

<p>Cash for HostFamilies CfHF Aceh 2005</p>	 Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	<p>Implementing phase Final Verification Report 15.05.2005 / HHE</p>
--	---	--

To be included in Final Report of CfHF Project Aceh

1 Aim of this document

This document shall give an overview over the process and results of data verification. Beneath concrete results (facts & figures) we'll also touch faced problems and difficulties.

2 Data collection / registration

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 Desas (head of villages) of the corresponding Kecamatan (sub district) Krueng Barona Jaya. Data registration and collection, have ended on 05.05.05 with the data entry in the MS Access database and clearing/cleaning of data of Kecamatan Baiturrahman

- The attached document *CfHF Aceh Registration Report_050508.doc* gives a summary overview over the registration process itself (updated until 08.05.05).
- The attached document *CfHF Aceh Monitoring DataEntry_050508.pdf* gives a summary overview over facts&figures of entered data (updated until 08.05.05)

3 Data verification

3.1 Preparation

Preparatory to the verification of data 30 students were interviewed and 20 of them hired as part timers aimed to work together in pairs with one motorcycle. In a second step they were instructed and briefed to do verifications with the required knowledge and serious preparation.

In the MS Access database a separate table with correspondent entry form was built. The verification form was coded in order to process entered verification data with statistical software SPSS.

3.2 Test verification

Data verification started with a test verification in the Kecamatan Kuta Alam in the 2 not destroyed Desas with a 10% randomised sample of 24 HF out of 241 HF. PM deputy Flavia Lazzeri took part in this first verification together with the local project assistant Linn forming an additional verification team. After this test verification and a deep debriefing of the participating verification teams the verification form was slightly modified and adapted to the requirements.

3.3 Regular verification and Sample size

Data verification was done in all 11 Kecamatans.

Verifying data was done with an overall random sample of 10% in the first 4 Kecamatans and the last Kecamatan (in order to get a large number of results in all Desas of these Kecamatans).


In 3 Kecamatans a random sample of 3% was made only in selected Villages (Desas) due to the large extension of these Kecamatans, their high number of up to 50 villages and their rural character.

In the resting 4 Kecamatans a random sample of 5% was drawn.

The indicated sample size (in%) in the following table may be less than 10% (5% respectively) due to the later enlargement of the population N (because of the inclusion of additional eligible host families) after the already done verification.

The average overall sample size of $n=484$ represents 7% of the total population $N=7'461$ of eligible host families as shown in the following tables and graphics.

Sample Size n and original Population N by District / Kecamatan			
	Sample n	Population N	n in % of N
Baiturrahman	135	1'314	10%
Banda Raya	40	922	4%
Darul Imarah	25	800	3%
Darussalam	31	891	3%
Ingin Jaya	31	829	4%
Jaya Baru	9	121	7%
Krueng B. Jaya	40	414	10%
Kuta Alam	23	205	11%
Lueng Bata	53	671	8%
Syah Kuala	13	381	3%
Ulee Kareng	84	913	9%
Total n	484	7'461	7%



The shares of the total of Aceh Besar and Kota Banda Aceh are not the same in the sample n (26% to 74%) as in the original population N (39% to 61%). In the sample n Banda Aceh is so to speak over represented compared to the original population N .

Sample Size n and original Population N by Regency / Bupaten				
	Sample n	% of n	Population N	% of N
Aceh Besar	127	26%	2'934	39%
Banda Aceh	357	74%	4'527	61%
Total n	484	100%	7'461	100%

A randomized sample of 7% with a sample size of $n > 400$ is statistically seen large enough to produce representative and reliable results. Therefore our presented verification results of the sample n reflect with a probability p of 95% the reality in its original population N . To visualize this point we projected in each table the verification results in the sample (shown as "Frequency in n ") to its "real" dimension listing the corresponding number of host families in the population N of all our CfHF Project eligible beneficiaries (shown as "Frequency in N ").

3.4 Special verification

A special verification was done in the Kecamatan Baiturrahman as there were detected 56 cases of double or triple identical addresses, but of different host families. All 56 addresses were verified. In 4 cases there have been entered in our CfHF Project lists two members of the same host families (one was the deleted as result of the verification). In 3 cases the second listed host family was the hosted IDP family (and was the deleted as result of the verification). In 5 cases the entered address of one of the doubles was wrong (and was corrected as result of the verification). In all resting cases there were in fact two houses with two host families on the same land and with the same address.

The 21 not found houses (out of the verification of the first 4 Kecamatan) were searched a second time by the verification team. With the help of the Kepala Dusun all houses could be found and the host families then could be interviewed for verification. They are included in the following analysis.

3.5 Drop outs

Not all of the listed host families in the sample n could be verified. One of the reasons was the fact that in 9 cases the verification team did not find the house of the host family. If we had verified 100% of all 7'461 considered eligible beneficiaries in our database, 139 host families could with a probability of $p=95\%$ not be found for a verification.

Reason	Number
Verification team could not find the house at the given address	1
A house was found at given address, but other people than the searched host family live there	6
Nobody lives at the given address, the found house is an office	1
A house was found at given address, but it is the host families 2 nd house, host family lives in their other house	1
Total drop outs	9

Therefore we do not know if the USD 13'900 given as cash support to these 139 not found host families (2%) have been misled to non eligible beneficiaries.

If the house was found, somebody must have been present to execute the verification interview and to fill out the verification form.

In the case of a found house but nobody's presence, verification could not be done. Due to this reason 23 cases of the sample $n=484$ dropped out, representing 355 host families.

Drop outs			
	Frequency in n	%	Frequency in N
House not found	9	2%	139
Nobody present	23	5%	355
yes = $n2$	452	95%	6'968
Total n	484	100%	7'461

Without any verification interviews there are no answers to be analysed. If this drop out of 5% was included in the statistical analysis, in each single table these 23 cases would figure as "no answer".

Therefore we do not know if the USD 35'500 given as cash support to 355 host families (5%) have been misled to non eligible beneficiaries.

As an alternative, we decided to exclude them from our statistical analysis explicitly, and consider them like questionnaires that have been sent out by mail but never returned for analysis.

3.6 Host families that did not host IDPs at all

HF was or is hosting IDPs			
	Frequency in $n2$	%	Frequency in N
no	2	0.4%	31
yes = $n3$	450	99.6%	6'937
Total $n2$	452	100%	6'968

In almost all of the found houses where verification was done successfully, the verified host family was (before verification) or is actually (at moment of verification) hosting IDPs.

Only 2 host families or 0,4% of the sample did not host IDPs at all.

USD 3'100 have probably ($p=95\%$) been misled to 31 host families (0,4%) which have never been hosting IDPs, even if they were considered eligible beneficiaries.

For our further analysis therefore remains a sample $n^3=450$ representing 6'937 host families or 93% of the total population $N=7'461$ of all eligible beneficiaries in our CfHF Project database.

This sample $n^3=450$ includes all host families selected by random where the house was found, a person was present for the verification interview and IDPs have been hosted after Tsunami.

3.7 Presence of IDPs at the moment of verification

One ore more IDPs were present for verification			
	Frequency in <i>n3</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>
head of IDP family was present	191	42%	2'931
other representative of IDPs was present	93	21%	1'427
no IDP was present	166	37%	2'578
Total n3	450	100%	6'937

In most of the cases (63%) there was also a representative of the hosted IDPs present, so additional questions concerning the IDPs could be asked in the verification interview. The presence of IDPs also allowed the cross checking of the answers given by the host family.


In 27% of the interviewed host families parts or even all of the IDPs had already left the house of their host family. This does not automatically mean that they miss our CfHF Projects criteria; since in some Kecamatans the verification was done in April or even in May, the hosting period could have been 3 months without the actual presence of IDPs. And if there was no IDP living in the host family's house in April or May, there could have been IDPs during the three months before....

All or parts of IDPs have already left the HF (so HF may in some cases not fulfil criteria "No of IDPs >1)			
	Frequency in <i>n3</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>
no	328	73%	5'079
yes = n4	122	27%	1'889
Total n3	450	100%	6'937

The table and graphic below show the place where IDPs who left their host family, choose to go to.

Almost half of them returned to their own houses. Only 10% choose to go to a tent camp or barrack camp.

Where did IDPs left to?			
	Frequency in <i>n4</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>
to other place	33	27%	511
to unknown place	14	11%	217
to their own house	48	39%	743
to other host family	15	12%	232
to IDP camp	5	4%	77
to IDP barrack	7	6%	108
Total n4	122	100%	1'889




- to other place
- to unknown place
- to their own hou
- to other host family
- to a IDP camp
- to IDP barrack

3.8 Hosting IDPs / Location and Statistics

Most of hosted IDPs live in the same house as the host family under the same roof. Nevertheless there are host families with several houses taking advantage and let IDPs live independently in their second house. Some of the host families have IDPs hosted under the same roof and additionally in their second house.

Even if it was not to be known it must be assumed, that some of the IDPs living independently in a second house of a host family must pay them a rent. At least we heard some rumours indicating the high probability of this fact.


Where are the hosted IDPs living?			
	Frequency in <i>n3</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>
IDPs are living in same house as HF and in other house of HF	16	4%	277
IDPs are living in other house	16	4%	277
IDPs are exclusively living in same house as HF	418	92%	6'382
Total n3	450	100%	6'937



- IDPs are living in same house as HF and in other house of HF
- IDPs are living in other house of HS
- IDPs are only living in same house as HF

In average each host family is hosting 6,87 or nearly 7 IDPs. The range runs from 1 IDP up to 43 IDPs in the maximum. One half of the host families is hosting less than 5 IDPs (median), the other half of the host families is hosting more than 5 IDPs. The verified host families hosting IDPs (*n3*=450) are giving private shelter and therefore a valuable alternative to the live in a camp or a barrack for totally 3'107 IDPs. Projected to the total population of host families (*N*=6'937) 47'657 IDPs have found a temporary home in a host family.

Statistics of IDPs hosted by HF	
Mean	6.87
Std. Error of Mean	.267
Median	5.00
Std. Deviation	5.685
Minimum	1
Maximum	43
Sum in <i>n3</i>	3'107
Sum in <i>N</i>	47'657




3.9 Host families fulfilling CfHF Projects Criteria

Numerous host families dropped out of the total of all registered host families because they were considered not eligible beneficiaries. A registered host family only was considered eligible if 2 or more IDPs were hosted (criteria 1) and hosting period started December 04 or January 05 (criteria 2).

Out of the sample (n3=450) of verified host families that did host IDPs

1. 3% did exclusively not fulfil the criteria 1 and hosted only 1 IDP. This corresponds to a number of 123 host families in the original population (N=6'937) of all registered host families hosting IDPs. They nevertheless fulfil criteria 2 and hosted this IDP more than 3 months.
2. 6% did exclusively not fulfil the criteria 2 and hosted their IDPs beginning hosting period in February 05 or later. This corresponds to a number of 416 host families in the original population (N=6'937) of all registered host families hosting IDPs. They nevertheless fulfil the criteria 1 and hosted at least 2 IDPs.
3. 2% did nor fulfil criteria 1 neither criteria 2 and hosted less than 2 IDPs starting the hosting period in February 05 or later. This corresponds to a number of 123 host families in the original population (N=6'937) of all registered host families hosting IDPs.
4. The big part of almost 90% of the verified host families fulfils both criteria. This corresponds to a number of 6'197 host families in the original population (N=6'937) of all registered host families hosting IDPs.

Fulfilment of the CfHF Projects criteria						
Criteria 1 \ Criteria 2	Hosting period is less than 3 months			Hosting period is 3 months or more		
	Frequency in <i>n3</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>	Frequency in <i>n3</i>	%	Frequency in <i>N</i>
Number of IDPs is less than 2	8	2%	123	13	3%	200
Number of IDPs is 2 or higher	27	6%	416	402	89%	6'197
Total n3	35	8%	540	415	92%	6'397



Most of the 416 host families mentioned under point 2. despite of not fulfilling our CfHF Projects criteria 2 (because the started hosting IDPs in February or later) are today still hosting IDPs and in fact **do host** their IDPs already **more than 3 months**.

They have been considered not eligible beneficiaries and therefore did not receive our CfHF Projects cash support – because of a suboptimal formulated criteria!

USD 32'300 have probably (p=95%) been mislead to 323 host families (5%) which, did not fulfil the criteria 1 only hosting one IDP.

Regency:	District:	Village:
		Date:
		Time start interview:
		Time end interview:

A Host Family	Name of Host:	SDC CfHF Code:
1 House not found: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no		
2 Nobody present: <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Head of HF present: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no		4 Comes back at: _____
5 If no Head of HF, other representative of HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no		6 Who: <input type="checkbox"/> wife <input type="checkbox"/> relative
7 Name of interviewed person (HF): _____		
8 ID/KTP Number (HF): _____		
9 Address: _____		

B General Information		
10 Have you been hosting IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no		
11 Beginning of hosting IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> December <input type="checkbox"/> January <input type="checkbox"/> February <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
12 IDPs living now in same house with HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	13 How many IDPs: _____	Persons
14 IDPs living now in another house of HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	15 How many IDPs: _____	Persons
16 IDPs has left the HF <input type="checkbox"/> no		
<input type="checkbox"/> yes	17 Date of departure: _____	How many: _____
18	To where: <input type="checkbox"/> barracks <input type="checkbox"/> own house <input type="checkbox"/> other	
	<input type="checkbox"/> camps <input type="checkbox"/> other HF <input type="checkbox"/> do not know	

C IDPs		
19 Head of IDPs present: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	20 Reason of absence: _____	
21 If no Head of IDPs, other representative of IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	22 Who: <input type="checkbox"/> wife <input type="checkbox"/> relative	
23 Name of interviewed person (IDP): _____		
24 ID/KTP Number (IDP): _____		
25 Number of IDPs living in the house with HF: _____ Persons (IDPs)		
Signature HF: _____		Signature Team Leader: _____
Signature IDP: _____		

SDC Office contact number: Ruri 0812 694 5400

Checking Verification	1. Criteria (KTP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted
	2. Criteria (IDPs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	PM Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected
	3. Criteria (period)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	<input type="checkbox"/> Doubtful

Coded Verification Form (for entry in PC and further analysis with SPSS)

A. Host Family

- 1** House of HF was found: yes no (1 or 0)
1a House was found at the given address: yes no (1 or 0)
2 Somebody was present: yes no (1 or 0)
3 Head of HF was present for interview: yes no (1 or 0)
5 If no, other representative of HF was present: Wife (2)
 Relative (1)
 other (0)
No entry empty field

B. General Information (information given by present HF representative)

- 10** Have you been hosting IDPs: yes no (1 or 0)
11 Beginning of hosting IDPs: Dec. (3)
 Jan. (2)
 Febr. (1)
 Other: (0)
No entry empty field

- 12** IDPs living now in same house with HF: yes no (1 or 0)
13 How many IDPs: Persons (number)
14 IDPs living now in another house of HF: yes no (1 or 0)
15 How many IDPs: Persons (number)
16 IDPs has left the HF: yes no (1 or 0)
17 Date of departure: date (date)
18 To where: barrack (5)
 camp (4)
 other HF (3)
 own house (2)
 does not know (1)
 other (0)
No entry empty field

C. IDPs (information given by present IDP representative)

- 19** Head of IDPs was present at time of verification: yes no (1 or 0)
21 If no, other representative of IDPs was present: yes no (1 or 0)
25 Number of IDPs living in the house with HF: Persons (number)

D. Checking Verification (comparing VF with correspondent dataset in database)

- 26** Criteria No. KTP: is Ok (existing&same as in DB) yes no (1 or 0)
Missing (at verification) yes no (1 or 0)
Could not be verified yes no (1 or 0)
27 Criteria total No. IDPs: is Ok (existing&same as in DB) yes no (1 or 0)
Missing (at verification) yes no (1 or 0)
Could not be verified yes no (1 or 0)
Is equal 2 or higher yes no (1 or 0)
28 Criteria Hosting period: Ok (at least 3 Month) yes no (1 or 0)

E. PM Decision

- 29** verified beneficiary is: accepted (2)
 doubtful (1)
 rejected (0)