

## KRDI VMA Assessment – Part 2

### 4.6 Impact Indicators Assessment

To quantify the improvements in the communities where KRDI works, the project has identified a series of indicators measuring the improvements in sectors of health care, the environment, agriculture, potable water supply, and education. VMA-Kukes worked with several local government units to collect data relevant to the indicators. Sources of data were collected from the Development departments of the Communes and Municipalities, the regional Health and Education Directorates, the Regional Council and the Prefecture.

The data found for the indicators is based on the 19 completed infrastructure projects implemented during 2006 in Kukes and Has districts. The process of gathering the data was a slow task since there were changes to the administration of the local government staff following the local elections in early 2006.

The table below describes the improvements that have resulted from KRDI interventions. The tables below are categorized by each sector and compares of the villages in 2005 (before KRDI involvement) to community improvements in 2006 (after KRDI project implementation).

#### A. Health

<b>3 Health Centers were implemented by KRDI in 2006</b> (Health centre in Ujmisht , Surroj, and Orgjost)					
Nr.	Health Center Construction Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of Villages in the District with Health Centers	#	9	12	+3
2	Number of Families benefiting from proximity of health centers	#	1686	2081	+395
3	Number of women using local health centers	#	2026	2124	+98
4	Number of child patients attended	#	31	57	+26
5	The average distance to travel to the nearest health center	km	0.5	0.4	-0.1
6	Number of vaccinations provided	#	2883	5150	+2267
7	Number of health specialists working in rural communities	#	33	39	+6

#### B. Environment

<b>3 Environment related projects were implemented by KRDI in 2006</b> (A sidewalk in Kukes, and rural roads in Vrij-Arren and Metaliaj Fajza)					
Nr.	Environment Related Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of households with access to a main road	#	926	1595	+669
2	Number of rural roads connected to regional/ national road network	#	4	6	+2
3	Area of land rehabilitated/ or cleaning and greening	m2	5600	5600	0
4	Number of inhabitants affected by greening/rehabilitation	#	4620	4620	0

## C. Agriculture

<b>2 Agriculture related projects</b> (An irrigation canal in Koder Lume and in Canaj-Osmanaj-Bicaj)					
Nr.	Agriculture Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of Villages with irrigation canals	#	19	22	+3
2	Number of families with access to irrigation	#	1909	2166	+257
3	Amount of water conserved due to lining of irrigation schemes	liters	331	383	+52
4	Amount of irrigated land	hec-tars	619	717	+98
5	Number of farmers using land for agriculture	#	191	296	+105

## D. Water

<b>4 Water Supply projects</b> (Potable water supply in Cernaleve, Brekije, Orqikel, and Letaj Golaj)					
Nr.	Potable Water Supply Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of villages with water supply	#	7	11	+4
2	Number of households with access to safe water drinking supply	#	859	1254	+395
3	Distance traveled to get to the closest source of water (average)	min-utes	1	0.5	-0.5
4	Percent of bacterial contamination in water	%	0	0	0

## E. Education

<b>3 School projects</b> (Construction of a kindergarten and school in Kalis, rehabilitation of a high school in Shishtavec, and construction of an elementary school in Gjegje)					
Nr.	School Construction Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of villages with schools	#			
2	Number of households benefiting from schools	#	4936	5387	+451
3	Female student enrollment in primary and middle level schools supported under KRDI	#	45	58	+13
4	Average time in minutes to travel to school	min-utes	6.4	5	-1.4
5	Number of schools with potable	#	26	26	0

	water supply				
--	--------------	--	--	--	--

## F. Governance

**Governance related activities include the participatory process in project identification, trainings and capacity building of all stakeholders involved**

Nr.	Governance Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Situation at the end of 2005	Situation at the end of 2006	Change
1	Number of CBO Members Contributing (in-kind with labor) to project implementation	#	600	790	+190
2	Number of women CBOs involved in project implementations	#	9	16	+7
3	Amount of land donated to CBOs for projects	m2	15000	19000	+4000
4	Number of Development Units established in communes of Kukes District	#	15	20	+5

## G. Others

### 4 Projects that are classified as other projects by VMA-Kukes

(an electrical line in Domaj, bridge construction in Bushtrice, a sewage system in Myqhas and a foot bridge in Zarisht)

Nr.	Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact			
			Electrical line	Bridge	Foot bridge	Sewage system
1	Number of beneficiaries (families)	#	57	145	185	45

## 5. Analysis of the Findings

The 'bottom-up' methodology used to implement KRDI has brought positive changes to the social-economic status of the region, and has also led to improvements of human social capital. Positive changes in the 'way of thinking' were verified during the interviews, group discussions and information-gathering process.

By involving the community in all aspects of project implementation, (i.e. the process of selection, monitoring, and additional in-kind contributions) have ensured sustainability and ownership of the projects. Further capacity building efforts have improved the effectiveness of human and financial resources and have ensured an improved quality of infrastructure projects.

"Other donors have come to Koder Lumi to do projects but these projects were unsuccessful and are not maintained. The UNDP/EC project has been successful because our community was involved, and got us employed. The key to a successful project is to get the people involved."

**-Xheme Petku, Head of Village and CBO**

The information collected from the numerous interviews, focus group discussions and data based on the project indicators, have been analyzed based upon the three categories of change that shaped the assessment.

**5.1 Changes in “Ways of doing”:** 60% (or 419 persons) of the total number of respondents interviewed were members of CBOs. Female interviewees accounted for 43% of the total number of respondents, or 311 persons. This was an increase of 12.4% more female respondents than the previous Assessment of 2005. In comparing findings and comments made in the previous assessment, community inhabitants have noted that there was a general increase in the participation and membership of CBOs. Many have commented that CBOs have organized their communities to actively participate in local decision-making process. These sentiments were also raised in the focus group discussions.

Capacity building in terms of the numerous trainings offered by KRDI has generated positive comments from beneficiaries of the project. 98% of training participants believe that the knowledge gained from the trainings have been put into practice. Despite the growing number of women participating in the KRDI project through CBO membership, and efforts to bring greater attention to gender equality, it was found that only 3% of the total number of respondents participated in gender training. Though it is a slight improvement to last year’s Assessment (2.4%), it clearly indicates that continued efforts are needed to improve upon this component of the project.

Findings continue to show that CBOs, local government and other beneficiaries continue to participate actively in the prioritization of their needs. A high percentage of respondents, 84% (or 549 persons) confirm that they have been part of the project identification and selection process in one way or another. Additionally, 75% of those interviewed (or 489 persons) say that they were encouraged by local government or CBO heads to take part in the selection of projects for their villages.

From the data collected during the focus group sessions and the interviews show that the community has experienced an increase in democracy and transparency of community activities. Several participants within the focus group discussions have mentioned that CBO functioning has gone beyond that of simply identifying priorities and implementing development projects. It has led to an organization that is capable of resolving the social and problematic issues of the village.

“The road built by KRDI brought us closer together geographically but it also brought us nearer to each other increasing our feelings of responsibility and partnership.”  
-CBO member of Metaliaj

An example from the Head of the CBO in Shishtavec, illustrates the change brought about by KRDI, he said, **“We are organized as a community to connect a new spring to the existing water supply of our village. We are in the last phase of negotiations to complete this initiative, which is supported by the community financially. The experience gained during the implementation of KRDI projects has been of great help.”** The villagers are now working voluntarily and will contribute to cover the financial costs of this project.

The establishment of the Development and Programming departments in the communes and municipalities are beginning to act as the liaisons between CBOs and other representatives of the local government. They have been keeping track of CBO membership lists and have created work plans jointly with community members on future partnership initiatives. Local government staff allows CBO members to use Commune offices for CBO meetings. They provide further support by helping to establish “maintenance groups” that are responsible for the upkeep of newly constructed or reconstructed projects. This is a further example of the changes in the “ways of doing.”

**5.2 Changes in “Ways of Thinking”:** 90% of those interviewed (or 499 persons) confirm that CBOs are the most effective form to address problems of their village. Additionally, 98% of CBO members confirm that CBOs functions “well” or “satisfactorily”. This shows that the project has brought about drastic changes in the mentality and behaviors of the beneficiaries targeted by KRDI. It has also brought about changes in the process of decision-making, and the prioritization of their needs.

From the interviews and focus group discussions it is clear that after the beginning of the project and as a result of trainings and participation, the community has changed its behaviors and ways of thinking with regards to cooperation with local government. The level of trust between the groups remains to be high in comparing with last year’s Assessment. During the current assessment, 88% of respondents believe that during their work with projects of KRDI relations have improved with local government representatives, as compared with the 34% of who have declared that they had good relations with the government before the beginning of the Project. It became evident during the focus group discussions that people were more active and interested in improving their communities then ever before.

“We learned that the real governance is the community itself. If we stick together, then the local government will definitely support us.”  
-CBO member of Bicaj

**5.3 Changes in “Ways of Being”:** There have been many more infrastructure projects implemented since the previous Assessment of 2005. In contrast to last year’s assessment, there were a higher number of those interviewed that believe that the implementation of these projects has had a positive impact. 90% of those interviewed indicated that the quality of the project has been “good” or “satisfactory”. Respondents often used words like “effective”, “good quality” and “successful” to describe KRDI’s role in infrastructure building.

Projects implemented through KRDI have changed people’s lives. Household economies, education, health and culture are the sectors where the beneficiaries have noted changes. In terms of the longer-term benefits some respondents have noted that their ways of thinking and being have positively changed. Seasonal employment in offered during the infrastructure projects have helped to boost the local economy. Projects such as an irrigation system have made the work of agriculturalists easier to harvest their produce. As one interviewee noted, **“single and sporadic efforts to solve problems concerning the community are a thing of the past. It seems that KRDI has brought stability and sustainable development to Kukes. The community has learned that they can be successful with their efforts if they work together”**.

There have been some problems and complaints reported by some CBO members who have completed the projects. These problems are concerning those of a technical nature. For example, though the community of Letaj in Has district has appreciated the implementation of the water supply project, at the time of the assessment, this project was not functioning well due to a social problem in the community. A solution by the community and the local government is a necessary action.

64% of the respondents indicated that all persons benefited equally from these projects. 15% of those interviewed have said that women benefit from the projects. From the focus group discussion it became apparent that there were other unforeseen benefits of a single project. For example the bridge construction in Bushtrica commune in Kukes district has benefited the people of Bushtrica enabling them to go to school, access health care and sell their produce in other areas. This bridge has also benefited those living in surrounding villages. The Commune Head illustrates this by saying that, **“The bridge allows for our community to connect to others, but it also has positive effects on the economy, health and education of our community. It serves useful for the people outside of Bushtrica in 3 villages of Kalis Commune. The river is no longer a threat to people’s lives.”**

During the Assessment of 2005, it was noted that many female interviewees did not see their role as imperative in KRDI projects. There were also very few females partaking in the survey because of their limited participation in CBOs. During the current Assessment, there were many more women interviewed because KRDI had taken a conscious effort to engage them in CBO formation and activities. Though the number of women-based CBOs has increased, there still needs to be further efforts made to integrate these women into society at large.

99% of the respondents (or 644 persons) indicated that the project is beneficial to their whole village. 77% of those interviewed said that they personally have benefited “to a great extent”, especially for projects that deal with education, the economy, and health. A large majority of respondents, 97% (or 631 persons) indicated that they would contribute to the maintenance and sustainability of the projects.

“Since UNDP and KRDI have been able to support us to solve some of problems, we should work together to preserve and maintain them.”  
-CBO member of Ujmisht

**5.4 Other Findings:** Compared to the findings from the Assessment 2005, the visibility of KRDI and understanding of the EC as a key donor has increased. 38% of respondents recognize both UNDP and EC as donors, while 51% recognize only the EC as the donor and 7% recognize only UNDP as the donor. During the interviews respondents indicated that they learnt about the Project and donors through regular TV broadcasts, numerous information boards, and by word of mouth.

Migration is a key issue faced by inhabitants of the Kukes region over the past 15 years. In dealing with participants during the focus group discussion questions were raised on the issue of migration and how it correlates in improvements made to the Kukes community life. From the discussion it was clear that the majority of participants preferred to stay in their communities and factors such as improvements to infrastructure, employment and general economies of the families were made. Participants reiterated that the KRDI Project gave them the belief in improving their livelihoods. They further called for continued implementation of infrastructure and called for continued possibilities of employment in helping to reduce migration.

## **6. Best Practices, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations for UNDP Albania**

There are several best practices that have developed since KRDI was first initiated. Most notably their involvement within the CBOs was seen to be a practice that was highly appreciated and effective for them to solve their problems. The beneficiaries themselves have highlighted many of the positive practices used from their experience:

- The community involvement in the process of identification, prioritization and selection of the infrastructure projects implemented;
- The democratic process used in selecting the infrastructure including the use of voting by community members, and having open debates;
- An active participation of community members through volunteer labour and other in-kind contribution (i.e. land donation) has ensured community ownership of their projects and ensures proper management and maintenance of the projects;
- By bringing together the local government and the community the level of trust has increased;
- The financial contribution of the local government has restored the belief that local government officials work for the people they represent;
- Involvement of women in CBO membership has increased their role and voice in community infrastructure projects;
- Extensive participation in the formulation of development plans for the communes;
- Strengthening the functions of the CBO through capacity building activities.

In terms of lessons learnt, there are areas that require further improvements:

- Empowering of CBO and increase of their capacity;
- It is necessary to increase women's participation in the process of decision-making;
- It is necessary to select of companies that have the required capacities to implement the infrastructure projects;
- Projects should be implemented according to the technical specifications and standards;
- Continue with the current methodology used to prioritize and select projects by the community;
- Identify and eliminate any possible social problem that may hinder the project prior to project implementation;
- Top priority projects are sometimes not implemented because of the limitation of funds;
- Projects that create jobs and improve the employment situation have greater benefits for the communities.

Key Recommendations for UNDP include the following:

- Implement separate projects that are specifically targeted for women to increase their participation and improve their role in community development;
- Increase the number of participants (men and women) for gender training;
- Before projects are implemented, provide copies of the technical specifications to CBO members and have community meetings so that they are equipped with the knowledge and can better monitor the implementation process;
- Target greater youth involvement in the CBOs by encouraging their participation in the selection of projects;
- Increase the amount of fund per project so that top priorities could be implemented;
- Expand the geographic coverage of the KRDI to include an additional two or more communities in each commune/municipality;
- Encourage the implementation of projects that will stimulate employment of the community;
- Allow room in the project for professional courses, or vocational training, for the women and youth of the community;
- Further outreach and support is required to those communities who are not part of the KRDI targeted areas. It would be useful to share the model of participation and project implementation to those areas.
- Continue with training and other capacity development activities;
- Encourage the CBOs to take on a greater number of small projects together with local government. These projects should be led only by the community/CBOs (without KRDI funds).

"We are students from a school reconstructed by KRDI. We come to say thanks to UNDP and the donor EC."  
-CBO member of Shishtavec

## **7. Annexes**

### **Annex 7.1 List of Targeted Villages**

Table of new beneficiaries in Kukes and Has districts (25% of total number of households)

No	Name of Project	Commune/ Municipality	Villages	Total Number of Households in Village	Total Number of Households Interviewed
1	Reconstruction of Irrigation canal	Bicaj	Osmanaj & Canaj	510	14
2	Construction of School and kindergarten	Kalis	Kalis	133	30
3	Construction of Irrigation canal	Shtiçen	Koderlume	240	51
4	Reconstruction of Sidewalks in main street	Kukes	Kukes city	621	129
5	Construction of Water supply	Shishtavec	Cernaleve	112	28
6	Rehabilitation of high school	Shishtavec	Shishtavec	332	63
7	Construction of Water supply	Golaj	Letaj	158	8
8	Construction of Footbridge	Kruma	Zarisht	206	46
9	Construction of School, Kindergarten and Health Centre	Zapod	Orgjost	239	68
10	Construction of Water supply	Zapod	Orçikel	65	17
11	Construction of Linkage road	Fajza	Metaliaj road	146	33
12	Construction of Water supply	Topojan	Brekij	235	47
13	Construction of Vehicle bridge	Bushtrica	Bushtrica	160	36
14	Construction of Health Centre	Surroj	Surroj	96	19
15	Construction of Electrical line	Gjinaj	Domaj	56	14
16	Construction of Sewage system	Gjinaj	Myç-has	53	11
17	School	Bushtrice	Gjegje	45	21
18	Construction of Health Centre	Ujmisht	Ujmisht	40	13
19	Construction of Linkage road	Arren	Vrrij	26	6
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>3471</b>	<b>650</b>



Table of former beneficiaries interviewed from 2005 Assessment in Kukes district (15% of total number of households)

No	Name of Project	Commune/ Municipality	Village	Total Number of Households	Total Number of Former Beneficiaries Interviewed
1	Secondary Irrigation Channels	Shtiqen	Shtiqen	245	7
2	Reconstruction of Irrigation Channel	Malzi	Kalimash	169	5
3	Irrigation Canal	Malzi	Mgulle	134	4
4	Construction of Health Centre, School and Kindergarten	Malzi	Petkaj	152	5
5	Water Supply	Terthore	Bardhoc-1	85	3
6	Water Supply	Terthore	Bardhoc-2	110	3
7	Construction of Main Street	Shishtavec	Borje	231	7
8	Cleaning and Greening	Kukes	Quarter 2	380	11
9	Irrigation Canal	Arren	Arren	93	3
10	Network & Information Centre	Bicaj	Bicaj	220	7
11	Irrigation canal	Gryke-Caje	Shkinak	102	3
12	Irrigation canal	Gryke-Caje	Caje	110	3
13	Construction of Health Centre	Topojan	Topojan	174	5
14	School, Kindergarten, Health Center	Ujmisht	Zall Lusen	95	3
15	Drinking Water Supply System	Kalis	Geshteje	112	3
16	School	Bushtrice	Gjegje-	110	3
17	School	Zapod	Bele	159	5
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>2681</b>	<b>80</b>

**Annex 7.2 Questionnaire Plan (and Team Assignment)**

Date	12/03	13/03	14/03	15/03	16/03	19/03	20/03	21/03
<b>Team I</b>	Koder Lume (35)	Bicaj (21)	Kalis, Geshtenje, (33)	Shishtavec (40)	Caje, Shkinak, Gjegje, Ujmisht (12)	Zapod Orgjost (34)	Bushtice (36)	Ujmisht (13)
<b>Team II</b>	Shtiqen and Koder Lume (23)	Bardhoc 1 (2)	Krume, Zarisht (46)	Shishtavec and Orcikel (40)	Arren, Vrrij, Surroj (28)	Zapod, Orgjost (32)	Gjinaj, Myc Has, (25)	Kukes (35)
<b>Team III</b>	Malzi, Mgulle, petkaj, Kalimash (14)	Borje, Cernaleve, (35)	Metaliaj, Letaj (41)	Topojan (30)	Topojan and Bele (27)	Kukes (23)	Bushtice, Gjegje (21)	Kukes (30)
<b>Team IV</b>						Kukes (18)	Kukes (19)	Kukes (15)

### Annex 7.3 Focus Group Discussion Plan

Date:	12/03	13/03	16/03	21/03	22/03	23/03	26/03	27/03
<b>Team I</b>	Briefing (Orientation)	Heads of CBO Krume	Bicaj CBO Members  Ujmisht CBO Members	Bushtice CBO Members  Kalis CBO Members	Shishtavec CBO Members  Topojan CBO Members	Zapod CBO Members	Kukes Heads of Communes  Krume Heads of Communes	Kukes Heads of CBO  Gjinaj CBO Members

Date:	28/03	29/03	30/03	02/04
<b>Team II</b>	Kukes Heads of CBO  Shtiqen CBO Members	Arren CBO Members  Surroj CBO Members	Fajza CBO Members  Golaj CBO Members	Kukes CBO and Community members

### Annex 7.4 Assessment Terms of Reference (including Questionnaires and Project Indicators)

**1). Rationale:** In follow up to the Tri-partite review of European Commission funded projects in the Kukes Region, and as part of overall monitoring and evaluation activities the UNDP-Albania Country Office will undertake a comprehensive mid-term assessment of the results of the EC funded KRDI project in order to develop lessons learned and best practices for improved project efficacy and for utilization in future interventions in the Kukes Region. The results to be assessed are broadly categorized as follows:

- Level of community participation in selection and implementation of projects including the extent to which women and the poorest were involved in the project selection process;*
- Behavior and attitude change amongst local government officials and CBO and community beneficiaries as a result of the training and capacity building offered through KRDI;*
- Direct development impact of infrastructure works on the CBO and community beneficiaries including changes (positive or negative) in life styles, economic opportunities, migration, education, quality of health, etc.*

A mid-term assessment was conducted by the UNDP in November 2005 and the objective was to look at the results achieved. The findings of this mid-term assessment report can be downloaded from the UNDP website by visiting <http://www.undp.org.al/?elib,717>.

- 2). **Scope:** The Assessment Mission will cover the follow groups: all beneficiaries of training and capacity building initiatives as part of KRDI; and all CBOs, Communities, and Local Government counterparts that have benefited from an infrastructure project under KRDI. While not *all* members will be interviewed or questioned (see 'methodology' below), the sample groupings will be selected to ensure broad representation.
- 3). **Methodology:** To ensure impartiality and integrity of results, an independent NGO will be utilized. It is foreseen that the assessment process will occur in three parts and utilize three methodologies to measure the categories of changes resulting from the KRDI project as noted in the chart below.

Aspect of KRDI to Assess	Categories of Change	Specific issues to examine
<i>Level of community participation in selection and implementation of projects including the extent to which women and the poorest were involved in the project selection process;</i>	<i>Ways of Doing</i>	<i>People</i> (Have gender dynamics changed, or new relationships formed? What about partnership and collaboration – is it felt that these have improved or worsened?)
<i>Behavior and attitude change amongst local government officials and CBO and community beneficiaries as a result of the training and capacity building offered through KRDI;</i>	<i>Ways of Thinking</i>	<i>Methods</i> (decision-making, systems, ways of organizing, norms) <i>Policy Development</i> (guidelines, rules and regulations, political and organisational)
<i>Direct development impact of infrastructure works on the CBO and community beneficiaries including changes (positive or negative) in life styles, economic opportunities, migration, education, quality of health, etc.</i>	<i>Ways of 'Being'</i> (aspects of life that have changed as a result of the intervention)	<i>Economy</i> (income, jobs, other resources) <i>Communication</i> (information sharing, networking) <i>Technology</i> (equipment, computers, other) <i>Any Others</i>

The first part of the assessment will utilize a standardized survey (see **annex 1**). This survey has three parts to assess the different aspects of KRDI listed above. The survey will be undertaken in all 22 villages that KRDI has undertaken activities in the districts of Kukes, Has and Tropoja. The sampling size for each village should not be less than 25 % of the total village population. One section of the questionnaire focuses solely on the development impact of the project and will only be utilized for villages where the infrastructure work has been completed. In addition to interviewing households involved in projects during 2006, the NGO will be required to re-visit at least 20% of households in Kukes district that participated in the previous survey conducted in 2005 in order to compare and analyze the results of the project. For this survey there will be additional sets of questions that will need to be addressed (see **annex 4**).

The second part of the assessment will utilize focus group discussions. Targeted towards a smaller (no more than 10) group of representatives (local government representatives and CBO leaders), the discussions will be conducted by the NGO and utilize the following "open-ended" question (rather than the multiple-choice answers of the aforementioned questionnaire): **"What changes (positive or negative) have occurred in your region or community as a result (directly or indirectly) of the KRDI project?"** Different focus groups will be formed to assess the changes noted in the chart above. Specifically, the following are the proposed division of focus group sessions:

- i). **Heads of Commune.** All heads of communes that have been working with KRDI will be brought together and asked the questions listed in **annex 2** –but with a specific focus on issues raised during the survey concerning "ways of thinking."
- ii). **Heads of CBOs.** In several focus groups the head of the CBOs will be brought together to explore the changes in the "ways of doing" as noted in the above table, as well as the other points noted in annex 2.
- iii). **CBO members and other village inhabitants.** Focus groups will be made for villages that have received a project (and thus can discuss the development impact of it) and those that are currently in the process of completing the infrastructure work. As with the other focus groups, all questions as noted in annex 2 will be

discussed; as the CBOs and village inhabitants are the 'hub' of KRDI's efforts (meaning that they both are part of the process of choosing the priority infrastructure work as well as directly benefiting from it) the questions for these focus groups.

The "Spider Web" format for focus group discussions will be utilized. With this method individuals write on 'post-it-notes' all the examples of 'changes' from their individual perspectives and paste them in a category of change as described above. This allows for transparency (everyone can read other's examples) as well as equal opportunity for individual to contribute information, especially for those less assertive in oral discussion. The facilitator will then encourage open dialogue elaborating on examples, indicators of change, the identification of factors that contributed to change (positive or negative), lessons learned, issues and challenges and recommendations. A list of guiding questions (see **annex 2**) will be used for the focus group discussion.

The third part of the assessment will involve the collection of data from local government sources. The NGO will use the existing a set of indicators (see **annex 3**) with baseline figures, and add current data figures. The indicator tables have been divided into six sectors: health, environment, agriculture, education, water and governance. The NGO will be responsible to compare and analyse the progress of the project based on these indicators.

The NGO will receive a familiarization course from staff with the UNDP Kukes Regional Development Initiative programme over a course of 1-2 days prior to undertaking the three aspects of the Assessment. Additionally, staff of UNDP will make themselves available for the first focus group discussions if so requested by the NGO.

**4). Timeline:** It is envisioned that the assessment will take place from **12 March – 27 March**, and be followed by the final report on **03 April 2007**.

**5). Annexes:**

- i). Questionnaire for all villages targeted under the KRDI project
- ii). Guiding questions and themes for the focus group discussions
- iii). Indicator tables and baseline figures
- iv). Survey Questionnaire for those previously interviewed
- v). Current list of completed KRDI projects

**Annex 1 – Survey Questionnaire for CBO Members and Other Residents of Villages**

Date Survey undertaken (day/month) \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Gender of survey respondent M  F

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Village: \_\_\_\_\_

Commune: \_\_\_\_\_

Past survey participant: Yes  No

**Aspect of Project**

**Questions for CBO Members**

**Answers**

*Level of community participation in selection and implementation of projects including the extent to which women and the poorest were*

1). Are you a member of a community based organization? *involved in the project selection process;*

\*\*\* If the answer is "no" then please elaborate why in the space below  
\*\*\*

Yes

2). Have you heard about the KRDI project?

\*\*\* If the answer is yes, please ask if they know who the main funder/donor of the project is and write the answer below \*\*\*

No

*** If the answer is yes, please ask if they know who the main funder/donor of the project is and write the answer below ***	Yes	
	<p>No</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>3). To what extent were you involved in the process deciding what project your village was to receive?</p>	<p>A great deal <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Some <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>4). Did the head of the commune encourage you or your CBO or village to participate?</p>	<p>Little <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>None <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>*** If the answer is yes, please enquire further on <i>how</i> this was done – (informally, through formal meetings etc.) and write the answer below***</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

	<p>5). Have you received training from UNDP in the course of prioritizing and receiving the project?</p> <p>*** If the answer is yes, please enquire further as to what type of training has been received and write the answer below***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>6). If so, was this training useful (did it help you understand and participate more effectively?)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><i>Behavior and attitude change amongst local government officials and CBO and community beneficiaries as a result of the training and capacity building offered through KRDI;</i></p>	<p>1). How would you describe your relations with the local government (commune heads, village elder, members of the regional council etc.) <b>before</b> the KRDI Project</p> <p>*** Please elaborate on their response below – seek specific reasons either positive or negative for their response ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Did not have any <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>2). How would you describe your relations with the local government (commune heads, members of the regional council etc.) <b>after</b> the work of the KRDI Project?</p> <p>*** Please elaborate on their response below – seek specific reasons either positive or negative - for their response ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No change <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>3). Do you think CBOs are an effective means to address the development issues facing your community?</p> <p>*** Please elaborate the response below. If “yes”, then ask them to explain why and if the answer is “no” then why not? ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

	<p>4). If you are a member of a CBO, how does your CBO function?</p> <p>*** Please elaborate the response below focusing on the positive and/or negative aspects of how the CBO functions including frequency of meetings, rules of procedure, understanding of the role of the CBO etc. ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Well <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not well <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><i>Direct development impact of infrastructure works on the CBO and community beneficiaries including changes (positive or negative) in life styles, economic opportunities, migration, education, quality of health, etc.</i></p> <p><b>*** This series of questions only to be asked for villages with completed projects ***</b></p>	<p>1). How would you rate the quality of the project implemented in your village?</p> <p>***If the answer is “Not Good” please enquire further as to what needs improvement and write the answer below***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Good <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Don’t know <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>2). Is the project beneficial to <u>you</u>?</p> <p>*** Please elaborate the answer below, specifically in terms of whether it has or has not improved individual or family quality of life (and how – be it economic, health, education or other affects), changed the need to migrate seasonally or permanently for work or education, or provided other benefits or not. If the interviewee cites “no” please also specify why ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>A Great deal <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Some <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Little <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>None <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>3). Who do you think this project benefits more (if anyone)?</p> <p>*** Please have the interview elaborate on their answer in the space below. Why does the project have a greater impact on one of the groups listed below? Also consider the reverse – why doesn’t the project impact the other groups? ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Men <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Women <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Youth <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Of equal benefit to all <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>4). Is the project beneficial to the <u>village</u>?</p> <p>*** Please elaborate the answer below, specifically in terms of whether</p>	<p>A Great deal <input type="checkbox"/></p>

	<p>it has or has not been of benefit to the village in terms of economic development, health, education, migration etc. If the interviewee cites “no” please also specify why ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Some <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Little <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>5). Did you have another project that was a different priority than the one selected?</p> <p>***If the answer is yes, please inquire what their priority is and write it below. Also inquire as to why it was not selected***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>6), Will you contribute to the sustainability of the project in your village (through maintenance, paying fees for services etc?).</p> <p>***If the answer is “yes” please elaborate <i>how</i> the interviewee will contribute ***</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>



## **Terms of Reference – Guiding Questions for the Focus Group Discussions**

**\*\*\* The NGO is encouraged to add questions as necessary \*\*\***

- 1) How do people learn about KRDI projects and what do they know about it?
- 2) What role did you have in KRDI projects? How did you participate?
- 3) You know, everyone in community should be involved in decision concerning community life improvements. That kind of involvement is not easy. What is your opinion?
- 4) How would you describe the quality of KRDI projects?
- 5) What comments do you have about KRDI projects /
- 6) Do you have any comments/opinions about how local stakeholders have participated in KRDI projects?
- 7) Did the projects improved community life? In what aspects?
- 8) Meetings sometimes seem to be events when leaders and KRDI staff decide on the projects to be implemented. What is the opinion in your community?
- 9) What if you were in charge of the KRDI? How would you do a better job?

## Terms of Reference – Survey Questionnaire for those previously interviewed

Date Survey Undertaken (day/month) \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Gender of survey respondent M  F

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Village: \_\_\_\_\_

Commune: \_\_\_\_\_

Past survey participant:  Yes  No

Aspect of Project to Assess	Questions for CBO Members	Answers
<i>Level of community participation in selection and implementation of projects including the extent to which women and the poorest were involved in the project selection process;</i>	1). Since the previous survey taken, have you become a member of a community based organization?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
	2). Since the previous survey taken, have you heard about the KRDI project?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
	3). Has your involvement in the process of deciding what project your village was to receive increased?	A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some <input type="checkbox"/> Little <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/>
	4). Since the last time you took the survey, has the head of the commune encourage you or your CBO or village to participate?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
	5). Since the past survey, have you received training from UNDP?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
	6). If so, was this training useful (did it help you understand and participate more effectively?)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Behavior and attitude change amongst local government</i>	1). How would you describe your relations with the local government (commune heads, members of the regional council etc.) <b>before</b> the KRDI Project?	Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Not Good <input type="checkbox"/>

<i>officials and CBO and community beneficiaries as a result of the training and capacity building offered through KRDI;</i>		Did not have any	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2). How would you describe your relations with the local government (commune heads, members of the regional council etc.) <b>after</b> the work of the KRDI Project?	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
No change		<input type="checkbox"/>	
3). Do you think that CBOs are an effective means to address the development issues facing your community?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4). If you are a member of a CBO, do you think your CBO functions well and effectively?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Direct development impact of infrastructure works on the CBO and community beneficiaries including changes (positive or negative) in life styles, economic opportunities, migration, education, quality of health, etc.</i>  <b>*** This series of questions only to be asked for villages with completed projects ***</b>	1). Since the implementation of your project is it being maintained and well kept? If not, please explain briefly below.	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2). Is the project beneficial to you more now then in the past?	A Great deal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Little		<input type="checkbox"/>	
None		<input type="checkbox"/>	
3). Is the project beneficial to the village more now then in the past?	A Great deal	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Some	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Little	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4). Has this project impacted your life directly in a positive manner?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5). Did you have another project that was a different priority than the one selected?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Terms of Reference - Quick Impact Assessment Indicators

Several indicators have been identified for measuring and quantifying the impact of project implementation within local communities. The data presented here represent the preliminary findings based on discussions with local authorities and those responsible for data collection and analysis at the sectoral government departments. This "Quick Impact Assessment" and the indicators within will form the basis of a full in-depth impact analysis that will be undertaken during 2006. The tables below show the indicator and progress against it (pre and post KRDI intervention) and are divided amongst the following sectors: Health, Environment, Agriculture, Water, and Education. There are also additional indicators measuring progress on governance issues.

### i). Health

No.	Health Center Construction Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	# of Villages in the District with Health Centers	#	6	9	+3
2.	# of Families benefiting from proximity of health centers	#	1372	1686	+314
3.	# of women using local health centers	#	1424	2026	+602
4.	# of child patients attended	#	96	31	-65
5.	Average distance to travel to nearest health center	KM	4.3	0.5	-3.8
6.	Number of vaccinations provided	#	2883	3605	+ 722
7.	Number of health specialists working in rural communities	#	33	40	+7

Sources: Development Unit in Commune and Health Department; Regional Council; Prefecture

### ii). Environment

No.	Environment Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	Number of households with access to a main road	#	0	926	+926
2.	Number of rural roads connected to regional/ national road network	#	4	4	none
3.	Area of land rehabilitated/greened	m2	0	5600	+5600
4.	Number of inhabitants affected by greening/rehabilitation	#	0	4620	+4620

Sources: Development Unit in Commune & Roads Directory, Environment Department Regional Council; Prefecture

### iii). Agriculture

No.	Agriculture Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	# of Villages with irrigation canals	#	11	19	+8
2.	# of families with access to irrigation	#	979	1909	+930
3.	Amount of water conserved due to lining of irrigation schemes	Liters per sec	112	331	+219
4.	Amount of irrigated land	Hectare	292	619	327
5.	# of farmers using land for agriculture	#	86	191	+105

Sources: Development Unit in Commune and Irrigation Directory

### iv). Water

No.	Potable Water Supply Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	# of villages with water supply	#	4	7	+3
2.	# of households with access to safe water drinking supply	#	491	869	+378
3.	Distance traveled to get water (average)	Minutes	14	1	-13
4.	Percent of Bacterial Contamination in Water	%	1.015	0	-1.015%

Sources: Development Unit in Commune and Water Directory; Health Department.

### v). Education

No.	School Construction Project Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	# of Villages with schools	#	31	36	+5
2.	# of households benefiting from schools	#	4078	4936	+856
3.	Female student enrollment in primary and middle level schools supported under KRDI	#	0	45	+45
4.	Average time in minutes to travel to school	Minutes	35	6.4	-28.6
5.	Number of schools with potable water access	#	21	26	+5

Sources: Development Unit in Commune and Education Directory; Regional Council; Prefecture

**vi). Governance**

No.	Governance Indicators	Unit	Outcome/Impact		
			Baseline (pre-KRDI Intervention)	Post-KRDI 2005	Change
1.	# of CBO Members Contributing (in-kind with labor) to project implementation	#	0	600	+600
2.	# of women CBOs involved in project implementations	#	0	9	+9
3.	Amount of land donated to CBOs for projects	Square meters	0	15,000	15,000
4.	# of Development Units established in communes of Kukes District	#	3	15	+12

Sources: Development Unit in Commune and Education Directory; Regional Council; Prefecture

**Annex 7.5 Pictures from the Assessment**











