

Cash for HostFamilies CfHF Aceh 2005	 Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Implementing phase Final Registration Report 15.05.2005 / HHE
---	--	---

To be included in Final Report of CfHF Project Aceh

1 Aim of this document

This document shall give an overview over the process of data collection, data entry and data clearing/cleaning. Beneath presenting facts & figures we'll also touch faced problems and difficulties in order to obtain conclusions and lessons learned for further implementations of Cash Projects.

2 Data collection and registration process

The data collection or so called registration process started on 28.02.05 by instruction of the Camat (head of sub district) and the Kepala Desa (heads of village) of the corresponding Kecamatan (sub district) Krueng Barona Jaya and ended on 30.04.05 with the entry of data of Baiturrahman.

The main steps of this registration process (data collection) have been in general the following (executed generally in each single Kecamatan):

1. **Visit of the Camat** and information about our CfHF Project and the planned registration & verification procedure. At the time of this visit also a date for a official meeting with the Camat and his Kepala Desas is fixed.

Result: These information visits with all involved Camats took place from 14.02.05 until 17.03.05. Most of them had to be repeated.

Comment: Visiting the Camats in their Kecamatans is very time consuming. First their offices are often relatively far away (up to ½ hour of travelling by car) and they are generally working only until midday. Meetings at a fixed time are generally not feasible due to the lack of planning habit in governmental environment. Due to this facts very often a planned visit could not be realized even if the way to the Kantor Camat was made what in fact was a time consuming driving around during hours without any results.

Problem: When the former governor of Aceh was condemned to jail for 8 years in March, the acting governor resp. former vice governor of Aceh replaced the Bupati of Aceh Besar who himself then replaced some of his Camats (2 of them involved in our CfHF Project). Since the former Walikota of Banda Aceh died in Tsunami his former secretary was named new Walikota. As a consequence he replaced his Camats in some 4 Kecamatans.

6 out of 11 visited Camats have been exchanged/replaced after our first visit due to this politically instable and still changing situation. Due to this fact some information visits had to be done at least twice. Some of the Camat knew already (at the time of beginning of the CfHF Project) that they will be replaced and therefore acted obstructive or at least did not collaborate in a very motivated manner. It stands for itself that all newly named Camats then also replaced parts of their staff, what caused in some Kecamatans a loss of knowledge concerning our CfHF Project.

All this caused a nasty time delay and slowed down the progress of our CfHF Project.

2. **Meeting with Camat and Kepala Desa** of involved Kecamatans to instruct about registration & verification procedure. At this meetings the registration form was handed out in order to be filled out with collected host family data by the present local authorities. A date of return the filled out registration forms was also fixed in this meetings.

Result: These meetings have been held from 28.02.05 until 15.03.05 in 6 Kecamatans (out of 11). In 3 Kecamatans the former Bupati of Aceh Besar was against meetings and in 2 Kecamatans the Camats themselves didn't find it necessary to hold this kind of meeting and then instructed their Kepala Desas by themselves.

Comment: NSTC. Most of the meetings have been formal, efficient and effective.

Problem: In the Kecamatans where the Camats decided to make the instruction themselves and no meeting was held problems rose up at the moment they were replaced by the new Bupati. Their successors then didn't know about our CfHF Project and therefore data collecting process was slow, lasting and unsatisfying. Registration was faster advancing in the Kecamatans where the meetings have been held and the quality of collected data was far better than in the others.

3. **Waiting for data** to be filled in the registration forms by the Kepala Desas and collected by the Camats. Repeated visits of Camats and **receiving collected data**.

Result: This waiting and data receiving/collecting period started after the first meeting on 28.02.05 and went on until 30.04.05. We received all overall register data of 8'779 potential host families not counting some lists which had to be returned due to bad data quality.

Comment: Collecting registration data was very time consuming. Data were often promised for a certain date and then delayed and delayed again. With the aim not to kill our CfHF Project we had often to extend the given deadlines several times.

Problem: Our CfHF Project never has been of first priority for the local administration.

Since Tsunami local authorities have been very busy at heavily reduced resources. One of the duties have been the numerous registrations of IDPs. Several registrations of IDPs had to be done for NGOs and UN organisations for the displacement to IDP camps, later on again for the displacement to temporary shelters/barracks and last but not least for the distribution of kind relief. The IDPs then had to be registered for the government in order to pay the cash support from the government. All former house owners who lost their houses in the Tsunami or who's houses were damaged had to be registered for the support for reconstruction.

Believing the information of several Camats there has no valid database been established up to today and therefore no valid citizen data are available (not even a tax register dating before Tsunami). Since IDPs have been and still are moving around all over the province registrations will go on until everybody will have settled down again at a fix spot.

4. **Data entry in Access DB and returning of incomplete data to be completed or corrected.**

Incomplete datasets or data of poor quality had to be sorted out and then listed in specially prepared lists. These lists then were returned to the Camats for completion/modification. As soon as this data had been completed/modified the Camat were visited again and data were recollected a second time. This step had to be repeated several times in most of the Kecamatans.

Result: Data entry started on 09.03.05 and ended on 01.05.05. Almost 8'400 potential host families have been entered in the MS Access database. Received data were entered by two persons and then controlled (missing or incomplete datasets, doubles, etc), clarified and cleaned. Returned datasets were compared to earlier received data and these were completed, modified or deleted. After clearing 7'461 host families were designated to be eligible beneficiaries for our CfHF Project.

Comment: Received data were of very different quality. Some registration forms were filled out by handwriting, most with typing machine and only 2 Kecamatans delivered data as Word-file or Excel-file. Depending on every single Kecamatan 5% up to 20% of received data were incomplete (missing mandatory entries) and had to be returned to the Camats in order to be

completed and delivered again. This implicated a repeated collecting process and was very time consuming. In several Kecamatans KTP numbers of eligible host families were still missing when first payment period already had finished.

Problem: Data entry did – per se – not produce problems. Despite of the good technical handling of the database, specially the entry of data of poor quality made the handling time consuming because of the many special cases to be considered, because of many corrections to be made or the adding or the completing of half entered data which was required.

2.1 Chaotic citizen register of local authorities

Many problems produced the poor data reliability of official data of Acehese citizens and the chaotic governmental register (archive) of citizens data.

2.1.1 Names

Acehese people don't use first names and family names in the same manner as Europeans do, nor is the name of a person normally written the same way by himself and in his official documents. Even nicknames appear in official documents. And the name of a person changes as soon he was to Mecca as a pilgrim (additional first name "Haji"). So for the person Muhammad Ali Ahmad many different ways may exist of how his name is written, presented and appeared in official documents:

- Ali Ahmad
- Ahmad Ali
- Ahmad
- A. Ahmad
- Drs. A. Ahmad (if with University degree)
- Haji Ali Ahmad (if been in Mecca)
- H. Ali Ahmad (if been in Mecca)

In many cases the names of potential beneficiaries on the received lists of the Camatats (filled out mostly by the Kepala Desas) were not written in the same way as they figure in the KTP of this people. So presenting themselves in the bank BRI branch to withdraw the cash support bank officers rejected the payment due to differences between the name on the KTP and the name on our SDC list. This of course produced a lot of unnecessary complaints and corrections in our database. It also inhibited in many cases to detect double names.

2.1.2 ID Cards

Normally KTP (ID-Cards) are issued by the Camatats office. But in some Kecamatans of Aceh Besar also so TNI (military authorities) issue KTP. So there are several "standards" resp. no standards concerning KTP number form and no uniform systematic way for issuing KTP exists. It may occur that the KTP number on a persons KTP is different to the KTP number in the archives of the local authorities – if they have any centralized archive. In some Camat offices we saw issued KTP numbers entered by hand and archived in a book. Even if they figure in chronic order of date of issue there is no way to find a certain KTP number in a reasonable time.

Citizens are given a new KTP each time the move from one Kecamatan to the other. Many people do not "update" their KTP and were therefore entered in our database with the old KTP number of their former living place. Some of them get a new one and keep the old one, so they have actually two KTPs. As there is no centralized citizen register at the regency level (Kabupaten) nobody finds out, nobody bother.

Many persons have two KTP issued in different years (we found out because of identical address of a person who tried to get the money twice; once as Ali Ahmad with KTP 123/01/SK/BA/03 and once as Ahmad Ali with KTP 123/01/SK/BA/2004) even if they did not move to an other Kecamatan.

Also it appeared that Kepala Desas wrote down the KTP number of host families in a slightly different way as written in the KTP (123/01/SK/BA/03 instead of 123/01/SK/BA/2003).

.... And so on

2.2 Consequences

All mentioned factors made it very difficult to manage the data itself, compare data, find double entries and at the end caused a lot of rejected payments by the bank BRI due to different entries on our payment lists and the presented KTP of the beneficiary.

This caused us to modify our payment instructions for the bank BRI branches as follows:

- Unlike in the payment procedure of the already realized 1st payment, bank officers SHOULD PAY out the money and NOT REJECT payment in the following cases:
 - All of the beneficiaries listed in the final list of SDC with correct name and KTP number have to be paid, although the name and KTP number is not issued in the same Kecamatan on the SDC list where the beneficiary actually lives.

Examples:

Name on SDC list	KTP number on SDC list	Decision
Suryadi	179.3.345.2003	Do not reject– please pay
Samsul Rizal	173/06/SK/BA/2003	
Drs. Syahrir Amin	176/01/AB/PDMD/2003	

- **Given a correct KTP number** (number is identical in KTP and SDC list):
If the name on the KTP differs from the name in the SDC list obviously because of typing error or wrong writing please DO NOT REJECT payment

Examples:

Name on KTP	Name on SDC list	Decision
Suryadi	Suriadi	Do not reject – please pay
Samsul Rizal	H.S. Rizal	
Drs. Syahrir Amin	Syahmir Amin	

- **Given a correct name** (name is identical in KTP and SDC list)
If the KTP number on the KTP differs from the KTP number in the SDC list obviously because of typing error or wrong writing please DO NOT REJECT payment

Examples:

Number on KTP	Number on SDC list	Decision
159/08/BR/BA/03	159/08/BR/BA/2003	Do not reject – please pay
159/08/BR/BA/03	195/08/BR/BA/03	
159/08/BR/BA/03	15908/BR/BA/03	

3 Results

The following table gives an overview over the entered data:

Summary of Final Data Entry by District

Status quo: 15.05.05

District	Total registered Host Families	Total eligible Host Families (Beneficiaries)	in % of total registered HF	Eligible but with missing KTP No (included in Total eligible Host Families)	in % of all eligible HF
Kuta Alam	248	205	90%	0	0%
Ulee Kareng	1'099	913	83%	70	8%
Syiah Kuala	382	381	100%	3	1%
Jaya Baru	149	121	81%	9	7%
Lueng Bata	717	671	93%	30	4%
Banda Raya	1'027	922	90%	41	4%
Baiturrahman	1'350	1'314	97%	4	0%
Krueng Barona Jaya	415	414	100%	0	0%
Darussalam	1'054	891	85%	186	21%
Ingin Jaya	959	829	86%	86	10%
Darul Imarah	996	800	80%	148	19%
ToT Kota Banda Aceh	4'972	4'527	91%	157	3%
ToT Aceh Besar	3'424	2'934	86%	420	14%
TOTAL	8'396	7'461	89%	577	8%

4 Data verification

Data verification is described in detail in the document [CfHF Aceh Verification Report_050515.doc](#)

5 Preparing final beneficiary lists for payment

All eligible host families entered the final lists for 1st payment period except the eligible host families with missing KTP number. These were listed in a separate list and returned to the Camats to be completed meanwhile 1st payment period was ongoing.

After the 1st payment period the returned lists with completed KTP numbers entered in the new final lists for 2nd payment period together with the rejected beneficiaries from the 1st payment period.

There have then been a number of drop outs after the 1st payment period:

- Beneficiaries who's KTP number could not be completed ▶ they were deleted
- Beneficiaries who moved away to live in an other city ▶ they were deleted
- Beneficiaries who were detected to have been listed twice ▶ they were deleted
- Beneficiaries who could not come to the bank personally ▶ they were replaced
- Beneficiaries who died ▶ they were replaced

Payment will be described in detail in the document [CfHF Aceh Payment Report_0505xx.doc](#)

6 Conclusions

In a country without a centralized citizen register and missing standards the ID cards of beneficiaries are not longer a tool for unique identification. If they are used as if they were, many difficulties may rise. Even if its possible to be done (as we did in the CfHF project Aceh) it provokes a lot of unexpected surprises, additional work and time delays.

Registering procedures have to be adapted, many special cases must be foreseen and its almost impossible to be prepared for all different kind of rising problems of smaller and bigger consequences. May be this issue could have be foreseen in the assessment done in January and February. But even if they were, we can at this time not imagine valuable alternatives that could have be chosen without complicating or delaying the project in a unacceptable way.

May be doing the registration by ourselves would have been more efficient in terms of time saving, but it must be doubted that it would have been of less complications.