

CAC South Asia – Questionnaire for Independent Project Completion Assessment

Key Project Data (From Completion report)

Title of Project	Urban Corruption Survey	
Project Code		Project Location Behrampur, Orissa, India
Corruption Problem being addressed	Petty corruption in the delivery of basic services in Behrampur	
Project Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the level of corruption in providers of six selected basic services; 2. Increase public interest in issues surrounding corruption; and 3. Help identify appropriate remedial actions and communicate those to policymakers and the general public. 	
	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Implementation period	March 1, 2008- Feb. 28, 2009	March 1, 2008-May 31, 2009
Total Budget	I. Rs. 594,000	I. Rs. 600,863
PTF Contribution	\$15,000	\$15,000
Top Three Results (actual)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of corruption survey to map the magnitude of corruption in delivery of six major services: Drinking Water, Municipal Services, Public Healthcare, Public Distribution System, Behrampur Development Authority Services, and Land records Administration. 2. Formation of Coalition Against Corruption (CAC) to bring together civil society organization to interface between the public officials and the civil society on issues of corruption. 3. Recognition of YSD as a credible watchdog for monitoring and combating corruption in Behrampur. The project also helped establish YSD's capacity for managing significant size projects. 	

Completion Assessment¹

1. Summary of Assessment.

a. Overall Achievement Rating²

2

Guidance. The degree to which the project achieved, or seems likely to achieve, all or most of its objectives. Please provide this rating after the detailed assessment under Section 2.

b. Commentary on Overall Assessment.

c. Guidance. Please provide a narrative to accompany your overall achievement rating taking into account your overall assessment (in a maximum of 20 lines) of taking into account quality or project design, implementation performance and

¹ Ratings Scale: 1 = Highly Satisfactory/Likely; 2 = Satisfactory/Likely; 3 = Moderately Satisfactory/Likely; 4 = Moderately unsatisfactory/Unlikely; 5 = Unsatisfactory/Unlikely; 6 = Highly Unsatisfactory/Unlikely; NA = Not Applicable

² The degree to which the project achieved, or seems likely to achieve, all or most of its objectives.

results achieved. Reasons for rating of 4 or more may please be explained here. It is suggested that this be written last after the detailed assessment (Section 2 below) has been done and Overall Achievement Rating determined.

The main focus of the project was on gaining better understanding of the level and dynamics of corruption bearing on the delivery of selected services rather than to combat corruption per se. The projects also tried raising public awareness of the problem and engaging the service providers in a constructive manner. All these provided a good foundation for the Phase II project. Arguably, this project would not fit with the current PTF expectations as to directly combating corruption. The positive experience with this project suggests the need for more flexibility in funding by the PTF.

Although the project implementation had to be extended by 3 months, the project successfully completed all the planned activities and successfully delivered all the outputs. Financial reporting was meticulous and website was well maintained. The positive implementation experience reflects in large measure the dedication, professional competence and inter-personal skills of the YSD project coordinator, Mr. Bibhu Prasad Sahu

Project results were more in the nature of outputs rather than outcomes and all the intended outputs were achieved. The successful execution of the project has also given credibility and confidence to YSD for moving on to the bigger challenge of combating corruption under the Phase II project (already underway).

2. Detailed Assessment: (Ratings with brief comments)

1. Quality of the Project Design

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a. Elaboration of the corruption problems to be addressed. | 2 |
| b. Clarity and relevance of the objectives to the corruption problem being addressed. | 2 |
| c. Coherence of Results Framework (Log frame) | 2 |
| d. Constructive engagement plan | 2 |

Comments:

2. The Implementation Performance

- | | |
|---|----------|
| a. Extent to which the planned project activities and outputs were completed. | 1 |
| b. Adequacy of financial reporting. | 1 |
| c. Adequacy of documentation posted on the website. | 1 |

- d. Constructive engagement during implementation 2

Comments:

3. The Results:

- a. Accomplishments of the results specified in the log frame and/or project proposal. 1
- b. Robustness of the evidence for the results narrated in the completion reports. 2
- c. Responsiveness of authorities to constructive engagement. 2
- d. Value added of peer learning activities and events. 2
- e. Project contribution to CSO partner capacity to carry out anti-corruption work. 2

Comments: *(Please briefly explain the ratings and any noteworthy aspects)*

4. PAC-PTF Advice (Please consult CSO Partner)

- a. Value added of PTF technical advice
- b. Value added of PAC technical advice

Comments: *(In your comments please include Strong and weakest points of PTF-PAC interventions and suggestions for improvement)*

PTF assistance and advice during the design and appraisal phase was much appreciated by YSD. The PTF could however done a better job in critiquing the conceptual basis of the “bribery index” used for measuring the level of corruption among various agencies of the Behrampur municipality. The index as defined appears hard to explain to the stakeholders; equally importantly, the reported values are also hard to interpret.

Perhaps reflecting the initial teething problems in operationalizing the PAC business model, the support and assistance from PAC was not as substantive or timely as it could have been.

5. Assessor’s recommendation for continued support for Phase 2. *Please provide us with your views on whether, given the implementation experience and the results achieved you would recommend continued funding. Please choose one: Highly Favorably; Moderately Favorably; Favorably; Moderately Unfavorably; Unfavorably; or Not favorably. Please provide brief justification for your recommendation.*

The project was an excellent candidate for follow up support as recognized by PTF through approval of a Phase II project.