

**Partnership Transparency Fund
Citizen Against Corruption Project (Phase II)**

Self-Assessment by Grantee Organization

Questionnaire and Guidelines

A. Key project data	
1. Name of the CSO	: Youth for Social Development (YSD)
2. Project Title	: Community Engagement in Fight Against Corruption and Improve Service Delivery in Brahmapur city of Orissa, India (Anti-corruption Phase-III)
3. Project Location	: Berhampur, Ganjam, Odisha, India
4. Grant Amount (in USD)	: 35000US\$
5. Period of Implementation	: From: 01/08/2011 To: 31/03/2013
6. PTF Project Advisor	: Dr. Sidhir Chitale
7. Date of Self-Assessment	: 06/06/2013

B. Please give your self-assessment for various aspects of your project. (See Scoring Guidelines below)	
1. How would you rate the relevance and design of your Phase 2 ¹ project on a scale of 1-5 as per scoring guidelines?	4
2. How would you rate the efficiency and effectiveness of your Phase 2 project on a scale of 1-5 as per scoring guidelines?	5
3. How would you rate the combined outcome and impact of your Phase 1 and 2 projects on a scale of 1-5 as per scoring guidelines?	4
4. How would you rate the sustainability of your Phase 1 and 2 projects on a scale of 1-5 as per scoring guidelines?	4

Annex: Scoring Guidelines

Approach and Phase 2 Project Design

Rating	The Project...
1	<i>targeted a relevant problem unsatisfactorily/ identified an applicable cause-and-effect design unsatisfactorily</i>
2	<i>targeted a relevant problem partially satisfactorily/ identified an applicable cause-and-effect design partially satisfactorily</i>
3	<i>targeted a relevant problem satisfactorily/ identified an applicable cause-and-effect design satisfactorily</i>
4	<i>targeted a relevant problem highly satisfactorily/ identified an applicable cause-and-effect design highly satisfactorily</i>
5	<i>targeted a relevant problem exceptionally well/ identified an applicable cause-and-effect design exceptionally well</i>

¹ Phase 3 in case of YSD and CUTs.

Phase 2 Project Implementation

Rating	The Phase 2 Project...
1	<i>was implemented unsatisfactorily regarding outputs created and/or cost-benefit-time considerations</i>
2	<i>was implemented partially satisfactorily regarding outputs created and/or cost-benefit-time considerations</i>
3	<i>was implemented satisfactorily regarding outputs created and/or cost-benefit-time considerations</i>
4	<i>was implemented highly satisfactorily regarding outputs created and/or cost-benefit-time considerations</i>
5	<i>was implemented exceptionally well regarding outputs created and/or cost-benefit-time considerations</i>

Combined Outcomes and Impact of Phase 1 and 2 Projects

Rating	The Projects...
1	<i>had no discernible impact</i>
2	<i>had low impact with little prospect of sustainability</i>
3	<i>had moderate impact with some prospect of sustainability or had high short term impact but little prospect of sustainability</i>
4	<i>had a moderate impact with good prospects of sustainability or had major impact short term but may not be sustainable</i>
5	<i>had major impact which is likely to be sustained</i>

Sustainability

Rating	The Phase 1 and 2 Projects...
1	<i>cannot or should not be replicated</i>
2	<i>has a few elements that may be replicated; lessons learned can be used in this particular country setting; is not recommended to be replicated</i>
3	<i>can be replicated, however important stakeholders, goals or processes will have to be aligned and reconsidered thoroughly</i>
4	<i>can be replicated; major goals, elements and stakeholders are in place and can be easily engaged in a similar project</i>
5	<i>can be replicated 1:1 in the same sector or a different sector making use of the same stakeholders</i>

C. Please provide a brief reflection for each following question by looking back at the cumulative experience of your Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects.

1. Do you think that the defined objectives and outcomes of the projects were appropriate to the context and problem being addressed? Please explain.

The project objectives and outcomes are appropriate to the context and problems being addressed. The objectives defines keeping in mind with the previous two phases (I &II) and in consultation with the community monitors and project staff. The objectives and outcomes driven by the communities and accepted after its design specifically on selection of sectors like PDS, ICDS and drinking water and the strategy i.e. community engagement and working with the frontline staff. The results of the phase-III seen in the project completion report narrate its achievements.

2. Do you think that the activities were appropriate to achieve the defined objectives and outcomes? Please explain.

The activities designed looking into the objectives and outcomes are quite appropriate and consultative

with community monitors, project staff and the project mentor PAC. The achievement of results shows that they were appropriate is quite useful for replication in the future.
3. What adjustments and changes were required in the planned activities and why?
There were very less number of adjustments and changes done in the project implementation (evident from the completion report). These minor/small changes are due to availability and mismatch time of among various stakeholders.
4. What challenges did you face in implementing the projects and how did you address them?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community mobilization in anti-corruption project where results are delayed, sometimes invisible and difficult to measure, were quite challenging. The same issue has been mitigated by mobilizing them through rights awareness and sensitization and engaging community leaders and elected representatives with the beneficiaries. • Engaging senior public officials, who can make decisions and frontline staff getting benefitted due to corruption, are difficult to mobilize and engaged. Engaging champions, pressurizing through senior departmental officials at the state level and involving PDS shop owners association and AWWs union in ICDS made the team easy to mobilize and engage. • Political elites at the community level are most obstacles and challenging in the project implementation. This has been mitigated through engaging with the elected representatives and leaders of the oppositions in the wards. • Shop owners of PDS and AWWs of ICDS services are very defensive due to many issues they are facing in day to day provision of services. They at a point of time didn't cooperate with the team. Engagement with the shop owners association and local MLA find us a way to engage and involve them in our initiative to fight corruption. • There are many threats to our staff and community monitors not to engage anti-corruption initiative and even not to enter few slums and AWCs, PDS shops. But due to intervention and engagement of elected representatives help us in escaping threats from the elites • Low level of support from the peers and other partners of citizen against corruption project for a state level advocacy for more transparency and improved service delivery and limited guidance from the national mentor have limited the achievement of more better results.
5. What measurable results were achieved by the combination of Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects? Please describe by using the core results indicators and any other measures used by you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 206 (1404 no in 10 wards) of eligible excluded beneficiaries got poor left out (PLO) ration cards in 13 slums • All ration card holders of the 13 slums have the stipulated quantities of ration items regularly on stipulated price. • All the 22 ration shops operating in the 13 slums (59 shops in 10 wards) are open at the accepted times (two times in a day) and share all related information with the community, respond to the genuine demands, follow the stipulated rules and procedures • Beneficiaries and communities in 13 slums are empowered (aware and sensitized on their rights and entitlements) • 31 grievances and 67 RTI applications filed by Community on PDS • Strong city level coalition (CAC) established and addressed issues of PDS, ICDS and drinking water • Community participates actively in the whole management of the ICDS in 10 slums and receive stipulated nutritional food and services in time under ICDS in 10 slums • 78.4% of households getting safe drinking water regularly and sufficiently in 13 slums
6. Looking at the 'results' that the projects have achieved, are you satisfied? Please explain your answer(s).

<p>We are satisfied, but our satisfaction level is moderate. Because what we have achieved in terms of results are significant but still to do lot and could have done much better and results may be more and methods are institutionalized if there will be an efficient network in place to advocate at the state level for a big change. On the other hand the mentoring part is not sufficiently made by the umbrella organisation which has been assigned but it was not efficient.</p>
<p>7. What challenges did you face in managing the financial aspects of the projects?</p>
<p>No challenges, because we a good financial management system in place.</p>
<p>8. Do you think the projects have produced enough 'value for money'? Could it be better?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderately achieved the value for money. Many of the things are not done in proper order. For example result indicators defined much delayed. • Training and capacity on many aspects of project has not been done properly and sufficiently. • Both the umbrella and donor could have done better if those things were mitigated properly and on time.
<p>9. Do you think the 'changes' brought about by the projects are likely to be sustained in the longer term? Why or why not?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many things will be surely sustain and many will not. • Community engagement and the skills of the community groups have will be utilized in future for anti-corruption activities and changes like engagement with the front line staff specifically PDS shop owners may not sustain due to more policy level issues and state government intervention are not achieved.
<p>10. What lessons can be learned from the two (Phase 1 and 2) projects? What worked well or should be avoided in future? What will you do differently if the projects/program is to be continued and be implemented again?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional engagement of community groups in monitoring service delivery and fighting corruption are commendable and building blocks (P-II&III) • Right to Information is an important tool to get information, analyze and fight corruption has doubled the confidence of the citizens (P-II&III) • Elected representatives plays a major role - had influence on policies and decisions (P-II&III) • Support from the higher level officials structures not favorable -due to gap in State's policies and practices (compared to the lower level officials/structures the higher ones were not supportive) (P-II&III) • Communities are interested in addressing corruption in other issues like ICDS, IHSDP and other civic issues—particularly through using RTI (P-I) • Ration shop owners association and AWW workers union are cooperative to become transparent. (P-II&III) • The tools are very important like RTI, social auditing, citizen report card, public hearing, and advocacy to take the anti-corruption agenda forward. (P-III) • Knowledge materials developed are very important and make it happen to replicate by others and in many states and countries (P-II & III) • City level coalition (CAC) played major role in bringing transparency and improve service at the local level but they don't have sufficient reach to the state level. (P-II & III)
<p>Better do</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Citizen Against Corruption partner's can influence state policy but didn't happen due to weak

<p>support from all the partners. In future may be good strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better space was not created in the beginning of the project and will do if implemented in future • Use technology to demonstrate the change (business process reengineering) in future.
<p>11. Whom did you disseminate the lessons learned from these projects? What were the responses?</p> <p>To the beneficiaries, public officials and civil society organizations at the district and state level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiaries: to engage intensively and in other sectors also and worry for their mistakes • Public officials praised efforts and assured their continued support to such type of engagement and intervention • A very good leaning from the lessons by the CSOs and CAC network to engage in future and replicate the method and tools • Other development partners praised and assure for continued support specifically to disseminate the method and tools and also knowledge materials

Overall Score Calculation

Category	Value	Raw Score (from Evaluation)	Weighted Score
Approach & Project Design	15%	12%	.15 x Raw Score
Project Implementation	20%	18%	.20 x Raw Score
Outcomes, Impact & Sustainability	45%	35%	.45 x Raw Score
Replicability	20%	16%	.20 x Raw Score
Overall Score	100%	81%	Sum of Above

THANK YOU.