Governance and Transparency Fund programme
Project completion report

GTF number	CN-010
Short title of programme	Developing southern civil society advocacy for water and sanitation in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Central America.
Organisation	WaterAid
Start date	01/10/2008
End date	30/09/2013
Amount of DFID Funding:	5 million GBP
Brief summary of the programme	The WaterAid/GTF programme aims to increase the capacity and resources of civil society 'policy communities' in 16 target countries (across Africa, Asia and Central America) to participate in effective evidence-based dialogue with decision-makers in the water and sanitation sector and build pressure to secure pro-poor services. The programme also aims to improve the allocation of resources for the water and sanitation sector. A series of activities will enable civil society to develop understanding of local budgeting and increase advocacy actions to improve sector financing. Our focus on inclusion of marginalised groups in research, advocacy and decision-making will also contribute to the 'poorest' benefiting from changes. To increase the impact of the voice of civil society, the programme also aims to support national governments and service providers to respond appropriately and to actively engage in dialogue with actors such as local governments and service providers in the sector.
List all countries where activities have taken or will take place	Ghana, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Mali, Uganda, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Madagascar, Zambia, India, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala.
Target groups and wider beneficiaries	• Local partners (CSOs and CSO networks – national and regional) • Duty-bearers (Governments and/or service providers) • Communities
Paper prepared by	Papa Diouf WaterAid 47-49 Durham Street SE11 5JD Tel: 020 7793 4947 Email: papadiouf@wateraid.org

2. List of acronyms

ACORD	Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development
AHJASA	Honduran Association of Water Boards
ANDA	National Alliance for the Defence of Water
AMBF	Association of Municipalities of Burkina Faso
ARS	Achievement Rating Scale
AWSDB	Association of Water and Sanitation Development Boards, Ghana
CAEPHA	Coalition for Access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
CAPS	Comités de Agua Potable
CBO	Community-based organisation
CEDARENA	Centre for Environmental Law and Natural Resources
CIDI	Community Integrated Development Initiatives
CNA	Capacity needs assessment
CONIWAS	Coalition of NGOs in the Water and Sanitation Sector, Ghana
CCRDA	Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Associations
CRDW	Diorano-WASH Regional Committee
CRSD	Centre for Rural Studies and Development
CSO	Civil society organisation
DBOLDA	District water and sanitation coordination committee (DWSCC)
DFID	Department for International Development
E&I	Equity and inclusion
FAN	Freshwater Action Network
FANCA	Freshwater Action Network – Central America
FANSA	Freshwater Action Network – South Asia
FIA	Final Impact Assessment
FER	Final Evaluation Report
FUPNAPIB	Pico Bonito National Park Foundation
GGWG	Good Governance Working Group
GPAE	Economical Agriculture Promotion Group
GTF	Governance and Transparency Fund
HEWASA	Health through Water and Sanitation, Uganda
HLM	High Level Meeting
HRWS	Human right to water and sanitation
JSR	Joint sector review
KEWASNET	Kenya Water and Sanitation CSO Network
LGA	Local government authority
LLTS	Leaders-led total sanitation
MARI	Modern Architects for Rural India
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NBA	Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan (Total Sanitation Campaign)
NEWSAN	National Network on Water and Sanitation
NGO WASH	NGO WASH Forum Zambia
NGO F	NGO Forum for Public Health, Bangladesh
NICE	National Initiative for Civic Education
MARI	Modern Architects for Rural India
MTR	Mid-term review
RICHE	Information and Communication Network on Water, Hygiene and Sanitation, Burkina Faso

RTE	Right to education
RTI	Right to information
RWSN	Rural Water Supply Network
SATHEE	Society for Advancement in Tribe, Health, Education and Environment
SWA	Sanitation and Water for All
SPONG	Permanent NGOs Secretariat
SUWASA	Sustainable Water and Sanitation for Africa
UP	Union Parishad
UWASNET	Uganda Water and Sanitation Network
VAREN	Vision Africa Regional Network
VFM	Value for money
VWSC	Village water sanitation committee
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WEIN	Women Empowerment Initiative in Nigeria
WES NET	Water, Environment and Sanitation Network, Malawi
WIN	Water Integrity Network
WSF	Water and Sanitation Forum, Ethiopia
WWF	World Water Forum

Cover photo: Community in Somulathanda, a remote tribal habitation in Warangal, India holding a village committee meeting. Due to their continuous follow-up on the need for a pipeline, the government has sanctioned of Rs.62000 for laying pipelines for the entire habitation. Credit: MARI

3. Summary of activities and achievements (max 2 pages)

3.1 Period since last annual report

Over the past six months of the programme, many activities were carried out at national, regional and global levels to prepare for the closing off the GTF programme. Before going any further, it is worth mentioning that although the GTF funding is coming to an end, the programme will continue building on its outcomes and learning generated..

Over the past few months, an innovative approach was used across the programme to assess the extent to which the programme has been successful in achieving the set objectives, but also demonstrate in-depth what changes the programme was able to achieve. To that effect, a global evaluation and impact assessment were simultaneously conducted building on in country level evaluations and impact assessments that took place in 14 countries[1]. This process has been a real learning for WaterAid as an organisation as it is the first time that our advocacy work has been reviewed which constitutes a unique opportunity for WaterAid and country programmes embarked on governance advocacy work.

As part of the evaluation process, the final annual GTF meeting took place in July 2013 to discuss the initial findings of both assessments and reflect on what the achievements have been, understand the changes that were brought about and how best to sustain them long after the programme ends. The discussions which aimed to increase ownership among countries were fed into the final evaluation and impact assessment reports (see annexes).

During the reporting period, our programme has also continued consolidating the learning generated throughout its implementation. Whilst the GTF learning handbooks were disseminated internally and externally at global level, many countries, including India and Ghana, documented and shared their learning in different ways, eg between partners and with the wider WASH sector. Moreover, our programme has used key opportunities to share the learning around the outcomes of the programme implementation in various key international sector fora. Henceforth, sessions on Governance and Rights were led by our programme at the Stockholm Water Week (SWW) and the Institute of Water Association (IWA). Our programme has also actively collaborated with the Special Rapporteur on the Human Right to Water and Sanitation especially through e-discussions and supporting the development of the next handbook which will draw on the learning from our experience.

In order to ensure the sustainability of our GTF programme and its full integration to WaterAid's plans and strategies, the learning from our programme implementation has fed into regional and global initiatives. These include the Rights Based Approach (RBA) which is an organisational initiative currently piloted in eight GTF countries, aiming to develop an in depth understanding of what it means and a guiding framework. Moreover, our programme supported a cross regional budget advocacy and parliamentary engagement workshop to link parliamentary engagement at sub-

---

[1] For more information on findings, please see links to full report.

national and national levels, potentially to influence work with Parliaments at the regional and Pan-Africa levels. This builds on the previous budget advocacy exercises that were carried out through our programme in relation to the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) partnership. To embed further the GTF programme learning into what we do, our programme has also used its learning to influence the 54th session of the African Commission on Human and People's Rights (ACHPR) in order to ensure there is a consolidation of a comprehensive approach of the human right to water as initiated by the ACHPR. At the national level, many country programmes (in collaboration with partners and building on the GTF programme) have developed successful proposals to carry on the next phase of the GTF programme e.g. Ghana and Madagascar with the European Commission, Malawi with DFID, Zambia with UNICEF, etc.

Lastly, our programme worked closely with the Learning Advisor on the Most Significant Results. This has been a great opportunity to deepen our understanding on what changes have been brought about by our programme and what the process for change has been.

In relation to our set objectives, our programme continued to strengthen the capacity of CSOs and networks through tailored capacity building initiatives. For example, in Ethiopia WSF conducted a study on budget tracking to develop its capacity to analyse budgets in order to see how it addresses pro-poor issues and identify best practices that can assist the Government in making better budget decisions.

In order to increase CSO and network engagement in decision-making processes, our partners in Ghana called on local governments to explore private sector financing for WASH local development plans at the Mole XXIV Conference. Meanwhile, in Uganda, our partner NAPE supported a municipality to develop its advocacy strategy for 2013/15 with a focus on advocating improved sanitation in the municipality.

Throughout the reporting period, it was noted that more communities across the programme are demanding increasingly more accountability and responsiveness from the duty bearers following the different actions carried out. In Burkina Faso, seven communes held public hearings where by citizens had the opportunity to question newly elected government officials on their WASH programmes. This was used as a conduit to demand accountability and influence the quality of services.

The past six months also contributed to show increased evidence of duty bearers' increasing willingness to respond to citizens' demands. In Bangladesh, all the 67 Union Parishads of the Moulvibazar district have shared their 2013/14 financial year budgets for the first time. In Mali, technical and financial partners committed to fund the water treatment plant in Kabala (Bamako) which had previously experienced shortages. In Costa Rica, following numerous advocacy activities on the negative effects of pineapple plantations on water quality, an inter-agency commission was created, resulting in the private sector proposing good practices throughout the cultivation process. More information can be found in Annex 1, Final Achievement Rating Scale (ARS).

3.2 For the entire duration of your programme

MSR 23 Uganda: Using water point mapping to improve access to safe water
Key results: In Uganda, a mapping process at district and sub-county levels revealed incomplete wells depriving over 400 people of access to safe water. The Government resumed work on these wells as a result of pressure from the concerned communities.
Key activities: • Preparatory activities: developing the capacity of CSOs, development of the water point mapping tools, identification and training of community field-based monitors. • Data collection and compilation of sub-county water point mapping reports. • Dialogue and engagement with local government authorities: conducting feedback and discussion meetings and carry out the community radio programmes.
MSR 24 Uganda: Using radio to improve the accountability of duty bearers for the provision of water and sanitation services.
Key results: More than 11,850 people have directly benefited and are accessing clean and safe water as a result of improved commitment and accountable decisions by the district local government authorities in the south western region of Uganda. ACORD, a GTF implementing partner, has utilised the media (Radio West) to air the communities' concerns about access to safe water and sanitation, giving an opportunity for the duty bearers to respond. This has been critical to build trust between service users and duty bearers as well as improving the accountability of the duty bearers to the commitments they make.
Key activities: • Identification of key WASH issues by the advocacy committees. • Community meetings to prioritise issues, and gather background and details of these issues. • Support journalists to record community voices on issues of concern, inform the community of the date and time they will be broadcast and encourage them to call-in during the show. • Conducting power mapping analysis of the issues identified. • Meet and engage local leaders and technical staff in regarding these issues. • Officially invite service providers, local leaders and communities to the radio talk show for an aired open discussion and engagement about issues. • Return to the affected community to give feedback and lay strategies for follow-up of commitments and future engagements.
MSR 25 Ghana: Using public expenditure tracking to improve budget provision for water and sanitation services
Key results: At the local level, 26,565 people are directly benefitting from improved water and sanitation services and it is expected that over 361,912 people will benefit in the long term. Public expenditure tracking initiatives have resulted in four District Assemblies increasing budget allocation and support to WASH services. At the national level, the Government showed a renewed commitment to increase financing to achieve the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) partnership agreement.

Key activities:
- AWSDB, CONIWAS gathered data on planned budget and expenditure from the district assemblies and the Ministry of Finance and the sector Ministry.
- Data collected was analysed and triangulated through a validation workshop at the district and national level.
- Awareness raising activities were conducted at district and national level in order to sensitise the members of community on Government efforts to meeting the SWA commitment at local and national levels. Furthermore, validation workshops and conferences were utilised to hold the Government to account.
- Key influencing targets (District Chief, Budget Officer, Finance Officer, Internal Auditor), allies and moments were identified at the district level and lobbying activities were carried out.
- At national level, lobbying and campaigning activities were carried out directed at the Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of Water Resource and Housing.

MSR 26 India: Wider access to government subsidies to build toilets

Key results:

In the state of Orissa, local partner, Gram Vikas, worked with 3,596 households in 61 villages to construct a private toilet and bathing room and 24-hour piped water supply. This followed their successful intervention at national level to remove the distinction between those above and below the poverty line as a condition for receiving Government subsidies to build toilets.

Key activities:

Training and capacity building programmes:
- On Right to information (RTI) for community leaders; on Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRI) and local governance; to create awareness on gender issues; on leadership; hygiene and school sanitation among children and women; on forming federations at the Gram Panchayat level and engaging closely with local officials to sensitise them on WASH needs and on how to access Government resources.
- Stakeholder engagement on three levels: engaging with people's representatives and informing them about the MANTRA model of Gram Vikas; engaging with Government officials of the DDWS and helping communities access resources for WASH, and organising and participating in forums on WASH including NGOs and civil society partners.

MSR 27 Nicaragua: Improvement in the delivery of services through the setting up of local Water and Sanitation Committees

Key results:

The Water and Sanitation Committees (CAPS – 5285 nationwide) are now legally recognised as providers of services to rural and semi-rural communities under the Special Law for Water and Sanitation Committees No 722 (approved in 2010). This allows them to act with greater transparency and accountability to its beneficiaries (1.2 million people – the total population at the national level benefiting from CAPS) and the Government.

The programme was concerned with: 1) Influencing the drafting of the CAPS law; and 2) Building the capacity of 42 CAPS in five Departments (or Districts).

Key activities:
• Strengthening the CSOs and CAPS in public policy advocacy processes, integrated water resource management, water resource legal framework, transparency,

accountability and access to information.
• Participating in the drafting and dissemination of the draft CAPS law, as well as the alternative country report on human right to water and sanitation.
• Design and production of popular versions of the Special Law of CAPS used in dissemination and capacity building of this law.
• Advocacy at local, departmental and national levels through press conferences and multi-stakeholder forums with community leaders and decision makers to highlight the role of the CAPS and the coverage and quality of drinking water and sanitation in rural communities.

MSR 29 India: Improved funding for water and sanitation services for excluded communities through Right to Information (RTI) training

Key results:
Improved funding for WASH services for excluded communities through RTI training. These communities secured water and sanitation infrastructure and services, together with other programmes and services.

Key activities:
- Training programmes for VWSCs on RTI
- Regular support meetings for the VWSCs in the filing of applications and follow up social audits
- Organisation of interface meetings
- Setting up an informal federation of VWSCs
- Use of access centres
- Exchange visits
- Use of existing platforms such as grievance days, pressure groups, etc

4. Key findings

4.1. Management response to final evaluation

Final evaluation conclusions	Management response
1. WASH problems require context specific solutions. This is amplified in a governance or RBA programme where partners work with citizens to build their voice around an issue. The flexible funding of GTF has allowed CSOs and networks to invest in very relevant national, regional and local advocacy priorities. For WaterAid, it has provided the opportunity to connect with international priorities. Unfortunately the lack of a relevant regional structure in Africa has had an impact.	**Agreed**
2. The inefficiencies of the inception phase have had an impact on the GTF. No new systems or processes were established to manage the GTF	**Agreed**

3. There is a positive message from the Value for Money section: direct investment in advocacy works. The GTF has been good value for money. The flexible nature of the funding has had a direct contribution to this result.	**Agreed**
4. Defining how to integrate equity into advocacy and expectation management would have assisted GTF partners. Furthermore, the monitoring and evaluation system and approach to tackling equity needs to be strengthened in order to capture better data.	**Agreed.** This is a wider sectoral issue that WaterAid is currently leading on.
5. The GTF has struggled with collecting robust monitoring data on governance advocacy changes and has not used suitable indicators for this purpose. The final logframes were of poor quality and working at the output level. It has therefore been difficult, without data from a programme monitoring framework to assess progress against the purpose statement.	**Agreed**
6. WaterAid is not systematically monitoring their influencing. The GTF programme was an opportunity to try and monitor their contribution in relation to other stakeholders and begin to put some sort of value (high, medium or low), if WaterAid chooses not to 'count numbers'.	**Agreed**
8. WaterAid needs to better understand the differences between different types of networks, at different levels and choose what works best for the sector. Then integrate this way of working/ roll out consciously with programme implementation.	**Agreed**
Final evaluation recommendations	
WaterAid	
1. Learn from the experience of managing and strategically 'owning' a multi-country programme, carry out a comprehensive review of current systems and processes 'suitability' for large and/or multi-country programmes.	**Agreed.** A formal learning review of the GTF programme is planned to take place over the next months to inform any future multi-country programme design and implementation. It is worth mentioning that some of the learning has been embedded in to country strategies and plans

2. Refresh the IPD Approach Paper for the next strategic period.	**Agreed**. Discussions have already taken place at SMT level. A discussion paper on governance building on the GTF programme's experiences will be developed over the next couple of months to input into the current development of our next strategy.
3. Review the remit, role and responsibilities of the Regional Advocacy Managers.	**Don't agree.** The remit and roles and responsibilities of Regional Advocacy Managers (RAMs) are clear and link to the regional priorities and focal areas. Although there have been some challenges in engaging them during the first phase of the programme (as highlighted in the Mid Term Review), the RAMs have increasingly been involved in the programme implementation towards the end of the programme. Moreover, regional discussions are currently being held and facilitated by the RAMs on how to embed the learning from the GTF programme in the regional to maximise impact.
4. Continue to invest in and build on results of governance advocacy work from GTF.	**Agreed.** See above.
5. Be bold and build a governance advocacy strategy (theory of change and framework) for WaterAid and look at how refreshing the *Sustainability framework* (to integrate this work) could create a 'blueprint' for sustainable programming	**Agreed.** The governance advocacy 'strategy' is being discussed as per the next global strategy development. The revision of our *Sustainability framework* in order to widen its scope by adding the governance and rights component is planned for next fiscal year.
6. Develop a framework for assessing influencing, look at work being down throughout the sector to address difficult contribution/attribution issues – DFID, WSP, UNICEF, PLAN.	**Agreed.** This has been highlighted by the DFID PPA Independent Progress Review and it is part of our next global strategy development since the focus is likely more on influencing.

7. Begin to sketch out a process (perhaps as part of the next Global Strategy) parallel to the post-implementation surveys for 'assessing the impact' of advocacy, influencing and policy programmes.	**Agreed.**
8. Explore how/if WaterAid country programmes in Africa could begin to feed into a global framework on governance such as the Ibrahim Index of African Governance.	**Agreed.**
9. If WaterAid wants to be an inspiring leader in WASH, it could consider integrating, where possible, governance advocacy into international programming during the next Global Strategy period.	**Agreed.** See above.
10. Package up a WaterAid RBA to community empowerment and start to organisationally address why and when WaterAid should lead in countries where there is limited CSO and CBO capacity.	**Agreed.** This is currently being done in line with the RBA pilot work.
11. Put equity centre stage: provide the Equity and Inclusion Senior Officer with space to lead on producing a learning paper tackling the complexity of how WaterAid could roll out a RBA across international programmes and policy based on the experience of GTF partners (eg SATHEE in India).	**Agreed.** It links with the recommendations No 12.
12. Strengthen and reinforce the work that has begun in annual reporting by country programmes on contextual drivers and leverage figures.	**Agreed.** This is in line with our newly developed programmatic approach being currently embedded.
13. Hold a roundtable discussion on: 'Who is WaterAid partnering with at the global level and for what purpose?'	**Agreed.**
14. Commission further research on network partnerships to fully understand the phenomenon that is emerging in the CSO space and consider how, given the crowded nature of the landscape, WaterAid is best placed to 'use' this model for delivery and sustainable programming.	**Agreed.**

4.2. Programme management
Nothing has changed since last annual report.

4.3. Programme results and impact
The global impact assessment exercise provided some strong insights on the changes brought about by the programme through clear change pathways. The four domains of change that were identified in line with our programme's original 'theory of change' are summarised as below:
- Changes in the ways in which CSOs function and network, and their capacity to influence the design, implementation and evaluation of effective WASH policies at all levels.
- Engaging CSOs in the decision-making processes.
- Ways in which citizens demand accountability and responsiveness.
- Changes in the ways that governments and service providers are accountable to citizens and service users in the WASH sector.

This section builds on the global impact assessment exercise that was carried out reinforced by the most significant results analysis (MSRA) – both provided great reflection opportunities. For additional information on the impact assessment and MSRA, please see Annex 5.

a) What has changed
Policy
Over the past five years of implementation, there has been increasing evidence of CSOs and networks effectively contributing to sector debates, policy development and laws across our programme and at different levels. For example, our partner the Honduran Association of Water Boards (AHJASA) through its national-level advocacy has managed to participate in the regulation of the latest laws and worked to develop discussion and approval of water policy, which has ensured participation of the users in the development of plans and budgets. Moreover as already shared in our previous reports, our partner GPAE in Nicaragua played a pivotal role in changing the water law which makes the WSCs legally recognised as providers of services to rural and semi-rural communities under the Special Law for Water and Sanitation Committees.

Changing the policies at national level can be quite lengthy and was not necessarily achievable within a five- year project. However many of the partners managed to influence the institutional framework including the new ministry in charge of Water and Sanitation in Nigeria, institutionalisation of public hearings in Mali and a good governance working group in Uganda, for example. One of the prominent examples and most significant results was in India with our partner Gram Vikas, who worked at the national level to remove the distinction between those above and below the poverty line as a condition for receiving Government subsidies to build toilets. In the state of Orissa this meant that Gram Vikas could work with 3,596 households in 61 villages to construct household toilets and piped water supplies (detailed account included in Annex 5).

Practice
Evidence of our work under the GTF programme leading to increased delivery of new services and/systems can be highlighted across the programme, particularly in South Asia, Ghana, Uganda, Malawi and Guatemala, Burkina Faso. In India, there was improved funding for water and sanitation services for excluded communities through the use of the Right to Information Act. This was pivotal in addressing lapses

in implementation and verifying the quality of the services, tackling household exclusion and issues of corruption, directly benefitting 749,602 people.

In Uganda, the findings coming out of a water point mapping exercise at Kamwenge district and sub-district levels revealed incomplete wells affecting over 400 people. Following the pressure of communities showcasing the findings, the local government authorities resumed work on these wells. Moreover, 11,850 people in the South Western region are now accessing clean water as a result of commitments made by district local government authorities following community radio broadcasting programmes. In Ghana, four district assemblies have increased their budget allocation to WASH following the finding of a public expenditure tracking exercise. This has directly benefitted 26,565 people (detailed account included in Annex 5).

Behaviour
There have been significant changes in the ways in which CSOs and networks operate, and their capacity to influence WASH policies at all levels. They have improved their ability to represent the sector more effectively. As highlighted in the global impact assessment this includes increased recognition at national levels (Ethiopia, Nicaragua); being the 'recognised voice in the sector' (Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Uganda, Ghana); increased ability to influence the media (Uganda and Burkina Faso); reducing duplication of efforts (Ethiopia); influencing sector debates nationally (Mali, Malawi); and establishing new working groups (Uganda and Ghana).

This was possible through organisational strengthening based on the 7S framework (see annual reports from year three and four), a more focused membership and provision of regular and confirmed income as well as the ability to leverage resources. Examples include the ability of CONIWAS partners to undertake budget tracking which has lead to the Government being more responsive to CSO demands to increase WASH sector financing, and in Ethiopia, the improved understanding of CSOs about sector issues and programme design leading to an increased harmonisation of CSOs efforts. As a result, there is clear evidence of a shift towards greater credibility especially with CSOs, partners and some networks.

Moreover, there is increased evidence of informed and empowered communities no longer depending on CSOs staff to demand accountability and responsiveness. For instance, in India people are independently filing RTI applications and following them up to address a wide range of issues including electricity connections and roads.

Changes in power relations
There is clear evidence of CSOs' ability to judge and negotiate the existing political space effectively and strategise accordingly. For instance, in India CSOs have a clearer understanding of power structures and new perspectives on Government responses as a result of the stronger focus on rights based approaches and improved community mobilisation. In Ghana, CONIWAS was able to influence change at the Mole Conference, where it was able to dialogue with sector players and pressed for paradigm shifts in the Government's response to WASH. In Zambia, the Government signed up to the SWA partnership due to the pressure from the NGO WASH Forum.

As highlighted in the in-country impact assessment reports citizens' experience increased awareness and ability to demand rights. For instance, in Malawi, citizens understand better the government planning processes and that duty bearers are able to explain the challenges they face. The use of media is another effective way to highlight issues and publicly challenge authorities to deliver (Uganda, Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Mali).

b) Who has benefited
The direct target beneficiaries were: whole communities; intermediary community structures; marginalised and vulnerable groups such as women, children, the elderly and disabled. Our programme was designed neither to count the number of beneficiaries nor hold disaggregated data as mentioned in previous reports. However, there were attempts to count the actual beneficiaries of the identified most significant results.

c) How the change occurred
As mentioned above, our programme's overall change pathway focused on four elements which constituted the changes in the global impact Assessment exercise described above: 1) strong and well-functioning CSOs' ability to influence WASH policy and practices; 2) CSOs' engagement in decision-making processes; 3) better informed and empowered communities to demand more accountability and responsiveness and 4) duty-bearers are accountable to the end users with regards to WASH delivery.

Across the 16 countries our programme has been operating in, the political, social, cultural, and socio economical contexts are different. Therefore models of engagement with CSOs and communities vary accordingly, but a common element in successfully influencing change is the ability of the CSOs to negotiate the existing political space effectively and strategise accordingly at different levels. Here are some examples:

- Building the capacity of CSOs in the WASH sector in Mali to analyse institutions and public authority reports enabled them to become members of the national WASH sector review process. Communities benefitted because CSOs were able to monitor promises made by duty bearers.
- Budget tracking at district level in Ghana which resulted in greater access to water in two districts.
- Improved understanding of a RBA to WASH together with community mobilisation through the active participation of marginalised groups at meetings with government officials in India led to citizens gaining power and confidence to claim successfully their rights and entitlements.
- Use of local radio to voice concerns around lack of clean and potable water and sanitation services in Uganda resulted in system and service improvements as well as tackling corruption issues.
- Simplifying and translating the water code in Mali into local languages or producing a popular version of the CAPs Law in Nicaragua led to communities and citizens being better informed and equipped to hold their governments to account.

In terms of theories of change used, country programmes were expected to use WaterAid's outline change pathway to develop their own country specific theories of change (which reflected the very different contextual realities in which they were operating) as per our inception report.

d) Why changed occurred and analytical insights for future lesson learning
Each of the four dimensions of change included a series of assumptions to analyse factors that could affect progress or success. As the FIA findings point out change directly attributed to the GTF can be assessed more robustly when looking at its target groups (partners, networks and CSOs).

In addition the MSRAs process looked at the series of actions that were thought would lead to each result and tested it against the experience of implementation to ascertain the extent to which the original analysis played out.

Context
Depending on the context and political environment, there is a large spectrum of actors and factors that have supported or enabled changes to take place across the programme which the next programme phase can build on:
- Policies were already in place and there were enthusiastic and committed leaders (Burkina Faso).
- Networks were already strong and focussed (Mali).
- There was recognition at national levels that citizen voices should be included in WASH sector debates – therefore the Government was willing to buy into the process (Ghana).
- In a number of countries there was an existing or growing commitment to work in collaboration with CSOs to meet WASH sector targets and MDG 7 (India, Ghana Burkina Faso).
- In Ghana, social accountability conditions were included in funding partnership arrangements.
- In Ethiopia and Uganda, the reputation and standing of the WaterAid Country Office supported the GTF programme to establish itself in country
- In the countries where there was already an appetite for, or a need to include community voices in District and National plans, the GTF programme was able to find and work with more willing allies.

Key success factors
It is worth pointing out that some of the elements outlined in the context above have also been key success factors for the changes that took place. The factors differ according to the context and cannot be the same across the programme
- The provision of operational costs and other financial support to the CSOs and networks, and support and guidance from WaterAid country offices.
- Policies were already in place and there were enthusiastic and committed leaders (Burkina Faso).
- Networks were already strong and focussed (Mali).
- Recognition at national levels that citizen voices should be included in WASH sector debates (Ghana).
- An existing or growing commitment to work in collaboration with CSOs to meet WASH sector targets and MDG 7 (India, Ghana, Burkina Faso).

- In Ethiopia and Uganda, the reputation and standing of the WaterAid country offices supported the GTF to establish itself in country.
- Where interventions were successful, CSOs were able to judge and negotiate the political space and strategise accordingly.
- Existence of an enabling political environment and, in some cases, policy framework, which enabled citizens and Government to effectively engage with each other (India, Ghana).
- The ways in which traditional leaders were able to support efforts by leaning on authorities (Ghana, India).
- Improved spaces for engagement and improved relationships with district authorities (Uganda) and national Government actors and power holders in Ghana.
- The emerging recognition in Ethiopia that CSOs are key actors in WASH sector policy dialogue.
- Using a multipronged approach ('attacking on all sides') (Ghana).
- Increased confidence, improved skills and strategies within CSOs has enabled communities to move forward.
- The skills, judgement, reputation and/or recognition of the CSOs.
- Favourable political environments, growing support from other stakeholder and available political space.

Significant obstacles that were overcome
Depending on the context, challenges included those related to how networks operate – the focus of some networks was more on activities than strategy (Ethiopia), incompatible perceptions of issues and approaches, political rivalry and competition for funding between CSOs can compromise the effectiveness of coordination (Malawi).

In some cases, the level of support required to set up and maintain networks appears not to be cost effective against the changes that they were able to influence (Mali and Uganda). Another challenge that was overcome was communities not having the confidence or enough information to demand their rights successfully.

The sequencing of your interventions
There have been unintended positive consequences of GTF efforts that have affected communities either outside the programme intervention areas or where communities have successfully applied their new confidence and skills to demand a greater response in other sectors:

- In India, Gram Vikas' awareness-raising and capacity building work with poor communities in Orissa secured improved WASH services. In addition, communities have been empowered to secure other basic services such as electricity and promote gender equality.
- In Ghana, the water board in Bawku learnt from the budget tracking exercises conducted by the GTF programme and demanded the district to contribute to the maintenance of the water system (overall the equivalent to £6,600 was invested in repairs of broken systems in Bakwu west district). Results include anecdotal evidence of an 80% drop in water and sanitation-related diseases for children. Another very significant and unexpected impact is that there is a significant

reduction in rape, as girls now do not have to travel long distances to collect water.

- In Malawi the establishment of community by-laws has led to better sanitation and hygiene standards but also more self-help and better participation in community efforts to provide public goods and services for themselves.
- In Burkina Faso, through RICHE's efforts, there was improved sanitation and access to drinking water for the population of Polesgo, and Wemtinga B School.

4.4 Sustainability and value for money

1. Sustainability of services

As mentioned in our previous Annual Reports, our programme has reflected on how to ensure the sustainability the CSOs and CSO networks involved in the programme since its design and inception. As a result, a capacity needs assessment tool was developed in order to ensure that the organisations involved in the programme become stronger and well-functioning so that they are able to influence WASH policies and practices at all levels (in line with the first objective of our programme), both during its lifespan and after the funding stops.

As reinforced by our global evaluation, most countries' partners carried out an organisational capacity gap analysis with a clear capacity development plan which included skill development, staffing, systems development and strategies development. To date, 80% of the partners have used the CAN in different ways with a common denominator which is improve capacity in order to maximise impact. The tool has been disseminated internally (and used by non GTF targeted countries) and externally to a wide range of stakeholders and is currently used as a key reference for our partnership work. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the tool has not been done yet but it is planned for next year.

Moreover, our partners have focused on securing resources to continue their work building on their programme experience and learning and taking in to a next level. The in country evaluations have constituted a key reference document. For instance, our partner WESNET in Malawi secured a grant of approximately USD116,000 from UNICEF and £53,707 from DFID to continue and deepen its governance work building on the learning form the programme implementation . Under the same partner, our second partner NICE also received £99,353. Our Ghana and Madagascar GTF programmes secured a multi-year funding grant totalling approximately Euro 600,000 each from the EC to empower citizens and civil society organisations to improve the delivery, equity and sustainability of WASH services. These are some great examples of successful fundraising based on the learning from the GTF programme. It is very critical to reiterate the fact that not all partners have managed to secure funding and retain project staff which constitute a key impediment to sustainability as highlighted in one of our learning handbooks focusing on sustainability.

In Uganda, UWASNET has mainstreamed good governance through the organisational plans of all partners. In addition, certain partners have mobilised additional resources eg CIDI and ACORD. In Bangladesh, the NGO Forum work will continue through the water and sanitation taskforce committees. In Burkina Faso, the partnership between RICHE and other sector actors, as well as the focus group in

SPONG, will enable the media advocacy work to continue. In Costa Rica, consolidated groups formed under the themes of the programme (like FRENASAPP or ANDA) will sustain the advocacy agenda.

2. Sustainability of impact

There is clear evidence pointing to the sustainability of our impact across several local contexts and using various approaches to build the capacity of duty bearers and rights holders, create intermediary structures and institutionalise community processes. For instance, the creation of intermediary structures will continue as these become mainstreamed into community decision-making processes. In Ghana the Water and Sanitation Management Teams were strengthened with action plans were developed to accelerate accountability over time. In addition, the accountability platforms will be used to resolve development challenges. In Malawi, NICE's use of local governance structures will continue through interface meetings.

Moreover, there is an increased realisation among citizens to demand accountability, for instance through the newly introduced by-laws. In Mali, our partner CN-CIEPA was invited to speak in front of the Prime Minister. As a result it was decided that public hearings at local government level would be institutionalised. In Ethiopia WSF will continue to work especially as it has gained the Government's recognition and increased its visibility as a key sector player.

Likewise, our partners will continue to participate and contribute to decision-making processes which point to the institutionalisation of some mechanisms, for example: the Association of Mayors of Burkina Faso institutionalising public hearings, the participation of partners in national level working groups, and joint sector reviews.

As highlighted in the Final Evaluation Report, there are numerous opportunities for replicating our results. For instance, WaterAid Uganda is strengthening the advocacy capacity of its partners WEDA and TEDDO using the learning from the GTF programme (e.g. for instance how to do power analysis). CIDI has also widened their area of governance work to the northeast.

In Malawi, neighbouring villages of targeted communities have submitted requests to NICE to extend coverage to their communities (using training on Citizens Forums). In Honduras, AHJASA has integrated the GTF approach to their work plans, which constitute a unique opportunity to spread this learning. In India, social audit is now part of the implementation guidelines of the NBA (National Sanitation programme).

Value for money

The global evaluation of the progamme suggested that largely, we provided good value for money. It is worth pointing out that the main elements of this section have been extracted from the global evaluation report.

1. Economy

As highlighted in the Final Evaluation Report, the programme worked through CSOs with low operating and travel costs. For instance, in Ethiopia CCRDA gave the GTF programme access to its administrative and technical infrastructure and led the country steering committee at no additional cost.

The MSRAs have indicated fairly good value for money. For instance, the total cost of public budget tracking exercises in four district assemblies in Ghana totalled £8,483. These exercises led to 26,565 people having access to improved water and sanitation services. Another far reaching example was the national intervention of Gram Vikas to remove the distinction between those above and below the poverty line as a condition for receiving government subsidies to build toilets. The cost of Gram Vikas activities over the course of the programme totalled £152,380.

2. Efficiency
Salaries make up the greatest proportion of costs (£1,233,518). However, these are the same as or below national benchmarks.

As highlighted in the final evaluation report, depending on the governance arrangements in each country there are differences in how the remaining expenditure is proportioned. Another key aspect is that the overlapping nature of outputs makes it difficult to assess value for money. Activities may relate to more than one output or be allocated to different outputs depending on the project. The MSR analysing water point mapping in Uganda highlighted its efficiency: 400 beneficiaries directly gained access to safe drinking water which equated to £12 per person. In Ghana, the public expenditure tracking exercises pointed to a cost per beneficiary of £0.31.

3. Effectiveness
Although the programme was beset by series of challenges that undermined its ability to measure it effectiveness (please refer to Final Evaluation Report for more details), including the lack of time to conduct a thorough context analysis to inform logframes, there is evidence pointing to its effectiveness. In Ghana, advocacy following public expenditure tracking has resulted in improvements in both the local and national government's support to the WASH sector, including support for the rehabilitation of water systems and the governance structure of the Water and Sanitation Management Teams.

Another example from the water mapping exercises in Uganda highlighted how these exercises helped to change planning and resource allocation based on the evidence. HEWASA used approximately £1,250 which is substantially less than the average cost £5,000 that the Ministry of Water and Environment utilised per district.

4. Equity
There is evidence of equity approaches, analysis and thinking in 13 out of 16 countries. In India SATHEE, an INGO specialised in working with the most excluded, facilitated an equity driven approach. CRSD worked with Dalit communities. In Bangladesh, the NGO Forum worked with the hard to reach communities in the tea gardens.

Here are some examples of what has changed as a result of the GTF programme:
- In India, it is mandated in the Powers of Panchayati Raj Institutions that 50% of VWSC members are women. In SATHEE project areas, 70% of the original handpump maintenance allocation was redirected to tribe areas.
- Across all four FANCA countries women are now members of Community Water Boards.

- In Malawi, elderly and disabled people in Karonga and Rumphi have been provided with ECOSAN toilets. Moreover, youth in Rumphi rejected the planned number of taps. This led to the provision of an additional six community taps.
- In Burkina Faso, the Union of Disabled People has demanded that local authorities provide more inclusive services following a rights training and the development of an advocacy plan.
- In Ghana, women and children now participate in community scorecard processes without fear of intimidation.

4.5 Innovation

As our progress reports and learning documents pointed out we have developed a series of approaches throughout the programme implementation to tackle governance issues in an innovative manner and with a potential of replication as suggested above. Here are some examples:

Developing and disseminating of tools and resources

Practical tools were developed such as the Capacity Needs Assessment toolkit and Learning handbooks with step by step guide on different tools, methods and approaches (eg how to conduct a file a petition or do a power analysis) which are been embedded across all country programmes. Partners also developed resources to raise their credibility and profile in the sector (eg the Annual Joint Sector CSO Performance reports that show CSOs' contribution to the sector in Ethiopia). Our partners have also effectively disseminated national legislation (eg popular version of CAPS Law in Nicaragua)

Using existing rights and supporting legal reforms

As highlighted during Stockholm World Water Week, the programme used existing rights (such as the rights to education or employment in India) to make progress on WASH as well as supported concrete legal reforms (eg in Nicaragua through the water boards committees law).

Use of technology for evidence-based advocacy

Our partners have increasingly used technology to support advocacy work. Examples include water point mapping in Uganda, the Phone-In Programme in India and online discussions in Ethiopia. The use of community radio broadcasting programmes in Uganda has also been instrumental in raising the voice of previously marginalised communities.

Piloting transparency mechanisms

Our partners have piloted innovative approaches to increase transparency. For instance, the Open Budget System in Bangladesh whereby local district budgets are published by Government institutions has lead to increases in funding for the sector.

Advocacy at the national level based on local realities

Our work has increasingly contributed to national level advocacy, drawing on local level evidence. In Ghana, public budget tracking exercises and social audits supported the evidence-based advocacy activities of AWSDB during the national sector conference. This was also the case in Malawi and Uganda.

Engaging traditional leaders and key community stakeholders
Both were used effectively to have more traction when conducting advocacy activities. In Ghana, traditional leaders were used to build on indigenous knowledge and authority structures so they can advocate on behalf of the community (eg Queen Mother in Bongo). In Bangladesh, the NGO Forum persuaded doctors, teachers and faith leaders to join the forum on WASH and interact regularly with the Government. In Burkina Faso, the Leader-Led Total Sanitation programme aimed to engage local politicians by drawing to their attention the dire situation of their hometowns.

Establishing journalist networks
Strong journalist networks were used as an innovative way to raise awareness and influence national authorities to prioritise WASH (Burkina Faso, Uganda). In Burkina Faso, the Leaders led Total Sanitation Approach collected sanitation data from the areas of origin of key public figures, such as traders, politicians, journalists and civil society actors to ensure that all are engaged in the process.

Establishing innovative platforms for engagement
The programme developed innovative platforms. For instance, Access Centres in India disseminate information about ongoing WASH programmes and how people can derive benefits, and the Citizens Forums in Malawi.

Lastly, as the programme operated in 16 countries this gave ample opportunity for cross learning from different contexts through thematic webinars, annual and regional meetings. This was particularly interesting as WaterAid does not usually work in Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica,

5. Recommendations
Here are two key recommendations (for DFID and any other potential donors) that came out of our evaluations and impact assessment exercises which we fully agree with:

- **Revisit and strengthen the CAR framework and develop this into a more coherent Theory of Change** which provides an overview of how change happens in relation to governance and transparency, a clearly articulated vision of change, the potential role for networks, NGOs and CSOs in this context, and the assumptions that it makes along the way. This is likely to result in more joined up efforts across the board. Perhaps DFID could also consider giving more guidance on how impact/contribution should be monitored, especially in multi-country programmes.
- For multi-country programmes there is a need to **revise the Final Evaluation TOR**. The TOR would be more useful if it were a synthesis and gave the grantee flexibility to adapt the questions. For example replacing the advocacy question on country level impact to 'how far did GTF shape CSP advocacy priorities?'

WaterAid transforms lives by improving access to safe water, hygiene and sanitation in the world's poorest communities. We work with partners and influence decision-makers to maximise our impact.

WaterAid, 47-49 Durham Street,
London, SE11 5JD, UK

www.wateraid.org
+44 (0)20 7934500