

COMPARISON OF THE THREE (3) PROJECTS: Similarities and Differences¹

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAH-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
I. PROJECT RATIONALE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Political upheaval and financial crisis in 1997 where millions of rural population were pushed below poverty line. ❑ Change in leadership did not resolve the country's deeper governance problems despite improving rates of poverty reduction, vulnerability remained high. Many poor did not benefit adequately in economic growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (CIDSS) addresses poverty issues within the Minimum Basic Needs (MBN) framework of indicators. However, some community needs are beyond the MBN such as community infrastructure, hence, an expanded poverty reduction program is needed to address comprehensively poverty issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Need to alleviate the social and economic impact of the financial crisis in 1997 particularly the countryside, where the majority of laid off workers returned to. ❑ Strengthen community participation and the sense of community which had diminished during the successive military regimes and the economic boom. 	<p>SIMILARITY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The 3 projects were designed to address poverty situation in their countries. <p>DIFFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ KDP focused more on democratization due to changes in political leadership. KC version is more focused on community empowerment and local governance. SIF more concerned on economic revitalization in the countryside due to the bust of the bubble economy.

¹ The following acronyms mean the following: **KC** – KALAH-CIDSS; **WB**- World Bank; **DSWD**-Department of Social Welfare and Development; **SIF**- Social Investment Fund; **KDP**- Kecamatan Development Project.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Alleviation Of Poverty By Raising Rural Incomes <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen Local Government And Community Institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Good Governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Empowerment of communities <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement of local governance <input type="checkbox"/> Provision ff grants for Community Investment Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Revitalization Of Grassroots Society <input type="checkbox"/> Empowerment Of Local Communities / Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion Of Local Sufficiency Economic Systems <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion Of Cooperation and extension of networking <input type="checkbox"/> Stimulation Of Widespread Popular Participation In Social Development <input type="checkbox"/> Support For Investments In Community Assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The three projects have the same objectives of alleviating poverty, empowerment, and participation of the people and local communities
III. PROJECT PRINCIPLES			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Community participation and empowerment of the poor rural communities <input type="checkbox"/> Transparency <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Empowerment and participation <input type="checkbox"/> Localized Decision Making <input type="checkbox"/> Transparency <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Community Empowerment And Stability <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion Of Resource Sharing To Facilitate Investments/ Increase In Social 	<p>SIMILARITIES: All projects focuses on participation/empowerment, sustainability, simplicity.</p> <p>DIFFERENCES: KC explicitly covers in addition, social inclusiveness, institutional capacity building and demand driven as project</p>

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Simplicity ❑ Competition For Funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Simplicity ❑ Competitive ❑ Demand-Driven Poverty Reduction ❑ Socially Inclusive 	<p>Capital</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Investment/ Increase In Social Capital ❑ Civil Society Participation In Ongoing Learning And Development ❑ Community Centered Development ❑ Self Reliance And Collaboration ❑ Civil Society Networks Support For Social Empowerment ❑ Multi-Partite Collaboration 	<p>principles. These are, however, implicit in SIF. Only KC and KDP consider COMPETITION as a project principle.</p>
IV. SCOPE AND COVERAGE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Based on statistics provided by the Bappenas (similar to National Economic Development Office in the Phil.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KDP 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 501 Kecamatan (sub-districts) • 105 Kabupaten (districts) • 20 Propinsi (provinces) KDP 2 (expansion) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,082 Kecamatan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Provinces with poverty incidence higher than 40% (40 out of 73 Provinces) ❑ One-fourth (¼) of all the municipalities in the provinces targeted for coverage (190 municipalities) ❑ Universal coverage of all barangays (5,100 barangays) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Nationwide with emphasis on the following areas : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration of community organizations Affected by economic crisis • Poor and laid off wokers affected by economic 	<p>DIFFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ KDP has no universal coverage for Kecamatan. ❑ KDP targets are determined at national level ❑ KC targets came from national statistics targets 40 poorest

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 183 Kabupaten • 27 Propinsi 		crisis	<p>provinces with highest poverty incidence. The poverty studies contracted through an external consultant identified the poorest municipalities in the 40 poorest provinces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ SIF has nationwide coverage but no indicative target areas.
V. PROJECT STRUCTURE			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ National Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Inter- Ministerial Coordination Team □ National KDP Secretariat □ Consultant/ facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Management Consultants (NMC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ National <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ National Steering Committee (DSWD, NAPC, DBM, DOF, NEDA, DILG and three rep. From NGOs, Chairperson- League of Barangays) □ National Project Management Team □ Regional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Regional Project Management Team (Replication of the national 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ National <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Social Investment Fund (Executive Comm., GSB, CODI, MF, MI, SOFO)² □ Social Fund Office (SOFO) □ Regional Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Regional Subproject Coordination 	<p>DIFFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ KC and SIF has a policy making body in their structure. KDP has none. □ KDP is implemented by an inter-agency coordinating team. KC and SIF is implemented by a lone agency, with the other partner agencies as support. □ Both KC, KDP and SIF involve consultants external to govt

² **GSB**- Government Service Bank; **CODI**- Community Organization Development Institute; **MI** – Ministry of Interiors; **SOFO** – Social Fund Office

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provincial Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Inter- Ministerial Coordination Team □ Provincial KDP Secretariat □ Consultant/ facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Povincial Consultants (KMProp) □ District Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Inter- Ministerial Coordination Team □ District KDP Secretariat □ Consultant/ facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Management Consultants (KMKab) □ Kecamatan Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Kecamatan Head □ PjOK/PjAK □ Consultant/ facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Kecamatan Facilitators (FK) □ Assistant Kecamatan Facilitators □ Village Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Village Head □ LKMD □ Consultant/ facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Village Facilitators (FD) 	<p style="text-align: center;">member agencies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provincial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provincial Inter-Agency Committee (Replication) □ Municipal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Municipal Inter-Agency Comm. □ Municipal Inter Barangay Forum □ Barangay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Barangay Development Council □ Barangay Project Management Team 	<p style="text-align: center;">Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provincial Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Prov. Task Force (Prov. Civil Society) □ District Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ CO Network (GOs, NGOs, Civil Society) □ Sub-District Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ GOs, NGOs, Civil Society, Multi-Partite) □ Community Network (Villagers, Informal POs) □ Village <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Networks, Basic Sectors (disadvantaged, vulnerable and poor) 	<p style="text-align: center;">agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ However KC consultants are under the administrative and technical supervision of executing agency
VI. SUB-PROJECT MENU			
<p>OPEN MENU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Infrastructure 	<p>OPEN MENU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Infrastructure 	<p>MENU BASED :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MENU 1: Capacity And 	<p>SIMILARITIES:</p> <p>All projects cover physical</p>

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic activities • Loans to groups for economic activities • Savings and loan schemes for women group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Micro enterprises such as post harvest facilities, irrigation, etc 	<p>Learning Development In Community Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MENU 2 : Community Welfare And Safety • MENU 3: Restoration, Protection, Management And Promotion Of Culture , Environment And Natural Resources • MENU 4 : Community Capacity Building And Networking • MENU 5 : Immediate Community Welfare For The Needy Through Community Organization Network 	<p>infrastructure and economic activities/ project All projects involve services NGO /networks extent of involvement is dependent on project</p> <p>DIFFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Only KDP includes micro credit ❑ KDP specific emphasis on women's involvement (exclusive subproject) ❑ SIF more pronounced promotion of local wisdom ❑ SIF – sharing information through learning centers ❑ SIF- provides mutual aid assistance . Menu five is the only menu that responds to the poor through the initiative of the Networks ❑ KC and KDP utilizes NGO and Media for monitoring, evaluation. SIF provides tech.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
			Assist through resource access and proj. management
VII. NEGATIVE LISTS			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction/reconstruction of Government offices, praying places <input type="checkbox"/> Political activities <input type="checkbox"/> Military activities <input type="checkbox"/> Activities that would destroy environment: chainsaws, dynamite, fertilizers, chemicals <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase of boat exceeding 10 tons <input type="checkbox"/> Activities that would promote child labor <input type="checkbox"/> Pay of officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction/repair of government offices, meeting halls and place ff religious worship <input type="checkbox"/> Political and religious activities and materials <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially dangerous materials and equipment <input type="checkbox"/> Road construction into protected areas <input type="checkbox"/> Salaried activities that employ children below 16 years old <input type="checkbox"/> Activities that unfairly exploit women and men of any age <input type="checkbox"/> Recurrent govt. expenditure <input type="checkbox"/> Travel abroad <input type="checkbox"/> Consumption items or events <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase or compensation for land <input type="checkbox"/> Micro credit and livelihood <input type="checkbox"/> Activities which involves on-lending <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance and operation of facilities provided with funding or with prior source 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> In the beginning, there is defined negative list since subprojects are menu based. But evolved into more open menu during implementation 	<p>Similarities :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Almost similar negative list for KC and KDP <p>DIFFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> While construction of religion-related halls/ activities are disallowed in KC and KDP, SIF was able to fund Child Dev. Center cum monk shelter (MENU 2 – NAKON PHANOM) . <input type="checkbox"/> Micro lending is disallowed only for KC. KDP has micro lending for women while SIF was able to provide funding for income generating project called “ grant making” for economic activity.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
VIII. TARGETING OF AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION			
<p>❑ Poor communities located in backward Kecamatan based on the national statistics of villages potency mix by the local actual condition and local policies. Main criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having Large Number Of Poor Communities • Having higher poverty rate within Kabupaten (district) • Having relatively low level of health and education services • Having relatively low level of socio-economic infrastructure services 	<p>❑ Provinces With Poverty Incidence Higher Than 40% Based On NSCB</p> <p>❑ Selection of municipalities by an independent poverty study contracted to private group based on :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - level of community deprivation - quantity and quality of human capital - quality and presence of facilities - access to centers of trade - <p>❑ Provincial multi-stakeholders forum to announce selected municipalities</p> <p>to include setting of cost sharing/ counterpart of local government</p>	<p>❑ Emphasizes rural and urban poor areas most affected by the current economic and social crisis as determined by survey of the Ministry of Interior and the National Economic and Social Development Board</p> <p>❑ Uses targeting map , a mechanism of determination of indicative funding allocation at the Regional and Provincial level</p>	<p>Similarities :</p> <p>❑ All countries use specific poverty incidence measures based on national statistics. KC contracted an independent group for poverty studies as approved by the WB.</p>

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The National Management Consultants train master trainers . ❑ Master trainers train district consultants, sub-district facilitators at the regional level contracting resource persons ❑ Sub-district facilitators train village facilitators who conduct the socialization (social preparation) at the village level for six months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ For Phase 1, Cycle 1 DSWD National Training team contracted out a training organization to train area coordinators (ACs) and community facilitators (CFs) who will implement the program at the barangay (village) level ❑ For Phase 1 Cycle 2, DSWD National Training team will directly train ACs and CFs who will implement at the village level. ❑ For Phase 1 Cycle 3, DSWD national training team will train regional trainers who will directly train ACs and CF and other agency implementers at the regional, municipal and village level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ At the initial phase of project implementation, members of the SIF Executive Committee provides directions to the Regional SOFO's through meetings, brainstorming sessions and orientation sessions ❑ Conducted trainers training from the beginning . Also trig of trainers were conducted when Menu 5 was introduced. Equipped local external supervisors (LES) for project monitoring . 	<p>SIMILARITIES/ DIFFERENCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ KDP right from the start used training of trainers at the regional level. The trainers conduct capacity building to implementers at the district, sub-district and village levels ❑ KC for phase I contracted out a private training organization to train area coordinators (ACs) and community facilitators (CFs) who will implement project at the village level. For phase 2, DSWD directly trained ACs and CFs ❑ SIF has no formal training activities for implementers since community organizations and networks have ready projects plans or existing projects that only need fund augmentation ❑ SIF utilized existing resources and networks

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAH-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
			down the village level
X. IEC AND SOCIAL MARKETING			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ An Information Education Communication Unit at the National Management Consultant Office takes care of developing advocacy materials such as posters, comics, flip chart and others. Initial efforts were done jointly with John Hopkins University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The organic social marketing service of DSWD takes care of the development and production of IEC materials such as posters, flip charts and others. Initial efforts were done with McCann Ericson, an expert communications group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ At the national level, information about the project is known by the public through TV interviews by known personalities in coordination with the Public Relations Dept of the Office of the PM □ At the regional, district and sub-district level information about the project is transmitted through the different community organization , GSB and local offices of the Ministry of Interior □ At the village level, transmitted through word of mouth and the use of the village public address system and head of the village □ Written materials , 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Both KDP and Kalahi CIDSS have separate units in their organizational structure to take care of IEC and social marketing since they both used external consultants firm to help out in their design of IEC materials (John Hopkins for KDP and McCann Erickson for KC)

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
		brochures about specific projects are made through the initiative of the concerned networks (beneficiary organizations)	
XI. FINANCE			
FUND SOURCE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST:			
LOAN PROCEEDS – 94-96% GOI- 1% LGU CONT.- 3-5% SUB-PROJECT GRANT: LOAN PROCEEDS – 99% GOI- 1%	LOAN PROCEEDS- 55% GOP- 25% COMMUNITY CONT. 20% SUB-PROJECT GRANT: LOAN PROCEEDS – 95% GOP- 5%	22 M Bhat RTG equiv to 5% of the administrative cost Loan - 70% GOT - 20 Village - 10% + Grants from AUSAID A\$2.2 M	<input type="checkbox"/> KC project design requires substantial counterpart contribution both from Phil. government and the community while KDP and SIF requires minimal counterpart from respective groups and the community villages
Funds flow:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Funds released from the Treasury Office to the village collective account then to the project implementation team in the Desa (village).	<input type="checkbox"/> Funds released directly DSWD Central Account to the Barangay Sub Pr account	<input type="checkbox"/> Funds released from SOFO to the sub project account	<input type="checkbox"/> In KC and SIF, funds are directly released to community/ network accounts. KDP the other hand, has intervening level before release to village implementation team.
Documents Required For The Release Of Funds:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Decree of the Chamat as a result of the inter	<input type="checkbox"/> List of winning projects as	<input type="checkbox"/> Endorsement of the	<input type="checkbox"/> Both KDP and KC

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
village meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of agreement between the sub-district project manager and the UPK (FMU)	certified by the municipal inter-Barangay (village) forum <input type="checkbox"/> Bank accounts of winning Barangays	Prov'l com. <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend for approval of projects by the regional committee to the SIF Board for approval <input type="checkbox"/> Bank account of the member/ network	requires the endorsement of local government head at the municipal or sub-district level while SIF requires the endorsement of the regional committee
TOTAL LOAN FROM WB : \$273 MILLION (KDP 1)	\$100 MILLION	\$120 MILLION	
Accounting/Reporting: <input type="checkbox"/> Project transactions are recorded and books maintained by the finance unit at the village. All documents and files on financial transactions are kept at the village. <input type="checkbox"/> Financial reports prepared by the village through forms provided by the UPK	<input type="checkbox"/> Project transactions are recorded and books maintained by the finance unit at the Barangay. All documents and files on financial transactions are kept at the Barangay. <input type="checkbox"/> Financial reports prepared by the barangay through forms provided by the FM group	<input type="checkbox"/> Project transactions are recorded and books maintained at the project level . All documents and files on financial transactions are kept at the project level . <input type="checkbox"/> Financial reports prepared by a finance person assigned by network	<input type="checkbox"/> The requirements are similar in three (3) projects
XII. SUB-PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialization and preparation of village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social preparation and capacity building component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social preparation and capacity building 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ KDP orientation at Kecamatan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Municipal Orientation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Orientation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ KDP Orientation at Desa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st Brgy. Assembly (orientation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional Public 	

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHI-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Forum ○ Village Forum 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Idea exploration and identification of community needs (PRA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participatory Situational Analysis (resource map /MBN) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Household Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All underwent data gathering but differ in methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institution planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Org. verification team • Forming complaint unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2nd Brgy Assembly (data validation/ problem prioritization) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • org. of bgy. Proj. prep. Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collateral interview/ validation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sub proj development component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub Proj. Development Component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Social Collective Learning 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2nd meeting (collect list of proposals) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ capacity building on project development ○ development of sub project concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participatory Fora for : <i>Disadvantaged, community, network, mixed network, policies ,supervision , public and multi partite</i> ○ Project Design Dev. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • absence of capacity building for both KDP and SIF; project development common to all projects • The inclusion of capacity building was inserted at later part of KC.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prepare Project concept <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd brgy. Assembly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ approval of project concepts ○ org. of representation team ○ pre-inter brgy forum – establishment of criteria for project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory forum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Screening / ranking of projects ○ Preparation of projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KC and KDP sub project concepts formulated and approved by the community while SIF sub project concept/design was formulated by NGO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2nd intervillage meeting (rank) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make and correct high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st inter barangay forum (MIBF)- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project appraisal by provincial or regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter- community body formulates the criteria and

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>priority designs and budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ presentation and ranking of project concepts 	<p>level thru CO network forum. External appraisal the local level</p>	<p>forum procedures for KC and KDP.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3rd inter village meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirm selection based on actual designs and budget 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ confirmation of the detailed project prop at the KC and KDP is done after the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feedback • prep of detailed project proposal • community confirmation of final proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3rd village meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feedback results • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 4th Barangay Assembly – Feedback result of MIBF 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Formulation of Detailed project proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recom by Regional Committee for SIF Execom approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both KC and KDP done thru an inter village forum while in SIF done thru provincial forum for endorsement to region
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2nd inter bgy.forum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approval of detailed proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIF Executive Committee approves and provides final funding considerations and approved the contract with the community organization. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub- project Implementation and Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Organization and Net CO NWs implement sub-project and 	

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
		disburse funds	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepare for implementation • recruit workers-cf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Org. of Bgy. Sub Project Imp. Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procurement ○ Audit and Inventory ○ Bookkeeper 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organized grievance team not yet operational for KC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both projects has O&M activities . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KC requires a submission of an O&M plan as part of the implementation. • Implementation for both KC and KDP done by community (sub proj. implementation team)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Monitoring and Evaluation System 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Setting up of Project Monitoring and Evaluation System 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring: Internal and External 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Facilitators for KC and Village Consultants for KDP are both TA providers, monitor and community organizers while the SIF external local supervisors are TA providers and monitors .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village Meeting to account for village expenses (at least twice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision • Pre audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 6th Bgy. Assembly (evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Supervision and Disbursement 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maintenance of Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sub-project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking / Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Philippine team

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHI-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>and revolving of Loan Funds</p>	<p>Evaluation and Maintenance</p>	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Completion Forum • Public Forum (agreements disseminated through broadcast) 	<p>to recommend additional step integrating the poverty program to the local development plan for sustainability</p>
<p>XIII. Monitoring and Evaluation</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conducted by KDP Consultants including the maintenance of a management Information System (MIS) which monitors and regularly report on all relevant implementation aspects of KDP. (Physical and Financial) ○ Consultants are based at the national, regional, district and Kecamatan levels. Specific outputs are quarterly management reports, MIS databases, and resolving project implementation problems. ○ Monitoring by the GOI is conducted by officials at the national, provincial and district level. Specific outputs are progress and performance reports, Implementation both physical and financial and problems solved. ○ Community participation is done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Internal Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conducted by DSWD internal staff from the national and regional offices based on established reporting system and computerized MIS. ○ National office receives electronic data from the region, municipal and village level (quantitative and qualitative information about project progress, processes, problem encountered and recommendations/ solutions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Internal Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOFO in coordination with regional offices and central offices provides implementation support, installment inspection and problem solving forum . ◆ The central and regional monitoring/ evaluation com. conducts social mapping, , policy info disem. To the public, MIS system establishment/dev 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Internal Monitoring mechanisms employs MIS. KC and KDP commissioned external consultants for MIS development. MIS for SIF developed internally by staff.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>through monitoring by community members focused on project implementation and disbursement of project funds and activities. (The project monitoring board displays the financial statements and other reports of the project.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Province based monitoring by NGO's focused on relevant implementation aspects of KDP ○ World bank supervision missions ○ Financial audits by BPKP (Finance Development Supervision Agency) ○ Independent monitoring and reporting by local journalist with specified number of newspaper articles and radio reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ External Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NGO's and local media will be utilized to monitor project implementation with particular focus on incidence of graft and corruption, substantial delay in project implementation etc. ○ Participating beneficiary monitoring through barangay assemblies, use of community billboards in strategic places, compilation of project records, minutes of meetings, etc. 	<p>arrange tripartite fora.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ External Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Sponsors (NGO's and civil servant) and M & E Team (Academic Institutes) provide network support monitoring and TA* ◆ Network Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Beneficiaries undertake self-monitoring ◆ Supervision and inspection by group level committee and conducted through beneficiary /committee forum. ◆ Oversight by network committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ All projects are monitored by NGOs. In addition to NGOs, the Media also conducts monitoring in KDP and KC while the academic institutes conducts the same activity in case of SIF.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>Operational/Technical and Evaluation Studies <small>TA – Technical Assistance</small></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research studies were conducted by hired consultants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Researches/ studies will be conducted for enhancement of program operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impact studies were undertaken by SOFO in coordination with other org. as Thailand Research Fund • Academic institutes and NGOs 	
XIV. LOCALIZATION			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Village level planning link to sub-district level planning of government ◆ Organized and functional Operation and Maintenance Team at the village level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Passage of Resolution from the Municipality and the barangay indicating support to the KC ◆ Memorandum of Agreement between DSWD and Local Government ◆ Barangay Development Council to participate project planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Community revolving funds in diverse forms treated as such funds with profit used for other community small activities ◆ Decentralization of authority ◆ Installation of strong volunteers mechanism and enhanced intermediaries ◆ Formulation of Community Master Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ All localization mechanisms are in place. However, the KDP comprehensive localization component to include matching grant will be included in the 3rd phase . ◆ SIF localization is dependent on strong volunteer-based commitment. Localization initiatives are dependent on volunteer initiatives. Volunteer momentum may be difficult to sustain.
XV. GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Places strong emphasis for the promotion of women 's participation- there are a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Women form part of the marginalized sector in CIDSS- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Except for women victims of AIDS, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ KC guideline does not provide a strong

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAH-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>number of initiatives to improve gender equity and increase women's participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Separate subproject window for women and a separate special meeting to discuss women proposals ◆ Women generally comprise 26 to 45 % of the participants at KDP meeting ◆ 1 out of 2 projects funded by KDP are projects proposed by women ◆ Part of the design of the program is to elect one (1) male and one (1) female village Kecamatan Facilitator ◆ Special separate meeting to discuss women proposals ◆ Modules on gender training ◆ KDP tracks gender data thru all phases of project implementation 	<p>KALAH-CIDSS Initiatives to promote gender equity are shown in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tracking of disaggregated gender data in MIS ◆ Hiring of equal number of Males and Females for Area Coordinators and Community Facilitators 	<p>program does not provide initiatives to improve gender equity and encourage women's involvement</p>	<p>emphasis in the promotion of gender equity unlike KDP because women's participation is strong in the Philippines.</p>
XVI. SAFEGUARDS			
<p>GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Mechanism is evident through : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Complaint box per Desa ◆ Post Office Box (well publicized) ◆ Independent Monitoring by NGO and journalist ◆ Policy that each complaint or grievance is responded promptly and then followed up by local coordination team or consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ A complaint team will be established to look into the complaints by individuals, recipient barangays and municipalities against non compliance against project principles and guidelines. ◆ Documents are open for public scrutiny. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The Provincial Task Force is responsible to oversee and resolve complaint and in addition, verify info received. ◆ Informal mechanism of social control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Grievance mechanisms are provided for in the project operation. The KDP grievance mechanisms are more comprehensive . ◆ KC grievance mechanisms are still to be installed.

KDP (INDONESIA)	KALAHY-CIDSS (PHILIPPINES)	SIF (THAILAND)	REMARKS
<p>INDIGENOUS PEOPLES (IP) PROTECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Program approach provides access to underdeveloped rural communities without discrimination based on gender, ethnic or religion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ IPs are recognized as a basic sector and is considered as special poverty groups together with women . Presence of Special Poverty groups are one of considerations for targeting. ◆ Constructions into ancestral domain is incorporated in the list of subprojects not eligible for funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Understood to be part of Menus 3 and 5 – Preservation of Local Culture 	<p>Both projects have IP sensitive mechanisms</p> <p>KC defined IP as special poverty group.</p> <p>IP as defined by in the Philippines and Indonesia are not covered by SIF</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ incorporated in the list of subprojects not eligible for funding such as : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Activities That Would Destroy Environment: Chainsaws, Dynamite, Fertilizers, Chemicals ◆ Fishing boats not exceeding ten tons, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ incorporated in the list of subprojects not eligible for funding such as : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ pesticides and use of other toxins harmful to the environment, etc ◆ Road construction in to protected areas. ◆ Fishing boats and nets above legal size and weight ◆ Required clearances from appropriate agencies is a prerequisite for project approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Menu 3 – Natural Resources Preservation, Management and Environmental Protection and Culture. Collaboration in protection, revival and conservation of natural resources, arts and local wisdom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ All projects have adequate environmental safeguards. KC strictly imposes submission of environmental clearances as required by law