

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) GUIDES

KII GUIDE FOR ICMA TOP MANAGEMENT

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

This instrument will be used for key informant interviews with ICMA top management and component leads. The evaluation team will conduct the KII via Gmeet.

Before starting the KII, facilitators are requested to send a copy of the INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Refer to Annex C) to the participants and verbally seek the respondents' consent. Upon confirmation of intent to participate, ask the participants to attach their electronic signature and send back the completed form. Do not start without the completed form.

Except when internet connectivity is a problem, please request participants to turn on their cameras for recording purposes. At the minimum, the cameras should be turned on: at the beginning, end, and when the participants speak. Turning cameras on will verify the speaker.

As a reminder, participants should mute themselves while someone is talking.

OPENING SPIEL

Good morning/afternoon. Thank you for joining us today. Your participation is essential to determine the extent of achievement on the outputs and outcomes of SURGE.

I am _____. We are external evaluators supporting the Panagora Group in the conduct of the evaluation on SURGE. _____ will be joining us.

We will be recording our session. You will need to accept the recording before you are allowed to continue. We will now begin recording.

May I clarify at this point if you have submitted a signed Informed Consent Form and retained a signed copy? If not, may I request you to exit the session and e-mail us your signed consent form? You may re-enter once we receive the form.

I wish to reiterate that your participation in this KII is voluntary, and you may opt out. Should you opt-out, we will strike from our records all statements made by you.

For those who will continue with us, we wish to assure you that our conversation will remain confidential and will be discussed only within the research team led by Ramon Noriel Sicad of the CLAIMDev team. Should we use any of the statements you made in our report, we will seek prior approval to do so. You may then inform us whether you would like the information stricken or included in the report and whether or not you would like the information to be attributed to you.

Our KII for today should last no more than 90 minutes. Should our conversations be animated, we will interject with time checks.

We ask that you keep your cameras on for documentation purposes. Should you experience connectivity problems, we request that the cameras be turned on at the beginning and end of the session, at least when you speak.

Do you have any questions?

Now that we have addressed all questions, we will now start our session.

KII QUESTIONS

1. What activities/ interventions conducted by SURGE contributed significantly to achieving higher-level development goals (e.g., CDCS, CDI, PFG)? Please give at least five (5) and explain their relevance. (1.1) Were there opportunities to achieve this (1.1.4)
2. Based on your opinion, to what extent has SURGE contributed to achieving the development objectives of CDCS (previous and current), CDI, and PFG? Would you please give specific and concrete examples? (1.1.1) Were there opportunities for SURGE to achieve this? (1.1.4.1)
3. To what extent has SURGE contributed to the DOI (broad-based and inclusive growth accelerated and sustained) and DO2 (environmental resilience improved)? (1.1.1.1)
4. What specific international development commitments of the Philippines has SURGE been able to support? Please provide examples and discuss their relevance. 1.1.2 (for example, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change). Were there opportunities to achieve this? (1.1.4.2)
5. How would you describe the appropriateness, significance, and relevance of the SURGE design concerning the policy of USAID on urban resiliency and WASH? (1.1.3)
6. What activities do you think are relevant in achieving the development hypothesis of SURGE? Please cite at least five (5) specific and concrete examples. (1.2)
7. What activities do you think are relevant to the SURGE development hypothesis, i.e., resilient second-tier cities can serve as engines of growth and help equalize income distribution across the country? Cite at least five (5) outcomes and intermediate results generated by the project will continue after project completion without further assistance from SURGE? (3.1) What are the mechanisms or aspects that are put in place to sustain such gains? (3.1.1)
8. What is the likelihood that LGUs will take ownership of the interventions initiated by SURGE? (3.1.1.1)
9. Are local policies in place to ensure continuity of SURGE activities? Please cite examples. (3.1.2)
10. Were sustainability mechanisms integrated into the design and implementation of SURGE? What were the intended or unintended results? (3.2)
11. What were the exit strategies developed and implemented/conducted by the IPs? (3.2.1)
12. Which sustainability mechanisms worked or did not work? What were the facilitating and hindering factors? (3.2.2)

13. What gaps need to be addressed within the Mission and externally by the host government to ensure sustainability? (3.2.3)
14. What is the likelihood that the activities and benefits derived from SURGE/W-GDP will continue after project completion? Would you please cite the reasons? (3.3)
15. What is the likelihood that providing equal access to opportunities for economic empowerment to both men and women in the urban and rural areas will continue in CDI cities? Why? What are the factors that you can consider for this? (3.3.1)
16. What is the likelihood that the SURGE assistance package will continue to produce champions and leaders among target women entrepreneurs after project completion? (Learning Plan, W-GDP) (3.3.2)
17. Are there opportunities for replicating successful SURGE interventions in the future? What are these? Cite clear and concrete examples. (3.4)
18. Are there national or local government plans to replicate or expand any of the SURGE interventions in the future? What are these? (3.4.1)

MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO COMPONENT LEADS:

1. To what extent did SURGE improve local capacity in inclusive and resilient urban development (Component 1)? Kindly explain and cite examples. (2.1) What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of Component 1 targets? (2.1.1.1) How were the hindering factors addressed? (2.1.1.2)
2. To what extent did SURGE contribute to the improvement of the environment for local economic development (Component 2)? Kindly explain and cite examples. (2.2) What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of Component 2 targets? (2.2.1.1) How were the hindering factors addressed? (2.2.1.2)
3. To what extent did SURGE improve connectivity and access between urban and rural areas (Component 3)? Would you please explain and cite specific examples? (2.3) What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of Component 3 targets? (2.3.1.1) How were the hindering factors addressed? (2.3.1.2)

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

1. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed? Elaborate.
2. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
3. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

CLOSING SPIEL

We wish to thank you for your active participation in this KII. We appreciate the time you have taken to be with us today to contribute to an honest evaluation of the interventions about the SURGE activity. We have learned a lot from our session.

We wish to remind you that our session today will be held in the strictest confidence. We will contact you in the future should we use any of the statements you made in our report.

Continue to keep safe. Mabuhay ang Pilipinas.

We will now end the recording.

KII GUIDE FOR ICMA COMPONENT I LEAD

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

KII QUESTIONS

A. BEFORE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

- May we know the established criteria for proper selection/ identification of the WASH service providers to be assisted under the SURGE project. (i.e., Service Providers within the Eight (8) CDIs.)
- SURGE project conducted review/ assessment of the service providers' capacities. The Report covered only the three CDI cities, i.e., Batangas, Tagbilaran and Puerto Princesa. May we know if the same Reports are available for the other five CDIs. May we know the Type of Water Supply System being provided by each RWSA in each CDI.
- As part of the capacity assessment of service providers, may we know if the SURGE project reviewed the service providers' Level of Service (LOS) based on the established Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) supported by the available operation data/ information records? If so, can we have a copy of the results? (LOS should serve as a basis for the formulation of SURGE project Activity Work Plan and implementation strategy).
- May we know the results of the assessment conducted on the extent of further improvements of the existing operating facilities as well as the development of additional physical facilities (Hard component) in addition to the capacity building intervention (Soft component) in order to achieve the service providers' sustainable desired Level of Service coverage. (e.g., DMA formation is an instrument for NRW reduction, Georesistivity survey is for the new water sources, development of additional facilities is an instrument to expand service coverage.)
- May we know if the formulated Project Activity Work Plans were applied to all selected service providers or the application depends on the service providers' prevailing needs based on LOS. (It seems PPCWD is more or less already meeting desired the LOS).
- May we know if there was a review of the service providers' organizational structures assessing personnel qualifications and experiences (if situation permits) apart from determining if under or over manned. (over-manned results in inefficiency of the operations, Report revealed that certain RWSA is operating with an average of only four personnel.).
- May we know if the formulation of the SURGE project Annual Work Plan included the idea of considering a centralized system of providing WASH services in every CDI as one of the essential programs, wherein seven of the subject eight CDIs have established Water Districts. (CDIs'

competitiveness as second-tier cities - I read that even Maynilad recommended for a centralized system)

B. AFTER PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

- After the LWUA approval of the Water Safety Plan, Local Sustainable Sanitation Plan, and others, for the assisted WASH service providers, may we know if the assisted service providers have organized their in-house Teams (temporary or permanent) tasked to ensure continuous implementation of the plans. (RWSAs have limited technical personnel and the system is not so complicated)
- With the recorded more or less 134 trainings, seminars, and workshops conducted for WASH, apart from the ground survey undertaken, may we know the established indicators of how such activities substantially contributed to the achievement of the desired Level of Service (LOS) per CDI's service providers according to the parameters of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). (Service Coverage, NRW, Supply Quantity and Quality, etc.)
- Parallel to conducting/ facilitating WASH capacity building interventions for improved system operation and management practices, may we know what activities are carried out by the SURGE project to measure the achievement of the desired LOS parameters. (Example: GIS validation, reduced NRW level, increased consumers' billed volume, improved water quality at distribution system, etc.)
- Geo-resistivity surveys were conducted in a number of CDIs WASH service providers, may we have a copy of the results of the survey indicating the potential yield per VES Point in all surveyed service providers' areas. In addition, may we know if there had been surface water source assessment in areas with available potential surface water sources? (Supply and Demand analysis for each assisted service provider).
- In the SURGE project Annual Accomplishment Reports, the number of persons gaining access to basic water supply and sanitation services were indicated, i.e., 364,000), may we know what sort of mechanism was used to measure such achievements. Note that the total population of all subject CDIs is at the tune of 3,470,750 (i.e., referring to Outcome Indicators 1.1.7 and 1.1.8).
- May we know if the SURGE project facilitated a follow-through activity with all assisted service providers and/or LGU executives after the completion of each capacity building activity, especially on areas with quantifiable results. This is to ensure continuity of application of knowledge acquired during each session. (Example: WSP, BCP, LSSP, DMA formation for NRW reduction, frequency of waters sampling to ensure quality per PNSDW, etc.)
- Knowing that WASH services in all selected CDIs have a decentralized system, may we know then if SURGE pushed to consider existing Water Districts, LGU-operated system in Tagbilaran,

to represent as the “centralized system” despite Year 5 SURGE Work Plan Report explicitly stated the following?

“Most RWSAs and LGU Run water utilities are under- funded and services are inefficient”.

If not, may we know the reason why?

- In the case of Water Districts with concession-type Joint Venture Agreement with Private Proponent, like Metro Iloilo Water District (MIWD), may we know if the SURGE project has ever considered the possibility of strengthening the capacity of MIWD which became the Central Monitoring Units (CMU) tasked primarily to evaluate/ monitor the performance of the Joint Venture based on the agreed Target Service Obligations (TSO)? In actual PPP experiences on WASH, it was determined that most Water Districts and LGUs with concession-type Agreement with Private Proponent have limited capacity in doing their major role in the Joint Venture as CMUs.
- May we know if there are issues and concerns encountered with regards to the WASH service providers’ compliance with the government’s laws and guidelines on WASH. (e.g., Water Permit, Result of geo-resistivity surveys for potential sources of raw water, water quality monitoring according to PNSDW, etc.

On Sanitation Service:

Knowing that Water Districts are mandated to provide sanitation services within their respective service areas, sanitation service is not included in their priority programs. However, LGUs are always the ones initiating the provision of such service in most cases through the Private Sector Participation (PSP) program of the Government. Reports indicate that the SURGE project assisted LGUs in the required preparation and selection of interested Private Proponents following pertinent guidelines. May we know the extent of SURGE assistance. (Was SURGE involved in the preparation of tender documents and evaluation?)

RWSAs are operating only on small-scale systems, in most cases Level II water systems. May we know what assistance SURGE extended to RWSA on the provision of sanitation services.

C. MARAWI CITY WASH

- Reports revealed that MCWD was serving 41 out of 96 Barangays in the entire City which are divided into 15 Zones, may we have the list of the 41 served Barangays. The report indicates that the population service coverage, as of the year 2016, was at the tune of 14 % of the entire City while commercial and institutional establishments were not receiving the services of MCWD, Any reason why.
- Action Against Hunger prepared the Multi-cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) which defined the specific work plan for the restoration and rehabilitation of the WASH system in the city, may we then have a copy of the complete MIRA Report.
- SURGE project endeavored to extend Technical Assistance for the Mini Master Plan of MSU for the seven (7) Barangays divided into four Zones, may we know if the SURGE project initiated the

move to include the seven barangays to the service area of MCWD. If so, may we know the arrangements made between MSU and MCWD? (e.g., turn-over of existing MSU facilities, physical development of additional facilities by SURGE, distribution, billing, and collection).

- In terms of DILG's SalinTubig Program development assistance in seven (7) barangays, again not covered by MCWD service area, may we know the extent of SURGE contribution in the implementation of such assistance. Same as MSU areas, was there a discussion for the possible inclusion of the seven Barangays to the MCWD areas. (i.e., development of Level II system to be converted eventually into Level III system).
- Task Force Bangon Marawi (TFBM) reported that included in the overall city's restoration/reconstruction programs is the temporary and permanent resettlement housing being developed for the Internally Displace People (IDP) in five Barangays located in the eastern part of the city. May we know if there are SURGE contributions to the water supply services in the resettlement areas.
- Records revealed that Marawi City Water District (MCWD) was the third ever established Water District in the Country under PD 198, may we know if the SURGE project considered the idea of initiating the development of the MCWD as the "Centralized WASH service provider" in the entire City. (i.e. take-over of MSU water supply system in 7 barangays, IDPs resettlement in eastern Barangays, etc.
- As part of the capacity assessment, may we know if the SURGE project verified from National Water Resources Board (NWRB) if all the existing water sources of MCWD and MSU have been issued Water Permits?

KII GUIDE FOR ICMA COMPONENT 2 LEAD

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

KII QUESTIONS

EFFECTIVENESS

The project started with 3 cities (Batangas, CDO, Iloilo), followed by 6 others, including Marawi. From the report, it would seem that some cities were more advanced than others, and some cities had prior or co-USAID projects. Would you say that this had an impact on the effectiveness of SURGE? If there were prior projects, what would be the contribution of SURGE?

In terms of the CMCI indicator, is it correct to say that there were already some cities that belonged to the top 15%? What then would be the contribution of SURGE concerning this indicator?

Based on the submitted reports, there was one city that did not meet the target on CMCI. May we know which city this is? What would account for this?

I will not ask about the registered business indicator due to the pandemic, but for locally sourced revenues, was it a particular city that was not meeting its target? If so, may we know what would account for this?

Concerning the number of parcels, SURGE exceeded its target. What would account for this?

SURGE could pivot very quickly when the pandemic hit us. What would account for this?

There were some sub-components that SURGE was able to accomplish faster than others. For instance, in streamlining BPLS, shifting to online payments, manualizing operations. What would account for this?

Other areas took longer to accomplish. What were the challenges SURGE experienced?

Is there anything in the program design that you think would have made the implementation better?

Was the time allotted – 6 years – sufficient for SURGE to accomplish its goals? Had it not been for the pandemic, would not the project have attained its goals sooner?

SUSTAINABILITY

What exit strategies did SURGE adopt for component 2? Would the cities be able to sustain the momentum without SURGE? Would the LGUs be able to take ownership of the initiatives?

RELEVANCE

The objective of component 2 was to promote low-emission local economic development strategies. How were low-emission local economic development strategies operationalized?

Of all the activities and interventions, which were the ones that only SURGE could have done?

Do you think SURGE was effective in contributing to the US-PH Partnership for Growth as well as to the PDP?

As part of the project's overall approach to economic inclusion, SURGE advocates for, and works to, ensure that economic growth is equitably distributed and enjoyed by all sectors regardless of gender, ethnicity, and religious beliefs. How did SURGE ensure equitable distribution regardless of gender, ethnicity and religious beliefs? Was there a consciousness or deliberate effort or was it consequential?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

1. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed? Elaborate.
2. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
3. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

KII GUIDE FOR ICMA COMPONENT 3 LEAD

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

1. Component 3 seeks to expand economic connectivity and access between urban and rural areas through four sub-components. Could you please cite the key achievements of SURGE under each of the four sub-components?

[Notes: **Sub-component 3.1** – Reducing policy and regulatory barriers to productive rural-urban linkage; **Sub-component 3.2** – Reducing connectivity and information costs that inhibit the flows of goods and services; **Sub-component 3.3** – Strengthening supply chain linkages between urban and rural areas; **Sub-component 3.4** – Developing metropolitan arrangements that improve coordination and exchanges between cities and adjacent rural areas]

2. On the whole, to what extent did these key achievements under the four sub-components contribute to the objective of improving economic connectivity and access between urban and rural areas? Please cite specific cases/examples where SURGE contributed significantly to this objective? What factors promoted or hindered the achievement of the Component 3 objective?
3. Component 3, originally, has four performance indicators. To what extent did the ACTIVITIES of SURGE under Component 3 contribute to the achievement of performance indicator targets? What were the promoting or hindering factors in achieving Component 3 indicator targets? How were the hindering factors addressed?

[Possible follow-up questions – To what extent did the COVID-19 pandemic affect the Component 3 indicator targets? Do you think the ACTIVITIES were appropriate and sufficient in achieving the Component 3 indicator targets? What additional or alternative ACTIVITIES should have been implemented? Which ACTIVITIES should have been dropped/cancelled and why?]

[Notes: Component 3 indicators and % level of achievement as of June 2021: **3.1** – Time and cost of transporting goods between CDI city and pre-urban areas (replaced with Mobility plan/policies in select CDI cities prepared – 33%); **3.2** – Number of municipal (city) regulations and administrative procedures that have been simplified as a result of USG assistance – 109%; **3.3** – Number of beneficiaries receiving improved transport services due to USG assistance – 2% for individuals; 96% for cargo); **3.4** – Private investment in CDI cities and adjacent peri-urban areas increased – 80%]

4. Do you think the four performance indicators of Component 3 adequately capture the range and magnitude of the ACTIVITIES implemented by SURGE under Component 3? What changes or improvements in the performance indicators can you suggest?
5. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions under Component 3 in addressing the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., city officials) and target beneficiaries (e.g., business owners, etc.)? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance their responsiveness to the needs of key stakeholders and beneficiaries?
6. What sustainability mechanisms were put in place by the SURGE project to ensure that the SURGE initiatives and gains under Component 3 will continue after project completion in December 2021? What were the exit strategies developed by the SURGE project?

7. How do you assess the current technical, institutional, and financial capacity of CDI cities to sustain or ensure the continuity of SURGE initiatives/activities under Component 3?
8. Are policies in place to ensure continuity of SURGE activities under Component 3 in CDI cities? Do you think these policies are adequate for CDI cities to take ownership and continue/expand the SURGE initiatives under Component 3?
9. What key lessons have you learned from the implementation of the SURGE activities under Component 3? Which of the Component 3 activities, interventions, practices, and approaches worked well and should be continued or expanded by similar projects in the future? What were the facilitating factors? Which Component 3 activities, interventions, practices, or approaches did not work? What were the hindering factors?
10. In general, If SURGE could be re-designed or implemented differently, what changes or modifications would you propose to improve the overall effectiveness of the SURGE interventions?

KII GUIDE FOR LGU EXECUTIVES-MAYORS

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

Basic Information

Name of Mayor:

City:

Year/s elected as Mayor: () 2013 () 2016 () 2019

KII QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, what significant changes, benefits, or outcomes resulted from SURGE activities in your city? (Q2.1, Q2.1.1, Q2.2, Q2.2.1, Q2.3, Q2.3.1)

[Possible answers below]

- Component 1 Benefit/Outcome examples (Updated risk-sensitive, inclusive CLUPs; enhanced skills of LGU personnel in preparing risk-sensitive, inclusive plans, strengthened capacity of WDs/WSPs for water/sanitation service delivery, etc.)
 - Component 2 Benefit/Outcome examples (Improved CMC Index, increase in new business registrations, increase in locally-sourced revenues; updated land administration and information management system; etc.)
 - Component 3 Benefit/Outcome examples (Increased investments in CDI and peri-urban areas, policy and regulatory reforms in business/construction permitting, improved transport services, e.g., increased cargo movement from General Santos airport, etc.)
2. In your opinion, which local government functions/operations did the SURGE project generate the most significant contribution? Please elaborate (Q2.4.2)
 3. What key factors facilitated or contributed to the achievement of these benefits or outcomes? (Q2.1.1.1, Q2.2.1.1, Q2.3.1.1)
 4. What key issues/challenges have hindered achieving the intended benefits or outcomes of SURGE activities in your city? How did the SURGE project and your city address these issues/challenges? (Q2.1.1.1, Q2.1.1.2 Q2.2.1.1, Q2.2.1.2, Q2.3.1.1, Q2.3.1.2)
 5. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions in addressing the development priorities of your city as articulated in your Comprehensive Development Plan? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance its responsiveness to local development priorities? (Q1.3.3, Q1.3.3.1)
 6. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions in addressing the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., city officials) and target beneficiaries (e.g., business owners, etc.)? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance its responsiveness to the needs of key stakeholders and beneficiaries? (Q1.3.4, Q1.3.4.1)

7. What sustainability mechanisms were put in place by the SURGE project to ensure that the SURGE initiatives and gains will continue after project completion in December 2021? What were the exit strategies developed by the SURGE project? (Q3.2, Q3.2.1, Q3.1.2)
8. How do you assess the city's current technical, institutional, and financial capacity to sustain or ensure the continuity of SURGE initiatives/activities? (Q3.1.1)
9. Are policies in place to ensure continuity of SURGE activities/initiatives in your city? Do you think these policies are adequate for LGUs to take ownership and continue/expand the SURGE initiatives in your city? (Q3.1.2, Q3.1.1.1)
10. What key lessons have you learned from the implementation of the SURGE project in your city? Which of the SURGE interventions, practices, and approaches worked well and should be continued or expanded by similar projects in the future? What were the facilitating factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
11. Which interventions, practices, or approaches did not work? What were the hindering factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
12. If SURGE activity could be re-designed or implemented differently, what changes or modifications would you propose to improve the effectiveness of the SURGE interventions in your city?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

1. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed? Elaborate.
2. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
3. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

KII GUIDE FOR LGU DEPARTMENT HEADS

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

Basic Information

Name of Interviewee:

Current organization:

Position/Designation:

Role/participation in the SURGE activity:

KII QUESTIONS

1. Are you familiar with the SURGE activity of the USAID? How did you come to know about it? Are you familiar with International City/County Management Association (ICMA)? How did you come to know of it?
2. What activities/projects in your city did SURGE support? (Q2.4.1)?

[Possible answers below]

- Component 1 Activity examples (Mainstreaming DRR and CCA in local development plans; Training on GHG management planning; Establishing Urban Development Learning Program; Upgrading of water services of water service providers (e.g., water safety planning, non-revenue water (NRW) management, enhanced billing and collection, water demand management, etc.); Strengthening institutional capacities on sanitation (e.g., septage management, etc.)
 - Component 2 Activity examples (Streamlining/automating business permitting and licensing processes; Streamlining/automating construction permitting processes; Setting up of One-Stop-Shop for BPLS and construction permitting; Training of Local Economic and Investment Promotion Office and Business Support Organizations; etc.)
 - Component 3 Activity examples (Establishing market linkages between local producers and buyers, e.g., seaweed, cassava; formulating tourism development plans, establishing inter-LGU cooperation, e.g., Panglao Daus and Tagbilaran Executive Council in Bohol; etc.)
3. In your opinion, what significant changes, benefits, outcomes, or value-added resulted from SURGE activities in your city? (Q2.1, Q2.1.1, Q2.2, Q2.2.1, Q2.3, Q2.3.1)

[Possible answers below]

- Component 1 Benefit/Outcome examples (Updated risk-sensitive, inclusive CLUPs; enhanced skills of LGU personnel in preparing risk-sensitive, inclusive plans, strengthened capacity of WDs/WSPs for water/sanitation service delivery, etc.)

- Component 2 Benefit/Outcome examples (Improved CMC Index, increase in new business registrations, increase in locally-sourced revenues; updated land administration and information management system; etc.)
 - Component 3 Benefit/Outcome examples (Increased investments in CDI and peri-urban areas, policy and regulatory reforms in business/construction permitting, improved transport services, e.g., increased cargo movement from General Santos airport, etc.)
4. In your opinion, which local government functions/operations did the SURGE activity generate the most significant contribution? Please elaborate (Q2.4.2)
 5. What key factors facilitated or contributed to the achievement of these changes, benefits, or outcomes? (Q2.1.1.1, Q2.2.1.1, Q2.3.1.1)
 6. What key issues/challenges have hindered achieving the intended benefits or outcomes of SURGE activities in your city? How did the SURGE project address these issues/challenges? ((Q2.1.1.1, Q2.1.1.2 Q2.2.1.1, Q2.2.1.2, Q2.3.1.1, Q2.3.1.2)
 7. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions in addressing the development priorities of your city as articulated in your Comprehensive Development Plan? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance its responsiveness to local development priorities? (Q1.3.3, Q1.3.3.1)
 8. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions in addressing the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., city officials) and target beneficiaries (e.g., business owners, etc.) (Q1.3.4, Q1.3.4.1)
 9. What sustainability mechanisms were put in place by the SURGE project to ensure that the SURGE initiatives and gains will continue after project completion in December 2021? What were the exit strategies developed by SURGE? (Q3.2, Q3.2.1, Q3.1.2)
 10. How do you assess the city's current technical, institutional, and financial capacity to sustain or ensure the continuity of SURGE initiatives/activities? (Q3.1.1)
 11. Are policies in place to ensure continuity of SURGE activities/initiatives in your city? Do you think these policies are adequate for LGUs to take ownership and continue/expand the SURGE initiatives in your city? (Q3.1.2, Q3.1.1.1)
 12. What key lessons have you learned from the implementation of the SURGE activity in your city? Which of the SURGE interventions, practices, and approaches worked well and should be continued or expanded by similar projects in the future? What were the facilitating factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
 13. Which interventions, practices, or approaches did not work? What were the hindering factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
 14. If SURGE could be re-designed or implemented differently, what changes or modifications would you propose to improve the effectiveness of the SURGE interventions in your city?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

- I. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed?

Elaborate.

2. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
3. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

KII GUIDE FOR IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

Basic Information

Name of Interviewee:

Current organization:

Position/Designation:

Role/participation in the SURGE activity:

KII QUESTIONS

1. Are you familiar with the SURGE activity of the USAID? How did you come to know about it? Are you familiar with International City/County Management Association (ICMA)? How did you come to know of it?
2. Over the last six years (2015-2021), in which SURGE activities/projects was your agency actively involved? (Q2.4.1)

[Possible answers below]

- Component 1 Activity examples (Mainstreaming DRR and CCA in local development plans; Training on GHG management planning; Establishing Urban Development Learning Program; Upgrading of water services of water service providers (e.g., water safety planning, NRW management, enhanced billing and collection, water demand management, etc.); Strengthening institutional capacities on sanitation (e.g., septage management, etc.)
 - Component 2 Activity examples (Streamlining/automating business permitting and licensing processes; Streamlining/automating construction permitting processes; Setting up of One-Stop-Shop for BPLS and construction permitting; Training of Local Economic Investment and Promotions Office and Business Support Organizations; etc.)
 - Component 3 Activity examples ((Establishing market linkages between local producers and buyers, e.g., seaweed, cassava; formulating tourism development plans, establishing inter-LGU cooperation, e.g., Panglao Daus and Tagbilaran Executive Council in Bohol; etc.)
3. In your opinion, what CDI cities derived significant changes, benefits, outcomes, or value-added as a result of the SURGE activities? (Q2.1, Q2.1.1, Q2.2, Q2.2.1, Q2.3, Q2.3.1)

[Possible answers below]

- Component 1 Benefit/Outcome examples (Updated risk-sensitive, inclusive CLUPs; enhanced skills of LGU personnel in preparing risk-sensitive, inclusive plans, strengthened capacity of WDs/WSPs for water/sanitation service delivery, etc.)

- Component 2 Benefit/Outcome examples (Improved CMC Index, increase in new business registrations, increase in locally-sourced revenues; updated land administration and information management system; etc.)
 - Component 3 Benefit/Outcome examples (Increased investments in CDI and peri-urban areas, policy and regulatory reforms in business/construction permitting, improved transport services, e.g., increased cargo movement from GenSan airport, etc.)
4. What key factors facilitated or contributed to the achievement of these changes, benefits, or outcomes? (Q2.1.1.1, Q2.2.1.1, Q2.3.1.1)
 5. What key issues/challenges have hindered achieving SURGE activities' intended benefits or outcomes in CDI cities? How did the SURGE project and its implementing partners address these issues/challenges? ((Q2.1.1.1, Q2.1.1.2 Q2.2.1.1, Q2.2.1.2, Q2.3.1.1, Q2.3.1.2)
 6. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions addressing the national development priorities outlined in the PDP, 2017-2022, National Spatial Strategy (relevant to NEDA/HLURB), regional development plans (relevant to NEDA)? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance its responsiveness to national/regional development priorities? (Q1.3.1, Q1.3.1.1)
 7. How relevant or responsive was the SURGE in promoting international development commitments? To what extent has SURGE contributed to SDGs, Paris Agreement, etc.? (Q1.1.1, Q1.1.2.1)
 8. Are you aware of the sustainability mechanisms or exit strategies that were put in place by the SURGE project to ensure that the SURGE initiatives and gains in CDI cities will continue after project completion in December 2021? Was your agency involved in formulating these mechanisms or strategies? (Q3.2, Q3.2.1) Q3.1.2)
 9. How do you assess the CDI cities' current technical, institutional, and financial capacity to sustain or ensure the continuity of SURGE initiatives/activities? (Q3.1.1)
 10. Was your agency involved in formulating policies to ensure continuity of SURGE activities/initiatives in CDI cities? Do you think these policies are adequate for CDI cities to take ownership and continue/expand the SURGE initiatives? (Q3.1.2, Q3.1.1.1)
 11. What key lessons have you learned from implementing SURGE in CDI cities? Which of the SURGE interventions, practices, and approaches worked well and should be continued or expanded by similar projects in the future? What were the facilitating factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
 12. Which interventions, practices, or approaches did not work? What were the hindering factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
 13. If SURGE could be re-designed or implemented differently, what changes or modifications would you propose to improve the effectiveness of the SURGE interventions in CDI cities?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

4. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed? Elaborate.
5. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more

assistance? Elaborate.

6. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

KII GUIDE FOR WASH EXECUTIVES

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

I. GENERAL QUESTIONS:

- a. May we know which water supply and sanitation service provider you are engaged in and what is your position?
- b. What Type of Water Supply System in your service area is being provided? (i.e., Level II or Level III or combination of Level II and Level III)
- c. Do you have an active part in any area of the operations and management of water supply and/or sanitation systems in your Office? (i.e., Planning, Construction, System Operation and Maintenance, Customer Services, etc.)
- d. Do you have an idea on what level of services your Office has been providing to the water consumers including sanitation services to date? (e.g., number of household service connections, water production, percent service coverage, percent NRW level, water supply situation (24/7), line pressure, water quality, etc.)
- e. Does your Office frequently receive customer complaints regarding supply interruption, poor water quality, service connection and disconnections, billing and collection, etc.?
- f. Has there been an incident in the past where your Office considered the possibility of entertaining Private Proponents for the improvement of water supply and sanitation services in your service area by way of Public-Private Participation (PPP) program of the government?
- g. Are you fully aware of the USAID-SURGE project designed to provide technical support/guidance for the improvement of water supply and sanitation services, and what had been your participation in the implementation of SURGE project activities?

2. RELEVANCE QUESTIONS

- a. Are there any issues and concerns regarding the effect of climate change and seasonal disaster risks that affect the level of services your Office had been trying to resolve? If there are, what are they and which area in the system operations do you think would need special and urgent attention? (1.1.2.1)
- b. Are the water sources from river/ lake, spring, or groundwater and is your Office aware of the water extraction Regulatory requirements, like securing a Water Permit and Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) from concerned National Government Offices? (1.3.5)
- c. Are water quality monitoring in the distribution system and water sources follows the prescribed frequency of regular or random water sampling collection for Laboratory analysis according to the PNSDW and what type of analysis is usually conducted (i.e., Physico-Chemical, Bacteriological, pesticide, etc.?) (1.1.3)
- d. What are the priority hard component Projects, activities and expected intermediate results included in your Office's short- and long-term work plan that requires external support to achieve the overall system operations and management goal? (1.3.1)

- e. Does your Office frequently observe that some of your planning and operation personnel are somehow lacking know-how in their respective areas of system operation and management? (1.3.4)
- f. What activities/interventions do you know that need to be applied to substantially help improve water supply and sanitation operation and management practices? (i.e., capacity building, technical assistance on water source development, NRW reduction programs, data repository system, organizational strengthening, physical development of facilities, etc.) (1.3.4)
- g. Does your Office develop, with the approval of concerned national or local Offices, a Water Safety and Business Continuity Plan to address the possible effect of climate change as well as disaster risks as a challenge in delivering well-deserved water supply and services to all of the beneficiaries? (1.3.5.1)
- h. Has your Office favorably taken into consideration any opportunities online for different urgent needs of your Office as a water supply and sanitation service provider? If so, please enumerate some possible major opportunities. (1.3.5.2)
- i. To what extent would external opportunities influence the behavior (norms), and practices (rules and regulations) of the Organization/ Office including how value chain actors and supporting functions operate in these basic social services? (1;3;5;2)

3. EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONS

- a. Capitalizing internal resources, have there been positive or negative changes in the major areas of WASH operational and management practices along with the target achievements of the system's level of service indicators without external support/ intervention? If so, what contributes to the positive and/or negative changes? (2.4.1.1)
- b. Given an external support/intervention, would technical assistance like capacity building, water resources survey, application of various operational and management Software including Hydraulic modeling for water distribution engineering design and others, be very useful in arriving at a result that will lead to the achievement of the required services? (2.4.1.2)
- c. In applying the said external technical assistance, will there be internal or external factors that will hinder or facilitate the possible effectiveness of the implementation of the assistance and how would your Office address hindering factors? (2.4.1.2) / (2.4.1.3)

4. SUSTAINABILITY QUESTIONS:

- a. In terms of service sustainability, how would your Office maintain the positive changes brought about by the external support/ intervention with available limited internal resources, hindering effect of climate change/disaster risks that may embrace future system operations and management? (3.1)

- b. Knowing the government's usual tedious process of resources allocation, is there a possibility for your Office to entertain Private Proponents for the take-over of the entire system operation and management following the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) program of the government? (3.1.1.1)
- c. Realizing the inevitable change in political leadership in your area or sets of Officers in your Office, what makes you think that sustainability of the current high level of water supply and sanitation services will be maintained in the future? (3.1.1.1)

KII GUIDE FOR FARMERS GROUP LEAD

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

Basic Information

Name of Interviewee:

Current organization:

Position/Designation:

Role/participation in the SURGE activity:

KII QUESTIONS

1. Are you familiar with the SURGE activity of the USAID? How did you come to know about it? Are you familiar with International City/County Management Association (ICMA)? How did you come to know of it?
2. What activities/projects in your organization did SURGE support? (Q2.4.1)?
3. In your opinion, what significant changes, benefits, outcomes, or value-added resulted from SURGE activities in your group/organization? (Q2.1, Q2.1.1, Q2.2, Q2.2.1, Q2.3, Q2.3.1)
4. In your opinion, which organizational functions/operations did the SURGE activity generate the most significant contribution? Please elaborate (Q2.4.2)
5. What key factors facilitated or contributed to the achievement of these changes, benefits, or outcomes? (Q2.1.1.1, Q2.2.1.1, Q2.3.1.1)
6. What key issues/challenges have hindered achieving the intended benefits or outcomes of SURGE activities in your organization? How did the SURGE project address these issues/challenges? ((Q2.1.1.1, Q2.1.1.2 Q2.2.1.1, Q2.2.1.2, Q2.3.1.1, Q2.3.1.2)
7. How relevant or responsive were the SURGE activities/interventions in addressing organizational needs? How can SURGE activities/interventions be improved to enhance its responsiveness? (Q1.3.3, Q1.3.3.1)
8. What sustainability mechanisms were put in place by the SURGE project to ensure that the SURGE initiatives and gains will continue after project completion in December 2021? What were the exit strategies developed by SURGE? (Q3.2, Q3.2.1, Q3.1.2)
9. How do you assess your organization's technical, institutional, and financial capacity to sustain or ensure the continuity of SURGE initiatives/activities? (Q3.1.1)
10. What key lessons have you learned from the implementation of the SURGE activity? Which of the SURGE interventions, practices, and approaches worked well and should be continued or expanded by similar projects in the future? What were the facilitating factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)
11. Which interventions, practices, or approaches did not work? What were the hindering factors? (Q2.9, Q2.9.1, Q2.9.1.2, Q2.9.2)

12. If SURGE could be re-designed or implemented differently, what changes or modifications would you propose to improve the effectiveness of the SURGE interventions?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

7. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed?
Elaborate.
8. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
9. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

KII GUIDE FOR HEAD OF LOCAL CHAMBERS AND BUSINESS GROUPS

General Instructions, opening spiel, and closing spiel are similar to Annex 4.

Basic Information

Name of Interviewee:

Current organization:

Position/Designation:

Role/participation in the SURGE activity:

KII QUESTIONS:

Awareness and perceptions about SURGE (40 minutes)

1. Are you familiar with the SURGE activity of the USAID? How did you come to know about it? Are you familiar with International City/County Management Association (ICMA)? How did you come to know of it?
2. Do you think that the SURGE was able to improve conditions in your city? Can you elaborate
3. Let us move to the theme of resiliency. What are your perceptions about how SURGE has helped improve local capacity in inclusive and resilient urban management and processes? Were the interventions suited to your cities' needs? Can you be more specific?
4. Let us move to the theme of economic development. What are our perceptions about how SURGE has helped the environment for local economic development? Were the interventions suited to your cities' needs? Can you be more specific?
5. Let us move to the theme of urban-rural connectivity. What are your perceptions about how SURGE has helped connectivity and access between urban and rural areas? Were the interventions suited to your cities' needs? Can you be more specific?
6. Let us move to the theme of inclusivity. What are your perceptions about how SURGE has been inclusive in its interventions? Were the interventions suited to your cities' needs? Please use your definition of inclusivity.

Involvement or lack of participation in the process (30 minutes)

7. Was the business group consulted in the selection and design of interventions in your city?
8. What role did the business group have in the selection, design, and implementation of the intervention?
9. How satisfied are you in the involvement of the business group in the selection, design, and implementation of the intervention?

10. Were there any hurdles the business group encountered during collaborative efforts with ICMA?

COVID RELATED QUESTIONS:

- 10. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt SURGE addressed? Elaborate.
- 11. Were there needs that arose as a result of COVID-19 that you felt you needed more assistance? Elaborate.
- 12. Were there any projects that were delayed due to COVID-19? Will the delay impact the effective implementation of the project?

Recommendations for improvement (20 minutes)

- 11. Were any of the interventions covered by other donors and therefore rendered the SURGE intervention superfluous?
- 12. Are there other interventions you would have wanted to see implemented in your city?
- 13. Do you think the city still needs assistance from donors to improve the cities competitiveness? What could you suggest as improvements to aid extended to your city?

Sustainability

- 14. Do you think that the city will be able to continue the projects without SURGE/ICMA?
- 15. Are there any other items you wish to discuss?