**National Community Driven Development Project (NCDDP)**

**Process Evaluation of Project Implementation in Yolanda-affected municipalities**

Terms of Reference

1. **Background**

**The Philippines has a long history of participatory development, community empowerment and community-driven initiatives, which was given official support and recognition under the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC).** A key objective of the LGC is to increase the voice and participation of citizens in the devolved planning, budgeting and service delivery responsibilities of Local Government Units (LGUs). Historically, however, LGUs have struggled to fulfill the requirements of the LGC and to deliver on their governance and service provision mandates. This is due to a combination of factors such as: (i) entrenched patronage politics, (ii) limited technical capacity, (iii) the failure of mechanisms in the LGC to fully engage citizens in local development processes, and; (iv) an inter-governmental fiscal framework that promotes vertical and horizontal inequities and has no link to either performance or poverty. This can leave poorer LGUs in particular with inadequate resources and unfunded mandates. It can further result in many devolved functions still being implemented in whole or in part by National Government Agencies (NGAs).

**Against this background, Community-Based and Community Driven Development (CDD) approaches have been widely used by several sectors in the Philippines to support LGUs to improve the delivery of basic services and address poverty.** Building on years of support for CDD in the Philippines, the KALAHI-CIDSS National Community Driven Development Project (KC-NCDDP), approved in 2014, will be a major step forward in the evolution of the approach. KC-NCDDP builds on the successful KALAHI-CIDSS program that has been implemented by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), and will cover more than 840 of the poorest municipalities in the Philippines**.** The scale-up of CDD approaches coincides with additional efforts on the part of the Government of the Philippines to introduce participatory budgeting approaches and greater fiscal decentralization at municipal level through the Grassroots Participatory Budgeting Process – GPBP. The two programs, NCDDP and GPBP, are seen as complementary – both focusing on making public investments more responsive to and aligned with local development needs.

**KC-NCDDP aims to empower communities in targeted municipalities to achieve improved access to services and to participate in more inclusive local planning, budgeting and implementation**. This will be achieved by (i) strengthening community groups and *barangay* level institutions to better identify and articulate development needs, and manage public resources, (ii) financing priority small-scale community sub-projects, and (iii) enhancing the capacity of municipal-level government to partner with barangays in responding to priority development needs, and to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency.

**NCDDP follows the KALAHI CIDSS Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (CEAC) process outlined below.** A number of enhancements have been introduced in NCDDP design, building on the KALAHI-CIDSS Experience. In particular, DSWD has developed a new set of procedures for NCDDP implementation in post-disaster areas – a Disaster Response Operations Manual (DROM). The project targets in particular Yolanda affected municipalities in its first two years of implementation and will be a key element of Government post-disaster reconstruction strategy.

1. **Scope and key research questions**

Given this overall context, the process evaluation will focus primarily on assessing **the appropriateness of the Disaster Response Operations Manual** (proposed adaptationsto accelerate implementation in a post-disaster context) in the communities initially targeted during the project’s first year of implementation (Table 1).

****

The focus of the process evaluation will be to collect information that can help DSWD: (i) further refine project procedures for use in other disaster-affected areas; (ii) address gaps in procedures or in training of staff and; (iii) take corrective action as needed. In addition, data will be collected to provide a rapid assessment of how the KALAHI-CIDSS implementation experience has influenced DROM application (community mobilization and speed of response). This will be achieved by collecting data from old KC areas which have transitioned to NCDDP and from municipalities where no CDD programs have been implemented prior to NCDDP roll-out in 2014/2015.

**Table 2 – Site Selection for process evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NCDDP Yolanda Area (New Site)** | **NCDDP Yolanda Area (Previously Covered by KALAHI-CIDSS)** |
| Barangay 1 (Municipality 1) | Barangay 1 (Municipality 3) |
| Barangay 2 (Municipality 1) | Barangay 2 (Municipality 3) |
| Barangay 3 (Municipality 2) | Barangay 3 (Municipality 4) |
| Barangay 4 (Municipality 2) | Barangay 4 (Municipality 4) |

The analysis will focus on the following issues:

**(i) An initial understanding of community dynamics and local stakeholder engagement in the community planning processes**. In particular, given how community dynamics may have been significantly affected by the disaster, qualitative methods will be used to gain insights into the existence of different sub-groups within targeted communities, to better understand collaborative behavior and to map existing community organizations and initiatives which may support post-disaster recovery. The initial collection of information will focus on whether particular groups are more likely to be excluded from decision-making. Furthermore, the analysis will include a review of community planning processes, the identification of key groups, individuals that influence the decision-making process and a review of how vulnerable and marginalized groups engage with these community processes or face specific barriers to influence these decisions. **The analysis of the data collected will focus on understanding any differences between areas that are new to CDD and those where KALAHI-CIDSS was previously implemented.**

**(ii) A detailed understanding of the key steps in the project implementation process**. The research team will conduct periodic observations of project implementation and hold a series of Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews to collect information on the key issues outlined below. Selected information will be collected on the main project implementation steps. It will be important for the research team to familiarize themselves with the KALAHI-CIDSS and NCDDP Operations Manuals (OM), the Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (CEAC) and the DROM in order to develop a detailed field guide for the evaluation. The following questions provide an overview of the type of information that will be collected. A detailed field guide outlining the evaluation questions for each of the main steps in the DROM project cycle will be developed by the consultancy firm with DSWD and the WGB:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project phase** | **Process steps** | **Research questions** |
| **Social preparation** | Social mapping (and selection of informants) | The initial analysis carried out as part of the social mapping will help the research team gain a better understanding of the following: (i) which groups make up the community?; (ii) are communities homogenous re. ethnicity and religion?; (iii) what proportion of households have relocated due to the disaster? (temporarily/permanently) – i.e how has Yolanda affected the overall composition of the community?How harmonious are the group relations (e.g., is there any violence/conflict within the community or with neighboring communities?).How are relationships with local government units (Municipalities)? What sources of support for post-disaster reconstruction (kindly note this is different from relief) has the community received (what are the main programs, sources and remaining unmet needs) |
| Information dissemination about project interventions | What is the level of knowledge about the project in the targeted community?Are particular groups not aware of the project (or have limited information about the project)?Are adjustments necessary to the way information is conveyed to the community? |
| Disaster Needs Assessment  | How have volunteers been selected? Collect information on the profile of the volunteers: gender, whether volunteers are connected to the BLGU/community associations, (for example, have they previously occupied positions of leadership in the LGU?); have disasters affected they capacity to operate?What are participants’ perceptions of the Disaster Needs Assessment process? Are they able to engage given their workload/time-constraints? Are particular groups (who would like to be involved deterred from participating?), How do participants rate the guidance provided on DNA and training received on how to conduct it?What additional information has been provided to the community (to community volunteers) for the DNA? Has information been provided from secondary sources? From earlier DNAs conducted to assess relief needs?How was information collected? What are the main differences observed between the guidance in the DROM and its practical application?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** what proportion of current volunteers for post-disaster reconstruction were previous KALAHI-CIDSS volunteers? How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience contributed/or not to their understanding of DROM? Has experience with KC made communities more resilient to disasters? Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance on data collection (DNA stage)? |
| Establishing a Grievance Redress System | What initial information has been provided on the project’s Grievance Redress System?Are there any gaps in information or difficulties in establishing a functioning system? |
| Defining community priorities and vetting proposals | What information about the requirements of the DROM has been provided to the community barangay/municipal officials? What was the process used to prioritize barangays and initial sub-project ideas? What were the criteria used? How well were these understood by the Municipality, Barangay, and communities?Assess participation in the barangay meeting and MIAC that result in the initial short-list of “vetted sub–projects”. Are different cross-sections of the community represented (based on the initial community mapping are some groups over/under-represented?). How actively is each cross-section or group participating (quality of participation)? Is there any group dominating or steering the discussions? Assess the role of the CF, LGU officials during the prioritization process (to what extent is the final selection guided/influenced by their interventions during the discussion?). To what extent are “dissenting” view regarding priorities shared during discussions and taken into account? Were discussions held on Local Counterpart Contribution during the MIAC? If yes what was the outcome and what information was provided on the municipality on requirements?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** what proportion of participants in the barangay discussions and MIAC were familiar with KALAHI-CIDSS procedures? How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience contribute/or not to their understanding of the prioritization process. Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance?  |
| **Project development** | Technical support provided for proposal development | What technical support was provided by DSWD for the development of the sub-project? Are there any gaps that will need to be addressed? Particular attention will be paid to understand bottle-necks in the process that may need to be address to further streamline implementation.1. Outline the role of the AC; CF **and DAC**
2. Assess the adequacy of the AC (and **particularly DAC**: community ratio)

**Describe the technical review process** to which the sub-project was subjected. Please indicate the time-line for prioritization, project preparation, approval and receipt of the 1st tranche of funds by the community.**How many rounds of reviews** were conducted prior to approval and release of funds?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience influenced/not the way in which proposals were prepared and reviews conducted? Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance.  |
| Training of volunteers and development of sub-project proposals | How have the members of the project implementation committees been selected? What training have they received? Assess the extent to which they able to use the skills learned. Are there adjustments needed/recommended? (Additional training? Simplification of training materials for example?)How familiar are volunteers with procurement, financial management and environmental and social safeguards guidelines?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience influenced/not the way in which project procedures are understood and applied? Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance.  |
| **Project Implementation** | Beneficiary selection | What were the criteria used for beneficiary selection (private goods – e.g. housing reconstruction – or paid labor component of project activities?) What is the proportion of male/female beneficiaries? What process was used by the ACT to facilitate community validation of “beneficiary lists”? What role did the LGU play in this process? Did the LGU influence beneficiary selection process (in what way)?Is additional information needed in the DROM on targeting of beneficiary and adjustments to the community validation process which could help minimize elite capture?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience influenced/not the way in which beneficiary selection was carried out? Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance. |
| Small-scale infrastructure | Review the wage payment process and assess whether payments were made in a timely manner (adequate frequency for poor households?)Beyond the wage transfer was the infrastructure put in place considered useful (i.e. in line with priorities identified by the community?)How was the quality of construction ensured? And assessed? What standards (designs) were used? What supervision/inspection activities conducted?What were the main challenges during implementation (e.g. high costs of construction material)?**For areas previously covered by KALAHI-CIDSS:** How has the KALAHI-CIDSS experience influenced/not the quality control of small-scale works? Are any noticeable patterns between KALAHI-CIDSS and new areas in terms of performance? |
| Grievance redress | Have project beneficiaries/community members used the project’s GRS? Are there concerns about project implementation/distribution of benefits which are not being picked-up by the project’s GRS in post-disaster reconstruction settings? |
| **Capacity Building and Institutional Arrangements** | Training and performance of community facilitators and area coordinators | Review the training provided to Area Coordinators and Community Facilitators (CFs)Assess the facilitation skills of CFs in targeted areas? What were the facilitation challenges observed in target areas (for the analysis please contrast KALAHI-CIDSS areas and new implementation areas)? Are adjustments needed/recommended to the training provided?Are there noticeable differences in the quality of facilitation in KALAHI-CIDSS areas and new implementation areas (in the ability to mobilize communities and in the ability to deal with LGU’s involvement in the project)?What support was provided by ACTs to CFs by the RPMO? Were there gaps identified by CFs? Is the ratio of ACT to community adequate? What NGOs, CSO, international relief organizations are present in the targeted areas? What is their role in the rehabilitation process? What is the coordination structure in place for disaster reconstruction activities? How does NCDDP engage with these coordination mechanisms? What is the role of the municipality/RPMO in this process? (please highlight any coordination challenges that may need to be further addressed through revisions to the DROM)Are partnerships established with NGOs/CSOs for NCDDP implementation? What is the nature of the collaboration? |
| Monitoring | Assess the extent to which community volunteers and facilitators are able to comply with the project’s documentation requirements.Is there need to further streamline the information collected? What are the ACT, CFs recommendations? |
| Linkages with LGUs | The research team will meet separately with barangay officials to determine their level of support for/engagement in project activities.Assess the relationship with local governments (political economy analysis). Are there any noticeable patron-client relations that involve mayors and community leaders/groups? Do mayors view participation as something that can potentially undermine their influence over the community? Are mayors/barangay captains supportive/not supportive of particular elements of project implementation (particular attention could be paid to how the new targeting system put in place by the project is perceived and how Grievance Redress Systems are viewed). |
| **General Process Assessment** | Are there phases and/or steps in the entire DROM project development/implementation cycle above that need to be streamlined, expanded, added, removed, or changed/re-designed to ensure efficiency and quality? What improvements are required? |

1. **Methodology**

**Four research teams** will be working in parallel on the process evaluation (one in each of the targeted sites). Each team will have two members (one facilitator and one documenter) for purposes of conducting the FGD and KIIs. There will be one **Research Coordinator** who will lead and provide overall guidance to the work of both teams. He/she shall be responsible for: (i) ensuring that the key steps in the timeline provided and in the detailed work plan to be approved by DSWD and World Bank are followed as scheduled; (ii) mobilizing the two research teams; (iii) spot checking and quality assurance; (iv) consolidating the data gathered, leading the analysis (by providing a “third” and objective eye) and preparing the research reports in close consultation with the facilitators and documenters of both teams; and (v) liaising with DSWD and World Bank for all concerns arising from the conduct of the research.

In order to gain a good understanding of community dynamics and of the project implementation process, it is recommended that the research teams spend a sufficient period of time conducting participant observation in selected sites before beginning the assessment of project activities themselves. This will be critical to carry out a brief social mapping of the area and to ensure that informants are identified in an independent manner. The research team is expected to visit the communities periodically to observe key implementation steps during the first year of project implementation and to systematically collect information from the same set of informants/FGD participants. In addition the research team will ensure that households and individuals not directly involved in the project will also be regularly consulted (by randomly interviewing households in the selected areas). For the implementation of the assessment, the team will work in partnership with the DSWD field offices in relevant regions. In order to ensure that community responses are not influenced by the presence of government officials or civil society organization staff, researchers will conduct all of the field work independently. Sufficient time will need to be allocated for research teams to spend time in communities to carry out a brief social mapping and identify key informants in an independent manner.

Implementation of the assessment would be based on a **detailed field guide** to be prepared by the research institution. The issues to be included in the field guide are:

* Interview guides and Focus Group Discussion formats to be field tested and adjusted as needed. The guides will be developed based on the key research questions outlined in section 2 above.
* Approach to be followed in communities (including social mapping activities, feedback and validation discussions);
* Research instruments:
	+ In-depth interviews;
	+ Focus-group discussions;
	+ Informal interviews and participant observation;
* Research Ethics.
1. **Activities and time-line**

The key activities are expected to take place as outlined below over a one year period. As the research team will be following the project implementation cycle the suggested time-line below may need to be adjusted depending on the progress made by the DSWD in implementing the project, so time-frame and deadlines can be flexible. It is expected that the research team will conduct periodic (short) visits to the field sites to directly observe key steps in project implementation and to conduct follow-up FGD and KIIs. Each “data collection phase” is expected to take between 5 to 7 days, and there should be immediate sharing/reporting of initial findings after each data collection phase.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key steps**  | **Time-frame (estimate)** |
| **Preparation of detailed work plan,** including budget, suggested structure of the final report and site-specific reports to be provided by field research teams. | 15 September 2014 |
| **Field guide and research tools** designed and shared with DSWD and the Bank team for review. | 30th October 2014 |
| **Field guide and research tools** pre-tested and amended. Research teams will receive a final orientation session on their use before proceeding to the field-sites. The session will clarify the methodology to be followed and the outputs to be prepared by each of the field teams: (i) transcripts of key interviews and FGDs, (ii) photographs of visited sites, (iii) site-specific reports in line with agreed format.  | 30th November 2014 |
| **Data collection – Phase 1:** (i) social mapping in targeted communities, (ii) information on training activities, dissemination of information to LGUs and communities and social mobilization activities, (iii) Damage and Needs Assessment.  | 30th March 2015 |
| **Data collection – Phase 2:** (i) review outcomes of prioritization process, (ii) development of sub-project proposals, training of project implementation committees and initial stages of project implementation. | September/October 2015 |
| **Data collection - Phase 3:** (i) review project implementation, (ii) community-led project monitoring process, (iii) assess coordination with NGOs and linkages with LGUs, and (iv) use of Grievance Redress System.  | January/February 2016 |
| **Draft report –** Prepare draft report with summary of key findings and hold discussions with DSWD. | March 2016 |
| **Data collection – Phase 4: (i)** Review project implementation, (ii) focus on the quality of the infrastructure, (ii) review project monitoring and capacity building, and (v) assess the conduct of the community-based evaluation process. | April 2016 |
| **Final report –** Prepare final report incorporating comments/feedback from the DSWD and World Bank teams. | May 2016 |

1. **Budget and payment schedule**

The consultancy will be processed as a lump-sum contract following the payment schedule below:

* Detailed work-plan and & structure of final report (10%)
* Field Guide and research tools (30%)
* Draft report (20%)
* Final report (40%)
1. **Implementation and reporting arrangements**

The assessment will be carried out by a local research institution or university with experience of conducting qualitative research. The research team will work in close collaboration with DSWD staff at central level for the design of the field manual, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Key Informant Interview (KII) guidelines. The research team will report directly to Patricia Fernandes (Social Development Specialist, EASER).