilising capacity building grants?

Part C: Accountability

- I. How effective is the flow of information and funds between Program Coordination Unit/MOLG and the District. (Probe for flow of funds within the District *(departments and Lower level local governments)*)?
- II. Are you satisfied with the way LGDP funds were utilized?
 - If yes, were the funds used for the intended purpose?
 - Are you satisfied with the resource allocation criteria?
 - Are you satisfied with the resource disbursement mechanism?
- III. How effective is the existing reporting mechanisms for utilizing project funds and reporting progress *(to whom do you report to and how often)*?

Part D: Local Government Processes

- How has the annual Assessment exercise and the associated incentive system affected the local government processes *(staffing, planning, financial management, resource allocation, revenue mobilization, procurements and accountability)*?
- What management constraints did you face in the implementation of LGDP II investments in your local government?
- Is there any one factor that, in your view, has most significantly influenced the contribution and impact of LGDP II project at a local government level? *(opportunities or challenges)*
- How best do you think LGDP II should have been managed at district level in terms of planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring, supervision and reporting?
- Do you think the LGDP II investments have positively impacted on the community beneficiaries and beyond *(probe issues to do with service delivery, governance, quality of life and livelihood)*?
- Recommendations on how LGDP II should be managed to achieve its intended objectives.
- How has the Annual Assessment exercise and the associated incentive system affected resource allocation and accountability.
- What are the major challenges and constraints faced in implementation of LGDP II investments.

2. Sub County Checklist

The purpose of this checklist is to seek learning points from a cross-section of development partners and stakeholders. This will be aimed at ascertaining the extent to which the LGDP II implementation and management process made progress, succeeded, and created social impact to beneficiaries, and how best it can be improved in future LGDP programs.

Key informant interviews will be held with the Senior Assistant Secretary (Subcounty Chief).

Part A: Investments

Governance

- How much money was received by the sub-county (Consider duration of LGDP II)
- Record investments undertaken in the sub-county by parish
- What investment projects did your local government/department undertake under LGDP II?
- How are facilities put in place by LGDP II utilized?
- Are the facilities functional? (is it working, is it not working, when did it last stop working?)
- How was the decision to invest in these projects arrived at?
- How are these projects managed (probe whether there is a project management committee, how often the committee meet, are committee decisions adhered to)?
- Are you satisfied with the way these projects were managed?
- How do the beneficiaries (users) of the project communicate their views to the committee
- Would you consider extending the management principles used in this project to other local governments' initiatives?
- How often does the council, DEC and DTPC meet (probe what issues are discussed, quality of resolutions. Check minute books)?

- Have you experienced conflict between politicians and civil servants? If yes explain the circumstances and find out whether such cases are on the increase/decline
- Have they impacted on project implementation like halting construction of the road, well etc
- Have you witnessed cases of corruption in your council (probe the trend, number of *officials interdicted/arrested, also probe the role of district PAC*)?

Part B: Capacity Building

- I. Has this local government/department benefited from the training sponsored by the LGDP II project (*probe numbers of staff, course title, duration of training and evaluation of the training*)?
- II. How has the capacity building activities affected staff performance in their respective councils/department (*probe tasks i.e. records keeping, reporting etc*) which have improved?
- III. What major challenges/constraints in accessing and utilizing capacity building grants?

Part C: Accountability

1. How effective is the flow of information between District and Lower level local governments?
2. Are you satisfied with the way LGDP II funds were utilized?
3. If yes, were the funds used for the intended purposes?
4. Are you satisfied with the resource allocation criteria?
5. Are you satisfied with the resource disbursement mechanism?
6. Are the funds adequately disbursed to meet the challenges faced by the local government development investments?
7. How effective is the existing reporting mechanisms for utilizing project funds and reporting progress (*to whom do you report to and how often*)?

Part D: Local Government Processes

- How has the annual Assessment exercise and the associated incentive system affected the local government processes (*staffing, planning, financial*)

management, resource allocation, revenue mobilization, procurements and accountability)?

- What major constraints/challenges did this local government/department face in executing LGDP II funded investments?
- How best do you think LGDP II should have been managed at district level in terms of planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and supervision and reporting?
- Do you think the LGDP II investments have positively impacted on the community beneficiaries and beyond (probe issues to do with service delivery, governance, quality of life and livelihood)?
- Recommendations on how LGDP II should be managed to achieve its intended objectives.

3. CSOs Checklist

1. What areas of collaboration and partnership are existing between your organisation and the council?
2. What support have you extended to local governments in the previous two years (both HLGs and LLGs)?
3. What support have you received from local governments in the previous two years (both HLGs and LLGs)?
4. What benefits has the community got from LGDP II investment/projects?
5. How are facilities put in place by LGDP II utilized?
6. Are there user fees, completely free or regularly pay?
7. Are the facilities functional? *(Is it working, is it not working, when did it last stop working?)*
8. What local government processes are CSOs involved *(planning, capacity building etc)* and how has it impacted on service delivery?
9. How has LGDP II processes impacted on CSO (NGOs) method of work *(planning, accounting and procurements etc)?*

4. Private Firms *(Local governments Service providers)* Checklist

- What services/goods have you provided to local governments?
- What processes did you go through to provide goods and services?
- How effective are local government in contract management (*time to process payment, supervision, certification*)
- What are the challenges and problems?
- How has the private sector benefited from LGDP II investment?
- What positive changes have you realised as a result of providing services to LGs and community (*in terms of method of work, business management and practice, skills etc*)?
- Make an assessment of the quality of goods that you provided.

5. Interview Guide /Checklist – FGD Community Level

District : _____

Sub-county : _____

Parish: _____

Village: _____

Date: _____

No. of Participants: Girls:_____ Boys:_____ Adult Males:_____ Adult Females:_____

Facilitators:_____

Introduction: LGDP II was aimed at promoting a financial framework whereby most of the decisions of the regarding investment in development projects are taken by the Local Governments (LC5, LC3 and LC 2). The main areas of investment were: water and sanitation, health, education, roads, and agricultural extension. We would like to collect some information regarding your experience in LGDP II.

What investment projects (Sector???) did your Local Government undertake under LGDP II:

| Water | Sanitati on | Healt h | Educati on | Road s | Vet erin ary | Ent om olo gy | Drai nag e | Mar kets | Fish erie s | Stre et Ligh ting | Waste Manage ment | Agricult ural | Other (Specify) |
|-------|----------------|------------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

1. How was the decision to invest in these projects arrived at? (*Description of process: (What factors were considered? Who was involved?; How were the marginalized groups represented: like the poor, disabled, youth women)*)

2. Was a management committee formed?
 - If a management committee was formed ask:
 - How often does the management committee meet? –Composition?
 - How do people outside of this committee learn about its decisions?
 - How well are the committee’s decisions adhered to?
 - How do the beneficiaries (users) of the project communicate their views to the committee?
3. Would you consider using the management committee beyond the life of the project?
 - If Yes /No: explain why:
 - Would you consider extending the management principles used in this project to other initiatives?
4. Has the performance of your Local Council improved as a result of this project?
 - (If Yes/No ask respondent to explain their answer)
 - In what ways has the performance improved (*Probe for Accountability, Transparency, Timeliness, and Quality of services*)

Access to services: WATER

- Is this water source functioning? *Probe: How well is it functioning in terms of amount of water, its quality and frequency of breakdowns.*
- How many households use this water source? (*Probe: what proportion is this of the households in the village/parish*)
- Do you pay for the use of this water source? If yes, what is the mode of payment? What is the user fee? Can people afford the cost? If No, how does the community meet the water needs of those who do not contribute?
- How was this scheme decided? (*Probe for the consultation process.*)
- How far are the farthest users of this water source?
- In your opinion how much time do they spend in fetching water from this water source?
- How has the construction of this water source affected life in the community?
*Probe: In terms of time spent in fetching water (especially by school children)
 Number of households using safe water.; Water source functioning well?*

- Are there any water borne diseases such as diarrhea, dysentery etc in the community
- Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project?
- If Yes, how many?
- Are you satisfied with the items or service?
- why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

Access to services: HEALTH

1. Is this health facility functioning? Probe: How well is it functioning in terms of all parts being functional (laboratory, theater, maternity, availability of drugs, and staffing levels)
2. How many households use this facility?
Probe: what proportion is this of the households in the village/parish use the facility.
3. Do you pay for the use of this facility?
4. If yes, what items do you pay for?
5. What is the user fee?
6. Can people afford the cost? If No, how does the community meet the costs of repair/maintenance?
Probe: Easily/with difficulty?
7. How far are the farthest users of this facility?
8. In your opinion, how much time do they spend in coming to this facility?
9. How has the construction of this facility affected life in the community?
Probe: In terms of time spent in coming to this health center (especially by women and children.
10. Number of households using the facility
11. Number of immunizations, antenatal attendances, outpatient visits, etc.
12. Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project?
13. If Yes, how many?
14. Apart from jobs created during its construction has the facility led to more jobs for members of the community?
15. Are you satisfied with the items or service?

16. why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

Access to services: EDUCATION FACILITY

1. Is this school fully functioning? Probe: How well is it functioning in terms of numbers of pupils, teachers, desks, whether the buildings were completed etc
2. How many households use this school?
Probe: what proportion is this of the households in the village/parish
3. Do you pay for the use of this school?
4. If Yes, what is the user fee?
5. Can people afford the cost? If No, how does the community meet the costs of repair/maintenance?
Probe: Easily/with difficulty? Change in enrolment?
6. How far are the farthest users of this school?
7. In your opinion, how much time do they spend in coming to attend school?
8. How has the construction of this school affected life in the community?
Probe: In terms of time spent in coming to attend school, numbers attending school
9. Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project? If Yes, how many?
10. Has the presence of this school created additional jobs in this community (Please explain)
11. Are you satisfied with the items or service?
12. why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

Access to services: ROADS

1. Is this road in a good condition? Probe: How well is it functioning in terms of usability especially during the rainy season.
2. What is the main traffic on this road –whether used for ferrying merchandise or for connecting communities to services?

3. How has the construction of this road affected life in the community?
Probe: In terms of time spent and enabling reaching services such as hospitals, schools and markets.
4. What arrangements are there for the maintenance and/or repair of this road?
5. Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project? If Yes, how many?
6. Besides those jobs created during construction are there new employment opportunities arising out of the presence of this road?
7. Are you satisfied with the items or service?
8. why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

E. Access to services: PROVISION OF INPUTS

1. Did community members receive (...items)/a service(..like capacity building)?
Probe: How well is it performing- topics covered, numbers received/attending, and usefulness of service/item.
2. How many households are reached by this service or recieved?
Probe: what proportion is this of the households in the village/parish.
3. Do you pay for the use of this service/items?
4. If Yes, How much?
5. How has the availability of this service or how have they affected life in the community?
Probe: In terms of time quality of agriculture, productivity, marketability of crops and animal products.
6. Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project?
7. If Yes, how many?
8. Are you satisfied with the items or service?
9. why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

**F. Access to services: PROVISION OF VETERINARY AND FISHERIES SERVICES
(EXORTIC GOATS, FISH PONDS, FISH FRIES, ETC)**

1. Is this service available to members of the community? Probe: How well is it performing- topics covered, numbers attending, and usefulness of service.
2. How many households are reached by this service?
Probe: what proportion is this of the households in the village/parish.
3. Do you pay for the use of this service?
4. If Yes, How much?
5. How has the availability of this service affected life in the community?
Probe: In terms of time quality of agriculture, productivity, marketability of crops and animal products.
6. Were any jobs created during the implementation of this project?
7. If Yes, how many?
8. Are you satisfied with the items or service?
9. why? (reasons for the response whether yes or no)

Annex IV: Survey Questionnaires