WaterAid

WaterAid Programme and Policy Sanitation Conference

24 – 26 October 2007, Putney, London

A WaterAid report

"I have two sisters and three brothers and I make sure the little ones also wash their hands and bathe regularly. I like that we have latrines at school. I do not like going in the bush. There is less sickness in my family now and I want to help see that this does not happen again."

Nankpan Lohtur, 12, Warok, Plateau State, Nigeria

Table of contents

Summary

WaterAid's Programme and Policy Sanitation Conference was held in October 2007, just prior to the official launch of the International Year of Sanitation in November 2007. The conference brought together staff from WaterAid's London office and many of its country programmes, along with external sanitation experts, to discuss how WaterAid's sanitation work could be improved.

The first day of the conference sought to examine why sanitation is important, but also why it is such a challenge.

In terms of importance, effective sanitation was stated as being the single biggest improvement that can be made to people's lives in developing countries. Benefits include significant improvements in health due to the reduction in diarrhoeal diseases, economic benefits, increased school attendance, improved gender relations, environmental benefits and benefits for the disabled.

Despite its importance, sanitation is seldom treated as a political priority and consequently progress towards meeting the Millennium Development Goal target of halving the proportion of people without sanitation by 2015 is significantly off track. Possible explanations for the political neglect of sanitation include the significant costs of sanitation expansion, a lack of knowledge on how to develop sanitation programmes and fragmentation of institutional responsibility for sanitation.

Different approaches to sanitation are suitable for different contexts, therefore a 'one size fits all' solution cannot be prescribed. Many supply side solutions involving provision of subsidised latrines have failed due to not meeting the needs of the population, yet demand side 'sanitation marketing' programmes have also often failed due to lack of adequate market research on what will work in a particular context. Further research is required to fully understand the drivers for sanitation demand. There is a need to develop further expertise on the whole sanitation cycle, particularly in planning how latrines will be emptied. Further development of appropriate solutions for urban contexts and tailoring programmes for the needs of vulnerable groups is also required. The dynamic nature of these activities, as experienced by WaterAid's programmatic work, explains why WaterAid as an organisation has not come to a single solution to the sanitation issue.

WaterAid's sanitation policy principles need to be more clearly defined. The End Water Poverty campaign's principles of defining sanitation as a priority, securing financing for the sector and seeking to overcome institutional framework are a good basis for these principles. However, there was agreement the principles would need to be adapted for the context of each country programme.

WaterAid's sanitation programmes have thus far been predominantly rural. One of the most successful rural approaches is Community-Led Total Sanitation. Participants agreed there was a need to unpack the various elements of this approach to enable country programmes to adopt only those elements suitable for each situation. WaterAid's urban sanitation work has been more piecemeal, due to it being a more recent initiative, but there has been notable success in the social intermediation model in Bangladesh. In some countries WaterAid also plays a role in influencing national sanitation policies, coordinating the sector and undertaking research.

Areas up for debate include whether WaterAid should define shared sanitation facilities as acceptable, whether simplified sewerage is worth investigating and whether it is appropriate to provide hardware subsidies.

Looking forward, possible priorities for WaterAid's sanitation work include:

- Taking the lead at global policy level to:
  - advocate for the importance of waste collection and treatment, and establishing different service levels for different local contexts
  - act as a learning organisation, promoting innovation
- Influencing policy at national and sub-national levels:
  - ensuring WaterAid's policy voice is independent of programme work
  - encouraging flexible and effective regulatory frameworks
  - fostering policy development at local government level
- Defining clear programme design principles including:
  - seeking to understand the local sanitation market and developing tailor-made solutions
  - adopting a marketing approach adapted to local circumstances
  - considering the entire sanitation supply chain
- Tackling the urban challenge:
  - seeking to better understand the urban context
  - offering a brokering role between households and city authorities to improve planning
  - developing strategic relationships with local municipalities
  - building bridges with utilities to understand their plans for expanding sewerage systems
  - working more with small scale independent providers
- Placing more emphasis on small towns, a sector currently overlooked
- Retaining attention on rural areas, focusing on sustaining behaviour change

In order to achieve these priorities, WaterAid's programme level activities will shift a little. Research and learning activities may be developed in the areas of community mobilisation, technology choice, financing and urban issues. Policy and advocacy activities will also be strengthened at all levels. Country programmes outlined the staffing and budgeting implications these developments would require, and the support they would need from WaterAid's headquarters.

It was identified WaterAid in the UK needs to strengthen the community of practice on sanitation. Possible means of doing so include developing the understanding of WaterAid's current sanitation activities, establishing a strong monitoring and evaluation framework, conducting additional research on what impacts on the success of sanitation programmes and building a coherent national/international policy framework that can articulate diversity of approaches.

WaterAid in the UK has committed to reviewing WaterAid's sanitation and hygiene guidelines and producing an updated sanitation strategy, reflective of current thinking and practices.

List of acronyms used in the report

CBOs – Community Based Organisations

CLTS – Community-Led Total Sanitation

CSP – Country Strategic Papers

DFID – Department for International Development (UK Government)

EcoSan – Ecological Sanitation

IOD – International Operations Department (WaterAid)

IRC – International Water and Sanitation Centre

IYS – International Year of Sanitation

IWA – International Water Association

LMDGI – Local Millennium Development Goals Initiative

LSHTM – London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

MDG – Millennium Development Goal

M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation

NGO – Non-governmental organisation

PHAST – Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation

PPED – Public Policy and Education Department (WaterAid)

PSU – Programme Support Unit

SACOSAN – South Asian Conference on Sanitation

SPARC – Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres

SSIP – Small-scale Independent Provider

VERC – Village Education Resource Centre

WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

WEDC – Water Engineering Development Centre

WSUP – Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor

1 Introduction

In the context of the International Year of Sanitation (IYS), which was officially launched on 21 November 2007, WaterAid wished to clearly articulate its policy on sanitation. The Sanitation Conference brought staff from most WaterAid country programmes together with UK staff and selected sanitation experts to share views on how WaterAid could improve its programming and advocacy activities in the sanitation sector.

The conference marked a milestone in the history of the organisation as it was the first time that UK and country programme staff had gathered to specifically discuss sanitation. The event revealed the wealth of experience that has been accumulated in sanitation by WaterAid's country programmes and enabled participants to share this experience and their enthusiasm for the sector.

This report documents the conference proceedings, including external presentations on research, best practice and issues identified as requiring further research.

1.1 Objectives of the conference

The main purpose of the Sanitation Conference was to share knowledge on sanitation in order to identify ways in which WaterAid's sanitation programmes and sanitation policy and advocacy could be optimised. The conference combined external presentations on state-of-the art thinking on sanitation; presentations on WaterAid activities; and debates in plenary sessions and in working groups.

One critical objective was to develop a process for arriving at an organisation-wide understanding of WaterAid's strategy and guidelines for sanitation. WaterAid had previously produced guidelines for its sanitation and hygiene activities following the 'Turning Point' Conference held in Livingstone, Zambia (24 – 26 May 2006). The Sanitation Conference did not discuss those guidelines specifically and did not come up with revised guidelines. Instead, it sought to encourage a cycle of learning between country programme and policy activities and to set up a basis for identifying where such guidelines may be needed. Developing an updated strategy and guidelines on sanitation, which reflect current thinking and practices in the area, remains an urgent priority as outlined at the conference.

1.2 Objectives and format of this report

This report outlines the key topics that were discussed at the conference. It sets out a way forward for the organisation, reflecting the commitments that have been made at country programme and UK levels, as well as the areas where further research and policy development are required. Minutes of the discussions, as well as a film entitled 'Sanitation Matters', were produced and will be made available if there is sufficient demand for them from the organisation.

This report broadly follows the sequence of presentations and discussions at the conference:

- **Section 2** asks why focus should be placed on the sanitation sector and why it is such a challenge

- **Section 3** examines what common principles are currently driving WaterAid practices and what activities have been carried out on the ground. Such activities may (or may not) reflect those common principles and some areas remain up for debate

- **Section 4** sets out what WaterAid aims to do in the sanitation arena, based on the discussions at the conference, both at country programme and headquarters levels

- **Section 5** suggests some tentative conclusions and outlines the immediate next steps

The following annexes are also included:

- **Annex A** contains the conference programme

- **Annex B** includes a list of conference participants

- **Annex C** includes a list of the documentation and resources that were made available to the participants. Those references are available on the WaterAid intranet, in the Resource Centre http://waterworld.wateraid.org and on www.wateraid.net/penweb or from Shamila Jansz (shamilajansz@wateraid.org)

- **Annex D** sets out the work programmes that were developed at regional level in the last working group session. Although these work programmes do not have an official status at this stage (given that they were not approved at the country programme level), they act as a statement of intentions reflecting the lessons learnt and ideas drawn from the conference.

2 Why focus on sanitation?

The sanitation sector is in a state of crisis that needs to be urgently addressed. The IYS provides an excellent opportunity to push the sector to the forefront of international and national political agendas. So far, it has proved to be a difficult challenge because policy messages have yet to be clearly articulated.

The first day of the conference sought to examine why sanitation is important, but also why it is such a challenge.

> **"WaterAid staff at all levels need to think about what they would say if they were with a Minister in the lift for one minute. How could they convey the importance of sanitation and trigger increased emphasis on the sector?"**
> Barbara Frost, Chief Executive, WaterAid

2.1 Why sanitation is important

Effective sanitation is simply the single biggest improvement that can be made to people's lives in developing countries. The benefits of providing sustainable sanitation include:

Health benefits - when sanitation is combined with improvements in hygiene (especially hand washing), it can have significant health benefits, including a reduction in diarrhoeal diseases, intestinal worms and trachoma. According to a study led by Dr Sandy Cairncross at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), latrine installation alone can drive a 35% reduction in diarrhoeal diseases, whilst hand washing with soap can drive a 45% reduction. By contrast, an increase in water quantity and quality would lead to a 20% and 15% reduction respectively.

However, improvements in health are not necessarily the most important benefit or the main trigger of demand for sanitation from the community's point of view. A recent study by the LSHTM, commissioned by WaterAid, undertook a review of existing literature to identify the other, non-health benefits of sanitation (see Box 1 below) that act as key drivers of the demand for sanitation (see Section 2.2. below).

The study's authors found that the non-health benefits of sanitation are little documented and seldom separated from the benefits of providing clean water. This area therefore requires additional research so as to better make the case for sanitation investments. Research should be undertaken by a broader range of institutions and in a wider group of countries than at present. Having access to better facts and figures could help in quantifying non-health benefits, although giving a value to benefits such as an improvement in dignity remains a difficult task.

Box 1 – Non-health benefits of sanitation

A study by Kate McPhedran and Joanna Pearson sought to examine four main types of non-health benefits from sanitation, including:
- the impact on gender relations
- the benefits of school sanitation on enrolment and attendance
- environmental benefits
- the impact on disability.

It found that literature was concentrated on the first two areas and limited in the last two. The impact on gender relations is mainly through an increase in the safety, dignity and empowerment of women.

With regards to school sanitation, evidence is rather scarce. Only one major study was undertaken in Bangladesh in 1994, which found that improved sanitation increased school attendance by 11%. From an anecdotal point of view, however, the benefits are numerous. Although the impact on school enrolment seems limited (as it is usually driven by basic factors such as poverty or culture), the impact on attendance is more significant.

Sanitation can improve the safety of girls in schools (by reducing the risk of sexual harassment) and allows them not to miss school when menstruating. It also improves concentration and learning as children do not have to wait to get home to go to the toilet

---

and it reduces the incidence of worm infestations.

Source: Based on Kate McPhedran and Joanna Pearson's presentation

Economic benefits - some institutions have sought to calculate the economic return on investment in sanitation. WaterAid previously quoted that sanitation brings the single greatest return on investment of any development intervention (roughly $9 for every $1 spent).[1] However, the full range of benefits from sanitation investments still needs to investigated. For example, the potentially significant economic benefits of toilets on tourism in countries like Madagascar or of toilets in public places such as markets or stadiums have yet to be documented.

The participants agreed that WaterAid can play a critical role in developing and sharing knowledge on the benefits of sanitation, through sharing evidence that has emerged at the local level and developing strategic partnerships with research organisations. This will require being more rigorous and pro-active when evaluating the baseline data prior to the introduction of sanitation programmes.

2.2 Why sanitation is a challenge

Despite the importance of sanitation, the sanitation target of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) is the most off-track of all the targets. The aim of halving the proportion of people without sanitation by 2015 is unlikely to be met in most countries. At current rates of progress, the target could be missed by one billion people worldwide. The UN has estimated the cost of not meeting the water and sanitation MDGs at US $38 billion per year, with sanitation accounting for 92% of this value.[2] Sanitation is proving a significant challenge both at policy and programme levels, as discussed below.

Challenges at the policy level

According to WaterAid's policy team, there are several reasons for such chronic neglect:
- Sanitation is usually seen as a symptom of poverty rather than a driver of poverty reduction
- Financing to the sector is insufficient (often less than 10% of the total water budget) and allocated in a non-transparent and unpredictable way
- The sector is usually fragmented from an institutional point of view, with responsibilities being split between several (often competing) ministries (such as the Ministry of Water, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Environment)
- Responsibilities for service delivery are often allocated to local governments when they may not have the financial means to carry out their responsibilities. This often results in a lack of political will and institutional confusion

Many governments (both at local and national levels) have been struggling to develop their policies and practices in the sector. WaterAid, in its policy role, needs to understand what the reasons for such failures might be. Possible explanations are as follows:

---

[1] WaterAid, 'The State of the World's Toilets 2007', Report 2.
[2] WaterAid, *ibid*.

The costs of meeting sanitation targets are significant

Some governments are starting to rise to the challenge and have adopted clear targets for sanitation investments. However, the cost of meeting those targets is so daunting that it may appear unachievable. For example, the Ministry of Health in Tanzania has declared that there should be one latrine for every 25 children in education, when the current reality is closer to one latrine for 100 children. Reaching such a target would represent a significant financial undertaking given the rates at which new schools need to be built to keep up with population growth. Mobilising financial resources for the sector will require high level political support, both at the levels of donors and recipient governments.

When funds are available, how to spend them is not always clear

Given the lack of a clear vision for the sector and a lack of capacity, national and local governments often do not have a clear idea about what constitutes sanitation projects that are worth investing in. As a result, even if the funds have been allocated and are available (as in the case with transfers to local governments in Tanzania), local governments would not know what to do with these funds, which then risk remaining unspent or diverted to other uses.

Institutional fragmentation often results in inappropriate planning

At the national and municipal levels, there is often poor coordination and a lack of leadership. Decentralisation of responsibilities for sanitation is often not effective or complete, with insufficient financial means and inadequate human resources transferred to local governments. When municipalities are in charge of local sanitation planning, they have usually been unable to develop such plans effectively, as underlined by Darren Saywell (see Box 2).

Box 2 - Working with local governments to improve sanitation planning

At city level, conventional approaches to planning seem to fail because the objectives of householders do not match those of city planners, the plans lack flexibility or are based on unrealistic assessments of management capacities. There is usually *'...a mismatch between technical proposals and institutional realities...'.*

Following the Kyoto conference, the International Water Association (IWA) established a taskforce called Sanitation 21 that proposed an alternative framework to planning sanitation investments, which could help overcome some of these issues. The framework aims to be a simplified representation of a complex planning process and to help build bridges between institutional analysis and technical planning. The framework is based on three basic steps:
1. To understand the context and the institutional realities across the city (whereas households may be motivated by cleanliness and convenience to access sanitation, city planners would be more concerned with health, environment, economic development or utility finance)
2. To understand how a sanitation system relates to the broader city context.
3. To check whether the existing system can work across all domains of the city, especially depending on the availability of skills, manpower, time, financing or technical tools. If not, ascertain how the gaps in coverage could be filled

---

Source: Based on Darren Saywell's presentation, International Water Association (IWA)

Challenges at programme level

WaterAid has yet to come up with a shared vision of what does and does not work in its sanitation programmes. This is partly due to the complexity of the sector. Some of the key implementation challenges for country programmes are outlined below:

One size does not fit all

Experience has shown that there is no one standard solution that can be easily rolled out to achieve quick results and meet targets. It is difficult to pinpoint what makes a programme effective and 'one size certainly does not fit all'. What works in rural communities in South Asia, such as the well-publicised Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach (see Box 7), may not be transferable to rural communities in East Africa where the population is much more dispersed, with lower community cohesiveness, or to urban slums such as Kibera in Nairobi, Kenya.

Supply side solutions have failed and demand-led programmes are difficult to get right

Top-down supply-side programmes, under which governments, international agencies or NGOs have run massive programmes to install subsidised latrines, have often failed. This is mainly because many latrines did not meet the needs of the population, so they were not used and fell into disrepair. As Richard Franceys of Cranfield University noted, even where emphasis was placed on adopting a demand-side approach and using 'sanitation marketing' methods, results have been disappointing.

Franceys cited a project where round latrine slabs were developed and marketed so that they could be easily rolled down the street. This design failed to appeal to local populations because latrines were traditionally considered as a status symbol, and those who were prepared to invest in a latrine did not want to be seen on the street pushing them around. Too often the approach is sound but implementation is poor: the failure of the round slabs does not mean market-based approaches will always fail, but that in this case the market research was inadequate.

Demand for sanitation is not well expressed or understood

Even though demand for sanitation is strong, it is not always met because the demand is not adequately expressed or the supply market does not function adequately. Drivers for demand are sometimes unexpected. As Barbara Frost noted, a key driver for increasing the use of soap in the UK was the emphasis on beauty rather than on personal hygiene. For women, the increase in dignity and respect that comes with defecating in private is often invaluable and a much stronger driver for sanitation demand than hygiene.

In addition, drivers for demand vary from one user group to another and the process to move from an interest in sanitation to an actual investment is a complicated one, as the model developed by Beth Scott of the LSHTM shows (see Box 3).

Box 3 - Drivers of sanitation demand: moving from intention to choice

The LSHTM developed a behavioural model for understanding the steps households took to acquire latrines in developing countries with low sanitation coverage. The development of this model was based on two observations:

---

1. The majority of toilets are built by householders themselves, but at a rate which is too slow to keep up with population growth, particularly in Africa (100 million Africans gained access to sanitation between 1990 and 2000, but the number of people without access in the region increased by 70 million during the same period).

2. Models to predict demand for latrines based on willingness-to-pay studies (which are used to prepare externally-funded projects) tend to greatly over-estimate demand and fail to take into account social realities. Beth gave the example of a traditional healer in Benin who had decided to build a latrine but took three years before actually doing so. He finally build it when a promotional campaign told him about the options and a couple of households in the village had built latrines, so he could see the quality of the product and knew who could build latrines. The main constraints he faced in the process were not financial but linked to a lack of information, technical complexity and an overall lack of confidence about the project.

The LSHTM model seeks to investigate how people who have expressed a preference to build a toilet move to setting out their intention and finally choosing to build a one. The model sets out to predict patterns of demand more effectively and target interventions on the segments that are most likely to move from intention to choice. In Ghana, for example, it was found that only 30% of those who did not have a latrine expressed an intention to build one, and of those, only 1 in 6 finally managed to carry through their intention.

The study team concluded that to move more people from preference to choice, it is necessary to develop new products (such as packages better suited to dense urban areas), new financing mechanisms (such as access to credit, or payment by instalments) and to generate awareness about these new products and financing mechanisms. Another key factor is to target landlords, and potentially to make them legally responsible for latrine building (with associated penalties for failure to do so, as in the colonial era).

Source: Based on the presentation by Mimi Jenkins and Beth Scott, LSHTM

Sustainable sanitation does not stop at building latrines and the entire sanitation cycle needs to be considered

As Steven Sugden from the LSHTM emphasised, latrines cannot be used when the pit is full and it is therefore wrong to assume that everyone who has access to a latrine is effectively 'covered'. Latrine building programmes have often failed to consider what happens when the pit fills up. Pit-emptying activities need to be well planned, accessible and affordable. Designated waste collection and treatment points need to be clearly defined by municipal governments, with charging policies and penalty systems established that incentivise pit-emptiers to use the collection points, rather than unsafely dump their waste. Suitable technologies and training should also be made available to local private businesses seeking to invest in this area (see Box 4).

Box 4 - Making pit-emptying activities attractive and sustainable

The sustainability of pit-emptying activities heavily depends on the availability of suitable technologies. In many cases, manual emptying is carried out by householders or the 'shit man', with associated health and environmental risks (as the sludge is usually dumped on the street nearby). The LSHTM has worked, in association with WaterAid in many

instances, to develop pit-emptying pumps and vehicles that can access unplanned areas and form the basis for setting up small businesses, including in Maputo (Mozambique), Dhaka (Bangladesh) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania).

Beyond the development of suitable technologies, support to pit-emptying activities should seek to remove constraints in terms of access to finance and to make those activities more economically viable (for example, by reducing initial capital costs below US$200 per machine, providing training in business skills and increasing the number of collection points so as to reduce the length of the average trip to dispose of the waste).

Source: Based on the presentation by Steven Sugden, LSHTM

Sanitation challenges differ between urban and rural areas

WaterAid's experience has predominantly, although not exclusively, been in rural areas. This experience may not translate well into urban environments, where community cohesion is usually weaker, space is a real constraint and confused land tenure make it more difficult for households to invest in their own sanitation solutions. Whereas sanitation is chiefly a social and cultural issue in rural areas, it becomes more of an infrastructure issue in urban areas.

In urban environments, negotiating with local governments is more important, and considerably trickier as one needs to take account of local politics. However, given the patterns of population growth at a global level, the key challenge for sanitation is going to be in urban areas and particularly in unplanned areas. In the year 2007 global urban population outgrew rural population for the first time, and the population living in urban slums worldwide is predicted to rise from one billion in 2000 to 1.5 billion in 2020. Sanitation interventions need to be developed with a basic understanding of the patterns of urban growth, as these can vary considerably (see Box 5).

Box 5 - How sanitation solutions can respond to city growth

In cities where there is no physical constraint on spatial growth, peri-urban areas can expand and remain at relatively low densities. In such cases, latrines can be moved to a new location when they fill up, as can be done in rural areas. In most cities, however, there are physical constraints to growth. When existing urban areas get denser, the space to build a latrine decreases (as landlords prefer to add rooms rather than to build latrines), pressure on existing latrines increases, conventional sewers become difficult to lay, tankers cannot gain entry to empty pits and groundwater gets polluted.

In cities with high population densities, simplified sewerage may be more appropriate and more economical than pit latrines (as argued by Duncan Mara, see Box 9), except when population densities are so high that community block toilets are the only practical solution (see Box 10). In either case, there is still a need for a workable city-level collection and disposal system that creates the right incentives for waste to be properly collected and treated.

Source: Based on the presentation by Steven Sugden, LSHTM and additional presentations.

Promoting equity of access to sanitation is an additional challenge

WaterAid stresses access equity as a key principle for its activities. When designing programmes, it is therefore important to think of those for whom specific modes of access

may need to be included, such as young children, sick people, the elderly or the disabled. It is often cheaper to include specific solutions for these groups up-front in programme design rather than add these at a later stage, and the measures can have significant benefits. For example, a study quoted by Kate McPhedran and Joanna Pearson from the LSHTM found that installing handrails in the latrines of a school in Kenya contributed towards increased school enrolment of disabled children. But developing such programmes requires technical innovations and would inevitably generate additional costs.

3 WaterAid's policy principles and current practices

Faced with such challenges, WaterAid has developed broad policy principles for the sanitation sector. It has also initiated a series of programmes at country level, which have usually been developed in an ad hoc manner to respond to local needs and may or may not reflect such principles. As the discussions at the conference showed, some areas remain up for debate and would warrant the development of more specific policy principles and guidelines within the organisation.

3.1 WaterAid's policy principles

WaterAid has played a critical role in leading the End Water Poverty campaign.[3] A key output of this campaign was to agree on a set of principles to guide interventions in the sanitation sector (see Box 6). The IYS provides an invaluable opportunity to promote those messages, with events such as EASAN (East Asia Ministerial Conference on Sanitation and Hygiene) in November 2007, AfricaSan in February 2008 and the G8 Summit focused on environmental issues in June 2008.

Box 6 – The End Water Poverty campaign's guiding principles

Defining sanitation as a priority – the impact of sanitation on other MDGs and pro-poor economic growth should be fully recognised. The campaign is keen *not* to promote sanitation as a separate issue (such as HIV), but to show how one dollar spent on sanitation can lead to benefits in other sectors such as health and education.

Securing financing – 'no country plan should fail for lack of finance'. Recipient governments should present costed and credible plans to fulfil their duties in the sanitation sector, whilst donors should fill any financing gap. Separate budget lines at the national level should enable scrutiny and oversight.

Overcoming institutional fragmentation – one Global Action Plan should be developed to assert the integral role of sanitation in development, with a Global Task Force established to review progress, analyse systemic bottlenecks and propose solutions. At the national level, a single coordinating body should be established to develop a single plan and monitoring framework. In addition, policy communities of domestic stakeholders should be set up to carry out diagnostic activities and improve planning and monitoring capacities.

---

[3] See http://www.endwaterpoverty.org

The End Water Poverty principles could provide an invaluable basis for WaterAid's own actions. However, many questions remain unresolved, such as what constitutes 'good sanitation' or where financing, provided it is available, should ultimately go. Participants also pointed out that these principles would need to be adapted to each country's context. For example, in some countries it might not be possible to create a single coordinating body, and sector coordination may need to be interpreted in a more flexible way, especially when decentralisation has been implemented. However, it was clearly agreed there was a need to identify a political champion for the sector, such as has happened in Mali, where the President of the Republic has become a sanitation champion, greatly helping the advancement of the sector.

The role of policy communities should be well defined so as to not increase fragmentation, which further impedes the achievement of sanitation targets. Careful consideration of coordination of policy communities can prevent potential confusions, for example about coverage figures, which results in disagreement about the size of the challenge and the financing requirements to meet the MDGs.

3.2 Current practices

WaterAid has traditionally focused on the rural sanitation and water sectors. Recognising the importance of the urban sanitation challenge, several country programmes have developed sanitation components in urban areas, sometimes by bringing the lessons learnt from their rural programmes. This has yielded mixed results, given the different challenges in the two types of area. Country programmes have also placed emphasis, with varying success, on influencing policy at the local and national level.

Below we give an introduction to the main types of activities currently undertaken at country programme level. Additional detail is contained in the documents prepared for the conference (see Annex C for a full list). Given the wealth of experiences represented and the unevenness in the way these are documented, we can only give examples of practices at this stage rather than a comprehensive panorama (which is still to be drawn up, as mentioned in Section 4.2).

WaterAid's sanitation activities in the rural sector

WaterAid conducts sanitation programmes at the community level in rural areas in all of its country programmes except Pakistan. An approach that has proved to be particularly successful in recent years is what is commonly referred to Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS - see Box 7).

Box 7 - Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)

The CLTS approach was first tested by VERC (Village Education Resource Centre) in 1999 in rural Bangladesh, under the leadership of Kamal Kar. The approach relies on intensive facilitation at community level to stop open defecation in the entire community. It uses Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) methods to analyse the sanitation profile in the community, including the extent of open defecation and the spread of faecal-oral

---

contamination. The approach seeks to provoke powerful emotions such as disgust and shame, and to use humour and self-analysis to trigger a collective decision to build and use latrines, without external hardware subsidies.

It has been used in numerous countries with positive results, including in Asia (Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Cambodia, Nepal, Pakistan and others), Africa (in Egypt, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Ethiopia and Tanzania by Plan International and Nigeria and Ethiopia by WaterAid) as well as in some Latin American countries (Bolivia).

Success factors include the existence of a strong community spirit (with natural champions), natural conditions that make digging latrines relatively easy and harmless for the natural environment, and the absence of hardware subsidy programmes. Risks include the impact on water quality, especially when low-cost technologies are used. The ongoing research initiated by the Institute of Development Studies (and funded by DFID) is investigating CLTS programmes on the ground and seeks to better understand factors of success and failure.

Source: Based on the presentation by Lyla Mehta. See more information at:
www.livelihoods.org/hot_topics/CLTS.html

Several WaterAid programmes have adopted the CLTS approach, including Bangladesh, Nepal, Nigeria and Ethiopia (Burkina Faso has recently started training on the CLTS approach). Sharing of experiences between country programmes led to successful programme development, particularly following a field visit by Nigeria country programme staff to Bangladesh (see Box 8).

Box 8 - WaterAid's experience in adapting the CLTS approach in rural Nigeria

WaterAid's Nigeria country programme decided to try CLTS because previous subsidised latrine programmes had failed due to poor take-up rates. Following a study visit by WaterAid Nigeria's staff to Bangladesh in October 2004, the first pilot project was launched in July 2005. In the face of its success, a second expanded project was initiated in January 2007. A comprehensive review in July 2007 found that the CLTS approach had worked extremely well. WaterAid recommended that CLTS be included in the national sanitation policy, as the national sanitation implementation methodology.

CLTS in Nigeria relies extensively on encouraging the sense of prestige associated with latrine ownership, which was found to be a much more powerful lever than shame associated with open defecation (which was a very important factor in Bangladesh). The project also included support to supply-side markets, with the establishment of sani centres, the training of latrine artisans and building of demonstration latrine slabs. It was found that CLTS works particularly well when training and monitoring are carried out on a regular basis; when there are no competing programmes providing subsidies and when a reward is provided at community level. It has been more successful in the north of the country, where space for open defecation is limited (as opposed to the south where people can walk out into the forest to defecate). There are plans to test (and adapt) the approach in urban slums as well.

Source: Based on the presentation by Ada Oko-Williams, WaterAid Nigeria.

All participants agreed that it is important to 'unpack' the CLTS approach and to break it down into key elements, such as relying on community participation, the absence of

hardware subsidies and not being prescriptive in terms of technological solution. This can help country programmes to adopt the elements that work without necessarily having to import the whole package. Some pointed to the risk of stigmatisation associated with the 'walk of shame' and other similar methods placing emphasis on shaming those practicing open defecation, which may work against the interests of the poor and may not be culturally sensitive. Lyla Mehta indicated that this can be counterbalanced through strong community cohesion and the provision of limited subsidies to the poorest in certain circumstances.

As with all new approaches, there is also a danger of myth generation. CLTS may not work everywhere: in particular, there is limited experience of using CLTS in urban areas, due largely to the difficulties of relying on community participation and the lack of space for building individual latrines.

WaterAid's activities in urban areas

In the urban sector, WaterAid's sanitation interventions have been more piecemeal, triggered by collaboration with specific partners. For example, they have sought to support latrine emptying services in Maputo (Mozambique), the lack of which were identified as a key stumbling block for sustainable sanitation.

In Bangladesh, WaterAid's partners have pioneered the 'social intermediation model', whereby an NGO acts as a guarantor to a community which lacks official land tenure so that they can obtain an official, legal connection to both water and sewerage services. WaterAid's partners then support communities in constructing and managing community 'sanitary blocks', which include bathing and toilet facilities as well as access to water. WaterAid is also developing a new approach to services for slums in Dhaka and other cities, and participates in a forum with other actors (NGOs and donors) to collaborate with the utility in this effort. This effort not only requires attention to technical details but raises issues of legal rights to services.

WaterAid's activities at national policy level

In some countries, WaterAid is heavily involved in influencing national sanitation policies and coordinating the sanitation sector. In many cases intervening in policy interventions, such as participating in joint sector reviews, ensuring joined-up planning or lobbying in favour of a sanitation budget line has brought considerably greater benefits than undertaking small projects.

In Tanzania, WaterAid is working to bring players in the sanitation sector together, especially on the NGO side within cities such as Dar es Salaam or at national level. WaterAid in Tanzania is an active participant of the sanitation and hygiene thematic working group led by the Ministry of Water and the sanitation forum under the Ministry of Health. (As in many countries, the fact that there are two stakeholder groups led by different Ministries is part of the issue highlighting institutional fragmentation and lack of clear leadership for the sector.) WaterAid has also tried to give ideas to local governments in Tanzania about how they can spend allocated budget lines, as they often struggle to know what to do with such funds.

In Ethiopia, WaterAid is involved in the WASH forum, which involves all sector actors, the media and some leading personalities such as artists and musicians. In Mali, WaterAid

took the lead in a civil society movement based on the End Water Poverty campaign. Where WaterAid is involved in national level policy discussions such as this, it is important to ensure everyone is clear this work is separate from work undertaken with local governments at the programme level, so as not to confuse roles.

WaterAid's country programmes are also undertaking some research activities. In Tanzania, for example, the country programme has undertaken a toilet attribute study to better understand what motivates people to acquire a toilet and what features they look for in such a facility.

3.3 Areas for debate

The conference proved an excellent forum to trigger debate about areas where practices may differ from one country programme to the next and where clearer overall guidance may be required. A number of questions emerged which were 'posted' rather than resolved, on the principle that the conference was not the appropriate forum to reach a conclusion on such complex issues. The following list constitutes a good starting point for the elaboration of more detailed guiding principles for WaterAid's actions. It deals with the type of services that should be provided and the technologies and financing strategies that can be used to deliver such service standards.

Which standard of service should be offered in order to maximise the chances of success whilst ensuring equity and appropriate targeting of poor people?
Country programmes offer a broad range of service standards, ranging from individual latrines and household sewer connections to shared toilets, community-managed toilet/ sanitary blocks and public toilets in schools or marketplaces. These toilets may or may not be enhanced with bathing and washing facilities. Offering a range of service standards is of course fundamental to the concept of responding to demand, but this raises the question of whether WaterAid should align its programmes to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme standards of adequate sanitation (which exclude shared toilets) or seek to define its own.

For example, wherever possible, WaterAid in India works on the basis of non-shared latrines, based on the principle that even the poorest of the poor have the right to expect such a minimum level of service. Other NGOs in India, such as SPARC, have supported communities to develop shared community-managed latrines in slum improvement programmes (see Box 9), on the grounds that this is a standard of service that the poor can afford and which they have chosen. They further argue that this approach defends the community against 'gentrification' of the area whereby landlords put rents up after individual latrines have been built, making the area unaffordable for the poor, even though it was they who had been targeted by the latrine-building programme in the first place. Under CLTS-type programmes the focus is on stopping open defecation by any sanitary method, including shallow pits and shared latrines.

Box 9 - Making community toilets work in India

SPARC (Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres) is an NGO based in Mumbai, which works with two CBOs: the National Slum Dwellers Federation and Mahila Milan (Women Together, a decentralised network of women collectives organising women who live in slums and on pavements). These two CBOS work in 76

---

cities throughout India on issues of urban poverty, housing and infrastructure and are part of Shack Dwellers International (SDI).

SPARC has long been a campaigner for sanitation services for the urban poor, based on the observation that municipally-led sanitation is hardly available in slums. Where available, community toilet blocks are not maintained and fall into disrepair after six months to a year. This is because the quality of construction is poor and municipal staff, who in theory are in charge of managing and maintaining them, are not interested and not accountable to anybody. Communities are generally not consulted or involved in the planning and construction process. Even though such facilities are supposed to be free, they tend not to work.

In Pune (a satellite town near Mumbai), SPARC initiated a joint effort with the municipality to develop working public toilets. The municipal commissioner was a clear champion of the project, which helped considerably. The municipality provided the land, initial capital costs, water and electricity for free, whereas local NGOS and CBOs (selected via a tender process) were responsible for the design, construction and maintenance of the facilities. This collaborative effort led to the construction of 400 toilet blocks in Pune in two years, each with 20 seats, serving more than 50 people per seat per day.

To fund operation and maintenance costs, each family pays 25 to 30 rupees per month, irrespective of the number of people in the family and passers-by pay one rupee per use, which significantly contributes to the economic viability of the whole programme. A caretaker family lives on site for free, and gets free water and electricity, as well as a salary paid by the community.

Only the poor use such facilities (as others use their own private toilets) and the toilet blocks include separate children toilets. As a result, this project was deemed to clearly target the poor. It also demonstrated the importance of partnerships between local governments and the community sector. This project design was later adopted in Mumbai, with 300 toilet blocks built. The Government of India subsequently decided to allocate additional resources to toilet blocks in slums (with a 50% capital cost subsidy).

Source: based on the presentation by Sundar Burra, SPARC, Mumbai, India.

Therefore, a debate on the appropriate standard of service still needs to be held within the organisation. In several countries, including Ethiopia and Bangladesh, shared latrines are seen as an appropriate service standard for WaterAid's programmes, on the condition that they are well managed and financed sustainably, with a strong community management system. In some areas, people are so poor or their land tenure is so ambiguous that shared community-managed toilets are the only viable solution. In other areas, the provision of shared community toilets would not be deemed sufficient and other washing and bathing facilities would need to be provided in conjunction to the make the whole block financially viable. Making community facilities open to the general public on a pay-to-use basis can also improve the financial viability of community services (in appropriate locations).

To define appropriate levels of service for sanitation, a clearer distinction between community, public and institutional sanitation facilities should be drawn. Whereas it may be satisfactory to have facilities shared by a group of families, public facilities are often not seen as appropriate, especially for children or disabled people and community

members may struggle to pay on a per-use basis, preferring other more appropriate payment regimes.

Similar questions apply to broader programme design. In some cases, such as in Madagascar, country programmes have chosen to target the middle and upper classes in the first place, so as to develop the image of sanitation as a prestige attribute and also help with the establishment of local sanitation businesses such as pit emptiers or sanimarts. As mentioned in Box 3, many people choose to build a latrine because they observe that others have done it before them - these are referred to as 'early adopters' or 'first movers' - and that they have a clean and affordable system which is pleasant to use.

In order to trigger a demonstration effect, it may be necessary to start by focusing on the higher end of the market, on those who can afford to invest in a latrine or are able to take more risks, rather than to concentrate straight away on the poorest segment of the population. In addition, one should not lose sight of the fact that 'sanitation is a business' and it is often a good idea to establish sanitation providers, such as pit emptiers or sanimarts, as a profitable business before requiring them or giving incentives to them to serve the poor (which can be done via subsidies). WaterAid may therefore need to develop strategic approaches, whereby they support the highest segment in the first instance as long as a clear strategy is in place to reach the poor at a later stage (or simultaneously). In Mali, for example, WaterAid helped with the establishment of integrated sanimarkets and enabled the poorest to pay by instalments.

Which technologies can be used to reach the poor and keep costs down?
Country programmes have adopted a wide range of technologies, mostly related to on-site sanitation solutions. Other technologies, such as simplified sewerage (see Box 10), may provide an important way forward and WaterAid still has a lot to learn in terms of evaluating the suitability of such approaches.

Box 10 - Urban areas: is simplified sewerage a solution?

Simplified sewerage (also called condominial or shallow sewerage) was initially developed in Brazil in the late 1980s as a way to reduce the costs of expanding sewerage in unplanned areas. It has been used in many areas of the world, including in Bolivia, Pakistan and India. In Brazil, simplified sewerage has become the norm and is commonly used, including in the most affluent districts of the capital Brasilia. Simplified sewerage can be particularly beneficial in high density urban areas where there is no space for on-site sanitation.

Simplified sewerage is based on an innovative engineering design which aims at reducing the length, diameter and depth of the network required by routing the distribution pipes across pavements and/or backyards. The sewers are laid inside the block rather than under the street: given that wastewater is usually generated at the back of house, the house connections can be shorter and at a shallower depth.This also means that they can go in unplanned areas. A common use of small bore sewers is when a community takes a single connection to the network, at least initially.

In some cases, community participation is sought to build the sewerage networks at the local level, but this is by no means an integral part of the design. Such sewers can also work without a household water connection (as it was done in a small pilot project in Karachi, Pakistan), with people getting water by the bucket although most of the better

---

known examples have been installed in locations with household water connections.

In the case of Natal (North East Brazil), simplified sewerage was cheaper than on-site sanitation when population densities were above 160 people/ hectare and it was also about 60% of the cost of conventional sewerage per connection (at US$56 per connection in 1997). Because of the reduced costs, extended use of simplified sewerage is likely to be critical to meeting the MDGs.

*Source: Based on the presentation by Duncan Mara, **School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds.** See http://www.personal.leeds.ac.uk/~cen6ddm/simpsew for more information.*

Participants expressed doubts about whether such technology would be applicable in urban areas with relatively low population density, such as in West African cities where on-site sanitation is a more economical solution, or in areas with densities so high that there is no space for services such as in the slums of Kibera in Nairobi, Kenya. Sewers may also be difficult to lay in rocky terrains or in flood-prone areas, although this is not impossible if the sewers are over-ground or imaginative design is used.

All agreed that WaterAid should develop its knowledge of the technology and be pro-active about evaluating where it may be applicable. If WaterAid deemed it was appropriate, it could also lobby local and national governments to adopt this kind of system and modify national design codes, which tend to be inappropriate because they are directly copied from developed countries' codes.

How can programmes be financed and what role should subsidies play?

Subsidies are being provided by country programmes (or their partner organisations) either in the form of software subsidies for hygiene promotion, community mobilisation or training activities, or hardware subsidies for the facilities themselves. Hardware subsidies have been increasingly discredited in the sanitation community due to the failure of numerous programmes due to theft, over-inflated design, over-inflated costs, targets leading to unwanted latrines or patronage leading to latrines going to the wealthiest. Evidence also suggests that subsidised supply-driven programmes crowd out household investment and small private providers - households wait to access the subsidised service and trained artisans are drawn away from the private sector to work on the government programme.

An alternative is to use subsidies to create demand for sanitation rather than to pay for sanitation facilities. This is based on principles such as 'subsidise promotion, not production' or 'only subsidise that for which nobody else will pay'. However, some participants argued that given that the costs of sanitation facilities can be substantial, particularly for poor households, subsidies for the facilities themselves may also be needed in order to reach the very poor. Others drew a different conclusion, suggesting that in such cases support is needed for alternative lower-cost approaches as has been seen in the CLTS programmes in Bangladesh, where very low cost technologies and cross-subsidies for the poorest households have been designed by communities themselves.

There is a discrepancy in practices regarding hardware subsidies amongst WaterAid country programmes: some, including Zambia, rely on hardware subsidies for latrines whereas others, including Bangladesh and Nigeria, do not and believe them to be counter-productive.

Additional research into the feasibility of well-designed and well-targeted hardware subsidies is therefore required, in order to come up with organisation-wide policy recommendations regarding the most appropriate financing strategies. These could include other financing mechanisms such as micro-credit or revolving funds. One key principle is to keep an open mind on subsidies and to accept that whatever financing is required to address the identified bottleneck should be provided. It is important to remain flexible about approaches such as CLTS. There may be a case for subsidies, considering that they have fuelled the expansion of sanitation services in the developed world, but one has to examine the ways in which they can be made to work effectively.

4 Looking forward

Participants reflected on what WaterAid's future role in the sanitation sector could be and what specific actions should be undertaken to develop its thinking, strategy and practices in the sanitation sector, at headquarters and country programme levels.

4.1 What should WaterAid's role be in the sanitation sector?

As Henry Northover, head of PPED at WaterAid in the UK, emphasised, "WaterAid is seriously committed to the vision of universal access to water and sanitation". If it was to work towards this goal by itself, however, "it would take 2000 years". Serious policy changes need to take place if this dream is to become a reality. WaterAid should seek to define what such changes are and to influence the relevant institutions to bring them about. As with all actions undertaken by WaterAid, the organisation also needs to define which partners to work with, depending on what it wants to achieve.

Given the complexity of the sector, it is important to try and break down such tasks into small, manageable elements and to define priorities so that the smallest efforts can yield the biggest improvements. Below, we outline some of the principles that were voiced at the conference and could form the basis for defining a coherent statement of where WaterAid stands in the sanitation sector.

Taking the lead at the global policy level

WaterAid should seek to develop a clear vision beyond the MDGs
As mentioned above, the emphasis on access (defined in a relatively static and narrow way), which underlines the MDGs, is not always conducive to designing sustainable sanitation programmes that meet the needs of the population. The MDGs give incentives to governments and non-profit organisations to adopt 'target-driven' approaches, focused on the number of toilets built. In certain circumstances, this can prove unsustainable, if waste collection and treatment activities are not adequately thought through, and wasteful, if substantial hardware subsidies are provided for toilets that are over-designed and unaffordable.

WaterAid should help the entire sanitation community to move beyond just providing access ('it's not all about toilets') to a more universal vision, including hygiene promotion, school sanitation and sanitation for disabled people. The organisation should also encourage disaggregated assessment of coverage levels and may want to encourage

the development of new coverage indicators. The problem with the current binary system - with people being either 'covered' or 'not covered' - is that this system does not adequately reflect the possibility of having different service levels adapted to local circumstances. A more appropriate indicator may be to examine whether there is open defecation or not.

WaterAid should act as a learning organisation, promoting innovation and scaling up of such innovations

The conference clearly showed that we are far from having all the answers to the challenges raised in the sanitation sector. WaterAid should constantly seek to develop, test and implement new approaches or to support partners in doing so. As Barbara Frost stated, WaterAid should remain a learning organisation and have the ability to promote tried and tested innovations in the global policy arena so as to achieve scaling-up through the innovations being taken up by international organisations or national governments. For example, WaterAid could experiment with the simplified sewerage approach and if results are positive, promote such technology more actively. It could also seek to bring more private sector financing or private donors into the sector, which may be more receptive to innovative financing approaches and technologies.

Influencing policy at the national and sub-national levels

WaterAid needs to act as an independent voice at the national policy level

Several country programmes have already adopted this approach, by taking part in policy fora to discuss national sanitation policies and carrying out advocacy activities. Maintaining independence can prove a difficult balancing act in some cases, especially if WaterAid is working as a partner with national governments on implementation programmes.

WaterAid should seek to influence policy at the national level

WaterAid should lobby on broad policy decisions, for example, by making the case for sanitation investments to call for more resources being allocated to the sector, or on more specific topics, such as technology choice. For example, it could lobby at national level for a modification of technical standards when they are deemed too restrictive. For example, in Ghana national standards only allow Ventilated Improved Pit (VIP) latrines, leaving aside a broad array of perfectly acceptable technical solutions.

WaterAid should encourage flexible and effective regulatory frameworks, which can allow different levels of service or different types of providers, including small-scale independent providers (SSIPs) and encourage national policies to be inclusive (not just focused on latrinisation). Finally, it should encourage increases in the sector's financial allocations. This was compared to 'shifting the tanker' given how difficult this can be. Indeed, ministries usually get funding allocations based on the previous year allocation rather than in a way that reflects the true financial needs of a sector.

WaterAid should foster policy development at the local government level

At the local level, sanitation is often a forgotten sector and at the bottom of over-loaded governments' priorities. WaterAid should push for the creation of sanitation units at local government level, which would have processes and structures in place for planning and implementation of sanitation programmes. It should encourage a clear allocation of roles and responsibilities and the mobilisation of local funds for sanitation. WaterAid should encourage the creation of city-wide policy fora to support such processes.

Defining clear programme design principles

Programme design principles were articulated at the conference, even if they are yet to be clearly outlined in a policy document, as follows:

WaterAid should seek to understand the local sanitation market and develop tailor-made solutions

The organisation as a whole should not develop and apply a single model in terms of technologies used or financing. Instead, it should adapt successful practices from one area to the local circumstances of another, as was done with CLTS in Nigeria, (see Box 8). WaterAid should develop a range of simple and affordable technological solutions.

It should also be more responsive to demand, so as to understand the motivations and demands of different groups of people. The demand model developed by the LSHTM (see Box 3) provides an interesting methodology that WaterAid could test further in its programmes, in order to disaggregate the market into several groups based on a) who wants what type of service and b) how close and able people are to make the step to build a latrine so as to develop suitable strategies to help them do so.

WaterAid should adopt a marketing approach and adapt the product to local circumstances

Even though sanitation marketing has been tried many times (and has often failed), there may be room for being more imaginative about sanitation marketing, taking lessons from other sectors such as the mobile telephone sector, where demand has literally exploded in the last few years, or using advertising in a more aggressive or smarter way.

The entire sanitation supply chain should be considered

When designing a programme, WaterAid should examine the supply chain, ie ranging from the actual toilet, to collection, treatment and disposal, in order to understand where the blockages are and what can be done to lift them. For example, if the market for pit emptiers is insufficiently developed, it may be necessary to act at this level (see Box 4). However, WaterAid cannot work in all areas by itself. Given its limited resources and the size of the required investments, there is no point in WaterAid getting involved in activities such as wastewater treatment. Instead, it needs to develop strategic alliances and lobby for the allocation of government resources to treatment activities. What remains critical is a specific definition of which parts of the sanitation cycle the organisation should get involved in.

Tackling the urban challenge

WaterAid should seek to better understand the urban context

In urban areas short term political cycles, corruption, lack of accountability and the land market, amongst other factors, all impact on the sanitation sector. This means WaterAid needs to link in with research and learning networks (for institutional and policy mapping) and use that information in advocacy to explain what the problems are and propose potential solutions. It should seek to understand and manage the relationships between city councils and utilities, as they may each have their own planning framework for the development of the city's sanitation system.

WaterAid can build on its understanding of community management to offer a brokering role in the urban context

As Duncan Mara stated, city planners should be able to decide where sewers can be built and where on-site sanitation is the solution. But as Barbara Evans pointed out, "bolting the collection and treatment part and the community part together" is far from being trivial and needs to be carefully planned. Cities may be politically reluctant or technically ill-equipped to work with community projects, while NGOs working with communities may lack an understanding of the wider urban system.

Through its day-to-day activities, WaterAid is directly in touch with the household and community levels: one area where it could usefully contribute is by playing a brokering role with city planners and other institutional groups, in order to make the link between household and city priorities and improve the planning process, as recommended in Box 2.

WaterAid should develop strategic relationships with local municipalities

In the first instance, this requires gauging more precisely what their responsibilities are, as these vary greatly depending on the degree of decentralisation. In general, municipalities tend to be more powerful in Francophone Africa than in Anglophone Africa. As a second step, WaterAid could consider signing Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with municipalities for specific actions, as it is doing in the conurbation of Bamako in Mali with six municipalities. It should seek to influence local municipalities to encourage them to think about how they could operate better and help build local governments' capacity to develop plans and market such plans to donors to access funding.

WaterAid should build bridges with the utilities and understand how their systems work

In some instances, as in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the main sewers run straight through WaterAid's project areas but there are no links between the two types of service. Developing a better understanding of how the main utility's network works and where it operates at present, or based on future expansion plans, would help design programmes that fit better in the overall urban environment. One strategy adopted by WaterAid Bangladesh is to design interventions in peri-urban areas so that they can cope with future sewerage system expansion, which means that when they develop a latrine-building programme, they ensure the latrines can be connected with the future systems.

WaterAid should seek to work more with small-scale independent providers (SSIPs) and encourage local governments to strike relationships with private (formal or informal) providers

In most cities where WaterAid is operating, private providers play a significant role but do not get the formal recognition they deserve. There are limits to their expansion linked to their informal status, difficulties in accessing credit and limits to their technology and management expertise. If such constraints are found to be stumbling blocks for developing the supply-side of the market, WaterAid could get involved in alleviating such constraints.

Placing more emphasis on small towns

Small towns may offer a good opportunity to focus on the urban sector as it is a less crowded segment and one where needs are acute

Small towns represent a significant share of the urban challenge for infrastructure services. According to a World Bank report on small towns, "one third of the population of Africa and Asia live in towns of between 2,000 and 200,000 people. Both the number of towns and the number of people living in towns in Africa and Asia, as well as Latin America, is expected to double within fifteen years, and double again within thirty".[4]

Small towns commonly fall off the map of governments, donors and NGOs for a number of reasons. Small towns tend to be difficult to define specifically: what is a small town in India would be classified as a city in Zambia. In general, communities in small towns are less homogeneous than in rural areas and their service levels are blatantly inadequate. Local governments tend to be poorly equipped to face up to the challenge, being unable to attract sufficient financial resources and trained staff. Few donors (apart from the EU) and international NGOs are targeting this segment specifically.

WaterAid does not have much specific experience in small towns and has not developed a specific strategy for its activities in these areas

Small towns are not referred to specifically in WaterAid's strategies, budgeting or staffing. In the budgeting process, for example, there is the tendency to allocate 'so much for urban, so much for rural' when in fact, what is allocated to the urban sector tends to go to the larger metropolis, where much of the attention is focused. WaterAid should seek to develop a clear understanding of what is a small town and what the particular challenges are. It would need to understand the specific institutional context: in some cases, small towns are covered by a national utility (as with JIRAMA in Madagascar) but in the majority of cases, they are the responsibility of local governments which often lack capacity to plan and manage sanitation services.

WaterAid should develop its own experience of working in small towns and attract governments' attention on to this critical issue (at the local, national and international levels)

WaterAid has limited experience of working in small towns in Bangladesh and Nigeria, on which it could build to develop more credible experience. At the national policy level, it may want to encourage the creation of a national unit for small towns, so that this issue is adequately tackled. It would also need to lobby donors so that they focus on small towns and make clear statements in the international policy arena (with events such as an 'International Year of Small Towns'). WaterAid could encourage the creation of local government associations or work to support them where they already exist.

Retaining attention on rural areas

WaterAid should continue its work in the rural sector by focusing on behaviour changes and how such changes can be sustained

It should seek to identify the triggers or drivers of change and work through local leadership, as in Uganda, where this was a significant success factor. WaterAid should also conduct appropriate capacity building via local governments, user committees or households. But ultimately, WaterAid should recognise the limits of potential actions, ie 'not try to flog a dead horse' if there is no demand, particularly where population is very disperse.

---

[4] The World Bank, 'Town Water Supply and Sanitation', Bank-Netherlands Water Partnership, Project # 43, Town Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative, Washington DC, September 2004.

4.2 Getting there: actions at country programmes' level

The conference triggered country programme staff's energies and enthusiasms, which led to the development of provisional work plans at regional level on the last day of the conference. Key items from such work plans are presented in Annex E in terms of programme level, research and learning and policy and advocacy activities.

Programme level activities
Ongoing programme activities are progressing well and the conference led to only minor shifts in emphasis. If anything, Bangladesh wants to 'scale-up deep and wide' existing programme activities, so as to reach the maximum number of people. India wants to develop a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework, whilst others want to pilot approaches such as CLTS (Madagascar) or mainstream inclusion principles in programme development (West Africa).

Research and learning activities
In line with the idea that WaterAid should act as a learning organisation, the conference fostered many new ideas in terms of research activities, areas to be explored and partnerships to be developed or deepened. This centred on key areas such as:
- Community mobilisation methods, with several country programmes in West and East Africa planning to review or pilot CLTS, once it has properly been 'unpacked'
- Technology choice, to explore the potential for simplified sewerage in particular in Asia and West Africa or the use of EcoSan in East Africa
- Financing, to evaluate the opportunity and impact of subsidies in Southern Africa
- Urban issues, particularly to explore the issue of small towns in Asia or West Africa

Policy and advocacy activities
The conference demonstrated the need to strengthen policy and advocacy activities at all levels, in order to make the case for sanitation and focus people's minds on the issue. This will prove particularly important during the IYS. Such policy and advocacy will involve working with national governments to develop strategies, such as in Mali or Burkina Faso; with local governments to carry out planning, especially through the LMDGI; reaching out to the general public, with events such as the sanitation week in Uganda; and creating sanitation policy networks in and outside the regional level as in Asia.

Some country programmes also started to draw the **implications for staffing and budgeting**. This was mostly centred on the recruitment of specialist sanitation advisers, to assist with programme development and advocacy activities, especially in Mali, Zambia and Tanzania.

Country programmes indicated the **type of support they would need to receive from WaterAid in the UK** to conduct these proposed activities. This mostly centred on research activities that can usefully be carried out at the global level and the provision of technical support from the centre. WaterAid in the UK also has a key role to play in documenting existing experiences so as to encourage mutual learning and in allocating funding for research and piloting activities at the country programme level. WaterAid in

the UK has heard these key messages and intends to carry out the activities set out below.

4.3 Getting there: actions to be taken at headquarters' level

The sanitation conference highlighted that, even though WaterAid has considerable experience in the sanitation sector, such experience is not well documented or shared within the organisation. Guiding principles on sanitation exist, but are not circulated or referred to as a basis for developing programmes. As a result, sanitation programmes have developed in a fairly haphazard way, with a lack of clear guidance or feedback loops. WaterAid in the UK has a key role to play in strengthening the community of practice on sanitation within the organisation. The following paragraphs suggest ways of doing so.

Develop the understanding of WaterAid's current practices in the sector
Current sanitation practices are not currently documented in a comprehensive manner. Country programme staff were asked to bring summaries of their sanitation activities to the conference and to present them, but such presentations were too quick to allow for building a comprehensive understanding of what WaterAid is currently doing in the sector. As a result, the exercise of preparing a set of briefing notes / field notes, documenting the approaches to sanitation projects in each country seems essential and timely.

Establish a strong monitoring and evaluation framework
Ongoing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of WaterAid's activities is critical for learning and accountability, financial and otherwise, and to inform future decision-making and policy development (see Box 11).

Box 11 - How can monitoring and evaluation (M&E) be improved to inform policy development?

M&E activities should ideally track a small number of indicators of outputs, outcomes and impacts (ie the use of outputs in a sustained manner). In Uganda, for example, the national government developed a framework for donors to monitor the impact of their budget support to the sector in the context of a Sector Wide Approach (SWAP). The framework uses just 10 indicators to track the effectiveness of water and sanitation policies. The small number of indicators makes the system practicable : 'perfect is the enemy of the good in terms of indicators'.

Quantitative and qualitative indicators should be combined. The latter are usually more difficult to compile but may be more informative. Ideally, one would want to look at the chain of cause and effect: for example, whether information on sanitation has been disseminated, received and understood by the target audience; second, if it increased their knowledge about the issue and led (or not) to a change in behaviour and then, to an actual impact such as a reduction in diarrhoeal diseases. If a change is detected, it would be difficult to be certain that the particular intervention has had an impact (as extraneous factors may have interfered) so it would be better to show results somewhere up the causal chain as well. Information should be obtained through 'triangulation', ie by

---

comparing and contrasting different sources. Regarding policy interventions, one should look for evidence that policies are being put into practice. Finally, monitoring reports should be short, snappy and relevant.

Source: Based on the presentations by Jerry Adams (Head of PSU) and Andrew Cotton, WEDC, Loughborough University and an intervention by Sandy Cairncross.

Conduct additional research

Research is needed about what does and does not work in the sanitation sector and on the overall context for sanitation interventions. For example, in urban areas, sanitation provision is highly dependent on a complex web of issues involving land tenure, housing markets and the legal responsibilities of landlords. Landlords should in theory be responsible for providing sanitation to their tenants, but they do not do so because they are not present, are short of cash or are unwilling to invest in their properties and usually have no legal obligation to do so. The relations between tenants and landlords are complex and would warrant additional research in order to understand the dynamics behind sanitation investments. WaterAid may wish to undertake the research itself or build links with organisations that specialise in housing markets and related areas.

Build a coherent national/international policy framework that can articulate diversity of approaches

It will be critical to summon energies at senior political levels to champion change and pro-poor reform. To do so, a clear message must be articulated about how the sanitation challenge can be tackled, even if current practice shows that such a clear message is difficult to come by. WaterAid could also take the lead in building policy communities and establishing a watchdog for the sector.

Review the sanitation and hygiene guidelines in order to develop a new set of principles to guide practice

The existing guidelines (produced in 2006 for the Turning Point conference) did not have the opportunity to build on the community of practice within WaterAid and have not, therefore, found a large audience within the organisation.

In the context of the IYS, it is important to issue new sanitation guidelines in order to reiterate key messages on what WaterAid is trying to achieve. Given the complexity of the sector, such guidelines cannot be prescriptive or take the form of a manual.
They need to constantly evolve, because WaterAid does not have all the answers at present. A number of points have been noted as 'areas for debate' (see Section 3.3.). The guidelines could set out a clear plan for investigating such areas further rather than seek to provide definitive answers. The guidelines should develop clear principles for allocating country programme resources between water and sanitation and between main urban areas, small towns and rural areas. They could also develop criteria for selecting the technologies to be used so as to balance social inclusion with increasing access, and seek to define the meaning of success and inclusion for sanitation schemes, for example, how to select groups on which to focus, what makes sanitation tariffs pro-poor, etc.

The guidelines could feed into the new corporate strategy, which will update the current strategy for the years 2005-2010. New ideas could also feed into the drawing up and finalisation of country strategies.

5 Conclusions: next steps based on what we have learnt

The sanitation conference was a rare opportunity for WaterAid's UK and country programme staff to meet and share their experiences on sanitation. Staff gained exposure to concepts and ideas that are being discussed in the broader sanitation policy arena, such as CLTS, simplified sewerage and the specific needs of small towns. One of the main accomplishments of the conference was to shift people's minds away from narrow discussions on the relative merits of EcoSan or CLTS to a broader appreciation of the strategic challenges and opportunities that lie in the sanitation sector as a whole.

The conference led to the development of constructive ideas and embryonic work programmes at regional and headquarters levels. These draft work programmes will be taken forward to regional team meetings where they will be discussed and prioritised and built into regional and country plans.

At UK level, the conference discussions will feed into the development of plans for the IYS, including ways of supporting country programmes and new research initiatives so as to coordinate efforts and build on commonalities across regions. An urgent task will be to develop a new sanitation strategy and guidelines for the organisation, which will be done in an iterative manner to reflect ongoing learning within and outside WaterAid.

Critical to all of this is the need to maintain momentum and focus across the organisation. The sanitation challenge is so large that it will take many years of dedicated effort to address; sanitation must remain an urgent priority for WaterAid for the foreseeable future.

Annex A – Conference agenda

Day one:	Tuesday 23 October	
6.30-8.30pm	**Welcome dinner** Introductions and expectations	La Mancha Restaurant, Putney
Day two:	**Wednesday 24 October**	
8.30	Coffee	
9.00-9.15	Welcome and opening	Barbara Frost
9.15-12.00 (11.00 Coffee)	**Part A: Where are we – what do we know? (1)** Presentation: Making the Case Work Presentation of other 'advocacy/empirical' data Discussion: questions of clarification and debate on why it is so hard to 'make the case' for sanitation (ideas to be parked for Part C discussion)	Kate McPhedran Joanna Pearson (LSHTM) Sandy Cairncross (LSHTM) PPED
12.00-12.45	Working/networking time	
12.45-1.45	Lunch and networking time	
1.45-3.30	**Part B: Sanitation knowledge sessions (2)** What does Community-Led Total Sanitation really mean? Experiences in rural community processes Two 15 minute presentations and a one hour discussion – possibly with working groups.	Lyla Mehta (IDS) WaterAid Bangladesh and Nigeria
3.30 – 3.45	Coffee break	
3.45-5.30	**Part B: Sanitation knowledge sessions (1)** Demand and technology options Hygiene and behaviour change Two 15 minute presentations and a 90 minute discussion.	Beth Scott (LSHTM) Steve Sugden (LSHTM)
Evening session	Participants free to make own dinner arrangements	

Day three:	Thursday 25 October	
8.30	Coffee	
9.00-11.00	**Part A: Where are we – what do we know? (2)**	
	Mapping of WaterAid's existing work programmes and experiences	BE to facilitate
	'Bazaar' and discussion	WA regional/ international staff to 'map'
11.00-11.15	Coffee break	
11.15-1.00	**Part B: Sanitation knowledge sessions (3)**	
	Some other ways of thinking about technologies – linking with urban systems	
	Small bore sewers and appropriate waste water treatment	Duncan Mara (Leeds University)
	Serving the periurban poor with low-cost sewerage	Richard Franceys (Cranfield University)
	Community toilets and their management	Sundar Burra (SPARC)
	Discussion	
1.00-2.00	Lunch	
2.00-3.30	**Part B: Sanitation knowledge sessions (4)**	
	Working in the wider environment	
	Appropriate planning for dense urban settlements	Darren Saywell (IWA) Andy Cotton (WEDC)
	Discussion	WA Tanzania
3.30-3.45	Coffee break	
3.45-5.30	**Part C: How does sanitation play out in policy terms (1)**	
	Facilitated discussion on policy implications for sanitation work. How can we bring sanitation up to the level of coherent national and/or sector-wide policy making?	Henry Northover/ Barbara Evans
	Working Groups: Identification of key policy levers/ opportunities	
5.30 onwards	Free time for networking/relaxation Optional trip to art gallery Participants free to make own dinner arrangements	

Day four:	Friday 26 October	
8.30	Coffee	
9.00-11.00	**Part C: (2)** Working groups report back and open discussion Park key policy interventions for use in work planning later	Henry Northover/Barbara Evans
11.00-11.15	Cofee break	
11.15-1.00	**Part C (3): Monitoring and evaluation in sanitation and hygiene** Presentation/ group exercises.	Jerry Adams
1.00 – 2.00	Lunch	
2.00-4.00 with coffee	**Part D: Next Steps** Group work : What are we going to do differently in - Planning, design and implementing programmes - Budgeting - Staffing and partnerships - Policy and advocacy	
4.00-5.30	**Report back and agree on next steps**	Barbara Evans/ Jerry Adams to facilitate Girish Menon to chair
Evening	Farewell dinner	

Annex B – Conference participants

Attendants	Job title
WaterAid in the UK	
Barbara Frost	Chief Executive Officer
Girish Menon	Director – International Operations Department
Jerry Adams	Head – Programme Support Unit
Henry Northover	Head – Public Policy and Education Department
Tom Palakudiyil	Head - Asia
Lydia Zigomo	Head – East Africa
John Kandulu	Head – Southern Africa
Idrissa Doucoure	Head – West Africa
Therese Mahon	Regional Programme Officer - Asia
Jane Scobie	Regional Programme Officer – East Africa
Sam French	Regional Programme Officer – West Africa
David Shaw	Programme Officer
Ollie Cumming	Sanitation and Environment Policy Officer - PPED
Valerie Kuntz	Technical Advisory Services Manager – PSU
Nelson Gomonda	Regional Advocacy and Policy Advisor – Southern Africa
Country programmes	
Hasin Jahan	Programme Director, Bangladesh
Clarisse Baghynan	Programme Officer, Burkina Faso
Kuribachew Mamo	Sanitation & Hygiene Officer, Ethiopia
Ebenezer Kankam Appiah	Programme Manager, Ghana
Depinder S Kapur	Country Representative, India
Lovy Rasolofomanana	Senior Advocacy & Research Manager, Madagascar
Boyce Nyirenda - Rural	Programme Manager, Malawi
Adama Sanogo	Head of Programme, Mali
Artur Matavele	Advocacy and Learning Manager, Mozambique
Ada Oko-Williams	Zonal Coordinator, Nigeria
Wilhelmina Malima	Head of Urban Programmes, Tanzania
Tim Fowler	Country Representative, Uganda
Mahesh Mishra	Country Representative, Zambia
Contributors	
Steve Sugden	London School of Health and Tropical Medicine
Sandy Cairncross	London School of Health and Tropical Medicine
Duncan Mara	Leeds University
Lyla Mehta	Institute of Development Studies
Richard Franceys	Cranfield University
Darren Saywell	International Water Association
Andy Cotton	Water Engineering Development Centre, Loughborough
Sundar Burra	Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres
Kate McPhedran	London School of Health and Tropical Medicine
Joanna Pearson	London School of Health and Tropical Medicine
Beth Scott	London School of Health and Tropical Medicine

Attendants	Job title
External participants	
Tracey Keatman	Building Partnerships for Development
Tim Hayward	Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor
Peter Newborne	Overseas Development Institute
Conference organisers	
Barbara Evans	Consultant
Shamila Jansz	Programme Support Unit, WaterAid
Yvette Bruce	Logistics, International Operations Dept, WaterAid
Rapporteurs	
Sophie Trémolet	Consultant
Befekadu Yigezul	Volunteer, International Operations Dept, WaterAid

Annex C – List of resources

The following resources are available on the WaterAid intranet, in the Resource Centre http://waterworld.wateraid.org and on www.wateraid.net/penweb or through Shamila Jansz (ShamilaJansz@wateraid.org)

Key sanitation references from Conference Facilitator

Marion W Jenkins and Steven Sugden (2006) - Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper, **Rethinking Sanitation: Lessons and Innovation for Sustainability and Success in the New Millennium**

Netherlands Water Partnership, **Smart Sanitation Solutions** (2006) Examples of innovative, low-cost technologies for toilets, collection, transportation, treatment and use of sanitation products.

ODI, Briefing Paper (2006) **Sanitation and Hygiene – Knocking on New Doors**.

Stockholm International Water Institute (2004) **Securing Sanitation: The Compelling Case to Address the Crisis**

Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council and WHO, Programming Guidance (2005) **Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion** – Water Sanitation and Hygiene.

WSP, Field Note (2004) **The Case for Marketing Sanitation,**

WSP, Field Note (2004) **Mobilizing Resources for Sanitation**.

WSP, Field Note (2005) Private Sector Sanitation Delivery in Vietnam. **Harnessing Market Power for Rural Sanitation**.

WSP, Report (2006) The Mumbai Slum Sanitation Program. **Partnering with Slum Communities for Sustainable Sanitation in a Megalopolis**.

WSP, **Andean Program: El Alto Condominial Pilot Project Impact Assessment, a summary.** A quantitative approach to project-induced changes in household infrastructure and hygiene habits

External specialists' documents

Sandy Cairncross **Impact on diarrhoea of a city-wide sanitation programme in Northeast Brazil, LANCET**

Kamal Kar (2005) **Practical Guide To Triggering Community-Led Total Sanitation**. For use by front line extension staff, based on experience of facilitating CLTS in at least eight different countries in South and South East Asia and in East Africa.

Kamal Kar and Katherine Pasteur (2005) **Subsidy or self-respect? Community led total sanitation.** An update on recent developments.

Kamal Kar and Petra Bongartz (2006) **Update on Some Recent Developments in Community-Led Total Sanitation.**

Sundar Burra, Sheela Patel and Thomas Kerr (2003) **Community-designed, built and managed toilet blocks in Indian cities,** *Environment and Urbanisation.*

International Water Association (2006) **Sanitation 21: Simple Approaches to Complex Sanitation.** A Draft Framework for Analysis.

Duncan Mara and Graham Alabaste (2007) **A new paradigm for low-cost urban water supplies and sanitation in developing countries.**

Duncan Mara et al, (2007) **Selection of sustainable sanitation arrangements.**

Joanna Pearson and Kate McPhedran (2007) **The Case For Sanitation A Literature Review of The Non- health and Social Impacts of Sanitation.**

Petra Bongartz (2007) **Community Led Total Sanitation IDS Flyer**

Andy Cotton **Monitoring and Evaluation. Where are we with Sanitation?**

Marion W Jenkins and Beth Scott (2007) **Behavioural indicators of household decision-making and demand for sanitation and potential gains from social marketing in Ghana**

Beth Scott, Val Curtis, Tamer Rabie and Nana Garbrah-Aidoo (2007) **Health in our hands, but not in our heads: understanding hygiene motivation in Ghana**

Country Programme Documents

Shaikh . Halim - Village Education Resource Centre, Bangladesh (2005) Process Documentation: **People Initiated 100% Sanitation Approach,.**

Shayamal K Saha, Md Abul Kashem and S M Rofi (2006) **Walking Through Sanitation Ladder.** A Participatory Study on the Trends and Drivers of Community Movement in VERC - WAB's People Initiated 100% Sanitation Approach,

Paritosh Chandra Sarker **Compendium of Latrine Models on use in the Community Manual development - VERC**

Poor Sanitation: The Silent Plane Crash – Tanzania

World Toilet Day Event (2006) – Tanzania

Matthew Owen (Sept 2007) **Promoting better Hygiene & Sanitation in Tanzania – A Review of WaterAid's experiences and lessons learned.**

L W Materu (May 2007) **Desk Study on Sanitation Coverage Figures, Definitions and Indicators.**

WaterAid Madagascar (2004). **Sanitation: the Challenge and the Impact of Inadequate Sanitation and Hygiene in Madagascar.**

List of WAN and our Partners' Resources on Sanitation.

WaterAid Malawi, **Never Used a Latrine since 1946.**

WaterAid, **The State of the World's Toilets 2007, Report 2.**
See: http://www.wateraid.org/documents/the_state_of_the_worlds_toilets_2007_1.pdf

Annex D - Workplans developed at regional levels

The last session of the conference asked participants to draw the lessons from the previous days and set out practical actions they could undertake over the short to medium-term at country programme level. Participants were divided into regional sub-groups to do so. They were asked to set out key items for a proposed workplan, as well as the implications in terms of budgeting, staffing and advocacy needs. Finally, they were requested to set out what WaterAid's headquarters in the UK could do to support such country programme activities.

This Annex presents key items from these discussions in a relatively raw format, the main objective being to record what was said. Given that none of these work plans were discussed at country level, they are simply indicative and cannot yet form the basis for firm commitments.

Asia: Bangladesh and India (Nepal and Pakistan were not represented at the conference)

Programme level activities

Scale up existing programmes deep and wide.

Develop **M&E** and sector monitoring in India.

Research and learning activities

Small towns: undertake a scoping study at regional level to understand experience of small towns.

Community-managed toilets: document the experiences of running community toilets (in Nepal, Bangladesh and India) with regional support.

Undertake a review of CLTS in Bangladesh, Nigeria, India and Nepal to determine how WaterAid perceives CLTS.

Investigate **simplified sewerage** as a potential technical solution and receive technical support for use of such technology in small towns in Bangladesh.

Policy and advocacy activities

Identify champions and recognise them.

Help develop urban programme and policy frameworks and encourage the development of a strategy for small towns in the Country Strategic Papers (CSPs).

Lobby governments to influence a technology shift, as they are currently confined to traditional technologies such as simplified sewers etc.

Develop policy communities, especially with WASH.

Develop regional citizens' action networks.

Create policy networks beyond the region (eg with LSHTM, IRC, WEDC), linked up by resource persons to be made available by UK, engagement with other agencies for research and learning.

Develop indicators for advocacy initiatives and improve the visibility of advocacy initiatives.

Finalise plan for IYS and prepare presentation for the Third South Asian Conference on Sanitation (SACOSAN 3).

West Africa: Burkina Faso, Mali and Nigeria (Ghana was not represented at the conference)

Programme level activities

Mainstream principles of inclusion in programme development.

Research and learning activities

Existing action research has proved very beneficial, particularly in Mali (in partnership with WEDC, CREPA and Handicap International)

Document existing experiences and processes (there is some documentation on Nigeria at present).

CLTS is an attractive methodology but needs to be unpacked and appropriated:
- Repackage and rename it based on the principles that we understand to be CLTS
- Hold discussions at regional level and within country on its adequacy to the local context
- Define local standards with CLTS, reflecting what poor people want and what they should expect
- Reinforce software (for facilitation and mobilisation) particularly for behaviour change – Participatory Rural Appraisal is quite new (except in Burkina Faso, whereas Nigeria has no experience) and should be developed
- Hold a debate on the adaptability of CLTS in urban environments (in Nigeria, the principles of CLTS are being used in urban environments)

Equity and inclusion: identify groups of excluded people (such as disabled people, women, HIV sufferers, adolescent girls and the elderly). Some research and pilot work has already been undertaken, for example in Mali, WaterAid has conducted pilot projects with disabled people. Increase knowledge, practice and skills.

Carry out research and learning on different technology options and learn more about simplified sewerage. A priori, simplified sewerage seems too costly to be appropriate for the region but it should not be discarded off-hand.

A debate on appropriate financing mechanisms should be held at the local level. Innovative instruments such as micro-credit should be looked into.

Look into the issue of small towns. Nigeria already has experience in this area.

Partner with universities and research bodies at country and international levels.

Create learning centres and centres of excellence at regional level. For example, given that Nigeria has had success with CLTS, it could become a centre of learning on CLTS for the region.

Create capacity within our region to support others.

Policy and advocacy activities

Once research has been undertaken, carry out advocacy on what we think is best approach.

Develop ongoing policy activities
- Develop the regional level End Water Poverty campaign – a scoping study has already been done
- Campaign to prioritise sanitation – already quite strong
- Support national sanitation strategies in development in Mali and Burkina Faso
- Offer support for a sanitation task force in Nigeria
- Continue to strengthen Citizens' Action
- Develop champions for sector coordination - in Mali, the President is an effective champion for the End Water Poverty campaign
- Develop local taskforces in addition to the Nigerian national task force

Engage with and seek to influence urban planning at relevant levels

Decentralisation: strengthen the LMDGI and provide support for local financing gaps for sanitation

Develop partnerships:
- Build new ones and reinforce existing ones such as with Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) in Mali
- Work with non-traditional partners
- Identify private sector players and the benefits of working with them. We already know who they are in some cases. Could create a forum of private operators.

Implications for staffing and budgeting:

Feed the points discussed at the conference into the mid-term review of country strategic papers, especially in terms of implications for staffing (Mali is planning to hire a specialised sanitation officer in the near future).

Support needed from WaterAid in the UK:

- Budget support for funding opportunities
- Fill capacity gaps, capacity building and technical support

- Exchange visits and coordination (eg exchange with Bangladesh)
- Information and knowledge (this conference was the first forum to share experiences: this should be done on a more regular basis)
- Bring together experiences in some sort of documentation and review

Southern Africa: Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia

Programme level activities:

Madagascar: pilot CLTS schemes in Madagascar and work in low income areas with WSUP.

Research and learning activities:

Look back at existing sanitation approaches and experiences in Zambia and Mozambique to feed back into sanitation conferences.

Develop a regional understanding of adequate sanitation and access. Compare sanitation coverage levels across the region.

Examine financing of existing sanitation activities, analysing beneficiaries contributions and subsidies.

Review EcoSan methods: for example, need to understand the safety of latrine compost in Malawi. Could export experience of EcoSan based on partnerships with other organisations such as ENPHO.

Learn more on Sector Wide Approach (SWAP) processes in Malawi and Zambia.

Develop sanitation strategy for peri-urban areas in Madagascar: focus on understanding peri-urban options and develop an urban strategy. Conduct research on benefits of sanitation with Columbia University

Examine the issue of small towns in more depth.

Policy and advocacy activities:

Support local government partners in developing district wide sector plans and to understand coverage gaps and resource implications in Malawi and Mozambique.

Carry out and facilitate national sanitation mapping to overcome the problems with conflicting statistics, such as in Malawi.

Support the implementation of the national sanitation policy in Malawi. It is currently in draft form and should be approved before IYS.

Support the government to develop a national five-year sanitation plan and budget in Madagascar.

Lobby and support the government for effective decentralisation in Malawi and Mozambique.

Implications for staffing and budgeting:

Recruit dedicated sanitation policy officer in Zambia.

Support needed from WaterAid in the UK:

- Support in understanding SWAP processes
- Support in carrying out research on the benefits of sanitation in Madagascar with Columbia University
- Carrying out research and evaluating the impact and the opportunity of subsidies, as all four country programmes are providing some subsidies.

East Africa: Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda

Programme level activities

Carry out campaigning and social marketing: focus on how to create demand for sanitation.

Research and learning activities:

Develop technical approaches and methodologies:
- Tanzania: review of Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation (PHAST) and simplified sewerage
- Ethiopia: EcoSan and biogas as income generation potential, build databases linked to the WASH campaign to have one M&E technique, investigate the issue of small towns.
- Uganda: investigate the reasons for success of a CLTS programme by Africa AHEAD, which built 11,000 latrines in one year

Develop partnerships with Handicap International - hold a workshop during the year and look at techniques of inclusive design.

Set up partnerships with LSHTM and WSUP.

Organise a regional learning group on sanitation based in Ethiopia next year.

Work with the Overseas Development Institute on sanitation financing.

Policy and advocacy activities:

Lobby for champions for financing and policy development in the sanitation sector for example, in Tanzania, at the Ministry level. Lobby for additional finance and a separate sanitation budget line.

Build a case for sanitation, around the sanitation week and national sanitation workforce in Uganda. The sanitation week is very significant: use a singing group, endorse calendars and organise song competitions

Develop sanitation strategy in Ethiopia.

Implications for staffing and budgeting:

Reorganise activities in Uganda and Ethiopia.

Recruit a sanitation adviser in Tanzania for policy and practice.

Support needed from the WaterAid in the UK:

- Ongoing support from PPED
- Technical support for each country programme from WaterAid's sanitation working group
- Build closer links with the campaigns team in PPED.
- Assistance in developing strategic partnerships.
- Technical expertise, for example in looking at the feasibility of simplified sewerage.
- Developing regional programmes.

WaterAid

WaterAid's mission is to overcome poverty by enabling
the world's poorest people to gain access to
safe water, sanitation and hygiene education.

WaterAid
47-49 Durham Street
London, SE11 5JD
Tel: +44 (0)20 7793 4500
Email: wateraid@wateraid.org
Web: www.wateraid.org