

EVALUATION OF MOST VULNERABLE FAMILIES LISTING PROCESS
An Assessment by the Centre for Advanced Study for GTZ

Final Report
February
2005

Kristina Chhim
Sokhom Hean
Roger Henke
Kea Kunthmalia
Lath Poch
Lim Sidedine

CONTENTS

List of tables	p.3
Executive Summary	p.4
1. Background / context / aim of evaluation	p.6
2. Procedures of evaluation by CAS team	p.6
3. Findings	p.8
<u>3.1. Poverty identification process</u>	p.8
<i>Trainings and orientation on MVFL</i>	
<i>Creating the first draft of MVFL</i>	
<i>First public meeting to elect the village representatives (2nd group)</i>	
<i>Public announcement of the first draft of MVFL created by the 1st group</i>	
<i>Training to the elected members of the 2nd group</i>	
<i>Verifying the first list by 2nd group (by means of questionnaire)</i>	
<i>Completing final version of draft MVFL to be presented to the public</i>	
<i>Public announcement of final MVFL</i>	
<u>3.2. Results of the poverty identification process</u>	p.11
<i>Checking of the questionnaires of 6 short-listed families in 6 villages</i>	
<i>Interviews with 6 non short-listed families in 6 villages</i>	
<i>Public opinion check on MVFL</i>	
<i>Overall assessment of the accuracy of the lists</i>	
<u>3.3. Feedback of identification groups on difficulties during the identification process</u>	p.17
<i>DCDT</i>	
<i>1st group</i>	
<i>2nd group</i>	
<u>3.4. Perception of villagers about the usefulness of the MVFL</u>	p.18
<i>Suggestions of villagers</i>	
<u>4. Recommendations</u>	p.20
Annexes	p.22
Annex 1: Terms of reference	
Annex 2: Proposal Center for Advanced Study	
Annex 3: Guidelines for the creation of the "most vulnerable families list" by Commune councils and community people.	
Annex 4: The process described at village level	
Annex 5: Additional tables of results	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Basic information on the sample villages and MVFL information received

Table 2: Accuracy of processing the questionnaires

Table 3: Similarity and difference score by sample village (Plus or minus 1 score)

Table 4: Similarity and difference score by single criteria of identification

Table 5: Similarity and difference score by sample village with more or less smooth process of identification (Plus or minus 1 score)

Table 6: Number of non short-listed HHs that should have been and should not have been included in the MVFL (break-off point score 10)

Table 6A: Comparing the villagers' and CAS scores for 6 non short-listed families in Daun La'a

Table 7A: Name of poor HH in the village identified by short-listed respondents in the list

Table 7B: Name of poor HH in the village identified by non short-listed respondents

Figure 1: Summary indicator of the accuracy of the MVF Lists

Annex 5 Additional tables

Table 3A: Villagers' scores of short-listed families by village

Table 3B: CAS' scores of short-listed families by village

Table 4A: Similarity and difference score by single criterion and by village

Table 6B: Number of non short-listed HH that should and should not have been included in the MVFL by village

Table 6C: Scores of non short-listed HHs

Table 6D: Scores of non short-listed families by criterion and by village

Executive Summary

Three GTZ projects are undertaking a process of identifying of the Most Vulnerable Families in Kompong Thom province¹. This activity is implemented at the village and commune levels by groups of villagers and local authorities under the guidance of Community Development Facilitators and GTZ staff.

As results have started to flow in, the three projects have agreed to have an independent evaluation in order to verify the accuracy, fairness and reliability of the process and its resulting lists.

According to the participatory approach of the identification process the villagers themselves are supposed to establish the Most Vulnerable Families List (MVFL) in each village under the leadership of the Commune Councils.

The concrete key actors in the establishment process of MVFL are:

- Provincial Working Group
- DCDT (District Community Development Team)
- 1st Identification Group (CCs, village chief, deputy village chief, VDC, PBC)
- 2nd Identification Group (village representatives, elected by the villagers)

The steps of the Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process as intended are:

- Creating preliminary list of vulnerable families by 1st group
- Election of village representatives (2nd group) in public meeting
- Verifying the preliminary list by 2nd group according to the specific standard criteria (questionnaire – see annexes)²
- Official confirmation of the final MVFL by CC
- Public announcement of final MVFL to all villagers

As the budgetary limitations of the evaluation precluded a statistically representative approach to assessing the accuracy of the process and its results it was decided to sample locations purposively: 3 villages which in the eyes of GTZ seemed examples of a relatively smooth implementation of the process and three that were seen as more problematic. During the period of 2/1/2005 – 7/1/2005 the team of CAS visited 6 villages (4 villages in 2 rural communes, 2 villages in one urban commune) in 2 districts of Kompong Thom province (see table 1). They interviewed 2 representatives of the first group and 2 representatives of the second group in each village as well as 6 short-listed and 6 non-short listed families in each village.

The evaluation covered both the process and the outcome aspects of the MVFL. Regarding the *process* aspect the overall conclusion is that in none of the villages the poverty identification process took place exactly according to the order of steps, the full extent and the differentiation of various responsibilities of the process as described/suggested in the guideline:

- We came across two ways in which the preliminary lists were created:
 - the 1st group made a draft list of poor villagers for their village by themselves. In two cases the 1st group has fallen back on existing lists.
 - the 2nd group - instructed by the 1st group - provided a first draft to the 1st group, sometimes discussing it afterwards with the members of the 1st group
- The preliminary list is not well documented.
- The village chief played a dominating role in creating the first preliminary MVFL.
- In all villages public meetings to elect village representatives have taken place but the level of participation varied between 10% and 50% of all families of the village.

¹ The process is an adjusted version of the process implemented earlier in Kampot.

² In the WRITTEN guideline it is not specified how the process of verifying should be organized. It is unclear if face-to-face interviews by the 2nd group are intended. GTZ verbally confirmed that verification does not imply a physical visit of the HH. This means that the CAS assessment compares the checklist results of key informants (2nd group) with the results of the face-to-face interviews made by external interviewers.

- Village chiefs also dominated the election of village representatives. In most cases the village chiefs nominated candidates without asking them before presenting their names in the public meeting and requesting the participants to confirm.
- The process of verifying the draft MVFL by the 2nd group using the questionnaire differs considerably from village to village. The process of giving scores to the listed names was largely in the hands of the 1st group
- For only 3 villages we could confirm that public meetings to approve the final draft MVFL have taken place.

Regarding the *outcome* the major findings were that:

- The summary score assigned to the households on the lists were accurate, given the scores assigned to the individual questions.
- The check of the summary scores assigned to 6 listed families against the results from our face-to-face interviews with the same families uncovered 7 families, or around 20% of the total sample, that were on the list but should not have been on there.
- We analyzed the summary scores resulting from our face-to-face interviews with 6 non-listed families, comparing them where possible with villagers' scores and triangulating the information with public opinion information Almost one third of the interviewed non-listed families meet the criteria for being on the list. Triangulation of the results of the face-to-face interview check on non short-listed families with an alternative source of information - All 6 short-listed and non short-listed families were asked by the CAS interviewers to identify the five poorest families in their villages - strengthened our confidence in this 30% figure.
- When expressed in a one-figure indicator, that summarizes the inaccuracies of including families that should not have been on the list and excluding families that should have been on the list the two sources of error combine into a 60-65% overall accuracy of the MVFLs
- The results do not confirm that the quality of the identification process as perceived by GTZ influenced the outcome.
- It seems that the technicalities of the criteria scoring process are partly to blame for the inaccuracies observed

The assessment contains some feedback of key actors on difficulties experienced during the identification process The key actors highlighted problems regarding:

- Time and resource constraints
- Insufficient training
- Enticing villagers to participate
- The management of jealousy and envy amongst villagers

Also some perceptions of villagers about the usefulness of the MVFL were elicited. Most said that the identification of the poorest families in their village was important and that they hoped to benefit from being on the list. Some expressed doubts about the accuracy and the fairness of the identification process

1. Background / context / aim of evaluation

Three GTZ projects are undertaking a process of identifying of the Most Vulnerable Families in Kompong Thom province³. This activity is implemented at the village and commune levels by groups of villagers and local authorities under the guidance of Community Development Facilitators and GTZ staff.

As results have started to flow in, the three projects have agreed to have an independent evaluation in order to verify the accuracy, fairness and reliability of the process and its resulting lists.

According to the participatory approach of the identification process the villagers themselves are supposed to establish the Most Vulnerable Families List (MVFL) in each village under the leadership of the Commune Councils.

The concrete key actors in the establishment process of MVFL are:

- Provincial Working Group
- DCDT (District Community Development Team)
- 1st Identification Group (CCs, village chief, deputy village chief, VDC, PBC)
- 2nd Identification Group (village representatives, elected by the villagers)

The steps of the Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process as intended are:

- Creating preliminary list of vulnerable families by 1st group
- Election of village representatives (2nd group) in public meeting
- Verifying the preliminary list by 2nd group according to the specific standard criteria (questionnaire – see annexes)⁴
- Official confirmation of the final MVFL by CC
- Public announcement of final MVFL to all villagers

2. Procedures of evaluation by CAS team

After preparation and the design of additional questions the CAS team met with GTZ staff and representatives of PDRD Kompong Thom on 27 December 2004 to discuss the concept and process of identification of MVF, to agree on the selection of districts, communes and villages for evaluation and to discuss possible constraints.

As the budgetary limitations of the evaluation precluded a statistically representative approach to assessing the accuracy of the process and its results it was decided to sample locations purposively: 3 villages which in the eyes of GTZ seemed examples of a relatively smooth implementation of the process and three that were seen as more problematic. Then final Choice of villages was done by GTZ.

On 28 December 2004 and on 30 December 2004 the team met with the Steung Sen District Community Development Team (DCDT) and the Stoung DCDT in order to interview them about the training they have received from GTZ staff and about the training they have given to the first group of each village. They were also queried about the difficulties they encountered during the implementation process.

During the period of 2/1/2005 – 7/1/2005 the team of CAS visited 6 villages (4 villages in 2 rural communes, 2 villages in one urban commune) in 2 districts of Kompong Thom province (see table 1). They interviewed 2 representatives of the first group and 2 representatives of the second group in each village as well as 6 short-listed and 6 non-short listed families in each village. Representatives of the first and of the second group were interviewed about their understanding of the MVFL creating process and about their experiences of implementing of this process. The

³ The process is an adjusted version of the process implemented earlier in Kampot.

⁴ In the WRITTEN guideline it is not specified how the process of verifying should be organized. It is unclear if face-to-face interviews by the 2nd group are intended. GTZ verbally confirmed that verification does not imply a physical visit of the HH. This means that the CAS assessment compares the checklist results of key informants (2nd group) with the results of the face-to-face interviews made by external interviewers.

interviews focused on difficulties or interference they encountered in the accomplishment of their tasks.

As agreed, the team received a copy of the MVFL of each village compiled and signed by the village chief and confirmed by the Commune Council. Together with these final lists the questionnaires of the *families on the final lists* filled in by the identification groups were attached. During the initial planning of the evaluation with GTZ, it was understood that the team would receive the completed questionnaires of *all families on the preliminary list* in order to be able to use the scores of the families as selection criterion for the short-listed and non short-listed families to be interviewed. But in most villages only the questionnaires of the short-listed families in the MVFL were available despite repeated inquiries by the team. Only in one village all questionnaires were submitted.

Table 1 below summarizes some basic information on the locations and information received.

On the basis of the final lists the team selected the 6 families from each list who were qualified with the lowest scores for interviews. If one of the families was not available the next higher scoring family from the list was selected.

Because the team did not have the preliminary list nor questionnaires of the non short-listed families family names of the most vulnerable families who did not make it to the short-list were requested from the first or second group. In most cases family names were given by representatives of the first group.

The team visited all selected families at home to get an idea of the family situation. The 6 short-listed and the 6 non-short listed families were interviewed about their living conditions using the checklist of criteria, henceforth also called 'questionnaire', developed by the Provincial Working group. So the team used the same checklist of indicators as the village teams who established the lists originally. The families were also asked to identify the five poorest families of the village according to their own perception and to express their opinion about the usefulness of the MVFL.

On 10 January 2005 the team met with GTZ staff, DCDT and PDRD of Kompong Thom for a first discussion of findings.

Table 1: Basic information on the sample villages and MVFL information received

District	Commune	Rural/ Urban	Village	Nr. of HH	Families on final MVFL	Families on preliminary list*	CAS poverty assessment***
Stoeung Sen	Kompong Rotes	U	Kompomg Rotes	239	64	(72)	Less poor
		U	Kompong Thom	663	68	?	Less poor
Stoung	Rung Roeung	R	Por	115	26	?	Poorer
		R	Bos Tasaom	155	18	?	Less poor
	Samprouch	R	Krasang Chrum Choeng	139	52	(62?)	Poorer
		R	Doun La'a	230	70	88**	Poorest

* in () stands for a list without accompanying questionnaires, ? Numbers are unknown or not verifiable; in most cases the lists – if made at all – were the product of the 2nd group rather than the first as intended

** This is a preliminary list constructed on the basis of members of the 2nd group delivering names with questionnaires attached to the village chief (1st group) who had commissioned them to do so

*** A very rough comparison between villages to allow for an assessment of differences in numbers of MVF in the different villages

3. Findings

In this section we present an extract of all information on the Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process *gained by the interviews*. For the details about the intended process of identification of the poorest families and of creating the Most Vulnerable Families List at village level see annex 4. We do not claim that all of the information underneath correctly represents what has actually happened. It is what our informants, members of the 1st and 2nd villager identification groups, told us. In case their description differs from the process as intended, or perceived by other stakeholders actually involved in the described events (e.g. DCDT members and/or GTZ staff) this might be due to either misrepresentation by our interviewees *or* by them having different understandings.

Regarding the steps of the actual identification process the statements of the interviewees sometimes differed greatly especially between representatives of the 1st group and members of the 2nd group. We have the strong impression that persons of the 1st group tended to describe the process more according to their understanding of how the steps *should* have been undertaken rather than as actually implemented and that the members of the 2nd group described the process as it *really* happened.

3.1. Poverty identification process

Trainings and orientation on MVFL

The interviews with the DCDT and village identification groups confirmed that DCDTs and the 1st groups have received training and orientation in order to become familiar with the concept of MVFL and to discuss the appropriate methods of implementing the process.

The DCDTs of both districts have received separated one-day trainings from the Provincial Working Group. The three main points of the training were explanations of the purpose of MVFL, the term of MVF and the procedure of identification of the MVF using the criteria.

The DCDT and representatives of Provincial Working Group/GTZ then conducted trainings for the local identification groups consisting of commune councilors, village chiefs, deputy village chiefs, representatives of PBCs, sometimes VDCs or other associations (1st group). The training explained the term of MVF to the participants and how to identify the MVF by using the structured questionnaire with 8 criteria. With assistance of the trainer the participants exercised filling in the questionnaire according to their perception of poor families in their villages.

Creating the first draft of MVFL

The actual steps of creating the MVFL differed from village to village. The summary below is based on the interviews with members of the different identification groups. Representatives of the two groups often provided a slight different picture of the process. On the basis of the manifold pieces of information received we tried to reconstruct the identification process in each village as accurately as possible (details see annex 4) and to derive trends in every step of the process.

We came across two ways in which the preliminary lists were created:

- the 1st group made a draft list of poor villagers for their village by themselves. In two cases the 1st group has fallen back on existing lists⁵.
- the 2nd group - instructed by the 1st group - provided a first draft to the 1st group, sometimes discussing it afterwards with the members of the 1st group

In all cases it was evident that the members of both groups created the first list from their memory and did not visited the potentially most vulnerable families.⁶

⁵ GTZ clarified that these were Wealth ranking Lists compiled by village chiefs, VDCs and elders' groups, facilitated by the DCDTs in 2002 for use in the same project.

⁶ Visits by the 2nd group were not intended, see also note 2.

From table 1 it is evident that the preliminary list is not well documented. Its existing was not verifiable in three of the six cases, and of the three others only in one case were questionnaires available for the families that had not made it to the final list, in one case only their names were available and in one case only a total number was mentioned as having been presented during the first public meeting (see below).

The village chief played a major role in creating the first preliminary MVFL. According to the interviews the village chiefs of Kompong Thom village, Kompong Rotes village, Por village, Bos Tasoam village and Doun La'a village drafted the first list by themselves from their memory and then discussed the draft with other members of the 1st group. In several cases the village chief seems to have used knowledge of the 2nd group for drafting the list.

It seems that in at least 3 villages creating the preliminary list by the 1st group included/involved members of the 2nd group and we could not exactly find out in which order the steps of creating the first draft of MVFL and electing the village representatives (2nd group) happened.

The involvement of 2nd groups into the creating process of the first draft MVFL implied that members of the 2nd group were already nominated by the 1st group before they were 'elected' at the public meeting.

Also, members of the 1st group already seem to have had own ideas about the preliminary MVFL without informing the members of the 2nd group. In one case the village chief told the team that he was waiting for the proposals of the 2nd group in order to compare them with his own (secret) list.

According to the interviewees, in most cases where the 2nd group provided family names without having received a preliminary MVFL from the 1st group, the latter took the information without any feedback to the 2nd group.

First public meeting to elect the village representatives (2nd group)

According to the interviewees, in all villages public meetings to elect village representatives have taken place. The participation in the meetings was between 10% and 50% of all families of the village.

Only for Krasang Chrum Choeung village, the team received statistics on the number of participants. These indicate that the interview data can only be taken as tentative estimates. The participant list of Krasang Chrum Choeung village shows that 65 persons attended the meeting, but interviewees estimated that 80-90 persons were present. We have no way of knowing if really so many people attended the meeting and have failed to sign the participant list or if the interviewees overestimated participation.

At the public meeting members of the 1st group explained the purpose and procedures of the MVFL listing process to the villagers. After that the village representatives were presented and elected by applause or by hand raising.

In 2 villages representatives of DCDT or/and Provincial Working Group/GTZ were present at the meeting.

It seems that the village chiefs played an important role in the election of village representatives. In most cases the village chiefs nominated candidates without asking them before presenting their names in the public meeting and requesting the participants to confirm. The opinions on how the candidates were proposed differ considerably. Members of the 1st group normally said that the candidates were proposed by the meeting participants but all the representatives of the 2nd group said that the candidates had already been nominated by the village chief or 1st group. Sometimes, the statements also differ on how many candidates were proposed. In every village all candidates presented by the 1st group were elected without public protest.

Public announcement of the first draft of MVFL created by the 1st group

For 3 villages interviewees reported that the 1st group presented a kind of preliminary MVFL to the villagers during the first public meeting for election of the villagers representatives (2nd group) and explained that this draft had to be verified by the village representatives (2nd group) through questionnaires (Kompong Thom village, Kompong Rotes village, Por village). For the other 3 villages it was impossible to verify if and when the first draft has been presented to the public. Although the written guideline does not have explicit instructions about presenting the preliminary list during this first public meeting, GTZ feedback clarified that this was not supposed to happen.

Training to the elected members of the 2nd group

The village representatives received training on how to use the questionnaire to identify the most vulnerable families in the village. In all cases these trainings happened immediately after the public meetings in which the village representatives had been elected⁷. They were conducted mostly by members of the 1st group sometimes with support of representatives of DCDT and in 1 village by representatives of GTZ/Provincial Working Group (Kompong Rotes village). In general, the trainings lasted 1-2 hours.

Verifying the first list by 2nd group (by means of questionnaire)

The process of verifying the draft MVFL by the 2nd group using the questionnaire differs considerably from village to village. Since the statements of the interviewees are often inconsistent it is difficult to reconstruct the process as a whole.

The only commonality was that in all cases the members of the 2nd group did not do any face-to-face interviews and that 1st and/or 2nd group assigned scores only on the basis of their own observation, which is in line with the intended procedure.

Often the 2nd groups split into smaller groups and *collected* information separately. In some cases they then met again as a group to discuss the results and to compile the list before submitting it to the 1st group.

The process of *giving scores* to the families listed in the draft MVFL is similar unclear. Statements of the 1st group differ considerably from statements of the 2nd group.

All in all the interviews with members of the 2nd group indicate that the process of giving scores to the listed names was in the hands of the 1st group (in rare cases together with members of the 2nd group). Only in two cases did the 2nd group supply questionnaires filled in after having discussed their results at a meeting *amongst themselves*.

Completing final version of draft MVFL to be presented to the public

From the guideline it is not clear in which way the final draft MVFL should be completed before presenting it to the public.

The most common way was that the 1st group received information from the 2nd group more often on an individual basis than as a group result (Kompong Rotes village, Por village) and then finalized the draft MVFL by itself. Only in Kompong Chrum Choeung interviewees of both groups confirmed that they had met in order to discuss the results of the 2nd group *together* before presenting it to the public. Interviewees of the 2nd group of other villages could not report what happened after they had provided their information to the 1st group. Some of them said they believe that after giving all information the village chief had submitted the list to the commune council for checking and confirmation.

⁷ But for Kampong Chrum Choeung village: see annex 4)

Public announcement of final MVFL

For only 3 villages we could confirm that public meetings to approve the final draft MVFL have taken place. In 2 villages (Kompong Thom village and Por village) the statements of interviewees contradict each other. In one village the public meeting was broken off.

Overall assessment of the process of identifying the MVFs⁸

In none of the villages the poverty identification process took place exactly according to the order of steps, the full extent and the differentiation of various responsibilities of the process as described/suggested in the guideline.

The drafting of the preliminary list was in the hands of the 1st group (mostly village chief) but the process already involved the 2nd group. In most cases the first draft was based on information provided by the 2nd group and was then finalized by the 1st group, so that it is difficult to uphold that the process consisted of two steps, the second verifying the first.

The final drafts were presented at a public meeting in only 3 villages. In most cases the final draft had already been submitted to the commune councils for confirmation before it was presented to the public so that the public meetings could only serve as belated pro-forma confirmation by the villagers.

The selection of village representatives was not the result of an election by the villagers. Normally the village representatives (2nd group) were selected by the village chief prior to the public meeting and the villagers were only supposed to reconfirm the selection.

The 1st and the 2nd groups did not work independent from each other. The 2nd group served as information provider to the 1st group without, however, having access to the final decision of on the MVFL. They were not in the position of verifying the draft list made by the 1st group through checking it against the information they had submitted.

Key actors like the DCDTs and the provincial level made only very limited interventions. Only one village received regular support from its DCDT and the Provincial Working Group. In all other villages the monitoring and back-up process was scanty and the 1st groups were more or less left to themselves.

3.2. Results of the poverty identification process

The team assessed the accuracy of the results of the process from various angles.

- We checked the accuracy of the way that the questionnaires which we received from the village groups had been processed; i.e. were the summary score assigned to the households on the lists correct, given the scores assigned to the individual questions?
- We checked and analyzed the summary scores assigned to 6 listed families with the results from our face-to-face interviews with the same families
- We analyzed the summary scores resulting from our face-to-face interviews with 6 non-listed families, comparing them where possible with villagers' scores and triangulating the information with public opinion information
- We tried to express the accuracy of the results in a one-figure indicator, summarizing the inaccuracies of including families that should not have been on the list and excluding families that should have been on the list.

⁸ As stated in the beginning of the section on the findings: this assessment is based on our interviews. We cannot claim that our process descriptions are totally accurate. However, we do uphold that differences between the process as described by the informants and the intended procedure can at least be taken as an indication about inadequate understanding of village level representatives of the purpose and the procedure of the MVFL process.

Were the summary score assigned to the households on the lists correct?

Table 2: Accuracy of processing the questionnaires

Village	MVF questionnaires	Total mistakes	2-point mistakes
Kompomg Rotes	64	-	-
Kompong Thom	68	3	1
Por	26	-	-
Bos Tasaom	18	-	-
Krasang Chrum Choeung	52	-	-
Doun La'a	70	8	3
Total	298	11	4
	100%	4%	1%

Most of the mistakes were addition mistakes. 4 mistakes resulted from a criterion having two scores or a criterion not scored. In one case (Daun La'a) a family whose questionnaire was attached to the MVFL and whose score qualified it for inclusion was not on the list (so the list had 70 families with 71 questionnaires attached).

The summary scores indicate accurate processing of the checklists. The fact that any mistake slipped through does show that none of the levels above the village has deemed it necessary to run a check.

Checking the scores of 6 short-listed families in each village by face-to-face interviews

In every village the CAS team interviewed 6 short-listed families using the same questionnaire as the village teams. If we compare the results of the CAS interviews with the results of the village teams we can see that in all villages for at least one family the scores differ by a minimum of two points. And in the majority of the villages two amongst six families had differing scores (see table 3).

Table 3: Similarity and difference score by sample village (Plus or minus 1 score)

Village	Process Assessm. GTZ	Similarity		Difference*		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Kampong Thom	Problematic	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%
Kampong Rotes	Smooth	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Daun Laa	Smooth	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	Problematic	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Bos Tasaom	Problematic	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%
Por	Smooth	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Total		26	72%	10	28%	36	100%

* = we tolerated an error margin of plus/minus 1 score so all these differences stand for at least a difference of 2 points

The detailed data are reported in annex 5, tables 3A and 3B, showing the results per village for village groups and for CAS. As is evident from the tables in the annex, 7 of the 10 differences resulted in scores that disqualify the concerned families for inclusion in the list.

This means that our accuracy check uncovered 7 families, or around 20% of the total sample, that were on the list but should not have been on there.

We analyzed if all criteria were equally likely to be at the basis of differences or if some criteria were more likely to generate inaccurate identifications.

Table 4: Similarity and difference score by single criteria of identification

	Resident land		Production land		Source of income		live stock		House situation		Transport		Electronic appliance		Food security	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Similarity	22	61	20	56	24	67	29	81	31	86	26	72	24	67	22	61
difference	14	39	16	44	12	33	7	19	5	14	10	28	12	33	14	39
Total	36	100	36	100	36	100	36	100	36	100	36	100	36	100	36	100

The detailed data are reported in annex 5, table 4A. The criteria for livestock, the housing situation and transportation are least likely to result in mistaken identification. But even the criterion for which the village identification and our face-to-face check was most likely to be in agreement resulted in one out of seven families being given a different score.

*We conclude that the scoring of the criteria must be seen as problematic.*⁹ Three immediate reasons that come to mind are:

- The assessment of criteria only through observation, even from fellow villagers, cannot provide the necessary accuracy.
- The criteria had to be scored on three point scales. This results in a measurement which is not very subtle, forcing many choices that quickly add up to a mistaken identification. The simple adjustment of introducing 5-point scales would already make the measurement much more subtle in that small differences do not receive unnecessary weight (the scoring range is then from 0-40 rather than from 0-24). Differentiating the weight of the various questions would make the measurement even more subtle.
- The village groups lacked adequate training.

Table 3B in the Annex offers an additional angle on this same issue, how accurate and fair a tool is this list of criteria to identify the MVF in a village? From the 7 misidentified families 5 – i.e. 14% of our sample - ended up with a borderline score of 9. Below (see also table 6C) we see that those left out of the list who should have been on there also tend to be on the border line. Obviously any break off point will have its losers and winners. We suggest that when stakeholders are going to assess the implications of this finding they think about the consequences of applying the criteria in terms of false positives and false negatives. One could make a case that for the purposes of an MVFL it is important to ensure that the risks of not making the list while actually deserving the entitlements that are associated with a listed position – false negatives - should be minimized. We feel it is questionable if this set of un-weighted three-point criteria is subtle enough to ensure inclusion of the MVF.

A last consideration when reflecting on these differences is that the results do not confirm that the quality of the identification process as perceived by GTZ influenced the outcome. In villages where the process was considered smooth the differences are bigger than in villages where the process was considered problematic (see table 5)

Table 5: Similarity and difference score by sample village with more or less smooth process of identification (Plus or minus 1 score)

Village with	Similarity		Difference		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Smooth process	12	67%	6	33%	18	100%
Problematic process	14	78%	4	22%	18	100%
Total	26	72%	10	28%	36	100%

⁹ In this section we only address the technical aspects of the criteria system, not the process aspect.

Interviews with 6 non short-listed families in 6 in each village by face-to-face interviews

Only 1 village had questionnaires of families that were on a preliminary list but did not make it to the final MVFL (see table 1). Only in this village the CAS team could select 6 non short-listed families on the basis of their questionnaire scores (taking those with a score closest to the break off point) as was done with the short-listed families. So only for one village we can compare villagers' scores with those of our interviewers, and for all others the only assessment we can make is if our scores confirm their non-listed position or not. So we can only state if the interviewed families should be included into the list.

Table 6: Number of non short-listed HHs that should have been and should not have been included in the MVFL (break-off point score 10)

	Frequency	Percent
Should have been on the MVFL	11	31
Should not have been on the MVFL	25	69
Total	36	100

Almost one third of the interviewed families meet the criteria for being on the list.

Table 7B, 7C and 7D in Annex 4 provide the details. These show that in most villages two, and in 1 three of the six non short-listed families qualified.

The details also show that, similarly to the differences for the short-listed families (see above), *the majority of differences is at the break-off point*, in this case a score of 10. The highest score was a 13 (1 family).

For the one village for which we had filled questionnaires from the village group – Daun La'a – and thus could compare the CAS face-to-face interview scores with the villagers' scores the results were interesting, to say the least.

Table 6A: Comparing the villagers' and CAS scores for 6 non short-listed families in Daun La'a

Family	Villagers' score	CAS score
A	15	10
B	16	10
C	11 *	6
D	16	8
E	15	4
F	13	6

* This is the corrected score; the original villagers' score was 16

All the villagers' scores of these *non-listed* families, actually *qualified* the families, while only two of the CAS scores did so – and with a border line score. The average difference is 7 points! Given the fact that the accuracy of the Daun La'a scores for the families on the final MVFL (see table 3 and 3B) do not stand out as dramatically as the above scores it seems likely the village chief has acted as a 'corrective'.

Public opinion check on MVFL

Obviously, our sample size does not allow us to make statistically solid statements about 30% of the potential candidates for the MVFL not making it to the list. We knew this in advance and have tried to add an additional source of information regarding the likelihood of the process covering all MVFL (see annex 2). In itself, this source is also questionable but we expected that triangulation would at least allow for increased confidence in whatever conclusion we would reach.

All 6 short-listed and non short-listed families were asked by the CAS interviewers to identify the five poorest families in their villages. Tables 8A and 8B show the results.

Table 7A: Name of poor HH in the village identified by short-listed respondents in the list

Families mentioned in/out of the village MVFL	Count	% of Responses
In the list	116	68
Not in the list	55	32
	171	100

1 missing case; 35 valid cases

Table 7B: Name of poor HH in the village identified by non short-listed respondents

Families mentioned in/out of the village MVFL	Count	% of Responses
In the list	126	70
Not in the list	54	30
	180	100

For both groups the results are the same: 30% of the family names identified as the poorest families are not found on the MVFL.

In other words, triangulation of the results of the face-to-face interview check on non short-listed families with this alternative source of information on the proportion of qualifying families excluded from the final MVFLs strengthens our confidence in the 30% figure reported above (see table 7).

Overall assessment of the accuracy of the lists

How to weigh the various insights into the accuracy of the result of the MVFL process?

A first perspective on this is provided by looking at the absolute numbers on the final lists (see table 1). Applying absolute criteria makes comparison across different villages possible (e.g. as opposed to PRA results). This implies that one can expect some kind of correlation between the number of families on a MVFL village list, the size of a village (nr. of HHs) and its overall poverty. Based on observation, CAS researchers made a very rough partition between richer and poorer villages. One would then expect that within each group of three villages the number of MVF on the lists more or less corresponds with the nr. of households in the village. Table 1 shows that this is not the case. One may argue that this indicates that the 'criteria' for inclusion in the MVFLs¹⁰ differed across villages and thus that assessment of the accuracy of the results of the MVFL procedure should include a closer look at how the initial list is arrived at.

Another perspective is provided by the results of our face-to-face interviews. These have uncovered two sources of error: the final MVFLs contain families that do not actually qualify according to the criteria and all villages contain many families that do qualify but are not on the MVFL. A third possible source, wrong addition of criteria score, proved insignificant.

The percentages reported above for the two errors that are significant, 20% for the former and 30% for the latter, refer to different bases (the former the number of families on the list, the latter the 'universe of qualifying families). Ideally one would relate both to number of households in each village but given the small size of our sample at village level this would introduce a very large margin of error. We therefore opt for another representation: a one figure indicator of accuracy on a scale of zero (totally inaccurate) to 100 (totally accurate).

¹⁰ This does *not* refer to the checklist criteria but rather to the criteria used for drafting the first shortlist; remember that only those on the *initial* lists were 'benchmarked' against the checklist criteria

Combining the two sources of error results in 60-65% accuracy of the MVFLs:

Figure 1: Summary indicator of the accuracy of the MVF Lists

	Incorrectly on the MVFL	Qualifying population	
		On the MFVL	Incorrectly not on the MVFL
Original %	A=20%	B=70%	C=30%
A recalculated as % of B	A=14%	B=70%	C=30%
New basis for %	114		
A, B, C recalculated as % of 114	A=12%	B=61%	C=26%
	100%		
	Accurate Listings		Inaccurate Listings
Accuracy indicator	60-65%		35-40%
	100%		

Our results show that most inaccuracies are right around the break-off point which implies scope for improving accuracy without fundamentally changing the listing approach¹¹.

¹¹ This statement only refers to the technicality of the procedures, not the participatory process.

3.3. Feedback of identification groups on difficulties during the identification process

DCDT

DCDT members said that they had difficulties in using the term of most vulnerable families. They were unsure how to identify the poorest villagers and how to fill in the questionnaire. So they needed help from the Provincial Working Group during the trainings that they conducted to the 1st groups. The DCDT interviewees stated that the one-day training on MVF identification they had received was insufficiently to acquire the necessary self-confidence to provide training to the communal level and to control whole process. The term of MVF and the activities expected were new for them.

It was difficult for the DCDTs to explain the importance of the identification process of MVF to the communal and village level because villagers did not understand the underlying concept of MVF listing process. Villagers are convinced that they will receive gifts if their names are identified in the list of MVF and tried to be listed.

The interviewees also complaint that it was difficult for them to initiate and organize meetings with villagers. Villagers seemed uninterested or were too busy. And some villagers thought that participation would be of no use to them.

At the same time DCDTs reported that some local authorities did not pay much attention to the process. Sometimes village chiefs did not inform villagers about the purpose of the meetings or forgot to invite people to the meeting.

The lack of means of transportation¹², human resources and budget prevented DCDTs from checking and monitoring the process of identification of the most vulnerable families in the villages of the target area.

1st group

Interviewees of the 1st group reported that they could not pay much attention to the procedure of creating the MVFL because they were busy with their own business. Also, the training was described as being too short in order to really understand all the tasks required, especially regarding the organization of the verification process by using the questionnaire.

In addition to that complained about a lack of resources (e.g. means of transportation) to visit the villages and monitor the process of identification. Sometimes, the process was delayed because it was difficult for them to reach remote villages and/or for the villagers of remote villages to submit the lists to the commune or the district. It was difficult to communicate with each other during the drafting process.

Some village chiefs complained that the tasks were new for them and that they did not really understand the purpose of the activity. Training and time to familiarize oneself with the requirements was too short.

Sometimes villagers were seen as uninterested to join the public meeting because they thought it would be useless for them, especially those who are not so poor.

Some interviewees felt uncomfortable with the tasks because on the one hand people accused them of being biased and on the other they were annoyed if they were not put on the list. It was difficult to manage jealousy and envy of villagers. People did not understand the process of poverty identification and doubted that the families put on the list were really the poorest. Some wondered how the authorities could identify the poorest family without visiting the houses. At the same time people tried to be listed by pretending to be poor or were annoyed if they did not find themselves in the list.

¹² This is interviewee information; GTZ points out that the DCDTs have project motorbikes

Interviewees said that it was very difficult to conduct the public meeting for announcing the final MVFL. Participants were described as nervous and demanding, sometime even shouting to be included into the list.

2nd group

The interviewees of the 2nd group also reported that the training on MVFL was too short and the explanations on how the identification process should be carried out were too limited. They did not dare to complain during the training because of limited time available but as a result they felt unsure about how to accomplish the requested tasks.

Also all other meetings they had, either amongst themselves or with members of the 1st group, were very short because everybody was busy with their own livelihood.

The interviewees felt it was difficult and time consuming to visit the houses of the concerned families because they did not know if the families were at home. Often people were working outside or, if a home, engaged in family quarrels.

The interviewees complained that only few villagers came to the public meetings because many were busy, selling of goods or working field. Other stayed away because they did not see any benefit for themselves and some never went to any meeting in the first place.

All interviewees confirmed the statement of the 1st group that it was difficult to handle jealousy and envy of villagers. People did not understand the ongoing process and so members of the 2nd group tried to conduct it as discreetly as possible. Some interviewees said that they themselves had understood in the beginning that they would have to distribute gifts to the poorest families and only later learned that they only had to provide information to the 1st group (which was described as a relief).

Sometime poor literacy or other limitations (old age, deafness) limited the commitment of members of the 2nd group.

3.4. Perception of villagers about the usefulness of the MVFL

The CAS team asked all interviewed families to express their opinion about the usefulness of the MVFL.

Most of them said that the identification of the poorest families in their village was important and that they hoped to benefit from being on the list. They hoped that the government, NGOs and international organizations are going to use the list for providing rice seeds, cows, pigs, poultry, vegetable seeds and micro-credit for business to the poorest families. They hoped that their living conditions will improve through the MVFL process.

Some interviewees expressed confidence that village chiefs assessed living conditions correctly and that they now really know who are the poorest, the poor and the better off in the village.

However, several interviewees gave negative feedback on the identification process. They complained that the local authorities did not go directly to the villagers in order to ask them about their living conditions. How can they identify the most vulnerable families without talking to them?

Other interviewees accused their village chief or deputy village chief of putting the names of their relatives on the list and/or of favoring their close friends.

Some interviewees said that the MVFL is useless because authorities had made such lists of poor villagers many times before but interventions had never reached the poorest. Always only relatives or close acquaintances of local authorities had benefited from it. Apart from this they thought that in

this particular listing exercise the MVFL did not only contained the poorest families but also poor and better off families.

Suggestions of villagers

- Local authorities should inform villagers about the purpose and importance of the meetings related to MVFL.
- Local authorities should make publicly announce all names on the MVFL.
- Local authorities who are responsible for the process of identification should interview people about their living conditions and look at their houses before deciding who are poorest.

Recommendations

The MVFL process is quite complex, both in terms of purpose and procedure. However, proper understanding of both is an important prerequisite for an accurate process and outcome. Firstly, this implies proper training of all key actors. The ToT approach followed regularly resulted in inadequate understanding.

Two aspects of the procedure that warrant special attention are:

- The use of the checklist of criteria to verify the appropriateness of a families inclusion in the MVFL
- The role of the village chief

What exactly is intended by the *verification*? Is the verification intended as an 'objective' check on local knowledge/understanding? *To the extent it is* the instrument should allow for more subtle differentiation¹³ - and we have already suggested ways to increase the discriminatory power of the current instrument: giving some criteria more weight than others, and enlarging the answer grid from 3 to five options.

At the same time it is clear that the criteria are not meant to replace/supersede local knowledge. In a way it is not more than a tool to guide local discussions and make them more transparent. However, what exactly does that mean? It is clear that different villages have interpreted this very differently. It is also clear that nowhere did the checklist really work as an independent verification. One perspective to take on this is to stress the aspect of transparency/accountability and more collective decision-making over that of independent verification. This perspective puts less emphasis on refining the actual checklist and more on:

- Real shared understanding of what is the purpose of the checklist
- Collective filling in of the checklists
- Full disclosure of the checklists – of those that made it to the list and of those that did not make it
- Possibilities to discuss and amend the list (village meeting)

The transparency/accountability aspect needs strengthening. Procedures for filling in the checklists are unclear. Checklists of non-listed families do not exist in most villages. Village meetings to discuss the draft MVFL are not yet consistently held. To the extent that all of these aspects are already intended in the MVFL process their implementation in the six villages that CAS assessed indicates, again, insufficient understanding. It might also indicate insufficient resources.

The still very dominant role of village chiefs in many villages shows that the collectivization of local understanding cannot be assumed to be guaranteed by 'arranging' village representative groups. It seems necessary to specify some minimum procedures for the operation of these groups.

Also, especially in light of the often mentioned difficulties with villagers' expectations, suspicions, and jealousies associated with the MVFL, better understanding of the villagers seems needed. This implies more emphasis on the explanation of the purpose of the list to the villagers. That is not an easy task. MVFL are associated in public consciousness with receiving gifts, and public meetings are associated with wasting one's time. So getting people to listen to an explanation is difficult and if this hurdle has been taken one is confronted with an expectation that is inherently divisive. Misunderstandings and problems – as we indeed documented for the villages visited - are to be expected. One perspective to take on this is to accept that introducing a MVFL process, let alone one that is locally rooted and managed, is going to take several guided/supervised/facilitated tries of successively better 'quality'.

¹³ Local understanding can be expected to be quite complex, more complex at least than the current checklist

This first round seemed to lack sufficient monitoring of the process. Practical reasons for that are obvious: lack of resources (time, staff,...). These are probably here to stay. However, to the extent that this MVFL process is only the first round in a multi-round introduction of this tool, their negative impact will lessen.

In general it seems important to consider a longer-term perspective in a project like this. The stakes are quite high. Assuming a one-shot try is going to result in a sustainable self-managed poverty identification process at local level may be too optimistic. However, visualizing three or four rounds of this process to result in a locally rooted, supported and self-initiated seems much more realistic.

Annex 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process

Project: GTZ RDP
Location: Kampong Thom Province
Duration: 20 working days
Period: last week of November till end of December

Title: **Assessment of the Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process**

Aim of the consultancy

The consultancy aims to independently verify the accuracy and reliability of the poverty identification process and its results, as well as the constraints faced by the village identification groups in the course of implementing such process.

Background

Three gtz projects (RDP, Health and FSNPSP) have undertaken a process of identification of the Most Vulnerable Families in the whole province of Kampong Thom. Such activity is currently being implemented at the village and commune level by groups of villagers under the guidance of Community Development Facilitators and gtz staff.

Once the process is accomplished, the lists will be available for use of any project which intends to have a focus on poverty targeting. Moreover, it will constitute a tool in the hands of the Commune Councils, who will then be able to update their commune lists and will be encouraged to design, with their own means, ways of interventions to support the poor.

Criteria for identification were drawn up by a working group comprising staff from the three projects as well as other organizations and government staff. There are different sets of poverty indicators according to type of village (Urban, Rural or Floating).

As results from the field have started to flow in, the three projects have agreed to have an independent evaluation conducted in order to verify their accuracy, fairness and reliability, so that necessary adjustments could be made if this proves to be the case.

Tasks and methodology of the consultancy

The evaluation will be conducted in 4 sample rural villages of two communes in Stoung district (Khum Chamnakraom and Samprouch), plus two urban villages in Steung Saen district.

The evaluation method will involve verifying family situations through home visits and interviews, sampling 5-6 families from within and as many from the ones left outside the compiled village shortlists. The surveyors are using the same set of checklist and indicators as the village team who established the lists originally.

Also, interviews shall be conducted with members of the identification groups in the same villages, in order to receive an independent feedback on the difficulties (or interference) they have encountered in the accomplishment of such task. Perception of villagers (i.e. families included and not included in MVFL & CC), about the usefulness of the MVFL should also be collected.

The findings of the evaluation and recommendations for improvement shall be presented in a feedback session to all parties involved, which will be held in Kampong Thom freshly upon accomplishment of the field evaluation. A final report shall be submitted to the three projects not later than end of December 2004.

Details of Assignment

Task	Specifications	Days
1. Data Analysis	Selection of sample villages Analysis of MVF lists provided by the villages selected	1
2. Meeting	Meeting with identified groups and concerned staff that worked on MVF list compilation	1
3. Field Survey	Interviews with shortlisted/non shortlisted families and identification of group members in a total of 6 villages (4 rural and 2 urban) – Team split	7
4. Presentation	Workshop with concerned government and project staff	1
5. Reporting	Analysis of field data and preparation of report	10
Total Amount of days		20

Annex 2

Evaluation of Most Vulnerable Families Listing Process Proposal Center for Advanced Study

15 December 2004

Introduction

We apologize for sending in a proposal for this evaluation so late. CAS only learned about the ToR on December 14 through the liaison of Dr. Harold Thiesbrummel, GTZ.

Objectives of the consultancy as specified in ToR

- Verify the accuracy and reliability of the poverty identification process and its results
- Identify the constraints faced by the village identification groups in the course of implementing the process

Tasks & Methodology as specified in ToR

Interviews with 6 short-listed and 6 non short-listed families in 2 villages x 2 rural communes and 2 villages x one urban commune, total 12 x 6 = 72 interviews

Interviews consist of 2 parts:

- The checklist with poverty identification indicators used by the village teams to determine which families on the first short-list (available).
- Short questionnaire to collect perceptions about the usefulness of the MVFL (needs designing)

Interviews with members of the identification groups in the sample villages on constraints encountered (instrument need designing)

Presentation of results and recommendations for improvement to all local stakeholders

Final report

Details of the assignment as specified in the ToR

Task	Specifications	Days
1. Data Analysis	Selection of sample villages Analysis of MVF lists provided by the villages selected	1
2. Meeting	Meeting with identified groups and concerned staff that worked on MVF list compilation	1
3. Field Survey	Interviews with shortlisted/non shortlisted families and identification of group members in a total of 6 villages (4 rural and 2 urban) – Team split	7
4. Presentation	Workshop with concerned government and project staff	1
5. Reporting	Analysis of field data and preparation of report	10
Total Nr. of days		20

Proposal

General remarks regarding tasks, methodology and details

We feel that the proposed methodology does not fully match the stated objective of verifying the accuracy and reliability of the MVFL process. We understand the current evaluation to only cover the village level aspect of the process. But even from this perspective, it only covers part of the process.

The MVFL (village level) process consists of several steps:

- the pre-identification by a village working group
- the verification by another village working group
- the public presentation of the verified list

The current methodology focuses on the accuracy and reliability of the second step. We suggest including a check on the first step also. We propose to accomplish this adding two sources of data.

1. We ask all listed and non-listed families interviewed to identify the five poorest families in the village, excluding themselves. The families identified can then be checked against the pre-identification list and the final list.
2. Our interviewers use observation to identify the 5 most likely households to be included in the MVF list, based on their housing.

The interview with the Village leader (see below) should be scheduled at the end of the day so as to be able to check the results with him against the lists and ask for explanations in case of any of the above identified most likely candidates did not make it to the list.

For sampling the families from the final short list and those that did not make it, we suggest to concentrate on those that are the least clear cut cases. I.e. limit the sampling frame to those families *on the final list* that are *above* the median score of all the families on the final list, and to those families on the pre-identification list that *did not make it to the final list* that are *below* the median of those that did not make it. In this way the sampling frame is restricted to the families whose scores do not immediately identify them as either qualifying for the list or not qualifying at all.

The Inventory of constraints as experienced by those implementing the process is not allotted much time. We assume GTZ will facilitate meetings with the various village group members. This may either be done centrally or within each village separately. Given our observation above we suggest to include *both* the groups involved in the pre-identification and in the verification through the matching to poverty criteria by interviews/home visits. We also suggest ensuring that the information gathered from these groups is not (only) through group interviews. One important check is the lack of interference and as interference may well be channeled through one or more members of the village groups itself, one should allow for private interviews. Also, we suggest including the some of the facilitators involved in the process (GTZ staff, etc.) amongst those to be interviewed on perceived constraints. It would be ideal if the external consultant who did the ToT can be included as an interviewee. Her/his opinions on the potential constraints of the process – constraints that have probably influenced the ToT – would be relevant input.

As a feasible procedure to accomplish all of the above we propose to have a central Focus Group Discussion with facilitators on the process and its constraints, and schedule for 4 additional interviews in each sample village (the Village leader – part of both village teams - one other member of the pre-identification team, and two other members of the verification team).

This increases the total number of interviews to 96.

The Checklist with indicators is very short and available. However, there are no questions formulated on:

- Perceptions of villagers on MVFL process
- Constraints as experienced by village groups and facilitators

Instrument design is crucial for the results one gets so at least some time should be allotted for this.

The consultant doing this evaluation needs to be aware of:

- The policy background and intended practical uses of the MVFL
- The reasoning behind the indicators chosen

Those conducting the verification interviews and interviews with village group members also should be aware of the background of the whole process, and familiar with the poverty criteria instrument, the perception questionnaire and the interview guidelines for the village group members. It is essential that everyone involved shares the same understanding of question purpose, question frames, admissible probing techniques, etc. Some time for training is inescapable.

All of the above results in a proposal to spend more time in Kampong Thom than foreseen in the ToR.

We feel that it makes more sense to schedule a presentation of the results after the first draft of the evaluation report has been written (as opposed to immediately following the fieldwork as suggested by the ToR). Especially in case the evaluation identifies discrepancies between the scores of families on the final MVFL lists and their verification scores by our interviewers, and/or in case our check on the pre-identification procedure results in questions, it seems better to first analyze the material and then only discuss.

Proposal

See attached spreadsheet

Expected collaboration

Field work time schedules are crucially dependent upon the availability of interviewees. In a case like this wherein one pre-identifies interviewees receiving assistance from project partners to request availability of interviewees before the interviewers actually come to the village is especially important. Budgeting of the costs is based on an expected nr. of interviews/day. The feasibility of this budget is directly dependent upon the availability of the interviewees.

Constraints

CAS is already committed to other project in January. For us to be able to execute this evaluation the field work has to be completed by the first week of January at the latest.

For the report writing we intend to involve a new expatriate senior research member of CAS who is only available after 9 January. We therefore suggest allowing for at least a week after her return for delivering a first draft.

RH/15-12-2004

Annex 3

Guidelines for the creation of the "most vulnerable families list" by Commune councils and community people

Introduction

The following guidelines are based on the experiences of the working group members, who are working directly with community people, on the discussion held during several working sessions, and on the lessons learned from similar experiences conducted in the past in both Kampong Thom and Kampot.

Background and concept

The most vulnerable family list (MVFL) is an important tool to help different actors involved at local level to pay special attention to the poorest families. The list will be created at village level with one list per village.

It is difficult to use external actors such as NGO's or Government staff to do the identification of the most vulnerable families. It would take quite a lot of time to check on the conditions of each family and require budget to pay for their staff. The villagers on the other hand know one another very well and are quite able to judge on each other's living condition. Therefore the identification should be done by the villagers themselves and then be acknowledged by the local authorities such as village chief and CC.

To avoid unjust treatment of influential individuals in preparing the list the idea is to involve key respected villagers into 2 different working groups to have full transparency in the whole process. In case some key respected villagers still give unjustified advantage to anyone, the result or the MVFL will be discussed in public, which gives the villagers the opportunity to express their ideas or disagreement openly, take a judgement on it and find final agreement.

In a further step the MVF lists of all the villages will be consolidated into a commune list at commune level by including key respected villagers as witnesses. After application of this procedure in 4 target communes, if something is required to adjust or modify it, the working group will improve it and apply it as a model for the whole province.

Objective and purpose of doing the most vulnerable families list.

- To identify the poorest and prepare the list for using it as community benefit in the process of village planning
- To raise awareness within the Commune's Planning and Budgeting Committee on targeting the poor for activities planned in the commune
- To provide a targeting tool to CBO's, self-help associations, private donors and service providers to enable them to reach the most vulnerable families with their services
- To be an indicator to measure the impact of projects
- To apply flexibility in the process of collection of local contribution (exemptions or differentiated fees)

Preliminary step

Before starting the selection procedure of the MVF at commune and village level, a preparatory working group should be held at Provincial level. The members of a working group include: Community Development staff (PDRD), Planning Department, PDAFF, Health Department, WVC Kg. Thom, GTZ Food Security, GTZ Health, GTZ RDP, 2 CNGOs who have to define the procedure as well as the model criteria of selection to be included into a guideline for use in the commune and villages.

The model criteria for the MVF selection as proposed by the working group are proposed according to three different settings, which are listed below. They should be considered as indicators or cross checking mechanism to identify the MVF. However, not every MVF has to correspond to all the indicators at once.

Questionnaire Development for most Vulnerable Family Identification

**Rural areas
(Cross-checking mechanism)**

1	Resident land ownership	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 2 A <input type="checkbox"/>	More than 2 A <input type="checkbox"/>
2	Productive land	None <input type="checkbox"/>	1-20 A <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 20 A <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Source of income of the family	Wage labor 1-2 p., collect vegetables, fire wood from the field or forest <input type="checkbox"/>	Small or occasional business = wage labor 3 persons or more than 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	Established business or produce palm wine or sugar <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Livestock: (Cattle, buffalo, horse, goat, pig, poultry)	None <input type="checkbox"/> (0-5 poultry)	Little <input type="checkbox"/> (1 pig or 1 cattle or 1 buffalo or horse or 1 goat or 6-20 poultry) <input type="checkbox"/>	More <input type="checkbox"/> (pig, cow, buffalo, poultry)
5	House Situation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Thatch hut <input type="checkbox"/>	Wooden/Brick house <input type="checkbox"/>
6	Means of transportation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Bicycle/ox-cart <input type="checkbox"/>	2 Sets/Motorized transportation <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Electrical appliances	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Radio <input type="checkbox"/>	T.V/ Other <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Family lack of foods (Rice)	7-12 months <input type="checkbox"/>	4 - 6 months <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 4 months <input type="checkbox"/>

9- Type of Family (Just address the kind of family is not normal)

Old age Orphan Disable Chronic disease

Widow/Widower has children more than 5 and Age under 12 years

Questionnaire Development for most Vulnerable Family Identification
For floating areas
(Cross-checking mechanism)

1	Fishing Tools	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Single net <input type="checkbox"/>	More than 1 net <input type="checkbox"/>
2	Fish catch	0-1 Kg./day <input type="checkbox"/>	1-3 Kg./day <input type="checkbox"/>	More than 3 Kg/day <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Source of income of the family	Wage labor 1-2 p., collect vegetables, fire wood from the field or forest <input type="checkbox"/>	Small or occasional business = wage labor 3 persons or more than 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	Established business or renting or running taxi boats <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Livestock: (pig, duck, fish)	None <input type="checkbox"/> (0-5 ducks)	Little <input type="checkbox"/> (1 pig or 6-20 ducks)	More <input type="checkbox"/> (pig, ducks, fish)
5	House Situation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor boat house <input type="checkbox"/>	Good large boat house <input type="checkbox"/>
6	Means of transportation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Row boat <input type="checkbox"/>	Motor boat <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Electrical appliances	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Radio <input type="checkbox"/>	T.V/ Other <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Impossibility of buying foods (Rice)	7-12 months <input type="checkbox"/>	4 - 6 months <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 4 months <input type="checkbox"/>

- 9- Type of family (Just address the kind of family is not normal)
 Old age Orphan Disable Chronic disease
 Widow/Widower has children more than 5 and Age under 12 years

Questionnaire Development for most Vulnerable Family Identification
For urban areas
(Cross-checking mechanism)

1	Resident land ownership	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 1 A <input type="checkbox"/>	More than 1 A <input type="checkbox"/>
2	Productive land	None <input type="checkbox"/>	1-20 A <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 20 A <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Source of income of the family	Wage labor 1-2 p., collect vegetables, fire wood from the field or forest <input type="checkbox"/>	Small or occasional business = wage labor 3 persons or more than 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	Established business or produce palm wine or sugar <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Livestock: (Cattle, buffalo, horse, goat, pig, poultry)	None <input type="checkbox"/> (0-5 poultry)	Little <input type="checkbox"/> (1 pig or 1 cattle or 1 buffalo or 1 goat or 6-20 poultry)	More <input type="checkbox"/> (pig, cow, buffalo, poultry)
5	House Situation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Thatch hut <input type="checkbox"/>	Wooden/Brick house <input type="checkbox"/>
6	Means of transportation	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Bicycle/ox-cart <input type="checkbox"/>	2 Sets/Motorized transportation <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Electrical appliances	None <input type="checkbox"/>	Radio <input type="checkbox"/>	T.V/ Other <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Family lack of foods (Rice)	7-12 months <input type="checkbox"/>	4 - 6 months <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than 4 months <input type="checkbox"/>

Type of family (Just address the kind of family is not normal)

Old age Orphan Disable Chronic disease

Widow/Widower has children more than 5 and Age under 12 years

Recommended procedure in 5 steps:

Step 1

- Provide orientation on the whole process of selection of MVF to partner staff who works closely with community people.

The contents of orientation:

- Brainstorming ideas on MVF word and its definition to reach a joint understanding.
- Objective of selection of MVF and making the list.
- Steps and method used for MVF identification
- Present Criteria or indicators (check list), and merging ideas from brainstorming and how to use them
- How to draw a line of score for the assessment
- Presentation of the village list format and how to fill it in
- What needs to be prepared when conducting village meetings
- Conduct Role Play: Village meeting
- Presentation on how to combine commune list and how to do it ?
- Preparatory schedule with community people for step 3

Step 2

- Partner staff conducts orientation on selection of MVF to the implementers at commune level (CC, PBC, Village chief and vice chief). The contents are the same as they learned.
 - Brainstorming ideas on MVF word and its definition to reach a joint understanding.
 - Objective of selection of MVF and list.
 - Steps and method used, how to select key informants and guidance to village working groups for MVF identification.
 - Present Criteria or indicators (check list), and how to use them
 - How to draw a line of score for the assessment
 - Presentation of the village list format and how to fill it in.
 - **What needs to be prepared when conducting village meeting** (have to assure that they can prepare)
 - Conduct Role Play: Village meeting
 - Presentation on how to combine commune lists and how to do it
 - Preparatory schedule with community people for step 3 (have to assure that people are informed in advance to join the village meeting)

Note: After step 2 when they come back to village, they have to form a group and identify a draft first list of MVF based on their criteria.

Step 3

- Conduct village meeting to start the activity of selection of MVF.
 - Presentation of the objective of selection of MVF
 - Explanation method for MVF identification (How to do it: working group 1 identifies first list of MVF, selects key informants (Working Group 2) to verify first list by matching with checklist, presents the result in village meeting to finalize and approval by villagers, Village chief signs and submits to CC for endorsement, Conduct random spot check to assure the MVF list is correct)
- Before villagers go back home ask them to select key informants, form working group 2 and present them to villagers to make sure that they trust them.
- CC and Village Chief explain the working group process to the group (under the facilitation of DCDT and DFT)
- Working group 1 gives a draft first list to group 2
- Working Group 2 starts to verify first list
- Ask 2nd working group to draft shortlist according to the format and show it on a flipchart

Step 4

- Village meeting to present results to villagers
- Ask approval from villagers
- In case of disagreements, the WG has to discuss case by case and come to a decision seeking consensus from everyone
- Village chief and villager responsible for listing sign MVF list and send it to commune council

Step 5

- Conduct commune meeting:
 - Invite representatives from village WG's to attend as witnesses
 - Consolidate village lists at commune level
 - Endorsement from commune council
 - Submit commune list to district authority

Role of key actors in the creation of the MVFL

Key actors	Activities
Villagers	➤ Check and comment on the MVFL (in step 4)
Village level working group and key informants working group	➤ Draft the first MVFL and submit to key informants group. (step 3) ➤ Key informants group verifies the list by matching with questionnaire.
Village chief, PBC, key persons and CC	➤ Agree on the procedure and criteria (step 2) ➤ Conduct the village meeting and facilitate to select key informants and form working groups ➤ Present the result of MVFL to villagers (step 4) ➤ Attend the commune meeting to consolidate the commune list (step 5)
Village chief	➤ Endorse the MVFL and submit to CC (step 4)
CC	➤ Endorse the MVFL after finalization by villagers (step 5)
DFT	➤ Advise CC and PBC (step 2, step 3 and step 5) ➤ Join with DCDT to conduct the orientation of MVF process(step 2)
DCDT	➤ Conduct the orientation of MVF process (step 2) ➤ Advise the Village working groups ➤ Advise village chief in conducting village meeting (step3 and 4)
Provincial working Group	➤ Create guidelines for selection procedure ➤ Train DFT and DCDT staff ➤ Promote use of the MVFL by relevant departments or agencies
GTZ	➤ Advise and Join the Working group ➤ Conduct a trial on the creation of guidelines

Annex 4

The process described at village level

Trainings and orientation on MVFL¹⁴

The training to the 1st groups in Samprouch commune was provided by members of the DCDT without other guests from PDRD. In Kompong Rotes commune and Rung Roeung commune the training sessions were mainly conducted by GTZ staff.

In Rung Roeung commune one representative of PDRD Kompong Thom was present during the training to the 1st groups.

As an exception the members of 1st group of Kompong Thom village in Kompong Rotes commune directly participated in the training session of DCDT of Stoeung Sen district provided by the Provincial Working Group.

Creating the first draft of MVFL

In Krasang Chrum Choeung village, Doun La'a village and Bos Tasaom village interviewees of the 2nd group reported that they were instructed by the 1st group (mostly village chief) to provide family names and information on their living situation in order to draft a first list. They did not receive a preliminary MVFL but were asked to find families by themselves. In some cases the village chief expected 15-20 names, in other cases the number remained unlimited.

In **Bos Tasaom village** representatives of the 2nd group said that they were instructed by the village deputy chief to make the first draft of MVFL. This draft they have then submitted to the deputy chief. The members of the 2nd group had not visited the houses of concerned families but compiled the first draft from their own knowledge of the situation in their village.

Also in **Krasang Chrum Choeung village** the members of the 2nd group were instructed by the village chief to provide names of families for the list. They split into several groups covering a certain area of the village and collected information without using the questionnaires. They did not ask the concerned families directly but gathered additional information to their own knowledge in general if needed. The 2nd group met then with members of the 1st group to summarize all information into the first draft of MVFL. During this meeting both groups jointly filled in the questionnaires according to their knowledge of the living situation of the concerned families.

The same happened in **Doun La'a village**. The village chief instructed the 2nd group to submit a first draft of MVFL consisting of 15-20 families. According to the interviews with members of the 2nd group the members of the 2nd group met at a secret place in order to discuss and draft the list without visiting the houses. They also filled in the questionnaires. The village chief then completed the draft. The team could not verify when this process happened. Concluding from the interviewees of the 2nd group it seems that the first draft was not presented at the first public meeting but only as final draft at the second one.

In **Kompong Rotes village** and **Por village** the village chiefs used already existing lists of poor families as a basis for creating the new draft of MVFL.

In Kompong Rotes village the village chief invited the parent's children association chief and 15 village group leaders to help him in drafting the first MVFL on the basis of this old list.

First public meeting to elect the village representatives (2nd group)

It is evident that at least in **Krasang Chrum Choeung village** the representatives of the 2nd group had started work already before they were elected in the public meeting. The 14 members of the 2nd group attended training provided by the Provincial Working Group/GTZ to the 1st group. Interviewees of the 2nd group confirmed that they were nominated before but at the public meeting later villagers accepted them as experienced and capable to accomplish the requested tasks.

¹⁴ Again, this is based on interviewee information. GTZ added that in Samprouch and in Rung Roeung PDRD provincial CD staff, a GTZ RDP TA and a DFT were also present.

In **Kompong Thom village** the village chief nominated 7 candidates for the public meeting. One Commune Council member presented the names of them on behalf of the 1st group to the meeting with request for confirming by applause.

Persons of the 1st group explained to the interview team that they have pre-selected these candidates in order to ensure that the village representatives are literate people with good work experience.

In **Kompong Rotes village** the 1st group nominated and presented 6 or 10 candidates. These candidates were also pre-selected by the village chief in order to have village representatives who are capable to accomplish the tasks required, who are neutral and reliable, not too poor and not too rich. The second criterion was to have 2 representatives each from the beginning, from the middle and from the end of the village.

Every candidate was called by name and the villagers showed by hand raising if they agree. 6 candidates were elected. Interviewees mentioned that 1 of the elected representative later resigned because of family reasons and it was unknown if he was replaced.

In **Por village** the village chief told the team that 6 candidates were proposed by the meeting and 3 of them were finally elected. Interviewees of the 2nd group said that the village chief nominated 3 candidates and these 3 candidates were elected without any problems.

The cases were similar in **Doun La'a village** and **Bos Tasaom village**. The candidates proposed by the village chief or other members of the 1st group were always elected by the villagers without any problems or public protest.

Training to the elected members of the 2nd group

In **Por village** and **Krasang Chrum Choeung** village representatives of DCDT attended the meeting and contributed to the training.

The trainings in **Bos Tasaom village** and **Kompong Thom village** were conducted by members of the 1st group with any other guests from district or provincial level.

In **Doun La'a village** the interviewee of the 1st group said that a representative of DCDT attended the training while interviewees of the 2nd group said that except the village chief and commune council members no other representatives of district/provincial level were present to give training and explanation to the 2nd group.

Verifying the first list by 2nd group (by means of questionnaire)

In two villages the members of the 2nd group individually provided names of poor families to the 1st group without any feedback and without knowing about the recommendations of other members of the 2nd group (Por village, Bos Tasaom village).

In Kompong Thom village, Krasang Chrum Choeung village and in Por village interviewees of the 1st group told the team that 1st and 2nd group had met in order to discuss the results but only interviewees of the 2nd group of Krasang Chrum Choeung village confirmed that they had met with the 1st group after submitting their proposals.¹⁵

According to the interviews with members of the 2nd group most of them made observations without using the questionnaire. They used the criteria as an orientation for their assessment of the living situation of the concerned families.

¹ It is unclear how the process of verification *should* look like and which steps are intended after the 2nd group has filled in the questionnaires. Should there be a meeting of both groups in order to compare the results of the 2nd group with the preliminary list of the 1st group and to finalize the MVFL together? Or is the finalizing of MVFL a separate step exclusively the responsibility of the 1st group?

In **Kompong Thom village** the interviewees of the 1st and 2nd group provided different versions of the process.

According to the interview with the village chief the members of the 2nd group collected additional information and observed the living situation of concerned families. But they did not interview the families. At a second meeting villagers were invited to finalize the draft of MVFL. 1 Member of the 2nd group called every name in the list and gave scores according to the 8 criteria of the questionnaire. Commune Council members attended the meeting but members of DCDT or Provincial Working Group/ GTZ did not join. Participants could add information or protest if they thought that the assessment was not correct. There were many persons who requested to be listed too but only few of them were accepted because most did not meet the requirements.

The second interviewee of the 1st group (deputy village chief) reported that after receiving the draft list from the 2nd group they had met to finalize the draft. They decided to take 68 families on the MVFL. Then 1 representative of the 1st group and 1 of the 2nd group signed the list and they submitted the list to the commune council. He is not aware that there was a public announcement meeting.

The one interviewee of the 2nd group said that the 2nd group received questionnaires from the 1st group in order to identify most vulnerable families. They split into several groups and observed the living situation of families. The interviewee said that he had identified 10 families without filling in the questionnaires. He then submitted the list of 10 families to the village chief. Afterwards he had never received any information about the process again.

The other interviewee of the 2nd group said he was part of a group of 6 persons to identify poor families. He had received a copy of the questionnaires for orientation but wrote his notices on a separate sheet of paper. He identified 26 families but after discussion with his colleague he decided to take only 12 of them. He filled in the questionnaire for these 12 families and submitted the documents to the 1st group. He has no knowledge of the results of the other members of the 2nd group and of further proceeding.

In **Kompong Rotes village** the members of the 2nd group met after they had received training by the 1st group in order to fill in the questionnaires according to the names in the draft MVFL. They did not make face-to-face interviews with the families but in questions but discussed every case among the members of the 2nd group and gave scores into the questionnaires according to their knowledge and discussion. The group's identification were made by observation of living conditions, housing land, rice field and means of transportations. When the 2nd group was not sure to decide in giving scores they requested the help of the village chief.

According to the interviewee of the 1st group (commune chief) the 2nd group of **Por village** went to the houses and asked the families listed on the MVFL by using the questionnaires. At the same time the asking members of the 2nd group filled the questionnaire for each family in by giving scores in the presence of the asked family member. After completing all questionnaires by the 2nd group the members of the 1st and of the 2nd group have met in order to verify the names of the MVFL.

Interviewed persons of the 2nd group said that they went to the houses of each family listed on the MVFL but without questionnaires. They did not make face-to-face interviews but observed carefully the living situation of each family. They did not go as a group. Every member of the 2nd group has made his own observation by himself. One interviewed person of the 2nd group said that he collected information of 15 families without having the MVFL or the questionnaire. Afterwards he went to the village chief and confirmed in verbal that all families he had observed would fit all 8 criteria. The village chief ticked off the names on the list he had in hands during this meeting. Finally the interviewed person went home without knowing what other members of the 2nd group have made. After that mission he was never called to a meeting of the 2nd group again.

The second interviewee of the 2nd group of Por village confirmed that procedure by saying that he went several times to the houses of 4 families, observed their living situation within the duration of 3 days and reported the results to the Commune Council. He had not made any interviews with the families and he did not fill in any questionnaire.

The interviewed person of the 1st group in **Bos Tasaom village** said that the members of the 2nd group had received a copy of the MVFL and 1 copy of questionnaire sheet as orientation. 9 family names were registered on the list. The members of the 2nd group returned the list with names of 22 families. The 1st group was not sure if all these families would fit the criteria and so the 1st group decided to confirm the list in the second public meeting together with all villagers.

The interviewed person of the 2nd group said that they have received a list from the 1st group with 20 names. After long discussion within the 2nd group they decided to accept only 1 family as most vulnerable because they understood that they had to identify the poorest families that means that these families have really nothing. The 2nd group did not make any interviews and they did not filled in any questionnaire. They provided the list with only one family name to the 1st group. The interviewed person did not make any statement how the 1st group answered.

In **Krasang Chrum Choeung village** every interviewed person provided a slight different version of verifying the MVFL.

The first interviewee of the 1st group (2. deputy commune chief) said that the members of the 1st and the 2nd group had met to give scores to all families listed on the MVFL. They did not visit the concerned families but exchanged information and knowledge with each other. After completing the questionnaires they submitted the documents to the commune council. Then Members of CC and DCDT discussed the list again and checked if all families really met the criteria. Finally the list was signed by the Commune Council and submitted to the district.

The second interviewee of the 1st group said that the members of the 2nd group had received instruction to go to the houses of families and to categorize them into 3 categories (poorest, poor and little poor). They did not receive a MVFL or questionnaires. After 2 hours the members of the 2nd group had collected information of 70 families. They did not go as a group but as individuals. The resulting list of 70 families was discussed in a public meeting with 117 participants. After one-day discussion 52 families were accepted to be listed on the MVFL.

DCDT 'approved' the list and the village chief signed it¹⁶. Then the MVFL was submitted to the Commune level.

The first interviewee of the 2nd group said that they did not go to the houses of the families. They had met with members of the 1st group in order to discuss the MVFL. After discussing the list the 1st group organized a public meeting to announce the list to the villagers. At the meeting every name was called and given scores to that family.

The second interviewee of the 2nd group said that the 2nd group had provided the first draft of the MVFL by collecting information about the possible families. They did not go to the families directly and no interview was made. During the identification process the interviewed person had identified 16 families but after discussion with another member of the 2nd group they decided to take only 7 of them. They submitted the 7 names to the 1st group.

After 3 days members of the 1st group and all 14 members of the 2nd group met in order to discuss the result of collected information. The meeting decided to put 62 families on the MVFL.

Afterwards the 1st group organized a public meeting to announce the list to the villagers. At the public meeting it was decided to accept only 52 families to be on the MVFL.

In **Doun La'a village** the situation was similar.

The interviewee of the 1st group explained that the 1st group submitted the questionnaires to the 2nd group with the request to fill them in. He said that the 2nd group needed 4 weeks for that before they returned the documents. The interviewee could not make further statements on the process. He also did not

¹⁶ Actually, DCDTs do not have the right to approve the list (GTZ comment). Their role is one of facilitation and acting as resource persons. The phrasing by the interviewee does not necessarily reflect misunderstanding of the formal responsibilities but does indicate the still very prevalent attitude that when higher level authorities are 'involved', their 'approval'/'acquiescence' is needed for the process to move on.

participate in the public meeting. The interviewer had the impression that the interviewee was only little interested in the poverty identification process and had no clear information about it.

According to the interview with a representative of the 2nd group the 2nd group met in a secret place in order to discuss which families should be considered and to draft the first MVFL. At the meeting they tried to give scores to the families but it was not so clear to them what they had to do. Nevertheless they drafted the list and submitted list and questionnaires to the village chief. They did not receive any answer from the village chief and the interviewed person did not know what the 1st group has made with the list. Later there was a public meeting to announce the list to the villagers.

The second interviewee of the 2nd group said that they had collected information on the families but not in a group but separated from each other. Every member of the 2nd group identified 15-20 families. All in all they put 90 families on the list. Sometimes they asked the village chief to help in deciding. After completing the list they submitted it to the commune council. Afterwards there was a public meeting to announce the list but because of too much trouble the village chief decided to break off the meeting. So the list was not confirmed by the villagers.

Completing final version of MVFL to be presented at a public meeting

According to interviewees of the 1st group the 1st group sometimes involved the 2nd group in completing the list but only the interviewees of the 2nd groups of Krasang Chrum Choeung village confirmed this procedure. In general the 2nd group provided names and information, sometimes as a group, sometimes as individuals, to the 1st group (village chief or cc member) but was not involved in compiling and completing the final MVFL.

According to the interviews with representative of the 2nd group in **Por village** the 2nd group submitted names of families to the 1st group in verbal but afterwards they were never invited to a meeting with the 1st group in order to create the complete list in a participatory process.

In **Kompong Rotes village** the 2nd group had made minutes on their discussion and decision on the draft MVFL and submitted it to the village chief for completing the process. They were not involved in creating the final list.

In **Bos Tasaom village** the 2nd group did not receive any answer or inquiry from the 1st group after they had submitted their draft list with only one family name. Even in the public meeting of announcement of the final MVFL nobody of them was asked to explain their decision.

In **Kompong Thom village** the process is not quite clear. The village chief told the team that the 1st group had met with members of the 2nd group in order to finalize the MVFL that was then presented at a public meeting. The interviewees of the 2nd group did not confirm that they were involved in any process of finalizing and that there was a second public meeting to announce the final list.

In **Krasang Chrum Choeung village** the process is similar unclear. The interviewees of the 1st group said that 1st and 2nd group had met to give scores to all families on the list. They completed the list together and submitted list and questionnaires to the commune council for confirmation. CC and DCDT then discussed the list again in order to check if all listed families would meet the criteria.

Public announcement of final MVFL

In 3 villages it was not clear if really public meetings to announce and to approve the final draft of MVFL had taken place. Statements of different interviewees of the same village differ or even contradict each other.

In **Kompong Thom village** the village chief reported that at a second public meeting the final draft of MVFL were approved by the villagers. The deputy village chief could not confirm that a second public meeting has taken place. According to him after discussing the draft list of poor families within the 1st

group they submitted the list with 68 family names with the signature of one representative of the 1st and of one of the 2nd group as the final MVFL to the commune council.

In **Por village** the interviewees of the 1st group said that a final draft list with 25 names was presented at a public meeting. Some participants protested that they were not on the list but after asking them according to the criteria it became clear that they were not qualified. Interviewees of the 2nd group told the team that they were not aware of any public meeting announcing the final MVFL.

In **Doun La'a village** after many protests of participants why they were not on the list the village chief decided to break off the public meeting and to delegate the case to the commune council for resolving.

In Kompong Rotes village, Bos Tasaom village and Krasang Chrum Choeung village interviewees of both groups reported that public meetings were held.

In **Kompong Rotes village** the interviewees of the 1st group said that after giving scores by the 2nd group based on the old list (72 families) they compiled the final draft and then 1 representative of the 1st group and 1 from the 2nd group submitted the draft with reporting to the village chief. The village chief submitted the final draft to the commune council for confirmation. Afterwards the 1st group organized the second public meeting where all names were discussed. 64 of the 72 families were accepted to be on the list.

One interviewee of the 2nd group told the team that they had discussed the names of the list they had received from the 1st group without filling in of questionnaires. Later they gave scores according to the criteria but made not any decision.

The other interviewee of the 2nd group reported that they had collected information separately from each other and provided these in formation to the 1st group without knowing what other members had provided. Afterwards unrest and rumors spread among the villagers because nobody knew whose names were on the list. Finally the 1st group organized a public meeting but nevertheless many families protested because they did not understand why they were not on the list.

In **Bos Tasaom village** the interviewee of the 1st group said that at the public meeting 22 names were presented and after discussion 18 families were accepted.

The interviewee of the 2nd group reported that because their draft list showed only one family name the representative of DCDT decided at the public meeting to give publicly scores to all families of the original first draft. Every name was called and the 1st group decided how many scores each family received. On this basis 18 families were put on the list. One of the interviewees of the 2nd group complained that nobody of the 1st group had ever discussed with them the result and even at the public meeting nobody of the 2nd group was asked or invited to give scores.

In **Krasang Chrum Choeung village** the interviewees of the 1st group said that the final draft (64 family names) was presented at a public meeting. After discussion 52 families were accepted on the list. The interviewees of the 2nd group confirmed that the list with 64 names was presented at the public meeting. But they added that the 1st group subsequently explained why only 52 names of them were acceptable and thus that the narrowing down was not the result of a public discussion but rather a proposal by the 1st group accepted by the meeting. The acceptance went not smooth: many participants protested. Some families left the meeting in anger.

Annex 5 Additional tables

Table 3A: Villagers' scores of short-listed families by village

Village	Villager's score											
	10		11		12		13		14		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kampong Thom	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	6	100%
Kampong Roteh	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	1	1.7%	0	0%	6	100%
Daun Laa	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	0	0%	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Bos Ta saom	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	0	0%	6	100%
Po	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Total	4	11%	11	31%	13	36%	6	17%	2	6%	36	100%

Table 3B CAS' scores of short-listed families by village

Village	CAS's score																	
	6		8		9		10		11		12		13		14		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kampong Thom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	6	100%
Kampong Roteh	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	6	100%
Daun Laa	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Bos Ta saom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33%	0	00%	6	100%
Po	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Total	1	3%	1	3%	5	14%	7	19%	7	19%	7	19%	6	17%	2	6%	36	100%

Table 4A: Similarity and difference score by single criterion and by village

Village		Resident land		Production land		Source of income		livestock		House situation		Transportation		Electronic appliance		Food security	
		Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ	Similar	differ
Kampong Thom	N	4	2	5	1	5	1	6	0	5	1	5	1	0	6	5	1
	%	67%	33%	83%	17%	83%	17%	100%	0%	83%	17%	83%	17%	0%	100%	83%	17%
Kampong Roteh	N	6	0	5	1	3	3	4	2	5	1	3	3	3	3	4	2
	%	100%	0%	83%	17%	50%	50%	67%	33%	83%	17%	50%	50%	50%	50%	67%	33%
Daun Laa	N	2	4	1	5	3	3	2	4	5	1	4	2	4	2	2	4
	%	33%	67%	17%	83%	50%	50%	33%	67%	83%	17%	67%	33%	67%	33%	33%	67%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	N	2	4	3	3	4	2	6	0	5	1	4	2	5	1	4	2
	%	33%	67%	50%	50%	67%	33%	100%	0%	83%	17%	67%	33%	83%	17%	67%	33%
Bos Ta saom	N	4	2	5	1	6	0	6	0	5	1	6	0	6	0	3	3
	%	67%	33%	83%	17%	100%	0%	100%	0%	83%	17%	100%	0%	100%	0%	50%	50%
Po	N	4	2	1	5	3	3	5	1	6	0	4	2	6	0	4	2
	%	67%	33%	17%	83%	50%	50%	83%	17%	100%	0	67%	33%	100%	0%	67%	33%
Total	N	22	14	20	16	24	12	29	7	31	5	26	10	24	12	22	14
	%	61%	39%	56%	44%	67%	33%	81%	19%	86%	14%	72%	28%	67%	33%	61%	39%

Table 6B: Number of non short-listed HH that should and should not have been included in the MVFL by village

Village	Should have been recruited		non listing correct		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kampong Thom	3	50%	3	50%	6	100%
Kampong Roteh	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
Daun Laa	2	33%	4	67%	6	100%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	2	33%	4	67%	6	100%
Bos Ta saom	2	33%	4	67%	6	100%
Po	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
Total	11	31%	25	69%	36	100%

Table 6C: Scores of non short-listed HHs

Score	Frequency	Percent
4	1	3
5	1	3
6	3	8
7	4	11
8	8	22
9	8	22
10	7	19
11	2	6
12	1	3
13	1	3
Total	36	100.0

Table 6D: Scores of non short-listed families by criterion and by village

Village	Scores																					
	4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		13		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kampong Thom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	6	100%
Kampong Roteh	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Daun Laa	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Krasang Chhrum Cheung	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Bos Ta saom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	6	100%
Po	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%
Total	1	3%	1	3%	3	8%	4	11%	8	22%	8	22%	7	19%	2	6%	1	3%	1	3%	36	100%