



DATA QUALITY CONTROL REPORT

Data Encoding and Editing

Following government restrictions, the 2020 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey (SSS) was conducted through purely remote means. The survey was administered by the trained enumerators of the UP-CIFAL Philippines through phone interviews; and hence, the printed survey questionnaires were filled-out by the field enumerators and were then transferred to encoding form accessible to all field interviewers as well as the field supervisors and team leaders. The data encoding form is simply the survey instrument uploaded into Google Forms. No alterations in the survey instrument were done.

The field enumerators encoded accomplished survey questionnaires, as soon as they are able, taking into consideration technical and internet connection concerns. The accomplished surveys were checked for consistency and completeness once they are uploaded. All interviews during both the lean and peak seasons were completed during a single call; hence, all encoded surveys were finished and completed. Only minor edits were done to the encoded responses. Specifically, these were done on items that required codes or numbers but the meanings or text equivalent were written for example, conversion of years to months. No further change or revision was done to the encoded responses.

During the first phase (peak season) of the SSS, two responses were removed from the accomplished 51 surveys: thus bringing down the number of completed and valid surveys to 49. The two respondents were excluded from the analysis since they had no or very limited engagement with the MWSS-CO and most of their answers, were “not applicable.” Their engagement also did not qualify among the services availed enlisted in the survey instrument. The 49 completed and valid surveys were used for data analysis for the peak season component. The 44 completed and valid surveys were used for data analysis for the peak season component. We note that there were survey items that respondents left blank either because the respondent did not have the information or did not wish to provide the information (e.g., asset values). For answers that were found to be incomplete or unclear, enumerators were allowed to do one follow-up call with the respondents to provide the unclear or incomplete details until February 16, 2021. The results of the data processing and analysis are detailed in the latter part of this report.

Coding

Coding of the explanations for the overall satisfaction survey was done to facilitate cross-tabulation with the numerical scores given by the respondents. The open-ended responses were firstly coded into three categories: 1) positive remarks about the MWSS-CO; 2) negative remarks about the MWSS-CO; and 3) neutral and unspecified concerns. Afterwards, subcategories were made to reflect similarities in the specific concerns or comments of the participants.

Most answers were coded or categorized under “service delivery”, “communication”, and “leadership” for both the positive and negative remarks. Additional codes pertaining to water supply or water delivery and inconsistency in the performance of the MWSS-CO were also used for the negative assessment or remarks given by the participants. Because of the diversity and scope of the engagement of the participants with the MWSS-CO, comments or concerns specific to their engagement were also given by the participants thereby limiting the use of codes. Answers that cannot be categorized were presented as “concerns specific to engagement”.

Coding was no longer used for the suggestions or recommendations of the participants since most of the respondents did not provide any suggestion or recommendation. The answers were instead presented through a narrative discussion.

Data Processing

As mentioned, 49 responses were used in the processing and analysis of the results for the peak season (January to June 2020) of the SSS. Forty-four (44) surveys were used in the processing and analysis of the results for the lean season (July to December 2020).

The UP-CIFAL Philippines proceeded with the data processing and analysis strictly in compliance with the guidelines provided in the Enhanced Methodology of the GCG. The results were analyzed according to the following segments: 1) total and 2) customer type (Manila Water Company, Inc., Maynilad Water Services, Inc., and Luzon Clean Water Development Corporation; and Bulacan Water Districts); 3) by rating; and 4) drivers or satisfaction (derived importance). Analysis by area or region/key city and based on service availed was not pursued as the selection of survey respondents was based on a predetermined list provided by the MWSS-CO. As mentioned, the engagements of the participants with the MWSS-CO were specific and diverse; thus, doing an analysis per type of service availed or per area or region/key city would only be impractical and insignificant to the results of the survey.

The analysis of the survey results focused on assessing the stakeholders’ levels of satisfaction on their engagement with the MWSS-CO according to the indicators specified in the survey instrument. These are: 1) Overall Satisfaction Rating; 2) Staff and Organization; 3) Partner Organization; 4) Complaints Handling and Record-Keeping; 5) Information and Communication; 6) Organization’s Website; and 7) Facilities. In addition, each of the attributes or items included in the survey instrument were also subjected to descriptive and statistical analysis.

The descriptive analysis of the survey results was presented through a tabular frequency count of the numerical scores given by the participants. Examples are shown below. Formatting of the tables and the overall presentation followed the template that the UP-CIFAL Philippines has been using in the previous SSS.

Preliminary Results

Below are the preliminary results of the data analysis for the SSS in terms of overall satisfaction. Three tables are presented: Aggregated overall satisfaction for 2020 which combines the lean and peak seasons, overall satisfaction by respondent cluster for the peak season, and overall satisfaction by respondent cluster for the lean season.

As shown in the tables below, the MWSS-CO was able to reach the target satisfaction rating of 90% for both peak and lean seasons. The satisfaction rating slightly decreased during the lean season. The said change can be attributed to lesser respondents and the minimal changes in the scores given by the respondents. Table 1 below provides the overall rating, and the subsequent tables show the side-by-side breakdown of the scores by stakeholder and stakeholder clusters and for both the peak and lean seasons.

Table 1: Overall Satisfaction Rating (Aggregated)

5-Point Likert Scale	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1 –Very Dissatisfied	0	0.00%
2 – Dissatisfied	3	3.23%
3 – Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5	5.38%
4 – Satisfied	63	67.74%
5 – Very Satisfied	22	23.66%
NA- Not Applicable	0	0.00%
Total	93	100.00%
Mean	4.12	
% of Satisfied Customers	91.40%	

Table 2: Disaggregated Overall Satisfaction Rating by Stakeholder and Stakeholder Cluster

Stakeholder	Overall Satisfaction						ROW TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	
Water District Cluster							
Bulacan Water District	0	2	1	30	13	0	46
	0.00%	4.35%	2.17%	65.22%	28.26%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.17						
% of Satisfied Customers in Water District Cluster	93.48%						
Water Concessionaire Cluster							
Luzon Clean Water	0	0	2	10	2	0	14
	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	71.43%	14.29%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.00						
% of Satisfied Customers	85.71%						
Manila Water	0	1	2	12	4	0	19
	0.00%	5.26%	10.53%	63.16%	21.05%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.00						
% of Satisfied Customers	84.21%						
Maynilad	0	0	0	11	3	0	14
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	78.57%	21.43%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.21						
% of Satisfied Customers	100%						
% of Satisfied Customers in Water Concessionaire Cluster	89.36%						

Table 3. Sample of Aggregate Analysis Peak and Lean Season: Overall Satisfaction

PEAK SEASON			LEAN SEASON	
1	0		1	0
2	1		2	2
3	3		3	2
4	34		4	29
5	11		5	11
NA	0		NA	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	49		TOTAL RESPONSES	44
mode	4		mode	4
AVERAGE	4.122449		AVERAGE	4.113636
Percentage of Satisfied Respondents	91.84%		Percentage of Satisfied Respondents	90.91%

Table 4. Sample Overall Satisfaction by Respondent for the Peak Season

No. of responses per score							
Stakeholder	1	2	3	4	5	NA	TOTAL
Maynilad Water	0	0	0	6	1	0	7
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	85.71%	14.29%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.14			% Satisfaction 100%			
Manila Water	0	0	2	6	2	0	10
	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.0			% Satisfaction 80%			
Luzon Clean Water Development Corporation	0	0	1	16	7	0	24
	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	66.67%	29.17%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.0			% Satisfaction 95.84%			
Bulacan Water Districts	0	1	0	16	7	0	24
	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%	66.67%	29.17%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.21			% Satisfaction 95.84%			
AGGREGATE	0	1	3	34	11	0	49
	0.00%	2.04%	6.12%	69.39%	22.45%	0.00%	100.00%
Average	4.12			% Satisfaction 91.84%			

Table 5. Sample Overall Satisfaction by Respondent for the Lean Season

No. of responses per score								
Stakeholder	1	2	3	4	5	NA	TOTAL	
Maynilad Water	0	0	0	5	2	0	7	
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	71.43%	28.57%	0.00%	100.00%	
Average			4.29		% Satisfaction			100%
Manila Water	0	1	0	6	2	0	9	
	0.00%	11.11%	20.00%	66.67%	22.22%	0.00%	100.00%	
Average			4.0		% Satisfaction			88.89%
Luzon Clean Water Development Corporation	0	0	1	4	1	0	6	
	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	100.00%	
Average			4.0		% Satisfaction			83.33%
Bulacan Water Districts	0	1	1	14	6	0	22	
	0.00%	4.55%	4.55%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	100.00%	
Average			4.17		% Satisfaction			90.91%
AGGREGATE	0	2	2	29	11	0	44	
	0.00%	4.55%	4.55%	65.91%	25.00%	0.00%	100.00%	
Average			4.11		% Satisfaction			90.91%