



Technical Assistance Consultant's Report

Project Number: 39074
January 2009

Demographic and Health Surveys in Pacific Island Countries (Financed by the ADB Technical Assistance Fund)

Prepared by Macro International Inc.

Maryland, United States

For Secretariat of the Pacific Community

This consultant's report does not necessarily reflect the views of ADB or the Government concerned, and ADB and the Government cannot be held liable for its contents. (For project preparatory technical assistance: All the views expressed herein may not be incorporated into the proposed project's design.)

Asian Development Bank



Evaluation and Completion Report

**Demographic and Health Survey
in Pacific Island Countries
TA 6258-REG**

29 April 2008

CONTENTS

	Page
1. BACKGROUND	1
2. CONTRACT DEVELOPMENT	1
3. SURVEY DESIGN	3
3.1. Choice of Pilot Countries	3
3.2. Sample Design and Implementation	4
3.3. Questionnaire Design	5
4. SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION	6
4.1. Main Training and Fieldwork	6
4.2. Data Processing	7
4.3. Report Writing and Data Dissemination	8
5. CONCLUSIONS	8
REFERENCES	10

1 BACKGROUND

The main objective of the Pacific Islands Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) pilot project was to produce high quality information about a range of reproductive and child health indicators. The limited availability of high quality data on social indicators in most of the Pacific Islands countries was widely acknowledged (ADB, 2005). The necessity to report periodically on progress towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) highlighted the need to enhance data collection efforts and the idea to implement Demographic and Health Surveys emerged. Evidently, in April 2005, at a regional meeting of the heads of offices for planning and statistics in Noumea, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) proposed that a coordinated regional approach to conducting a DHS would be more cost-effective and efficient than various agencies working on their own (ADB, 2005). This view was generally accepted and the project gradually coalesced around ADB and the Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC). Other donor organizations contributed to the effort, e.g., Australian Aid for International Development, New Zealand Aid for International Development, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the World Bank.

2 CONTRACT DEVELOPMENT

On 31 October 2005, ADB issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for recruitment of a consulting firm to provide technical assistance to the DHS in the Pacific Islands. Specifically, the RFP called for a team of three short-term consultants: a Public Health Specialist and Team Leader (12 person-months); a Sampling and Survey Specialist (6 person-months); and an Economist (6 person-months). Key activities included developing appropriate new sampling methodology and survey instruments, undertaking surveys in three pilot countries, assisting in reporting requirements on the MDGs, and supporting implementation of a development plan for evidence-based policy making. As it turned out, many of these activities were later modified. However, the RFP also indicated that the project was meant to involve development of a basic regional core DHS questionnaire, transfer of technology of conducting such surveys to the local counterparts, project management and logistics, training of local staff, data management, etc., all of which were accomplished.

Generally speaking, Macro's view was that the RFP was overly ambitious, especially with regard to the time allowed for completion of all activities. Designing the sample and questionnaires for the surveys, conducting the pretest and main surveys, processing the data and drafting a report usually takes a minimum of 18-24 months per country. In addition to completing the surveys and analysis, the RFP assumed that there would still be time to use the data to draft a basic social services policy.

The RFP also had a curious mix of consultants. For example, in the initial RFP, the Sampling and Survey Specialist was meant to not only develop the sample designs, but also to train interviewers, arrange transportation and lodging in the field sites, check the quality of completed questionnaires, and oversee the activities of the data entry clerks. In its other DHS surveys, Macro has separate sampling and data processing specialists.

On 21 November 2005, ADB issued a revised TOR, revising the number (from three to two) and type of consultants and requiring the DHS Specialist and Team Leader to be resident in Noumea for 18 months. At the same time, the due date for proposals was extended from 5 to 15 December to allow prospective firms extra time to respond to the revised TOR.

This substantial change in the RFP—after it was issued—was surprising. The difference between a resident consultant and short-term staff was considerable. Thankfully, Macro was able to quickly identify a suitable candidate for a long-term assignment.

On 8 December 2005, Macro submitted its technical and financial proposals to ADB. Perhaps Macro misinterpreted the objective of the project, but since the RFP did not indicate which countries were to be covered in the project, Macro proposed covering all 12 of Pacific developing member countries (PMDCs), namely: Palau, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Tonga, Samoa, and Fiji. Macro's proposal was to group the countries into regions that would each form a sampling domain. Data would be presented for the country as a whole, with few breakdowns within each country (except for Fiji, which was proposed as a separate domain by itself).

In contrast to the 2-person team requested in the revised RFP, Macro proposed a 4-person team of specialists—18 months for the Team Leader, 2.5 months for the Economist, 1.5 months for the Sampling Specialist and 2 months for the Data Processing Specialist. In late January 2006, Macro won the bid and negotiations between Macro and ADB were initiated. Initially, ADB indicated that the project would cover surveys in three pilot countries—Solomon Islands, Republic of Marshall Islands, and Tuvalu—instead of Macro's proposal to cover all countries. Surveys would be staggered at roughly 6-month intervals, making it more difficult to complete all activities in the proposed 18 months. Moreover, in an e-mail on 15 February, ADB indicated that they wanted to add one more country—Nauru—and hoped that this could be accomplished without raising the Macro bid. They also indicated that Macro should attend a planning workshop in Fiji.

The process of negotiation and planning could have been improved if the RFP had more fully reflected the nature of the work. The fact that the countries to be covered were not identified in the RFP, but rather by e-mail after Macro was selected, resulted in Macro's proposal not precisely reflecting the desired work. Moreover, the nature of the reports to be produced under the contract was not sufficiently addressed in the RFP and had to be negotiated by e-mail later. There was confusion as to terms like 'draft country report' and 'draft final report'.

One of the main areas of confusion, however, was the division of responsibilities between SPC and Macro. The RFP indicated that "The Executing Agency will provide the following: (to be specified in MOU between ADB and SPC; currently being drafted)". It was not until several months later that Macro became cognizant of the substantial role that SPC was to play in the implementation of the project. This lack of transparency—though unintentional—created unnecessary friction between the two groups. For example, it turned out that SPC took over the design of the samples for all four countries, making the Macro sampler redundant. It also would have been helpful if the RFP had included more details as to the role and responsibilities of the Team Leader.

The first main activity of the project was a very useful planning workshop attended by officials from SPC, ADB, UNFPA, AusAID, NZAID, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and the Macro Team Leader (Dr. Elizabeth Go) in Nadi, Fiji on March 16-17, 2006. The workshop brought together all the target countries and, more importantly perhaps, allowed discussions between Macro and SPC regarding our sometimes divergent views of the

project design and implementation. Discussions about the responsibilities of Macro vis-à-vis SPC continued in conference calls and emails. One of the main topics of discussion was to more clearly delineate the role of the Macro Team Leader, Dr. Go.

Unfortunately, the Fiji workshop was scheduled before the contract between ADB and Macro was finalized. Macro had expected to have Dr. Rutstein accompany Dr. Go to the planning workshop; however, he was not available and instead, visited Noumea later.

In sum, Macro's proposal differed in some fundamental ways from what was actually envisioned even at the time the contract was finalized. In retrospect, it probably would have been preferable to have re-vamped the contract deliverables then instead of later. For example, it was rather clear even then that there was no need for the Macro sampling specialist and need for more time in the area of data processing. It was also clear that Dr. Go would be travelling far more frequently than originally expected and that her travel budget was too low. Finally, the confusion over what constituted the required reports probably should have been resolved earlier.

3 SURVEY DESIGN

3.1 Choice of Pilot Countries

Macro took a secondary role in decisions about the countries to be covered in this initial, pilot phase, as well as about the implementing agencies and the survey design. Given Macro's lack of experience in the region, this was probably sensible. The decision to nominate the national statistical offices in each country as the implementing agencies fits the usual DHS approach and will no doubt enhance the acceptability of the survey results and the use of the findings for future development.

In some ways, the decision to implement a pilot project in 4 out of the 12 designated countries was odd. An alternative approach might have been to select, say, two countries, but to involve the other countries in more of the aspects of implementing those two, by involving them in the discussions about the questionnaires, inviting them to attend the pretest and/or main training, holding workshops on data processing. Perhaps the shortage of staff at the statistical offices would not lend itself to this approach. Nevertheless, it would be ideal if the statistical office staff in the four pilot countries could be pulled in to guide the process in the remaining countries, as a means of consolidating what they learned and of promoting capacity-building in the countries that will implement the survey in the next round.

The decision to implement the survey in Nauru was particularly questionable. With a total population of less than 10,000, there are probably fewer than 2,500 women aged 15-49 who would be eligible for interview. Despite the small size, the Macro sampling specialist determined that a minimum of 800 interviews would be necessary to produce estimates of fertility and child mortality estimates at a reasonable level of precision. Thus, with the sample of only 400 households that was implemented, many of the estimates are only available at the national level or have been suppressed altogether. Conducting surveys in small countries also exacerbates the problem of ensuring confidentiality between interviewers and respondents who are more likely to be acquainted. To the extent that respondents are not convinced that the information they share with interviewers will be kept confidential, they may color their responses. Macro suggests that in future, careful

consideration be given prior to embarking on surveys in very small countries and recommends focusing resources on the larger countries.

3.2 Sample Design and Implementation

The SPC sampling specialist prepared the sample design for each country, using the template given by the Macro economist during his visit to SPC. The DHS Sampling Manual was provided to SPC as reference in designing the sample. The sample design was specific to each country's situation, depending on the geographic level at which the key survey indicators are to be produced and the level of precision required. Scientific sampling probability was used for the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Nauru surveys; in contrast, purposive sampling was used for the RMI DHS for pragmatic reasons.

DHS standard procedures call for a listing of all households in the sampled clusters before data collection. The sample households are then selected from these lists in the central office so as to minimize any tendency to select easier-to-reach households. In the pilot countries, however, due to the high cost of transportation, household listing was undertaken by the interviewers and the household sample selection by the team supervisors. In RMI, no listing was done in Majuro and Kwajalein; instead, the sample structures were drawn from existing maps. In the Outer Atolls, the listings of households in sample villages/islands were done by the interviewers and all households listed were interviewed. In Tuvalu, the sample households were drawn by statistics office staff from the updated lists of households for each island. The DHS samples were not self-weighting, hence sampling weights were used. The weights consist of the design weights, combined with household and individual respondent non-response weights for the same domains. In the Solomon Islands, adjustments were made to cater for 33 missing EAs.

Macro feels that the sample designs for several of the countries could have been improved. In addition to being too small in some cases to be able to fully utilize the results at the sub-national and even national levels, in at least one country (RMI), the design evidently involved non-probability selection. In addition, although a separate household listing may not have been possible in all locations, it might have been feasible in some areas. In places where listing and household selection is done by the interviewing teams, Macro recommends following certain procedures to minimize bias (i.e., adequate training of teams on how to list households, selection of households by the supervisor, use of pre-determined random numbers).

Macro is not sure whether the sample design was ever written up for any of the four pilot countries and would recommend that this be done in future surveys. The apparent lack of adequate documentation and the departure of the SPC sampling statistician led to difficulties in obtaining the sample weighting factors in time for producing the preliminary report tables. It also meant that—contrary to DHS standard procedures—sampling error tabulations were not produced for any of the countries, since they require detailed knowledge of the sample design and the sample frame. Sample design is one area in which Macro feels it could provide useful assistance in any upcoming surveys.

3.3 Questionnaire Design

In its proposal, Macro strongly recommended the use of identical or nearly identical questionnaires in all four countries, both as a means to maximize efficiencies and to enhance cross-country comparisons. The DHS model core questionnaires for households, women and men developed by Macro for its international DHS program were the bases for developing a set of Pacific DHS core questionnaires. Macro also provided its optional, add-on modules. These questionnaires and modules were provided to the implementing agencies for adaptation to their context and data needs. In the Solomon Islands and Tuvalu, the Pacific DHS core questionnaires were adapted to their respective data needs and context, while in RMI, the DHS Model questionnaires were preferred. The Man's Questionnaire was administered to all men 15 years or over living in every other sample household.

Each implementing agency also decided which optional modules to adopt. For example, in the Solomon Islands, the Household Questionnaire included questions on mosquito bednets and the height and weight measurements section. The RMI questionnaire did not include the questions on bednets and the measurements section was replaced with a section on malnutrition based on observations of various physical conditions of children 0-5 years old. The Tuvalu Household Questionnaire included the height and weight measurements but added waist and hip circumference measurements. In RMI and Tuvalu, the domestic violence module was asked of one randomly selected ever-married eligible woman in the sample household. Although these kinds of changes resulted in less uniform questionnaires across countries than anticipated, the adaptations were reasonable.

Macro has a strong tradition of involving stakeholders and potential data users in the process of survey and questionnaire design on the theory that such involvement (1) results in a stronger survey tool that reflects the country's data needs; (2) serves to enhance the acceptance and utilization of the survey results; and (3) creates 'ownership' of the survey. During the design stages of most DHS surveys, the implementing agency or the Steering Committee calls one or more meetings to discuss the survey design and questionnaire content. Attendees include government officials from the Ministries of Health, Planning, Education, and Women's Affairs; non-governmental organizations active in family planning, maternal and child health, and community development; and donor organizations. In the pilot countries, consultations were generally limited to officials from the health and planning departments only. Macro recommends that more time be allocated to organize consultation meetings to 'advertise' and promote the survey in future surveys. Given the small size of most of the Pacific countries, this aspect of the project should be relatively inexpensive and easy to organize.

As recommended by Macro, each implementing agency arranged to have the questionnaires translated into and printed in the major language in order to reduce the possibility of misinterpretation of the questions. In most cases, the Macro Team Leader ended up making the modifications to the questionnaires and adapting the DHS Model Interviewer's Manual and Supervisor's/Editor's Manual for use in each country.

All questionnaires were pretested prior to the main survey. Again, the Macro Team Leader was the principal trainer for the interviewers in the first three countries¹, with minimal inputs

¹ The Macro Team Leader left the project just before the training and data collection in the final country, Nauru, so many comments on survey implementation are concentrated on the first three pilot countries.

from the national statistics office staff. A UNICEF consultant was the lone trainer for the nurses.

4 SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Main Training and Fieldwork

In all pilot countries, announcements for applications for interviewers were released over the radio. However, the recruitment and selection process differed among the pilot countries. In the Solomon Islands, statistics office staff were deployed to the provinces a few days prior to the pretest to recruit applicants. There were no written guidelines or procedures on how to conduct the recruitment and selection of applicants and there was no assessment test. In RMI and Tuvalu, applicants underwent written assessment tests and panel interview. Recruitment of trainees with the desired qualifications was not always easy and in at least one of the pilot countries, priority was given to recruiting relatives and friends of survey staff.

Training was implemented by the Team Leader and staff of the statistics offices, largely following Macro standard training guidelines. Fieldwork started immediately after the training course, lasting 3-6 months. The DHS team approach for fieldwork was adopted, mainly to achieve a higher level of supervision of the work. Further supervision during the fieldwork was limited because of budgetary constraints and lack of regular staff to act as field coordinators/supervisors.

Data collection in the Pacific presents some unique challenges. Fieldwork involved an array of logistics arrangements. For example, in the Solomon Islands, the teams in selected provinces were provided with an outboard motor boat to transport the interviewers from one enumeration area to another, with the team supervisor as the driver. Some teams took planes—especially in RMI—while others took ships to reach outer provinces and islands. Generally, it was the team supervisors' responsibility to find a suitable lodging place, particularly in areas where daily commuting can be a problem. In RMI, the statistics office's publicity and information campaigns were effective in seeking support and cooperation not only for the survey but also to provide accommodation for the teams. In Tuvalu, the Steering Committee arranged for the accommodation of the teams in the Outer Islands.

Another somewhat unique challenge in the Pacific is the small size of the populations. Privacy of interview and confidentiality of information are critical issues in the tiny island countries where almost everyone knows each other and the houses are close by. During the planning stage, stakeholders cast doubts on how interviews with sensitive questions could be done and how the information collected could be kept confidential. There were suggestions to exclude some sensitive questions so as not to jeopardize the entire survey. However, the pretest results showed very few refusals. Although respondents initially felt uncomfortable with the sensitive questions, they cooperated after the interviewers explained the importance of the data. In one pilot country, there was strong support from both local officials and the community in general. This was made possible through effective information campaign, close coordination with local officials, and the tactfulness and commitment of the interviewers and supervisors. Interviewers took an oath of confidentiality of information, in accordance with the Statistics Act of the respective country.

The lack of availability of experienced statistics office staff was a significant problem in the pilot countries. Due to the staff shortages and the often heavy workload, staff who logically

might have been seconded to the survey were often pulled off onto other tasks. Lack of high-level support to the survey as well as day-to-day supervision of activities can demoralize the field staff and result in poor quality data. Although it may seem obvious, there is no substitute for a well-trained, highly motivated, and adequately paid field staff. Macro recommends that staff shortages be discussed in the design of any follow-on phase and that innovative solutions be tested, e.g., use of the staff from the pilot phase countries to lend their experience in the next phase either on a voluntary or consultant basis; providing incentives such as extra compensation or overtime pay; or hiring a temporary, full-time consultant during the critical stages of training, field supervision, and data management.

Macro also recommends that a bit more attention be paid in future surveys to adequately budgeting for the local costs. For example, the number of trainees recruited in the Solomon Islands fell short of the number planned because of budgetary restrictions. This meant that there was no allowance for attrition and dismissal of interviewers who proved to be incompetent during the training and fieldwork. Moreover, three weeks of training was insufficient in some countries; budgets for future surveys should allow a bit of extra time.

4.2 Data Processing

Macro took a lead role in the area of data processing for the pilot countries. The Macro Data Processing Specialist, Hendrik (Han) Raggars, adapted the standard DHS programs for data entry and editing to fit the Pacific Islands core questionnaires. He then adapted this to fit the specific questionnaires in each country. In order to increase efficiency and cut costs, Macro suggested a joint training for the designated data processing staff in RMI and the Solomon Islands, which worked well. The training—which took place in the Solomon Islands—involved setting up the data entry system and data management. The Macro and SPC Data Processing Specialists returned to the Solomon Islands and RMI after the data entry was completed to do the final editing and preliminary tabulation. Joint training was likewise planned and implemented in Tuvalu, with the Nauru data processing person participating. The SPC Data Processing Specialist, Leilua (Lei) Taulealo, took charge in training Nauru in setting up the data entry system, with on-line assistance from Macro DP specialist. However, on-line assistance was not possible in Tuvalu due to internet connectivity problem caused by lightning in late June 2007. With strong encouragement from Han Raggars, Lei was able to set up the system by herself.

Data entry generally started 3 weeks after the start of fieldwork and was completed within a month after the fieldwork was completed. The data were entered twice to eliminate errors arising from incorrect data entry. Once the final set was complete, the sample weights were incorporated and selected tables on key indicators produced.

DHS surveys routinely involve a minimum of two visits by a Macro Data Processing Specialist—the first to set up and initiate the data entry and editing systems and the second to review and check all the data files for completeness and consistency; run the imputation programs; review and convert the ‘other’ answers from alpha to numeric codes; calculate the sample weighting factors and add them to the data file; and produce a first draft of the tables for the preliminary report.

Given that 8 data processing visits were out of the question for this project, Macro tried to make the best use possible of the limited number of visits (3) by combining countries whenever possible and by working to train up the SPC Data Processing Specialist as best as

possible. Macro also made use of the e-mail to review problems, answer questions, provide advice, and transfer programs and data files.

Although the work with the SPC Data Processing Specialist was extremely valuable, Macro does not feel that she is ready to work entirely on her own yet. Because of the complex nature of the data entry, editing, and tabulation of the DHS data, Macro usually takes two years to train up a new data processing specialist. Macro recommends that the SPC Data Processing Specialist receive further training in CSPro and on the DHS data entry and tabulation programming, preferably in the form of workshops, as well as more ‘hands-on’ experience.

4.3 Report Production and Dissemination

Macro produced first drafts of the preliminary reports for all four countries, as well as draft tables for a final report in accordance with the DHS standard final report tabulation plan for all four countries. The most troubling aspect of the short time frame and limited funding of the project is that the only reports produced from the data are the preliminary reports. SPC is in the process of producing what Macro calls a ‘final report’ for RMI; however, there are no plans to produce detailed, final reports of the data for the other three pilot countries.

Macro strongly recommends that future surveys make allowance for far greater use of the data than was true for the pilot surveys thus far. For the DHS surveys, Macro usually organizes a “report writing workshop” in country in which a DHS staff person provides training to perspective report authors on how the survey was conducted; how to construct a table title; how to read a table; how to interpret the data; what is the difference between weighted and unweighted data; how to check for small sample sizes; and tips on technical writing. Macro encourages implementing agencies to recruit authors from the line ministries that are most likely to use the data, thereby educating stakeholders in interpreting the survey findings and creating a “data ambassador”. Macro also recommends that the report authors present their respective chapters at the national seminar to disseminate the data.

In addition to the final report and a one-day national seminar that are hallmarks of the DHS process, Macro also encourages the creative use of other materials and methods to disseminate the data and encourage use. Examples of other materials include Key Findings reports, fact sheets, one-page briefs, press releases, posters, and radio talk shows. Arranging for briefings for high-level officials, parliamentarians, and journalists are also ways of ensuring wider use of the survey results.

Macro firmly believes that attention given to encouraging wider data dissemination and use is re-paid in terms of creating further demand for data and thus institutionalizing the survey for the future.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the best way to summarize the project is to review the objectives. The main aim of the Pacific Islands Demographic and Health Survey (PIDHS) was to provide high-quality statistics in the areas of health and population that can be used to improve monitoring of countries’ progress toward reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as well as to assess the effectiveness of countries’ policies and programs. The MDG targets include:

target 4 (reduce child mortality), target 5 (improve maternal health), target 6 (combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases) and other health-related subcategories of MDG.

A closely related secondary objective of the project was to transfer skills for planning and implementing such surveys and for analyzing and utilizing the data. The idea was that through hands-on survey experiences, the capacity of the national statistics office staff would be built up.

Both these objectives were met in this pilot phase, though there is ample room for improvement on both objectives. Specifically, more activities related to report writing and data dissemination could improve the first objective and more workshops and on-the-job training would be advisable to improve the capacity-building objective.

To summarize the lessons learned:

1. Macro recommends that resources be focused on implementing surveys in the larger countries in future and that sufficient budget be allocated to local costs to allow sample sizes adequate for producing sub-national estimates.
2. Macro also recommends that surveys be based on scientifically selected samples and that the sample designs be written down and reviewed. Wherever possible—even if only in parts of a country—a separate household listing operation should be implemented in order to reduce bias. Sampling spreadsheets used at the time of sample selection should form the basis of the calculations for sample weighting factors to be added to the data file when it is complete. With all this in proper order, the tabulation plan should include calculation of sampling errors for key survey indicators.
3. Local cost budgets should be sufficient to recruit extra trainees so as to allow for attrition or dismissal of interviewers who proved to be incompetent and/or dishonest. If possible, budgets should also provide for short-term consultants to assist overworked statistics office staff with critical activities such as training, field monitoring, and data management. Survey planners should also ensure adequate office space for survey staff, if necessary by renting temporary space.
4. Planning for future surveys should allow more time for design and implementation. Specifically, Macro recommends that a Steering Committee be organized in each country and that the committee arrange for meetings with potential data users to elicit stakeholders' data needs and review the survey and questionnaire design. Sufficient time should also be allowed for recruiting and training interviewers. Finally, the survey schedule should build in time to analyze the detailed tables, draft a final report, and disseminate the survey results to users at a national seminar.
5. Planning for future surveys should build in as much cross-country collaboration as possible. Not only is it enlightening to see how a neighboring country handles various aspects of the survey, but it builds the local survey community and has many beneficial side effects. Macro has used study tours to attend field staff training and/or to visit field work in several of our survey projects to great advantage. Depending on the phasing of the various country activities, it may be more cost effective to bring staff from neighboring countries together as was done in the data entry training for Solomon Islands and RMI.

6. Given the small size of the statistics offices and the shortages of experienced staff, it is not realistic to think that even with intense capacity-building efforts, countries would be able to implement a credible DHS entirely on their own. Outside technical assistance will almost certainly be required in the areas of:

- survey design, planning and budgeting
- sample design
- questionnaire design
- field staff training and fieldwork monitoring
- data processing
- data analysis and report writing
- data dissemination and use

In terms of technical assistance for future surveys, it may make the most sense for SPC to take the lead in by building up a team of specialists that can provide help to individual countries. Given the distance from Macro headquarters to the Pacific, it may be advisable to utilize our expertise more in the form of capacity-building activities. Macro could send staff to conduct workshops in any of the above areas. Some workshops might be aimed more at country staff, while others may be more oriented towards training SPC staff (e.g., data processing). Macro has developed workshops on questionnaire design, data processing, report writing, and data dissemination. These could be adapted for use in the Pacific. In addition, Macro feels that future surveys would benefit from a visit by one of our sampling specialists.

Macro firmly believes that capacity is best built through on-the-job training. Consequently, any workshops should contain a high level of practical exercises and be immediately followed up with actual application of the training. For example, a workshop could be organized for data processing staff from 2-3 countries to work on adapting the standard DHS data entry programs for use in their particular countries. Alternatively, a workshop could involve trainees learning how to apply the new CSPro tabulation program to make tables from their survey's dataset. Survey staff could bring the tables from their country to a workshop covering data interpretation and report writing. As Macro gains more experience with adapting DHS procedures for collecting data using Personal Data Assistants (PDAs), a workshop on this might be useful.

In addition to any activities that Macro might be contracted to perform, ADB, SPC, and the Pacific Island nations will always be welcome to avail themselves of any products produced by the DHS program that are in the public domain, e.g., standard questionnaires, manuals, datasets, reports, databases (StatCompiler, HIV/AIDS Database, and StatMapper) and other materials that are on the DHS website. These materials can be enormously helpful to those tasked with implementing a DHS.

REFERENCES

Asian Development Bank, 2005. Technical Assistance for the Demographic and Health Survey in Pacific Island Countries. [Prepared by K. Taniguchi]. TAR: STU 39074.