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public funds. The project schemes helped them in working with the communities and fulfill some of the commitments.

91% of the Category 'A' respondents said that all segments of the community, including the disadvantaged people were represented in the community organization (CO) as SRS's social mobilization process that paid special attention to the disadvantaged members of the community. 4% disagreed and 5% did not know.

**Indirect beneficiaries**

- 90% Category 'A' and 88% Category 'B' respondents said that people outside the CO were also using the scheme. The women representing the remaining 12% were not sure.
- The Category 'A' respondents thought that 80% of the indirect users were Pakistanis and the rest 20% were Afghans. The Category 'B' respondents thought that almost 90% of the indirect beneficiaries were Pakistanis and the rest were Afghans.
- Nearly 90% of both categories of respondents agreed that there were no conflicts within or outside the beneficiary communities, with regard to the scheme location, design, construction or use. Some of the remaining mentioned minor conflicts that were resolved by SRS and the local councillors. Some were not aware of any conflicts.
- 99% of the Category 'A' respondents feel that the project model was best suited for the local situation and should be replicated in the same way. 90% of the Category 'B' respondents are also of the view that the project should be replicated without any changes to cover more communities in the province. 10% feel that small changes would be needed to include income generation opportunities to the poor.

**Survey teams' observations**

- Nearly all people are very happy with the CIIP schemes and have high regard for the concerned local government representatives, particularly the councillors, SRS and DFID for their positive and timely support.
- The project has helped the devolution process and brought different segments within the beneficiary communities, local government representatives and SRS closer because of the mutual consultation and participatory approach in every phase of the project. The three parties have much better understanding of each other's role in the society.
- The councillors are closer to the communities than Nazims. As such they should be the focal points of development in their respective areas.
- Majority (90%) of the project beneficiaries is poor or poorest of the poor.
- The communities have actively been involved in the design, planning and implementation of the schemes. Communities' capital cost sharing and playing the lead role in scheme implementation has created a sense of ownership and self-reliance.
- Most male community members are aware of the participatory approach but the women are not so familiar and need to be more involved in the project methodology, design and implementation.
- The women are generally not much aware of the development work and the participatory approach. While the men need to give more opportunities to the women, the women also need
to enhance their status in the society by improving their information and vigorously taking part in the activities in their communities.

- Women in rural communities, who fetch water from long distances when there is no reliable water source nearby, usually demand water supply schemes. The men, who go out for work and prayers, prefer cleaner streets and efficient drainage systems. The present ratio of drinking water schemes to sanitation schemes is roughly 1:2 and suggests that it might have been different if the local women had a stronger voice in decision-making.

- The middle class and the poor members of the beneficiary communities are better organised and know their needs, issues and constraints than the poorest of the poor and the destitute. The poorest of the poor and the destitute need further encouragement to express their views and needs and for more active participation in the community affairs.

- Most rural and peri-urban households are short of cash. It is therefore easier for them to contribute in kind (labour or material) than paying in cash. This is obvious from the fact that over 90% of the beneficiaries contributed in the form of labour and material.

- An important comment of the beneficiaries and local government representatives is that future projects should also include income-generating activities to help improve the economic condition of the poorer members of the community.

- Work on a few schemes (less than 5%) with technical complications, such as hard rock drilling is near completion but not yet finished. Such schemes should be completed before the terminal review at the latest.

- Overall quality of work can be described as 20% excellent, 20% very good, 40% good and 20% satisfactory. Remote areas where almost no development had occurred in the last 50 years or so, exhibit excellent quality of work and the local communities are quite excited about these schemes. The quality of work on schemes closer to main roads or urban areas is generally inferior to that in the remote schemes.

- Pavement of streets and lining of drains was carried out in the project schemes to minimise sanitation problems. In the past such streets were being used for pedestrian traffic only. However, after the street pavement heavier traffic has also started moving on these streets. The existing pavement may be damaged if the traffic flow is not controlled on these streets. The beneficiary communities, local government representatives, concerned Tehsil municipal administrations and SRSP need to take up this issue early. Future projects should consider plain cement concrete (PCC) pavement, instead of brick pavement, which costs a little more but is far more durable. Traffic survey should also be considered in the case of wider streets where trucks, animal-driven carts, cars, tractors and other transport could be expected.
Chapter 3: Lessons learnt and recommendations

**CIP and the devolution process:** CIP has significantly helped the devolution process by creating a very positive impact amongst all stakeholders and helping improve poor communities’ trust in their community organisations, local government representatives and SRSP. The partnership can be further be improved by enhancing the role of the local councillors.

**SRSP’s enhanced image:** NGOs have not generally enjoyed good reputation in the province, particularly the conservative areas, such asCharsadda and Nowshera. The clergymen (mullahs) and feudal lords look at even the slightest change in the society with suspicion and a possible threat to their hegemony. This is why women education and emancipation, NGO activities, etc. are not encouraged. Even SRSP was facing problems in this district until the launching of CIP. The situation is now changing and CIP has helped enhance SRSP’s image. In many cases the mullahs allowed the mosques’ public address systems to be used for disseminating project information to the communities. The feudal lords also have taken a softer line towards SRSP. **SRSP’s enhanced image provides it an excellent opportunity to further extend community and infrastructure development programme in the province.**

**Main beneficiaries:** Majority of the project beneficiaries is poor or poorest of the poor. The poorest of the poor and the destitute are less involved in contributing towards capital cost or O&M. **Future developmental projects in the province should give due consideration to the disadvantaged groups and include income-generating activities to help improve their economic status and cohesion with rest of the community.**

The project has revolutionised development projects’ implementation approach in at least 11 districts. The beneficiaries take so much interest that they often increased the community contribution to enhance physical coverage of the schemes, thereby increasing the number of beneficiaries. It is estimated that over 250,000 people are currently benefiting from the project. The local government representatives and COs strongly feel that CIP implementation methodology saves about 35-40% of the cost as compared to the contractor’s cost for the same job. It was reported that the district assemblies intend to request the provincial government to use, from the next financial year (2002-03) SRSP methodology for future development projects, including Khushhal Pakistan Programme (KPP). The project experience strongly suggests that NWFP’s provincial and district governments, as well as donors should implement future developmental projects through the beneficiary communities, who because of ownership can develop their areas efficiently, transparently and cost-effectively which often lacks in the government-implemented project.

**Women participation:** Women’s role is in decision making is generally low. This is mainly because of low literacy rate and extreme conservatism in certain areas. Some districts in have no women councillors and in some of the beneficiary communities, there were no WCOs. This situation is now improving and the high demand of girl schools in most communities is an evidence. **While the men need to give more opportunities to the women, the women also need to enhance their status by improving their information and be proactive.** NGOs, such as SRSP can play a larger role in women emancipation in the province.

**Quality of civil works:** The quality of work is generally good. **The quality of work on future projects can be further improved by making more effort in the investigation and design of**
schemes and involving the community and community representatives at every stage of the work.

**Replication:** The project has been able to achieve its major objective of rapidly addressing the infrastructure needs of the poor communities. SRPS's co-ordination with the district governments and local communities has been a significant factor in achieving the target. **CLIP has presented a good model for replication that can further be improved by addressing the issues of women development, income generation and increased focus on the disadvantaged members of the community.**

Mr. Wasiullah Khan, DG, NRB talking to the organised forums at Mirpur Abbottabad.

Mr. Brian Baxendale & Dr. Muhammad Abid speaking at the water quality workshop in Abbottabad.
PART A: Name: ___________________________ Date: ____________
Names of the Nuclei: ___________________________ District: ________________ UC: ________________ MCO: ________________
Region: ___________________________ Type of scheme: ___________________________

PART B: Reserve details
1. Name: ___________________________ 2. Gender: Male/Female 3. Age ________ years
4. Status in the household: Head/Wife/Other member.
5. Profession: ___________________________ 6. Average monthly income (Rs): ____________
7. Total number in the household: ____________ 8. Any other source of income: Yes/No.
9. If yes, what are the sources of income? ___________________________
10. Monthly income from other sources (Rs): ________ 11. Total monthly income: ________
12. Do you own a house: Yes/No. 13. Any other property: Shop/Land/Other ________
15. Do you rent a house: Yes/No. 16. What do you spend on utilities on average (Rs)? ________
17. Do you afford to send your children to school? Yes/With difficulty/No.
18. If yes or with difficulty, what do you spend monthly on children's education (Rs)? ________
19. If no, give reason: ___________________________
20. Average monthly expenditure on health (Rs): ________
21. Average monthly expenditure on traditional events/festivities (Rs): ________
22. Any other deduction from your income: Yes/No. 23. If yes, describe: ___________________________
24. Net income (Rs): ________ 25. Average funds available per family member (Rs): ________
26. Do you manage two meals a day? Yes/With difficulty/No.
Numerators’ Remarks: The respondent belongs to the category: 
Wall off/Middle Class/Poor/Poorest of the poor/Destitute

PART C: Community participation

1. How did you know about this project? (a) Through Nazim/Naib Nazim/Councillor, (b) media, 
   (c) SRSP, (d) word of mouth, (e) any other means (describe): ____________

2. Are you aware that this project primarily focuses poverty? Yes/No.

3. Were you consulted prior to identification of this scheme in your area? Yes/No.

4. If no, was it your (a) councillor, (b) Naib Nazim, (c) Nazism, (d) influential group among the community, 
   (e) other (describe) ____, who took the decision without consulting you?

5. If you were not interested in this scheme in your community, what type of scheme did you want?: 
   (a) drinking water, (b) drainage, (c) street pavement, (d) link road, (e) irrigation channel, 
   (f) Protection wall against floods, (g) any other ________________

6. Were you informed about the 20% community contribution in the beginning? Yes/No/Don’t Know

7. Were you asked to contribute your share of the community contribution? 
   Yes/No/Don’t Know

8. Did you contribute your share of the contribution? Yes/No/Don’t Know

9. If yes, how did you pay your part of the contribution? (a) by cash, (b) by labour, (c) by land, (d) by material, 
   (e) Don’t know (f) any other way (describe): ________________

10. If you paid in cash, how much was it? (a) Rs___________ (b) Don’t know

11. If it was in kind (labour, land, material, etc.), describe how much? Rs ________________

12. If your answer to questions 6 to 11 is no, was it because you were (a) unable to pay cash, (b) 
    unable to work as labourer because of: (i) poor health, being a woman and only men take such 
    decisions in your household, too old to work, disadvantaged in any other way __________ (c) 
    were not asked, (d) were not aware of the community contribution,
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(e) did not want to pay for a scheme in which you were not interested,

(g) any other reason __________

13. Do you know of any other household that may not have paid its contribution?

Yes/ No/ Don't know.

14. If yes, approximately how many households did not pay their contribution? __________

15. What is the total (Members and Non Members) number of households in your community?

________________________

16. If you and/or some other beneficiaries of the project did not pay their contribution, who did it on their and/or your behalf? (a) other members of community organisation (CO), (b) your councillor, (c) Nazism, (d) Naib Nazism, (e) someone else (explain) __________

17. If others paid your contribution, do you feel it might influence your right to use the facility?

Yes/ No/ Don't know.

18. Would you be paying O&M charges? Yes/ No/ Not decided.

19. If no, give reason ________________________________

20. Would the others, who did not pay their capital-cost contribution, also not pay O&M?

21. If no, give reasons as best as you can ________________________________
PART D: Direct beneficiaries

1. Are you pleased with the scheme in your area? Yes/Marginally pleased/No.

2. If yes, what benefits have you achieved individually? (a) clean and continuous drinking water supply, (b) cleaner streets, (c) proper drainage (d) better health conditions, (e) overall improved environment, (f) awareness about good water quality and hygienic practices, (g) other

3. Is the scheme conveniently located for women, children, elderly, etc.? Yes/Better than before/No

4. If no, was there any other more convenient site in the vicinity? Explain

5. Have you achieved any economic benefits because of the scheme in your area? such as (a) employment during construction, (b) time saving, giving more opportunity to work due to availability of clean water close by, (c) better health conditions allowing more time for work, (d) improved streets allowing greater business opportunities, (e) other

6. Approximately what savings do you anticipate because of this project implemented in your community, instead of a public sector agency? (a) 25%, (b) 30%, (c) 35%, (d) 40%, (e) 45%, (f) 50%, (g) Don't Know (h) other

7. What advantages do you foresee for yourself and your community as a whole because of the project? (a) cost saving because of no contractor or public sector involvement in works, (b) cleaner and healthier environment (c) improved co-operation within the community because of the formation of CO, (d) enhanced women development activities, (e) improved education and literacy levels, (f) discard of undue political pressure or bureaucratic interference, (g) any other benefit

8. Approximately what percentage of Pakistanis is directly benefiting from this scheme? (a) 50%, (b) 60%, (c) 70%, (d) 80%, (e) 90%, (f) 100%, (g) Don't Know (h) other

9. Approximately what percentage of Afghan refugees is directly benefiting from this scheme? (a) 50%, (b) 40%, (c) 30%, (d) 20%, (e) 10%, (f) none, (g) other

10. Do you think this project has helped the devolution process in some way? Yes/No/Don't know. 11. If yes, explain how?

12. If you are not pleased or only marginally pleased with this scheme, is this because you are handicapped by your (a) Ethnic origin, (b) Minority status, (c) Gender, (d) Remote location, (f) being a widow (g) poverty, (h) other and your opinion not given much weight by other community members/councillors? Yes/No/Perhaps.

13. Does your CO truly represent all segments of the community? Yes/No/Not sure
PART E: Indirect beneficiaries

1. Are some other people, outside your CO also using the facility? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
2. If yes, who are these outside indirect beneficiaries? (a) Pakistanis from nearby villages, (b) Afghan refugees, (c) a combination of Pakistani people and Afghan refugees, (d) not sure.
3. If yes, approximately how many indirect beneficiaries make use of this facility? ______
4. What percentage of these indirect beneficiaries are Pakistanis from nearby villages? _____
5. What percentage of these indirect beneficiaries are Afghan refugees? ________________
6. Did the indirect beneficiaries, particularly the Afghan refugees also make some contribution to the scheme capital cost? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
7. If yes, what was it? ____________________________________________________________
8. Has ever a conflict occurred between the indirect beneficiaries and your CO (direct beneficiaries) because of their using the facility? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
9. If yes, how this conflict was resolved? _________________________________________
10. Who resolved the conflict? __________________________________________________
11. In future would you like your CO and the district governments to implement similar participatory projects through local resources, utilising the same methodology for rapidly targeting the poor? Yes/ Yes, but with some modifications/ No.
12. If you would like this programme to be replicated with some modifications, please describe them _________________________________________________________________

Numerator's signature _______________ Respondent's signature ________________

Numerator's observations:
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Conclusion: ________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
NWFP - COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE INITIATIVE
POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
SOCIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
(For nazimeen and councillors)

PART A: General
Names of the numerators: _____________________________ Date: ______
Region: ___________ District ___________ UC: ___________
MCO/s: ___________ WCO/s: ___________ Type of scheme/s: ______

PART B: Respondent’s details
1. Name ____________________________ 2. Gender: Male/Female 3. Position ______

PART C: Scheme selection and community participation
1. How did you know about this project? (a) media, (b) District Government ______
   (c) SRSP, (d) word of mouth, (e) any other means (describe): ______
2. Are you aware that the project’s primary focus is on poverty? Yes/No/Don’t know.
3. How did you identify and select schemes in your jurisdiction? (a) by using your own criteria
   (briefly describe, if so) ____________________________ (b) by using the poverty based
   criteria provided by SRSP (c) by accepting demands of the most vocal communities, (d) under
   political considerations, (e) any other way (describe) ______
4. Do you think the criteria that you used addresses the real needs of the (a) poor, (b) poorest of the
   poor in the beneficiary community? Yes/No/Not Sure.
5. Did you consult the concerned communities, particularly the poor and the disadvantaged groups
   (elderly, ethnic minorities, women, disabled, those living in remote locations, etc.), prior to
   identification of the scheme/schemes in your area? Always/In most cases/Not always/Neve.
6. How many households exist in this community? ____________________________
7. What is the approximate population of this community? ____________________________
8. What is the approximate percentage of the poor and poorest of the poor in this community?
9. What is the approximate Percentage of the Poorest of the poor and Destitute in this community?
10. Did all members of this community willingly agree to contribute 20% of the scheme cost, prior to
    site selection? (a) all, (b) most of them, (c) few of them, (d) none.
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11. If only few or none of them willingly agreed to contribute 20% of scheme cost, was it because:
   (a) they were not involved in the scheme identification process, (b) they did not need this scheme,
   (c) they could neither contribute in cash nor in kind because of being disadvantaged in some way,
   (d) any other reason (explain) ____________________________

12. If they did not want this scheme, what type of scheme did they prefer?
   (a) Drinking water, (b) drainage, (c) street pavement, (d) link road, (e) irrigation channel,
   (f) protection wall against floods, (g) any other ____________________________

13. If the disadvantaged households could not give their share of community contribution in any possible way, who did it on their behalf? (a) the wealthier members of the community, (b) rest of the community as a whole, (c) district government,
   (d) other (explain) ____________________________

14. What is the approximate percentage of those who did not deliver their share of the community contribution? (a) Less than 5%, (b) 5%, (c) 10%, (d) 15%, (d) any other ___%  

15. How did most of the beneficiaries contribute their share? (a) in cash, (b) by providing land for scheme, (c) material, (d) labour, (e) site supervision, (f) other ______________

16. Do you think that those who could not pay their share would not be able to adequately benefit from the scheme? Yes/ No/ Don’t know.

17. Do you think that those who did not share in the community contribution for one reason or another may also not pay the O&M charges. Yes/ No/ Not sure
PART D: Direct beneficiaries

1. Are all beneficiaries pleased with this scheme? Yes/Marginally pleased/ No.

2. If yes, what benefits do they appear to have achieved? (a) clean and continuous drinking water supply, (b) cleaner streets, (c) proper drainage (d) better health conditions, (e) overall improved environment, (f) awareness about good water quality and hygienic practices, (g), other ________________

3. Do they realise or anticipate any economic benefits because of this scheme in their area? such as (a) employment opportunities during construction, (b) time saving because of availability of clean water close by, (b) better health conditions allowing more time for work, (c) improved streets allowing greater business opportunities, (d) more time for children’s schooling (e) other ____________

4. Approximately what savings has this project achieved because of implementation by the community, instead of a public sector agency? (a) 25%, (b) 30%, (c) 35%, (d) 40%, (e) 45%, (f) 50%, (g) Don’t know (h) other __________________________

5. What advantages has the project brought to individual households and the community as a whole because of? (a) cost saving because of no contractor or public sector involvement in construction, (b) cleaner and healthier environment (c) improved co-operation with the community because of the formation of CO, (d) enhanced women development activities, (e) improved education and literacy levels, (f) discard of undue political or bureaucratic influence, (g) any other benefit __________________________

6. Do you think this project has helped the devolution process in some way? Yes/ No/ Don’t know.

7. If yes, explain how? __________________________

8. If some members of the community are not pleased or only marginally pleased with this scheme, is it because they are in a disadvantageous position due to their (a) Ethnic origin (b) Minority status, (c) Gender, (d) Old age, (e) Remote location, (f) Widow status (g) poverty, (h) other ____________, and because of this reason they feel that their opinion is not given much weight by other community members, councillors and other district government officials.
PART E: Indirect beneficiaries

1. Are some other people, outside the CO also using the facility? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
2. If yes, who are these indirect beneficiaries? (a) Pakistanis from nearby villages, (b) Afghan refugees, (c) a combination of Pakistani people and Afghan refugees, (d) not sure.
3. If yes, approximately how many indirect beneficiaries utilise this facility? __________
4. What percentage of these indirect beneficiaries are Pakistanis from nearby villages? ______
5. What is the approximate population of Afghan refugees camped near the scheme ______
6. What percentage of these refugees is benefiting from the scheme? (a) 100%, (b) 80%, (c) 60%, (d) 50%, (e) 40%, (f) 20% (g) Don't know
7. Did the indirect beneficiaries, particularly the Afghan refugees also make some contribution to the scheme capital cost? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
8. If yes, what was it? _______________________________________________
9. Has ever a conflict occurred between the indirect beneficiaries, particularly the Afghan refugees and the direct beneficiaries because of former sharing the facility? Yes/ No/ Don't know.
10. If yes, how this conflict was resolved? _____________________________________________
11. Who resolved the conflict? ______________________________________________
12. In future would you like the local COs and district governments to implement similar participatory projects by using local resources and utilising the same methodology for rapidly targeting the poor? Yes/Yes, but with some modifications/ No.
13. If you would like this programme to be replicated with some modifications, please describe them ____________________________________________________________

Surveyor’s signature _______________ Respondent’s signature _______________

Numerator _______________ Observation: ________________________________

Conclusion _______________
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NWFP – COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE INITIATIVE  
POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
SOCIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE  
(For individual households)

Scheme surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Districts</th>
<th>No. of schemes</th>
<th>DWSS</th>
<th>Street pav. and Drainage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Charsadda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Peshawar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Nowshera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Kohat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Hangu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Karak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Abbottabad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Hari Pur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Mansehra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Battagarm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B:  Respondent’s particular

No. of respondents interviewed: 257

Male and female ratio of respondents: 171:86

Age limit of respondents: 16-70 years

53% Illiterate, 14% Below Matric, 11% Matric, % 18 above Matric

12% Farming, 11% Business, 18% Govt, servant, 27% unemployed, remaining are Daily wagers

Education: No. Income

Less Rs. 500: 6%
Rs. 500-1000: 47%
Rs. 1000+: 47%

Profession: 58% of the respondents were Head of the family, while the remaining were wives and others

Average monthly income: 83% of the people has their own houses

Status in the house: while 17% are tenants.

Sarhad Rural Support Programme
Harnessing people's potential
2. Affordability of sending their children to school

48% reported that they are sending their Children to school with no difficulty, 24% with difficulty while the remaining either have no school going children or cannot afford.

3. Managing of two meals a day

40% respondents said that they are managing it with no difficulty, 30% with difficulty, while 30% told that they cannot manage.

Numerator’s Remarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest of the Poor</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destitute</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART C: Community participation

4. First time Knowledge about the project

55% knew through Nazim/Niab Nazim/Councillors
20% knew from SRSP
16% from the word of mouth
9% from other family members

5. Focus on poverty

95% knew the focus of the project on poverty

6. Consultation prior to identification of this scheme in the area

88% reported that they have been consulted
12% did not know

7. Information about the 20% share

86% knew about the 20% contribution
14% did not know about it
8. Form of contribution
63% paid their share in the form of labour
13% paid their share by Cash
24% neither know nor paid

9. Labour work in Rs
Rs. 200 to Rs. 1800

11. Payment O&M charges
78% are willing to pay
8% are unwilling
14% were not sure about it.

PART D: Direct beneficiaries

12. Satisfaction with the scheme
97% pleased
3% marginally pleased

13. Individual benefits from scheme
The community as a whole benefited from
Water Supply and Drainage schemes

14. Scheme location
98% were agreed to the scheme location

15. Economic benefits of the scheme.
Easy, clean and continuous water supply
Improved and better streets for the Pedestrians

16. Approximate savings because of
Community involvement in the project
54% reported that about 35-50% have been saved
46% did not know

17. Advantages of the project as a whole
Cost saving because of no contractor involvement
Improved co-operation
Discard of undue political pressure
Enhanced women developmental activities

18. Pakistani Beneficiaries
96%

19. Afghani Beneficiaries
4%
20. Help in the devolution process
    74% were of the view that the project has helped it
    26% did not know, especially the females

21. True representation of all segments
    Of the community in CO
    91% told Yes
    4% said No.
    5% did not know

PART E: Indirect beneficiaries

22. People, outside the CO using the facility
    90% using the facility
    10% did not know

23. Outside indirect beneficiaries
    80% Pakistani, 20% Afgani

24. Conflict in the scheme.
    In 89% cases no conflict
    In 11% conflict occurred

26. Replication of the project
    96% were agreed with this model and they were
    of the view to replicate the other projects in this way
    While 4% did not know about it
Overall Comments

1. The communities selected are almost Poor and Poorest of the poor.
2. The communities have been involved actively in the identification, design and implementation of the schemes.
3. Most of the peoples were aware of the approach of community participation but most females are unaware and hence required to be involved in an effective manner.
4. The community with middle class and poor is well organised as comparatively the poorest of the poor community.
5. Major contribution is in the form of labour, because most of them cannot give their share in cash.
6. Maximum peoples are happy with the type of scheme and location.
7. This project has helped the devolution process a lot
8. With this project, the co-ordination between the community members has improved
9. The people are fully in consensus with replication of this model
10. The communities are demanding for revenue based projects.
11. The work in some scheme is still in progress and needs to be finished with in stipulated time
12. The projects with little bit technicality has not been completed or the pace of work is slow
13. The overall quality of work may graded as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/Satisfactory</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NWFP – COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE INITIATIVE
POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
SOCIAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
(For nazimeen and councillors)
Scheme surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Districts</th>
<th>No. of schemes</th>
<th>DWSS</th>
<th>Street pav. and Drainage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. District Charsadda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. District Peshawar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. District Nowshera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. District Kohat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. District Hangu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. District Karak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. District Abbottabad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. District Hari Pur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. District Mansehra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. District Battagram</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B: Respondent’s particular
No. of respondents interviewed: 66 (2 Tehsil Nazim, 1 Tehsil Naib Nazim,
20 UC Nazim, 5 UC Naib Nazim, 38 Councilors)
Male and female ratio of respondents: 56:10
Education: 15% Illiterate, 7% Below Matric,
33% Matric, 45% above Matric

PART C: Scheme selection and community participation

1. First time knowledge about the project: 45% through District Government,
41% through SRSP,
2% through media,
11% through other means

2. Focus on poverty: 98% knew the focus of the project on poverty

3. Identification of scheme: 78% by poverty based criteria,
10% accepting the demand of the community,
12% others

4. Fulfilment of the criteria of addressing the real need of the poor and poorest: 99% responded with full satisfaction by addressing the real need of the poor and poorest
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5. Consultation of the concerned beneficiaries

8. Overall distribution of the peoples.

Almost in all the cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorest of the Poor</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destitute</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Willingness of the community for 20% share

74% were agreed

26 % of the people were either unable to afford or not interested

82% paid their share in labour form

6% paid their share in cash

12% paid their share in material, land and supervision

PART D: Direct beneficiaries

9. Satisfaction with the scheme

95 % pleased

Clean and continuous water supply

Cleaner streets with proper drainage

Better waste disposal

Overall improved environment

Awareness about health and Hygiene

10. Benefits of the Project

Time saving because of easy availability of water near by

Better health condition

Improved street for pedestrians

Enhanced property rates

11. Economic benefits of the project

12. Approximate savings because of Community involvement in the project

88% reported saving of about 40-50% have

12% did not know
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13. Advantages of the project as a whole
- Cost saving because of no contractor
- Improved co-operation with in peoples
- Discard of undue political pressures
- Enhanced women development

14. Help in the devolution process
- 99% reported that it has helped it

PART E: Indirect beneficiaries

15. People, outside the CO, using the facility
- 88% told about its use.

16. Outside indirect beneficiaries
- 89% Pakistani and 11% Afghan

17. Conflict in the scheme
- In 87% cases no conflict occurred
- In 13% cases either there was some conflict or they did not know about it

18. Replication of the project
- 90% were agreed with this model and they were of the view to replicate the other projects in this way.
- 10% suggested some changes like reduction in the community share and form of contribution should not be in cash form

Overall Comments
1. The experience of involving the district government has been very good
2. They were very co-operative and actively involved in the identification, selection, design and implementation of the projects.
3. In some cases the local representatives seem to be a bit influential, but it has a good impact of controlling the things nicely.
4. The people have an easy access to them.
5. They are agreed with the current model and want this to be replicated.
6. They are also demanding for income generating projects.
7. They have been very helpful in resolving the conflicts.
8. In some cases, the councillors suggested that the process of identification and selection should be brought down to the grass root level i.e councillors should be given the task of identifying and selecting the schemes instead of Nazims.
Executive summary

- CIIP has significantly helped the devolution process by creating a very positive impact amongst all stakeholders and helping improve poor communities’ trust in their community organisations, local government representatives and SRSP. Over 90% of the respondents agreed with the replication of this model. Nearly nine out of ten respondents said that there was no conflict of opinion in scheme selection between the local government representatives and the members of the community organisations (CO). Most the remaining, mostly women did not know.

- The social survey results show that ninety percent of the project beneficiaries are poor or poorest of the poor. The poorest of the poor and the destitute, comprising 8% of the project beneficiaries are less involved in contributing towards capital cost or O&M.

- There are around 4% Afghan refugees reported as members of the COs and directly benefitting from the projects. The indirect beneficiary base is significantly low and in that too 69% are Pakistanis and 11% Afghanistan.

- Most women in the beneficiary communities are not fully aware of the devolution process or the participatory approach of the project. While male domination is an obvious reason, women's low literacy, generally passive attitude and lack of interest in community affairs also appear to be major causes for the lack of awareness. For these very reasons the women councillors are also not very effective in the district assemblies. However, in recent years most communities have realised the significance of woman education and emancipation. This is why over 80% of respondents expressed girl schools as one of their top priorities.

- The quality of work is generally good and cost-effective. According to the assessment of the Nazims, councillors and community members, these schemes have been implemented at nearly two-thirds of the cost if a contractor was involved.

- Over 90% of the respondents reported their satisfaction with the project implementation process undertaken and benefits accruing from the schemes. As such in 80% cases, the beneficiary contribution exceeded beyond 20%. The survey results show that 82% of the beneficiaries contributed in terms of labour, 6% percent through cash and 12% in the form of material and land.

- The project has been able to achieve its major objective of rapidly redressing the infrastructure needs of the poor communities, suffering because of the past and present refugee influx and prolonged drought. SRPS's co-ordination with the district governments and local communities has been a significant factor in achieving the target.

- All respondent groups agree about SRSP's pivotal role in advancing the devolution process and bringing the local government representatives and communities closer in the project areas.

- CIIP has also highlighted DFID as a significant donor in the infrastructure sector that has helped the devolution process in NWFP.
Chapter 1: Introduction

SRSP initiated a six-month (15 November 2001 to 15 May 2002) Community Infrastructure Initiative Project (CIIP) funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The spirit of the project was to strengthen the newly devolved district governments and provide through a process small infrastructure schemes to organised forums of men and women. The District Nazims of the eleven Districts\(^1\) carried out the area identification in consultation with Union Council (UC) Nazims. A total of 85 UCs were identified by the District Nazims based on the criteria of those areas that had negative impacts due to the influx of existing and expected Afghan refugees. This situation was particularly of concern because one million additional Afghan refugees were expected after the events of 11 September 2001. The refugees placed pressure on use of existing infrastructure, such as water, sanitation, and link roads. The other criteria that the concerned district governments used in identifying communities were the effects of drought, poverty and gender issues.

The UC Nazims identified 254 schemes, 90% of which related to water and sanitation. The other schemes were irrigation channels, link roads, etc. A total of 254 schemes were initiated and according to the weekly progress report till May 10 2002, 230 projects (91 percent) have been completed and the rest of the 24 schemes or 9 percent would be completed by 31 May 2002.

During the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of 1-3 March 2002, it was decided that in the final evaluation by end May, a poverty impact assessment (PIA) would be completed by 15 May. In order to minimise bias the study was to be carried out by SRSP teams not belonging to the same regions where they worked. It was further agreed that there will be three teams of surveyors and each team would assess nine schemes apiece.

This report is a result of this exercise. In this introductory Chapter 1, the methodology used for the study, including team composition and operational strategy to conduct the study are discussed. The Chapter 2 presents the survey data and its analysis. The Chapter derives conclusions and recommendations on the basis of analysis and lessons learnt. The summary findings of the study are given in the Executive Summary.

\(^1\) The 11 districts are: Kohat, Hangu, Kerek, Abbottabad, Haripur, Manshera, Batagram, Peshawar, Nowshera, Charsadda, and Chitral.

The heads of RSPN, NRSP, PRSP, GBTI and representatives of Planning Division of Pakistan listening to a presentation made by the empowered people of Haripur.
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Methodology

Sample selection

A random sampling technique was applied where the following areas were omitted in stratification.

- As drinking water and sanitation schemes comprised 90% of the schemes, PIA focused on W&S schemes only.
- Out of the 202 W&S schemes, a 13% sample was taken. The small size was due to the limited time available for the study. As such, 27 schemes were selected for survey. The ratio between water supply and sanitation in the project is roughly 1:2. The same ratio was used for survey as well.
- Chitral District was omitted due to unreliable accessibility and because most Chitral schemes are irrigation channels, which are beyond the scope of the survey.

Team selection and schedules

The DFID Advisor placed in SRSP and the Chief Engineer (CE), CIIP Project Management Unit (PMU) made the scheme selection. The DFID Advisor, CE (PMU), Chief PMER and Project Co-ordinator (CIIP) made the team selection. The teams included a PMU Engineer, a PMER Officer a Social Organiser (SO). Special consideration was made that gender balance within teams was maintained. Out of the nine persons selected, six were men and three women. The team composition had a blend of experience and youth.

Table-1: Team Composition and Area of Field Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of members</th>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Region represented</th>
<th>Where working</th>
<th>Where conducting study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Abdul Sami (Engineer)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Charsadda</td>
<td>Abbottabad and Mansehra (four districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Abdul Wadood (PMER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charsadda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fatima Ali, Senior Social Organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Latifur Rahman, Engineer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Mansehra</td>
<td>Peshawar and Charsadda (three districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wajha Khan, PMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Abid Zara Bangash, Senior Social Organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humayun Khan, Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabinda Haraf, PMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asghar Ali, Senior Social Organiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Survey

As was decided at the time of the MTR, the PIA would undertake the following:

- A well-being ranking of the entire community
- A careful identification of the poorer subgroups on the basis of gender, ethnic origin, marginal location, others (widows, elderly, disabled, etc.)
- Separate discussions of each of the subgroups of the poor
- Discussions with all groups clearly identifying:
  - The extent to which each group was benefiting from the scheme
  - Other schemes that the poorer groups might have preferred instead of the existing CIIP schemes
The costs, quantitative and qualitative benefits derived from the scheme by the poor and the community as a whole.

**Operational strategy**

The Table 2 indicates the steps taken to conduct PIA, whereas Table 3 presents the schedule of activities, schemes selected for the study and other salient information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>By whom</th>
<th>Dates for the activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample selection</td>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>3 March 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual scheme selection according to 1, above</td>
<td>DFID Consultant Team based at SRSP</td>
<td>End April 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Selection</td>
<td>DFID Consultant and SRSP Teams</td>
<td>End April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team composition for conducting the study</td>
<td>DFID Consultant and SRSP Teams</td>
<td>End April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey form development, field testing and finalisation</td>
<td>Development by end April, field testing and finalisation on 1 May 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting survey</td>
<td>Survey Teams, DFID Consultant and SRSP Teams facilitating the process</td>
<td>2-9 May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation</td>
<td>Survey Teams, supervised by the DFID Consultant and SRSP Teams</td>
<td>10-14 May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td>Adviser DFID and PM, PMER</td>
<td>16 May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of the survey results</td>
<td>DFID Adviser, placed at HO, SRSP and from DFID London</td>
<td>17-22 May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of the report for inclusion in the evaluation</td>
<td>DFID and SRSP</td>
<td>First week of June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was conducted within the time frame planned during the MTR. The study was conducted in an excellent team spirit. The survey forms were developed in a consultative process, by sharing in a debriefing session on Sunday 30 April 2002 with the survey teams. The teams carried out field testing of the survey questionnaires with the SRSP management supervising and facilitating the process. A session in the evening of the same day was held where amendments were made to the survey format in light of the recommendations of the teams. The teams after collection of data debriefed the management team SRSP, including the Project Management Unit based at SRSP. DFID Adviser has jointly written the report with the HO PMER Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemes And Teams</th>
<th>Team A</th>
<th>Team B</th>
<th>Team C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 02</td>
<td>Toif Khan</td>
<td>Garhi Sherdad</td>
<td>Jewar Ghandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 03</td>
<td>Mirpur/ Nawaz/ Shahr</td>
<td>Sadlatabad/ Deg</td>
<td>Randan Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 04</td>
<td>Chohan/ Khuda Colony</td>
<td>Manal M. Hameza Khan</td>
<td>Lendi Khel/ 182/ old Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 05</td>
<td>Backar/ Taiyari</td>
<td>P. Ketti Khel</td>
<td>Alagdi Karak/ Wankay Samij Khel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 06</td>
<td>Gharatbabad</td>
<td>Zahidabad/ Yoyo Kalai</td>
<td>Mohallah Sangihr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 07</td>
<td>Gorini</td>
<td>Sawar Khel</td>
<td>Hayat Town/ Mao Zap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 08-10</td>
<td>Data completion</td>
<td>Data completion</td>
<td>Data completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Story of Water through stages

The Drainage System – Before & After
79% of the beneficiaries are poor or poorest of the poor, 4% are destitute and 17% belong to the middle class.

Community participation

Nearly all respondents in Categories 'A' and 'B' are aware that the project's primary focus are the poor local communities suffering because of the Afghan refugee influx and over-exploitation of local infrastructure.

In Category 'A' 68% of the respondents confirmed that they were consulted about the type of scheme and its location. 12%, mostly women did not know much about scheme identification. This is probably because women have a secondary and subdued role in rural NWFP. Normally, men take most of the decisions and the women in the households are sometimes not even informed. All Category 'B' respondents confirmed having identified schemes on the basis of poverty and by asking the communities what type of schemes they wanted.

86% of the Category 'A' respondents were aware of the 20% community contribution but 14%, mostly women did not know about it. Category 'B' respondents are of the view that 74% of the beneficiaries contributed in the capital cost. The remaining 26% could not afford it or did not want to pay.

Nearly 63% of Category 'A' respondents said that they paid their contribution share in the form of labour, 13% claimed to have paid in cash. The remaining 24% (all women respondents) were not sure about community contribution. The Category 'B' respondents claim that 82% of the people contributed their share in the form of labour and 18% in the form of cash or material.

78% of the beneficiaries are willing to pay whatever operation and maintenance (O&M) charges would be due to them. 8%, some of them Afghan refugees and the rest destitute are not willing to pay. 14% (all women) respondents are not aware about the payment of O&M charges.

Direct beneficiaries

97% of the Category 'A' and 95% of Category 'B' respondents explicitly expressed their appreciation of the project and said that it is probably the best approach to provide basic facilities to the poor communities.

98% of the beneficiaries agreed that the schemes are ideally located for all members of the community.

54% of the Category 'A' and 88% of the Category 'B' respondents said that project implementation by the communities had saved an estimated one-third of the cost in comparison to the situation if the schemes had been contracted through contractors. 46% in Category 'A' and 12% in Category 'B', mostly women could not give their opinions.

96% of the direct beneficiaries are Pakistanis and the rest 4% are Afghans.

74% of the Category 'A' respondents said that SRSP has helped the devolution process through this project by providing the poorer communities an opportunity to work closely with their local government representatives. The women respondents representing the remaining 26% are not much aware of the devolution. Among the Category 'B' respondents that included women councillors as well, 99% said that SRSP and CIIP had helped the devolution process. Their opinion was on the basis that they had committed themselves for developmental work in their constituencies but could not implement due to bureaucratic delays in the availability of