KEYSTONE PERFORMANCE SURVEYS

Development Partnership Survey

WaterAid 2016 Report

keystone

Introduction

Since 2010, Keystone has been conducting benchmark surveys of partners of international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). WaterAid first took the survey in 2014, where one of the key recommendations was to administer a more on-going light-touch feedback process. This report is the first attempt at such an approach, and presents what the partners of WaterAid said about it and how that feedback compares to the data received in 2014. It provides credible data on how well WaterAid carries out its role in the partnership, as seen from the partner perspective.

The survey process was managed by Keystone Accountability. The questionnaire was administered to WaterAid's partners in English, French and Portuguese from 16 May to 20 June 2014. Regular reminders were sent to encourage a high response rate.

The questionnaire was administered online with paper forms for those who needed them. It was distributed by Keystone directly to partners by email. Keystone emphasised to partners that their participation was voluntary and anonymous.

The tables show distributions, both as percentages and as actual numbers in brackets. For the substantive question (tables 6-8), the Net Promoter Analysis is used[1].

---

1   'Net Promoter' is a registered trademark of Fred Reichheld, Bain & Company and Satmetrix. For more see: **www.netpromotersystem.com**, as well as the open source net promoter community at **www.netpromoter.com**.

Respondent profile

Table 1: Response rates	2016	2014
No. of partners invited to respond	319	247
No. of responses	110	122
Response rate	34%	44%

Table 2: Location of partners	
Country	%
Bangladesh	5.38% (5)
Ethiopia	2.15% (2)
Ghana	15.05% (14)
India	15.05% (14)
Kenya	1.07% (1)
Lesotho	1.07% (1)
Liberia/Sierra Leone	5.38% (5)
Madagascar	3.23% (3)
Malawi	3.23% (3)
Nepal	5.38% (5)
Nigeria	11.83% (11)
Pakistan	5.38% (5)
Papua New Guinea	3.23% (3)
Rwanda	2.15% (2)
Tanzania	3.23% (3)
Timor L'este	3.23% (3)
Uganda	10.75% (10)
Zambia	3.23% (3)

Respondent profile

Table 3: Length of the relationship	
	%
1 Year or less	3.73% (4)
1-2 years	17.76% (19)
3-4 years	19.63% (21)
5-6 years	14.02% (15)
More than 6 years	44.86% (48)

Table 4: Percentage of respondents who current receive funding from WaterAid	
Yes	No
95.33% (102)	4.67% (5)

Table 5: Status of partnerships with WaterAid	
Status	%
Ongoing	84.91% (90)
Confirmed exit upcoming	6.6% (7)
Don't Know	8.5% (9)

Substantive questions

Table 6: How WaterAid works with respondents					
To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Detractors (0-6)	Passives (7-8)	Promoters (9-10)	NPS 2016	NPS 2014
'WaterAid understands our strategy.'	21.2% (22)	37.5% (39)	41.3% (43)	20	15
'WaterAid has explained when it expects to stop working with us.'	57.2% (48)	21.4% (18)	21.4% (18)	-36	-31
'We understand WaterAid's plans and strategies.'	15.2% (15)	32.3% (32)	52.5% (52)	37	24
'WaterAid involves us in shaping its strategy.'	34% (34)	25% (25)	41% (41)	7	-22
'WaterAid is transparent about how it uses its funds.'	33.3% (33)	22.2% (22)	44.4% (44)	11	16
'WaterAid understands and respects our own vision, values and aspirations.'	25.5% (26)	26.5% (27)	48% (49)	23	N/A
'We feel comfortable approaching WaterAid to discuss any problems we are having.'	21.8% (22)	26.7% (27)	51.5% (52)	30	40
'We feel comfortable questioning WaterAid's understanding or actions if we disagree with them.'	33% (34)	31% (32)	36% (37)	3	9
'WaterAid is a leader in the sector(s) we work in.'	21%	23%	56%	35	38
Average NPS*				13	11

* Does not include line 6 which was not asked in 2014

- The above table shows the NPA breakdown for the 2016 results. It also compares the Net Promoter scores with 2014.
- The highest rated area was for the level of understanding of WaterAid's plans and strategies, where 52.5% were promoters (NP score: 37). This was closely followed by the extent to which WaterAid is seen as a leader in the sector (56% promoters, NP score: 35). These two areas were also highly rated in 2014.
- The lowest rated area was for WaterAid explaining its exit strategy, where 57% are detractors. The NP score (-36) was similar to 2014 (-31).
- Overall, the average NP score has marginally increased over time, although this does not represent a significant change.
- The only area that shows a statistically notable change over time is for the extent to which WaterAid involves partners in shaping its strategy, which increased from NPS -22 in 2014 to 7.

Substantive questions

Table 7: Making improvements				
How likely do you think it is that WaterAid will make changes as a result of your answers in this survey?				
Detractors (0-6)	Passives (7-8)	Promoters (9-10)	**NPS 2016**	NPS 2014
33% (34)	31.1% (32)	35.9% (37)	**3**	3

Table 8: The ultimate question			
How strongly do you recommend WaterAid?			
Detractors (0-6)	Passives (7-8)	Promoters (9-10)	**NPS 2016**
12.5% (13)	32.7% (34)	54.8% (57)	**42**

The above table shows the NP score for what is often called "The Ultimate Question" – the extent to which partners would recommend WaterAid to others. A positive NP score is the target here, with WaterAid's 42 comparing favourably to many other organisations.

Next steps

Some next steps are suggested below, which may be useful for WaterAid to consider.

a   Discuss the report at board level.
b   Discuss the main findings with your own staff and local partners to verify and deepen the analysis and demonstrate that feedback is taken seriously. These " sense-making" dialogues should focus on three main themes: (i) the areas where WaterAid needs improvement; (ii) questions arising from the findings that need more interpretation to understand; and (iii) specific corrective actions.
c   Implement corrective actions identified and agreed by staff and partners. Make sure everyone understands what these corrective actions are.
d   Consider separately the three categories of partners – promoters, passives and detractors – and elaborate specific strategies of engagement with each one of them.
e   Champion a culture of continual improvement, mutual respect and open dialogue with local partners.
f   Discuss whether local partners could collect similar benchmarked feedback from their constituents and use it to report performance. Partners may be able to develop internal benchmarks by comparing feedback scores from different points of service delivery or operational units.
g   Consider developing some common approaches to feedback and facilitating learning between partners.
h   Ask non-responders one simple question about why they did not answer the survey.
i   Consider publishing this feedback report and similar such reports in the future. This can strengthen the links between performance, reporting and funding decisions, creating powerful incentives for improvement. A growing number of the organizations in the benchmark dataset have published their Keystone partner survey reports.

Keystone would be happy to discuss these next steps with you and offer advice and guidance about how to implement them.