



Spot-checking and Back-checking Report (January to June 2020 and July to December 2020)

Following the standard guidelines and methodology provided by the Governance Commission for GOCCs (GCG), the UP CIFAL Philippines complied with the minimum requirement of spot-checking and back-checking 30% of the accomplished surveys.

Spot-checking was done via video conference platform due to the concerns of social distancing. Since surprise spot-checking is not possible through remote means, all spot-checking was scheduled. The field supervisors and the enumerator were in a video call through Facebook Messenger while the latter conducted the survey. Back-checking, on the other hand, was accomplished via phone calls during office hours. The field supervisor obtained the contact number of the surveyed respondent through the encoding sheet. The selection of respondents for both spot-checking and back-checking was made randomly.

Table 1. Spot-Checking and Back-Checking Matrix for the Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

Stakeholder	Spot-Checked	Back-Checked	Date of Spot-checking	Date of back-checking
MWSI	0	2	-	28 Dec 2020 (2 respondents)
MWCI	6	4	26 Nov 2020; 2, 3 (2 respondents), 17 & 23 Dec 2020	28 Dec 2020 (4 respondents)
Luzon Clean Water	3	5	26 Nov 2020; 4 & 8 Dec 2020	28 Dec 2020 (5 respondents)
Balagtas Water District	0	0	-	-
Bulacan Water District	0	0	-	-
Bocaue Water District	0	0	-	-

Marilao Water District	0	1	-	28 Dec 2020
Meycauayan Water District	0	2	-	28 Dec 2020 (2 respondents)
San Jose Del Monte Water District	0	0	-	-
Obando Water District	0	0	-	-
Calumpit Water District	1	1	22 Dec 2020	28 Dec 2020
Sta. Maria Water District	2	0	4 & 28 Dec 2020	-
Guiguinto Water District	1	0	22 Dec 2020	-
Malolos Water District	1	1	18 Dec 2020	28 Dec 2020
Plaridel Water District	1	0	24 Nov 2020	-
Total	15	16	-	-

Spot-checking

Notable challenges were encountered while conducting the spot-checking and back-checking. Some water district officers and staff were reluctant to participate in the survey. A few officers or staff were also hesitant to participate, and some of them declined participation due to non-involvement with the MWSS CO, since some shared that they belong to a division or department, e.g., Administrative, not having direct transactions with the MWSS-CO.

In particular, spot-checking was particularly difficult not only due to scheduling concerns but also because most calls done during supervision were ignored, rejected, or rescheduled for evenings. Spot-checking also encountered technical issues because some enumerators did not have extra mobile phones or laptops available to participate through video calls, as they use their own mobile phones for the phone interview. Each respondent was subject to two callbacks and/or follow-ups. When selected respondents could not be reached even after the callbacks, the enumerators randomly selected and contacted alternative respondents in the list provided by MWSS-CO.

Among the other challenges that the enumerators faced while doing their calls included:

- High rejection rate;
- Several respondents were unreachable due to wrong contact numbers and email;
- Calls were frequently aborted by respondents or dropped due to signal issues;
- Calls were frequently rescheduled due to respondents' unavailability.
- A few interviews exceeded the 15 minutes maximum call duration in the GCG Guidelines due to poor signal reception and dropped calls and long pauses and sharing of experience related to the items in the questionnaire by some respondents;
- Inaccessible or unresponsive landline numbers;
- Challenge with documenting data privacy waiver and consent via audio recording due to lack of separate recording equipment or problems with recording mobile applications; most data privacy waivers and consent were received through text message and via email.
- Some respondents noted that particular items were not-applicable or were not related to the nature of their office's engagement with the MWSS-CO. The enumerators were instructed to note the items that were skipped or marked "not applicable" by the respondents.

Back-checking

Sixteen (16) out of the fifty-one (51) respondents were back-checked, compliant with the required 30% of the GCG. Additional nine respondents were also called for back-checking but did not pick up the calls of the UP-CIFAL Philippines. A few of those nine respondents registered "cannot be reached," a similar concern observed during the spot-checking. Some of the numbers provided by the respondents were inaccessible. As a standard practice, whenever the respondent hangs up or does not answer the call, the field supervisor sends the said respondent a message to inform about the intent of the call. Some calls during the back-checking were dropped due to poor signal reception and required two to three tries before completing the back-checking.

The conversation between the field supervisor and the respondent typically did not last more than three minutes as most of the respondents had no concern regarding the survey *per se*. The respondents were asked to confirm their participation in the survey, answer a couple of items again to ensure consistency, and were also asked to give overall feedback about their experience. No inconsistency in the responses was noted.

Generally, the comment made by those back-checked can be summed up to "*okay naman, wala namang naging problema.*" and "*Maayos naman, I have no further comments.*"

Most comments noted from the back-checking were:

- The field interviewer was polite, professional, and administered the survey clearly. Several of the respondents back-checked complimented the enumerators, noting that the enumerators explained the survey sufficiently and went through each item thoroughly and with clarity.
- Respondent did not encounter problems during the survey per se; “Maayos naman” or “wala naman naging problema.” However, a couple of the back-checked respondents expressed their concern about the survey instrument. They said that the survey instrument was not entirely applicable given the nature of their engagement with the MWSS-CO. Nonetheless, the respondents also remarked that the survey was a good initiative and that they appreciate the MWSS-CO for getting feedback from the water concessionaires and not just customers.

CONCLUSION

Based on the spot-checking and back-checking conducted by the field supervisors, the enumerators of UP CIFAL Philippines complied, as much as possible, with the enhanced guidelines provided by the GCG. They adopted the prescribed methodology on the conduct and administration of the survey instrument, data encoding, and processing with the adjustment of doing these over the telephone.

The required number of Spot and back Checks were completed by UP CIFAL Philippines. The challenges observed during the spot-checking primarily involved difficulty contacting some respondents, need for additional equipment to record data privacy waiver and consent and to observe the conduct of the survey online, signal and reception issues, and replacement of unresponsive and transferred respondents.

Adjustments were made in the course of the survey implementation, in consultation with the MWSS-CO, to deal with realities on the ground while ensuring that the objectives and intentions of the survey were still met. With the help of the MWSS-CO, all challenges were addressed and resolved, and the SSS was completed by December 2020.