

# WaterAid Timor-Leste Country Programme 2010-2015 Evaluation



**Children in Timor-Leste enjoy the benefits of clean, safe water.**

Photo credit: WaterAid/Matthew Abbott

April 2015

Keryn Clark  
Meredith Hickman  
Alex Grumbley  
Jyoti Bhushan  
Justino da Silva  
Francisca Sarmiento

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary Recommendations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Evaluation Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Limitations</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Findings against the 2010-2015 strategic objectives</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>EQ1: Access to WASH improved and more equitable &amp; Inclusive</i>	7
Access to improved Water and Sanitation	8
Equitable and Inclusive Access to WASH	11
Improving Services to Maximise Sustainability	13
Improved Hygiene and Sanitation Behaviours.	14
<b>Recommendations</b>	17
<i>EQ2: Sustaining Community Infrastructure &amp; WASH rights</i>	19
Community Groups Sustaining Community Infrastructure:	19
<b>Recommendations</b>	27
WASH Rights (Citizen Action)	28
<b>Recommendations</b>	31
<i>EQ 3: Sanitation Marketing – meeting demand created by CLTS?</i>	31
<b>Recommendations</b>	34
<i>EQ 4: Appropriate Technology – water supply systems</i>	35
<i>EQ 5: Strengthening Effective Responses to WASH</i>	35
Government of Timor-Leste	36
Influencing other WASH actors	37
<b>Recommendations</b>	38
<i>EQ 6: Strengthened capacity to Deliver WASH Services – Partners, Local Government and Private Sector?</i>	39
<b>Recommendations</b>	40
<i>EQ 7: Universally accessible WASH Infrastructure - Collaboration with DPOs</i>	40
<b>Recommendations</b>	41
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>List of Annexes</b>	<b>42</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A big “obrigada barak” to all those that were interviewed as part of the evaluation: the community members that hosted our visits, the Government of Timor-Leste colleagues, NGO partner staff and WASH agencies. Thankyou to the WATL staff, particularly those in Liquica and Manufahi who organised the evaluation visits. Thank you all for answering our many questions!

Thank you to the Water Aid evaluation team, particularly for your enthusiasm to “think outside the box” and to critically reflect on the past five years.

## ABBREVIATIONS

A-GMF	Association of GMFs / <i>Asosiasaun GMF Sira</i>
ALFA	<i>Area Livre Foer Arbiru</i> (Tetum term for ODF – see below)
<i>Bairro</i>	A hamlet (or sub-village) – generally between 10-30 houses. A number of <i>bairros</i> make an <i>aldeia</i> (small village) and a number of <i>aldeias</i> make a <i>suco</i> (large village).
BESI	<i>Bee, Saneamento no Igene</i> (Tetum acronym for WASH – see below)
CBM	Christian Blind Mission
DAA	<i>Departamento de Abastecimento de Água</i> (District level Department of Water Supply)
DGAS	<i>Direccao Geral Agua e Saneamento</i> (General Directorate for Water and Sanitation)
<i>Ekipa BESI</i>	WASH Team – this a municipal level group involving representatives from DAA, Municipal Health Services, Department of Education at municipal level, an A-GMF representative and WATL staff.
FPA	<i>Fasilitador Posto Administrasaun</i> (Administrative Post Facilitator) – previously Sub-district Facilitator (SDF)
GMF	<i>Grupo Maneja ba Fasilidade</i> (Water Facility Management Group)
LBF	<i>Luta Ba Futuro</i>
JTR	Joint Technical Review
IWDA	International Women’s Development Agency
MHM	Menstrual Hygiene Management
M-Water	A software program used on a mobile phone or tablet to measure and analyse key indicators relating to water & sanitation.
ODF	Open Defecation Free
PWD	People with a Disability
SDF	Sub-district Facilitator (DAA staff at sub-district level – focus on rural water supply), now known as FPA (See above)
SIBS	<i>Sistema Informasaun Bee no Saneamentu</i> (Water & Sanitation Information System)
SPT	Sector Planning Tool (a BESI/DGAS tool aimed to collecting information on all partners are activities in the WASH sector (by community)
WAAus	WaterAid Australia
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WATL	WaterAid Timor-Leste
WAUK	WaterAid UK

## SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations from the evaluation for WaterAid Timor-Leste (WATL):

1. Learning from the sustainability of water systems (87%) and the continued maintenance of ODF status would be useful for WATL, and for the WASH sector in general.<sup>1</sup>
2. Working at the bairro level provides some challenges requiring coordination and planning. An understanding of any benefits for sustainability of working at the bairro level would be useful in terms of policy engagement.
3. Strengthen the WATL data management systems – the introduction of M-Water will support this, however ensuring simplicity of indicators and clarity of their definition is crucial. Related to this, improve coordination with DAA/DNAS regarding monitoring of GMFs (and water systems).
4. Consider the option for WATL to provide support to the DAA regarding the SIBS data collection, and use of the data in Liquica and Manufahi municipalities (in addition to the use of the M-Water).
5. Focus on triggering behaviours for HWWS, drawing on learning from the TL HWWS campaign.
6. Consider options for the A-GMFs. Given current capacity of the A-GMFs, and the challenging financing or business climate, for them to become financially sustainable will require a significant investment in the A-GMF, with a number of risks. WATL will need to assess if this strategy warrants the investment, given those risks. Based on this, WATL should enter into dialogue with the A-GMFs around realistic options for their role in the medium to long term.
7. Review the Citizen Action and monitoring of PNDS to ensure building the capacity of community groups, and not duplicating activities through a possible collaboration with TAF.
8. Monitor how community feedback tools for WATL, Government and other programs leads to improved service delivery of rural water projects and community capacity to resolve concerns regarding their water systems (#1 of the Citizen Action strategies listed above). This may require developing a mechanism to feed results back to service providers (including WATL).
9. There is an opportunity for the PNBESI-TL to use the TL Strategic Development Plan targets for rural WASH (or national WASH) as a basis for their policy dialogue, with monitoring of the sector (Government and agencies) around progress towards this target.
10. The policy and advocacy outcomes are in their early stages, with a highly motivated team. Developing a system for monitoring progress towards advocacy and policy outcomes, will support the team to be responsive, to adapt strategies if necessary and to share learning in this area.
11. Identifying and understanding the motivation(s), willingness to pay, supply chains relating to improved sanitation in communities that have invested would provide valuable learning e.g. in Surirema bairro (each HH spent approx. \$200 to build a bathroom that fulfills their aspiration)
12. Engage with BESIK to further for an initial test of Sanitation Marketing of the SaTo toilet pan<sup>2</sup>. This trial should be closely monitored to develop lessons for a larger sanitation marketing strategy.
13. Start a process of communication with DNSA & DGAS, and also DAA regarding the M-Water system, and how, if at all, they would like it to work with their MIS and options for collaboration.
14. Engage with DNSA on systems and approaches relating to rural water supply. Where there is a difference in approach, communication around the reasons for the differences will be useful.
15. Support the Ekipa BESI to link to their assessments to an implementation plan (including resourcing) for improved service delivery outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup> For water systems, a study of systems that are 4-5 years old, and serving both small and larger populations.

<sup>2</sup> Based on the four Ps of Sanitation marketing approaches, also considering the SaniFOAM framework that provides a useful check in the context of TL.

16. Identify options for both developing capacity development strategies and monitoring outcomes with both the two Ekipa BESI and the NGO partners.
17. Look at options for WASH programs to take a more holistic view of access to WASH facilities, e.g. paths to toilets, and to water points.

## INTRODUCTION

WaterAid has been working in Timor-Leste since 2005 working in partnership with PLAN for the first two years. In 2007, WaterAid Australia (WAAus) opened a country office, WaterAid Timor-Leste (WATL), and commenced activities in Liquica Municipality.<sup>3</sup> In 2011, WATL expanded the program to include Manufahi Municipality.

Liquica is located on the north coast to the west of the capital Dili. Parts of the municipality is a coastal plain close to the main road from Timor-Leste to Indonesia, however other communities are located in the mountain range in the south of the municipality. Liquica has a population of approx. 63,000, with a total 3 *posto-administravos* (sub-districts), with WATL working in all three. Manufahi in the south of Timor-Leste, is a remote municipality, and primarily a mountainous region.<sup>4</sup> Manufahi has 4 *posto-administravos* with a population of approximately 44,000.<sup>5</sup> WATL is working in 3 of the 4 *posto-administravos*.

In 2010, WATL, with support from the WAAus program team, developed a Country Strategy for the period from 2010 – 2015. While, various aspects of the program had been reviewed recently, this evaluation provides an overall review of the country program.

The WATL Country Strategy 2010 - 15 aimed to improve access to water, sanitation and hygiene for 20,850 people. It aimed to work with 98 communities in Liquica Municipality and 41 communities in Manufahi Municipality. Funding for the five-year period was proposed at AUD6.2 million.<sup>6</sup>

As at June 2014, since 2010, WATL has worked with 123 communities, providing increased access to WASH for a total population of 17,121.<sup>7</sup>

The purpose of the evaluation is three-fold:

1. To what extent, and how, has the programme **has achieved the objectives and outcomes** set out in the Country Strategy 2010-2015;
2. To understand what were the **strengths and weaknesses** of the programme from 2010-2015 and within the WASH sector today, understand any gaps re **capacity, research**, particularly **areas where WATL is well placed to add-value**.
3. In light of the above - make **recommendations** for the new country programme 2015-2020 with regards the current evolving country context

The evaluation was undertaken at national level and in both Liquica and Manufahi municipalities.

<sup>3</sup> Timor-Leste is in the process of decentralization, thus “Districts” are now known as “Municipalities” and Sub-districts as “Posto Administrativos”

<sup>4</sup> Timor-Leste Census 2011

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> WaterAid Timor-Leste, Country Strategy 2010-2015.

<sup>7</sup> The WATL team has been collecting PWD and sex disaggregated data for the past 2 years, however it is not available for the full 5 year period.

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Evaluation Plan provides the full methodology for the Evaluation - Refer to Annex E.

In summary, the evaluation used a qualitative methodology involving key informant interviews, community focus groups discussions and group discussions with staff and partners. The evaluation draws on previous reviews undertaken by WATL during the period.

The Evaluation Questions were drawn from the WATL Country Strategy 2010-2015 and are below:

1. To what extent has the program built the capacity of community management groups to both sustain community infrastructure; and to promote the voice of rural populations and marginalized groups regarding their WASH rights.
2. To what extent has access water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure and services been improved; and made more equitable and inclusive?
3. To what extent has sanitation marketing improved so that sanitation hardware supplies better meet the demand created by CLTS? What has WATL's role been in this change?
4. To what extent has the most appropriate technology been used in the design and construction of water supply systems?
5. To what extent has WATL and its partners influenced Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) to increase and be more effective in their response to WASH. To what extent has WATL influenced the work of other major actors in the sector?
6. To what extent has WATL strengthened the capacity of local NGO partners, sub-national Government and the private sector to ensure services are delivered at scale in an equitable and sustainable manner?
7. What have been the outcomes of collaboration with Disabled Peoples Organizations (DPOs) to demonstrate effective responses to universally accessible WASH infrastructure?

Question and discussion guides sought to elicit information from key informants and groups on what has worked well, what approaches/ strategies/activities were undertaken and in what challenges have existed.

Six communities were visited with 2 interviews in each – one interview with women, and one with the GMF. In one community teenage girls were interviewed. Consent was sought and gained from all those involved in focus group discussions. 3 communities were interviewed in Manufahi and three in Liquica (one in each sub-district). In all communities, the WASH programs had been completed within the last 2 years.

Interviews were held with Municipal Governments in Liquica and Manufahi – Municipal Administrator and the BESI team (DAA, Health, Education), with National Government including DGAS, DNSA and the MoH. Discussions and meetings with seven NGO partners were held in Dili and in the municipalities. There were also meetings with key informants – a full list is provided in Annex D.

Three workshops were held with groups of WATL staff as part of the evaluation: with the Liquica team, Manufahi team and the Advocacy team. A final presentation of draft findings and recommendations was made at the end of in-country visit.

## LIMITATIONS

1. Given the time available, only six *bairros* (sub-villages) were visited, with the focus being on qualitative data. All quantitative data was drawn from WATL monitoring systems and data available from the GoTL (SIBS) or BESIK.
2. Of the six communities visited, the WASH projects had been implemented within the past two years, with a number being recently completed. For this reason it was not possible to assess how the community and households managed their water and sanitation.
3. Due to time constraints it was not possible to meet with the PN-BESITL, and the meeting with the Advocacy Team was reduced to less than half a day.
4. There were some challenges in accessing WATL monitoring data, particularly uniformity of data across the two municipalities (program areas).

## FINDINGS AGAINST THE 2010-2015 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The evaluation findings are organized by the Evaluation Questions above, with the narrative addressing the sub-questions. As noted in the methodology, findings and recommendations from studies and reviews of WATL's work over the past two years will also be reference in the response to the evaluation questions. The evaluation uses data collected by WATL, which, to an extent, has been triangulated through discussions.

### EQ1: ACCESS TO WASH IMPROVED AND MORE EQUITABLE & INCLUSIVE

***To what extent has access water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure and services improved; and made more equitable and inclusive through WATLs work?***

This Evaluation Question covers the following:

- Access to improved water systems and sanitation facilities (infrastructure) – equitable and inclusive
- Services to maximise the sustainability of water services and improved sanitation status
- Improved hygiene behaviours - including Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)



### Summary of key findings

1. 89% of water-points reported to have full functionality, 2 years after completion. (WATL reporting - 2014)
2. Approx 17,121, additional people (approx. 2630 HH) have access to water through WATL supported construction of 123 water systems over the period from 2010-2015 (WATL Reporting)
3. Of the 117 sub-villages (bairros) where projects have finished, 94 have declared ODF (80%)- (WATL Reporting). WATL supports an ODF verification process
4. WATL monitors both functionality of water systems and the continuation of ODF for 2 years from project completion.
5. While there are high rates of building “tippy-taps” with soap at project completion, monitoring has shown HWWS rates drop off once the project is completed, as does promotion of HWWS. Tippy-taps tended to be poorly located.
6. 62% of GMFs had more than 30% of women in management roles, and 8% had women in technical roles. WATL has invested significantly in strengthening both gender equity and inclusion through the WASH program, however there continues to be a need for further strengthening of systems, attitudes and skills for partners and their staff.
7. WATL has supported the construction of smaller water systems at the bairro level (ranging from serving 3HH to 62HH), with 17 systems serving less than 10HH since 2010. On average, water systems supported by WATL serve 25HH.
8. In 2014, 92% of households from ODF communities were assessed to be using their toilets two years after ODF was declared (WATL Data collection). There is an indication that where a community has declared ODF, HHs are more likely to continue to use their toilet, however this requires further investigation.
9. 83% of target households had a HW facility with soap (at the end of the project), that monitoring one year on (pocket voting) found that only 19.25% of population practiced HWWS on at least three critical times (WATL Reporting 2014). This was backed by the FGDs. HW Facilities, were often not located near the toilet or the kitchen.
10. MHM activities show great potential for empowering young women, and as basis for greater awareness of their reproductive health (aside of the hygiene safety benefits).

## ACCESS TO IMPROVED WATER AND SANITATION

WATL have provided improved access to water and sanitation in 117 rural *bairros* (sub-villages) in Liquica and Manufahi municipalities. This accounts for approximately 20% of rural sub-villages in Liquica municipality and 4% of sub-villages in Manufahi municipality<sup>8</sup>. WASH activities were being undertaken at the time of the evaluation in a further 10 villages (commenced in 2014-15) bringing the total to 123 villages with access to improved water and sanitation. Of the 123 communities (bairros)

<sup>8</sup> It is not possible to provide an exact measure of scale, as WATL works at the *bairro* level, which are sub villages and not officially recognized and countered. However approx measure is that one *aldeia* has 4 *bairros*. Liquica district has 120 rural *aldeias* (approx. 480 *bairros*) and Manufahi has 122 rural *aldeias* (approx. 488 *bairros*) . Thus WATL has covered approx. 20% (97/480) of communities (sub-villages) in Liquica district and 4% (20/488) of sub-villages in Manufahi district.



that WATL is supporting (completed plus ongoing) WASH projects, 74 communities declared that they were open defecation free.

The population of the 117 sub-villages with completed WASH activities is 14,791<sup>9</sup>. It is estimated that in the 10 sub-villages, where WASH activities are in progress the population is 2,330<sup>10</sup>, bringing the total to additional population accessing improved water and sanitation in the period 2010-2015 to be 17,121.

The 2010-2015 WATL Country Strategy planned WASH activities would be completed in 139 sub-villages covering a total of 20,850 people (98 villages in Liquica, 41 in Manufahi = 139 sub-villages = 4170 households = 20,850 people). Summary data is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 Improved Access to WASH 2010-2015**

Access to	Improved Water (sub-villages)	Sanitation – Sub-Villages declared ODF <sup>11</sup>	Population	Country strategy
Liquica	97+4*** = 101	78 declared	13,071	98
Manufahi	20+2** = 22	16 declared	4,050	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>123*</b>	<b>94 declared**</b>	<b>17,121</b>	<b>139</b>

**Notes:**

\* For water the first figure is the completed + those in progress to get a total for the 2010-15 period.

\*\* Of these 94 declared a total of 28 were certified (19 in Liquica and 9 in Manufahi) - refer Findings below for more details of certification.

\*\*\* additional numbers include those water systems in progress, to bring the total for the 2010-15 period.

The number of sub-villages with access to improved water and sanitation facilities is slightly less than initially planned in the WATL Country Strategy. The WATL CD provided the following reasons for the reduced beneficiary numbers:

- In 2013, the WATL Country team, concerned about the quality of delivery, made a decision to reduce implementation numbers, in order to allow the team to support partners to focus on the quality of delivery. This then allowed for sufficient time for partner NGOs to engage communities fully with the aim of maximising community ownership of the infrastructure built. It also allowed for sufficient time to strengthen gender, equity and social inclusion activities by NGOs with the community groups.
- The actual funding did not match the projected funding in the CSP2010-15. Program funding was AUD1.5million lower than projected funding. This combined with the recent drop in AUD exchange rates against the USD further impacted funds available to WATL.

WATL has tended to support the construction of smaller water systems and promote improved sanitation at the *bairro* level. During 2010 to 2014, the water systems supported by WATL range from serving 3HH to 62HH, with 40 water systems serving less than 20HH (of which 17 systems serve less than 10HH). There is an average 25HH per water system (*bairro*).<sup>12</sup> The Timor-Leste Rural Water

<sup>9</sup> 12,034 people in Liquica district and 2,760 in Manufahi district.

<sup>10</sup> 1,442 people in Liquica district and 888 in Manufahi district.

<sup>11</sup> Data from WATL ODF Verification Record for Liquica, and from the SPT April 2015 for Manufahi.

<sup>12</sup> Calculation based on 118 communities (covering an estimated 2952HH) in the April 2015 SPT.

Supply Guidelines provide that rural water systems are considered a public system when they serve 20HH or more.<sup>13</sup> This is discussed in the section on sustainability below. The evaluation did not specifically look at the construction standards of water systems, as this was covered in the Joint Technical Review (JTR). A key issue raised in the JTR was the need for a greater focus on water quality.

As part of constructing community water systems, six primary schools, 3 health posts and one clinic have also been provided with a water point. There was no data available as to whether WATL supported improved sanitation in these facilities. The BESI team does include representatives from the District Health and Education departments, however there is no specific component that directly engages with either Department on the ongoing maintenance of either water or sanitation facilities.<sup>14</sup>

As part of the “access for all” approach WATL aims to ensure that all bairros in the aldeia have access to an improved water system.<sup>15</sup> DNSA guidelines suggest aiming for 80% of the aldeia. The DAA staff in Liquica expressed concern that as WATL was only working in sub-villages as opposed to the whole village (*aldeia*) some areas of an aldeia were not being covered. It was not possible to check this. The WATL database does indicate that not all bairros in an aldeia are engaged in WATL activities, however it was not possible to determine if other bairros had access to water and sanitation already (e.g. through other agencies work). The DAA WASH information system (SIBS) is designed to measure coverage at the aldeia level however the data is not available to review.

WATL uses ODF status as the target for improved sanitation, based on the public health approach whereby to achieve health benefits from improved sanitation, everyone in the community needs to be practising safe defecation, including children. The data shows that approximately 80% of communities (of the 117 where the project has been completed) where WATL supported programs declared that there were ODF (80% in both Liquica and Manufahi). It is worth noting that the rate of declaring ODF in Liquica municipality increased from 2012 onwards. As noted above with water systems, the approach to ODF declaration is generally at suco level, and thus there is a possibility of gaps, with WATL working at the bairro level. Overall, to maximise coverage, at a greater level than the bairro, requires coordination and planning and then communication with government around the approach.

The National Basic Sanitation Policy sets a process for community declaration, with follow up verification by a municipality level team including District Health Services, *Departamento de Abastecimento de Água* (DAA) and the Municipal Administration. The process supported by WATL is similar to that of the NBSP, whereby the Suco chief, and head of the GMF declare ODF (however at the bairro level). The ODF status is then verified by the municipality BESI team (supported by WATL), however verification of ODF tends to largely be dependent on the workload of the BESI team. From WATL records, the verification has generally been undertaken within the same month for systems from 2012-13.<sup>16</sup> Over the 5-year period there has been no follow-up verifications to determine if communities have maintained their ODF status.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ministry of Infrastructure, (2011) Timor-Leste Rural Water Supply Guidelines. Section 1, pg 10.

<sup>14</sup> This is a challenge across the WASH sector in Timor-Leste, and thus not confined to WATL alone.

<sup>15</sup> Pers comms with Jyoti Bhushan, WATL Liquica Program Manager.

<sup>16</sup> In 2010 and 2011, the initial verification was undertaken between 5 months and just over one year after ODF had been declared. The delay was due to challenges of all BESI members being available to undertake verification. The CD for WATL advised that more recently the BESI has added the ODF verification (including verification of HWF) to Water Supply construction checks.

---

## EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE ACCESS TO WASH

A key focus of WATL work is to maximise both equity and inclusion in relation to the provision of water and sanitation infrastructure. The following aspects of equity and inclusion were investigated through the evaluation:

- the approach to prioritizing program areas;
- access to all
- women's engagement, and
- specific issues for those with a disability.

Program Prioritization: WATL commenced work in Liquica Municipality in 2007 and expanded into Manufahi Municipality in 2011. The program team advised that the decision to start in Liquica Municipality was based on proximity to Dili, capacity considerations at the time and the context of starting a new WASH development program implemented through partnership in an insecure context with limitations on resources and staff. The Country Strategy states the decision to expand to Manufahi is based on its classification as a poorer municipality<sup>17</sup> and also direction from the national government on where support is needed. There is no information available on access to WASH by municipality in either the Census or the Demographic Health Survey (DHS). The GoTL SIBS information (available from 2011) which does provide detailed information on access to water and sanitation is currently not up to date.<sup>18</sup>

The DHS 2009-10 provides information on wealth quintiles by municipality. Of the 13 municipalities, Manufahi had the 5<sup>th</sup> highest percentage of population in the lowest quintile, while Liquica had the 4<sup>th</sup> lowest percentage population in the lowest quintile. Additionally, the Liquica DAA, provided that Liquica has a higher rate of access to improved WASH, and it is likely the decision of WATL to commence programming there was the proximity to Dili.<sup>19</sup> As per the wealth figures in the DHS 2009-10, more remote rural communities, tend to have less access to water and sanitation, however there is not data to confirm this. The decision by the WATL team as to locations to work was determined by WATL staff in consultation with the Municipal Administration and Suco Chiefs, and confirmed with the DAA, with main criteria for selection being that the community had no access to improved water.

Access to All: In the six communities visited as part of the evaluation, the water systems served most houses within the bairro, with a small number of homes that were not served (accessing a tap-stand), due to difficult topography and location with respect to the water system, making it unrealistic to do

---

<sup>17</sup> WaterAid in Timor-Leste. Country Strategy 2010-2015 – pg 3-4, however the analysis that the western municipalities are the poorest, is not in-line with the data provided in the DHS 2009-10 which shows that those municipalities most distant from Dili are poorer – Oecusse, Viqueque, Ainaro and Manufahi.

<sup>18</sup> The GoTL SIBS data provides detailed data (to the *aldeia* level) on various indicators relating to rural water and sanitation, however, as questions have been raised as to the current reliability of the data, thus it not been used in the evaluation to assess prioritization process. In June 2012, SIBS data showed that 53% of aldeais (villages) in Liquica and 30% of aldeias (villages) had a water system that functioned or partially functioned. However in both municipalities, not all data had been collected – thus exact figures are unreliable, however provides an indicator of coverage.

<sup>19</sup> The DAA in Liquica advised that according to their SIBS records as at January 2015, 72% of rural communities in Liquica have access to improved water (The JMP national rural rates for access to water are 61% in the 2015 update).

so.<sup>20</sup> Interestingly, in Manggaet, Manufahi on discussion with community members, those living far from the community were also vulnerable in other ways – one women was a widow, and her sons lived in other municipalities, the other was an old man with mental health issues.

In most communities all tap-stands in the community were built with a ramp (and some with a laundry washing bench). While this is a positive step, the actual accessibility to the tapstands is likely to still be a challenge for those with poor mobility as tapstands were often located in difficult to access terrain. In discussions with community groups, there was generally little understanding of what the purpose of the ramp was. WATL has also invested in working with households where a family member has a disability to look at suitable options to support that person to access the toilet with dignity. Refer to EQ7 for further discussion on work with Disability Peoples Organizations.

Regarding increased equity of rural water systems, a key aspect of the WATL Country Strategy is for an increase of women in the management of and/or decision making roles regarding their water system. Refer Table 2 for WATL data on women’s engagement for systems completed between 2010-14.

**Table 2 Women’s roles on GMFs – Systems Completed between 2010-2014**

	<b>Women hold more than 30% of management roles in the GMF</b>	<b>Women Technicians</b>
<b>Liquica</b>	59%	8%
<b>Manufahi</b>	87.5%	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	62.8%	7.9%

This data reflects a broader challenge across Timor-Leste (and globally) where there is often an enshrined gendered perception that technicians should be men. The recently revised *Fasilitador Posto Administrasaun* (FPA) manual states that there should be one male and one female technician (pg 24). However it is clear, while a starting point is to select women in key roles, it is also crucial that women in these roles are supported to perform the roles, in a way that both they and to a large extent of the community they are representing, feel that they are contributing. This will often require ongoing work by the NGO (or the A-GMF) to both provide relevant support to female members, and activities with community members around the importance of women in roles, traditionally seen as male roles.

From the evaluation and discussion with WATL staff, women tend to hold the role of treasurer, health promoter or secretary. WATL monitoring shows that 11 GMFs (of a total of 101 GMFs) have a woman as the head of the GMF. The evaluation team met with two women who headed their GMF (Asulema, Liquica and Solurema, Manufahi). In Asulema, the head of the GMF said that due to her experience of leading the GMF and the confidence the community had placed in her, she was planning to stand for the Suco Council elections due to take place later in 2015.

WATL has invested significantly in a systematic approach to equity and inclusion within their WASH programs, and in strengthening the capacity of the staff to provide support to partners (communities

<sup>20</sup> Given the challenging landscape in TL there is recognition of ‘difficult to serve’ HHs in the DNSA Rural Water Supply guidelines, thus the guidelines recommend that 80% of the homes within a community are within 200mtres of a water point. From the communities that were visited on the evaluation, WATL is working within this guideline.

and government) in improving inclusive and equitable approaches to WASH. WATL has partnered with specialist agencies (IWDA and CBM) to further develop gender equity and inclusive access, resulting in the WATL the staff and some of the partner staff having stronger systems, attitudes and skills to integrated gender and inclusion throughout program activities. WATL has developed a manual for Gender and WASH for use by its partners has been developed, and is been amended based on feedback from its use.

The two municipalities are using different approaches to both gender and inclusion. In Manufahi, the primary implementing partner (*Luta ba Futuro* - LBF) is collaborating with a women's organization (Feto ba Futuro) and a disabled peoples organization (RHTO) to support the implementation of gender equity and social inclusion, with all three organizations receiving ongoing training and mentoring support from WATL. In Liquica, the key staff (management and program staff) in all partners have been supported (through training & mentoring) to develop a more equitable and inclusive approach to WASH.

Further work remains to support partners to motivate communities around the key issues relating to equity and inclusion and WASH. WATL is aware of this, and planning continued investment to support ongoing strengthening of this aspect of the program.

---

## IMPROVING SERVICES TO MAXIMISE SUSTAINABILITY

Improved 'services' refers the ongoing provision of the service in the post construction phase – either the water supply system continues to provide water or in the case of sanitation, HH's continue to maintain their toilet and are able to access products to do so.

Regarding ongoing functionality of rural water supply systems, WATL monitoring has found that there is a full **functionality rate of 89% two years after completion** of construction.<sup>21</sup> This is a positive result and compares with results by the BESIK funded systems (3 years prior).<sup>22</sup> Currently WATL only monitors water systems for two years after completion.

In line with GoTL policy, a key strategy of WATL to maximising sustainability has been to support and strengthen the GMF capacity to manage their community water systems. WATL has supported the formation of, and the activities of an Association of GMFs (A-GMF) in each of the two municipalities. The A-GMF either has, or will have, a key role of providing ongoing support to their members. The A-GMFs membership is not limited to the communities where WATL has supported water systems, with the aim that the A-GMF will provide support to GMFs across the municipality. WATL has actively focused on strengthening the collaboration between the A-GMF and the Municipality level government – both DAA and the Municipal Administration. The findings relating to WATLs work to strengthening GMFs and A-GMFs, and the collaboration with Municipal/Municipality level are discussed in detail as part of Evaluation Question (EQ) #2 below.

---

<sup>21</sup> WaterAid Timor-Leste Country Program 12-month Report (2013-14).

<sup>22</sup> BESIK reported 84% of water systems full functioning, 3 years after completion, as at Dec 2014. Note the PDID (GoTL) functionality rates were 67% for the same period of time.

In the evaluation, the GMF members interviewed, had not yet needed to make repairs as most systems visited had been recently completed. These GMF members expressed that they felt they could make simple repairs, however they felt that major breakdowns would be a challenge – for example, a number of GMFs interviewed mentioned concern around the impact of landslides damaging water system infrastructure (both in Liquica and Manufahi). This is further discussed in EQ 2 below.

Currently the sustainability officer visits communities two years after construction to collect this data. Data is not collected by WATL for systems older than two years. Through DNSA and DAA, the GoTL information management system collects general information on functionality (SIBS), which ideally would currently provide data to WATL at the aldeia level on the level of functionality of water systems.<sup>23</sup> Nationally, there have been challenges in the ongoing operation of SIBS (refer to EQ 6 below), however in the meeting with the Liquica *Ekipa BESI*, DAA staff appeared to have updated SIBS data on the population accessing an improved water source in Liquica municipality.

As noted above, WATL has generally supported the construction of smaller water systems at the bairro level (ranging from serving 3HH to 62HH), with 17 systems serving less than 10HH since 2010. There may be advantages from this approach: such as greater community ownership of the system, which can be a positive influence on ease of management, however it could also prove a challenge if there are any breakdowns, as raising the funds to make repairs from a smaller number of HHs. Due to the nature of the evaluation, it was not possible to obtain evidence on the advantages and disadvantages of water systems that serve small population numbers. There is no clear policy statement by the GoTL as to what is considered a public water system, however DNSA Rural Water Supply Guidelines indicate that for DNSA planning purposes they focus on communities of 20HH or more, as a “public system”.<sup>24</sup> This impacts on the linkages with municipal level DAA, particularly the FPAs, which is further discussed in EQ 6.

Service delivery relating to sanitation is discussed in the section on improved hygiene and sanitation behaviours that follows.

---

## IMPROVED HYGIENE AND SANITATION BEHAVIOURS.

The evaluation focused on handwashing with soap (HWWS) and use of the toilet as key hygiene and sanitation behaviours. In addition to HWWS and toilet use, in one community the evaluation met with a small group of teenage girls relating to menstrual hygiene management activities of the program.

The program has focused on motivating households to build a toilet, and working with entire communities on the importance of everyone using a toilet (and safe disposal for faeces for infants). As the communities visited had recently built their toilets (within the past 2 years), there was limited information or evidence of the capacity to maintain or rebuild of their toilets. Thus FGDs in the communities visited tended to focus on people’s future plans around maintaining their toilet.

---

<sup>23</sup> SIBS – WASH MIS managed by DNSA collects functionality data at the aldeia level, thus if there are two or three water systems (as is the case in the aldeias where WATL is working) the functionality status would be across all water systems.

<sup>24</sup> Ministry of Infrastructure, (2011) Timor-Leste Rural Water Supply Guidelines. Section 1, pg 10.

WATL partners support the GMF's to take on the role of motivating HH members to continually use their toilets (rebuilding if necessary), and to encourage those who have not built toilets, to do so. Partners (with WATL support) train at least one person from each community to be a health promoter, who then takes on this role. FGDs revealed that there was an acceptance by GMF members (including the health promoter) that some people could not or would not build a toilet, thus the once the main community mobilisation activity around sanitation was completed (generally led by the partner NGO), the health promoter (nor other GMF members) did not appear to follow up with HHs that had not yet built a toilet. As noted in Table 1, in both Liquica and Manufahi 80% of communities where the program worked, declared ODF.<sup>25,26</sup> Data on the verification of the ODF status for these communities is not available, thus it is not possible to confirm that 80% of these communities were verified as ODF. Additionally, monitoring data post ODF to determine whether communities have maintained their ODF status was not available for the evaluation.

WATL monitoring found that in 2014, 92% of households from ODF communities were assessed to be using their toilets two years after ODF was declared.<sup>27</sup> This is a very positive result and indicates a change from two studies undertaken in 2012.<sup>28</sup> However, in discussions with community members, particularly those that had declared ODF more than a year ago, there was evidence of some people not using a toilet (for example Manggaet, Manufahi). In discussions with the WATL team, there are plans to start to collect data on toilet usage in more detail (and ongoing ODF status) as a part of the rolling out of the M-Water based data collection system.

While WATL focuses on the initial motivation is for everyone to use a toilet (i.e. ODF community), the WATL program also promotes options to improve their toilet. Discussions with communities revealed that many HHs while building a basic toilet most had not improved their toilets, with many stating an expectation that they will receive assistance to upgrade their toilet. The risk associated with a basic toilet is that maintenance, including cleaning it is often more difficult, and it becomes either unpleasant to use, or it collapses, and the family then returns to open defecation. This is discussed further in EQ 3 below. There was a varied experience relating to the sanitation marketing, particularly post-construction. In Maubara sub-district (Liquica Municipality), the A-GMF worked with some GMFs to sell sanitation products (produced by the A-GMF), however this was limited to a few communities.<sup>29</sup> However in other sub-districts in Liquica and in Manufahi, GMFs in the communities visited were not involved in encouraging HHs to upgrade their toilets. As discussed in EQ 3 below, Manufahi Municipality has limited sanitation product options, with the hardware store in town.

The Country Strategy set a target for 75% of community members to be aware of the importance of

---

<sup>25</sup> Calculation based on the systems that are finished – for Liquica, 78 communities from a total of 97; for Manufahi, 16 communities from a total of 20.

<sup>26</sup> 80% of communities achieving ODF is likely to be a high percentage in the context of Timor-Leste, however there is no comparable data available from other agencies/programs e.g. BESIK.

<sup>27</sup> WATL 2013/14 Program Report. WATL sanitation monitoring is undertaken by the Sustainability Officer, up to two years from project completion.

<sup>28</sup> An audit by WAAus in December 2012 in Liquica district, across all communities (ODF and non ODF) 72% of WATL supported households were continuing to use their toilets two years after being built. A small study undertaken in WATL supported projects in 2012 (Dwan P), found that there was a slippage from ODF of between 20-30%.

<sup>29</sup> Pers communications, Jyoti Bhushan, WATL Program Manager, Liquica.



practicing safe hygiene behaviors. WATL's data collection in 2014 found that while 83% of target households had a handwashing facility with soap (at the end of the project), that monitoring one year on (pocket voting) found that only 19.25% practiced handwashing with soap on at least three critical times. Monitoring found that two years after project completion this had reduced to 17% with a "tippy tap".<sup>30</sup> The evaluation team also found (through the FGDs) that participants across the various groups reported the importance of HWWS related to food preparation and eating, with few people mentioning the need to HWWS after defecation.

Interviews with the health promotion volunteers in the six communities, found that there was a focus on households building "tippy-taps" through the implementation period, however there has been little continued focus on promoting handwashing with soap, post project completion.

Studies on motivation for behaviour change regarding HWWS involves a number of factors – such as supporting the creation of an environment where it is easy to wash hands at the critical times (i.e. water and soap near the toilet and kitchen) and becomes "habit". In the communities visited, a number of "tippy-taps" were located at the front of the house, and not near the toilet or the kitchen. On visiting a selection of toilets, for those with traditional toilets, there was no sign of a place for hand-washing, or soap nearby. In one community (where improved toilets included a washing area) there was soap available within the toilet.<sup>31</sup> While it was not possible to confirm that HWWS was being undertaken at critical times, a clear indicator of HWWS after defecation is used soap (or ash) observed near the toilet.

Additionally an "emotional driver" may trigger a person to always wash their hands at critical times. Formative research, including research undertaken in Timor-Leste, has found that emotional drivers for HWWS include the value of nurture (caring for your children and family), disgust (at having faecal contamination on your hands) and to a lesser extent status and affiliation (i.e. socially acceptable behaviour) – more about having soap available in your toilet.<sup>32,33</sup> Across all FGDs, men and women felt that they knew it was important to HWWS, however it was difficult to practice all the time, as people are busy, and they forget. Interestingly, the cost of soap was not raised as a barrier. All communities had a functioning water-supply, and thus water was also not raised as a barrier. In the FGDs, participants found it difficult to suggest what would motivate people to HWWS.

Discussions with partner staff, and with community health promotion volunteers, revealed that the experience and related skills to trigger behaviour change regarding HWWS were limited, and the focus tended to be on the HH building a "tippy tap". As noted above, once the project was completed, Health Promoters interviewed reported that they did not continue to undertake hygiene promotion.

### Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)

The evaluation team met with four girls (aged 14 to 16 years) who had been involved in the menstrual

---

<sup>30</sup> It is not clear if the initial measure of a HWF was limited to being a "tippy-tap", and if the monitoring two years later was also limited to a tippy-tap – thus it is not clear if the same indicator was being measured. WATL has made some changes in HW indicators, and is now measuring any form of place to wash hands (e.g. a bucket, bowl etc).

<sup>31</sup> Sorulema, Manufahi

<sup>32</sup> Biran A et al, (2014) Lancet.

<sup>33</sup> HWWS Formative Research, BESIK TL

hygiene program at their school. They reported that the MHM discussion they were involved in had assisted them in understanding about menstruation and reproductive health and were able to confidently discuss aspects of this. They all used sanitary pads (note they were in a wealthier community) and would purchase these from the local kiosk (50c/each). They would be given money to buy pencils etc for school, and would use this money to purchase sanitary pads. They continued to go to school during menses. They felt confident to discuss MHM, notably different to attempts to have conversation with older females regarding MHM.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The functionality rate of 89% for water supplies less than two years old is positive in the current context. It would be useful for the WASH sector to identify the factors that support the sustainability – particularly as WATL is supporting two approaches that differ to the approach proposed by the government through the Rural Water Supply Guidelines – i.e. the support for an A-GMF and secondly the construction of water systems serving smaller population numbers (than the average of the majority of other water systems being built). Findings from this research, maybe useful for the review of the Rural Water Supply Guidelines (due in 2016) and for the development/finalisation of the National Water Supply Policy. However, in the communities visited as part of the evaluation, the GMFs have not undertaken any maintenance and for this reason it would be useful for WATL to either consider assessing the sustainability of water systems that have been constructed more than two years earlier; or to support DAA (the FPAs) to collect SIBS data which would provide an ongoing record of functionality of water systems. It is likely with age, water systems face potentially greater challenges with failures.
2. Working at the bairro level provides some challenges requiring coordination and planning – particularly given that GoTL Rural Water guidelines aim for 80% coverage at the aldeia level. Additionally, given that some of the communities that WATL work with to provide a water system, too small (i.e. serve less than 10HH) to be considered a public system, which may impact on future maintenance support. An understanding of any benefits for sustainability of working at the bairro level would be useful in terms of policy engagement.
3. Similarly, WATL would have a greater understanding of the continuation of ODF status within communities through data collection. This would support further analysis links between HH's achieving ODF status, and slippage of HHs to once again OD, and to further investigate why HH's stop using toilets, to adapt program delivery, if necessary. It is important that ODF status is monitored over a longer period of time, than is currently the case.
4. There is a large amount of WATL data on a range of aspects of WASH Program delivery although it is challenging to pull this data together to "tell the story" of WATL's achievements – and there is a good story to tell. WATL is investing in M-Water, and this is likely to substantially improve this issue. It will be important to have a key number of high-level indicators that are necessary for monitoring and to support analysis, as opposed to lots of indicators. There should be clear definitions of the indicators and checks to ensure data is robust.
5. There is clear value to policy dialogue, national planning and investment and WATLs own advocacy initiatives to have sound WASH sector data covering the country. The BESIK program is providing support to DGAS on the improving the SIBS data collection, however there is possibly an option for WATL to provide some support to DAA regarding the SIBS data collection, and use of the data in Liquica and Manufahi municipalities (in addition to the use of the M-Water). While the M-Water system is aimed at addressing specific program information needs by WATL, there is a risk that

any data WATL communicates (based on M-Water) will be questioned, given that the Government has an alternative system. Additionally, by both strengthening the DAA use of SIBS, in two municipalities will provide a useful example for other municipalities, of the value of information. WATLs possible involvement in the development of a Rural Water Asset Register for TL, may provide an opportunity to further engage with DNSA on data.

6. The current approach whereby partners focus on the building of “tippy taps” risks limited focus on behaviour change. This was demonstrated where HH’s in some communities visited proudly displayed their HWF, located neither near their toilet, or their kitchen. Based on discussions with GMFs – two aspects that may increase rates are: Firstly, activities that make HWWS easy to do and supporting to being a habit - thus addressing the issue raised of people being too busy, or forgetting to HWWS (i.e soap/ash and water to clean hands close to the toilet and the kitchen). Secondly, triggering an emotion, whereby people “feel” concerned if they have not washed their hands, e.g. a sense of feeling unclean, unsafe for their children. In order to support activities that trigger emotions, it is recommended that WATL adapt the focus of hygiene promotion to include triggering HWWS behaviours, drawing on learning from the HWWS campaign (supported by BESIK and MoH) could use targeted communication materials, linking into the mass communications of the campaign.<sup>34</sup> The option of supporting linkages between the GMF Health Promoters with the Ministry of Health Environmental Health staff, and HWWS campaign activities could also be further investigated. Health promoters could possibly be trained with a focus on select key messages based on a triggering HWWS, with the intention of reinforcing a message.

---

<sup>34</sup> The pilot of the HWWS Campaign found that in comparison to the baseline and the control there was a significant increase in HWWS after contact with faeces, there was also a slight increase from the baseline in relation to HWWS prior to contact with food, however there was not such a large difference to the control. The data for the campaign in Liquica, Lautem and Baucau was not available at the time of the evaluation.

## EQ2: SUSTAINING COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE & WASH RIGHTS

***To what extent has the program built the capacity of community management groups to:***

- ***sustain community infrastructure; and***
- ***promote the voice of rural populations and marginalized groups regarding their WASH rights.***

### Summary of key findings

- WATL has supported the establishment of 117 GMFs in the period 2010-15.
- Two Assosiasaun- GMFs (A-GMF) are providing support to those GMFs, with the A-GMF in Manufahi recently established in 2014, and understandably demonstrating a lower level of capacity.
- All six GMFs interviewed were collecting funds for management. As their water systems were recently completed, none reported making in major repairs. In Liquica there was evidence that spending for O&M had increased significantly over the past 3 years.
- GMFs interviewed explained that there was no conflict around the water system, however in communities visited, some HH paid, others did not; and some HH had organised hoses from the tapstand to their house, while others could not. These differential practices can lead to conflict.
- Many of the WATL funded water systems are have 20 or less HH thus funds raised, with the current HH contribution will be at most \$60/year, unlikely to be sufficient in case of a number of breakdowns, or a major breakdown. DNSA guidelines are that support can be provided for major breakdowns to systems that serve over 20 HHs.
- Women's roles on GMFs are discussed in EQ1.
- The capacity & functionality of GMFs are being monitored by various groups/agencies: Ekipa BESI and the AGMF (and currently by the WATL Sustainability Officer). There is limited information on how these different data sources are being correlated. In addition, the GoTL FPA has a responsibility to assess capacity of GMFs.
- As per previous reviews, the A-GMFs are dependent on WATL funding – the evaluation identified options for a business model to move towards a mores sustainable model, however noted a number of challenges with this approach. Alternatively, a possibility is that the A-GMF itself is a strategy for implementation with the approach being to make the GMFs and the access to support provided by the private sector sustainable, and the A-GMF is a tool to achieve that (i.e. there is no attempt to make it sustainable). Either of these strategies requires WATL to engage in dialogue with Government, and will requite capacity development strategy.

### Community Groups Sustaining Community Infrastructure:

The WATL strategy for strengthening community capacity to manage their water systems is as follows:

- Establishment of WASH community management groups for each water system: WATL implementing partners support communities to establish WASH community management groups, known as a *Grupo Manaja Fasilidade* (GMF). The GMF structure is recognised in GoTL Law and policy as being responsible for managing rural water supplies: day to day management and operation of the water system, collection of funds, controlling the flow of water (particularly in

the dry season), resolving conflict and promoting WASH behaviour change.<sup>35</sup> WATL supports the GMFs to undertake this function.

- Support to A-GMFs – to provide mentoring and technical support to GMFs: WATL has supported the formation of an Association of GMFs (A-GMF) in each municipality to provide ongoing mentoring support to the GMFs. Individual GMFs become a member of the Association in their municipality. WATL provides ongoing technical and funding support to each of the A-GMFs.

#### GMFs Sustaining Community Infrastructure

In the period from 2010 to 2015, a total of 117 GMFs (a GMF has been established for each water system) have been established (97 in Liquica and 20 in Manufahi).<sup>36</sup>

As noted above, in Liquica approximately 30% of the management roles within these GMFs were held by women, and approximately 8% of the technicians were women. In 10 GMFs (10.3%) women led the GMF. In Manufahi 18 GMFs (and the 2 GMFs in project in progress) had women in at least 30% of management roles, with 4 having 50% of women in management roles – 2 of the 20 GMFs had a female technician and one GMF had a female leader.<sup>37,38</sup>

The evaluation team interviewed GMF representatives in six communities (3 in Liquica, 3 in Manufahi).

GMF members interviewed reported the main activities they had undertaken since the inauguration of their water system included collection of funds (generally 25c/HH/month), the operation of the water system including opening and closing taps at certain times of day to maximise water availability, some cleaning of spring boxes. The communities visited all had their water systems completed recently, one in 2013 and five in 2014. None of the GMFs reported undertaking any major repairs. Some GMFs had held meetings and some had followed up with households regarding completing their toilets. In most cases, the hygiene promoter had not undertaken hygiene promotion since the end of the project.

While all GMFs reported collecting funds, they also reported that not every HH was able to pay. There was a level of understanding by GMF members that some community members experience hardship. It was however too soon after inauguration to determine, if this would lead to other HH's to also stop paying.

GMF members in most communities visited, mentioned the need to restrict water access during the dry season, and that this was accepted by communities. GMF members interviewed did not mention conflict relating to their water system, however one GMF mentioned that people had different views of where tapstands should be located prior to construction, with this being resolved through discussions.<sup>39</sup>

The evaluation took place at the end of the wet season, and water was being used for a wide range of activities, with some households running hoses from the tapstands to their houses – to kitchens and in some cases to their toilets/bathrooms. In some cases, HH members mentioned using water for

---

<sup>35</sup> Decree Law 4/2004, Government of Timor-Leste; DGAS Sub-district Facilitators Manual, Rural Water Supply Guidelines.

<sup>36</sup> The project is continuing in 6 communities, thus where [Figure 1 Ekipa BESI GMF Monitoring](#) is shown, it included in this count.

<sup>37</sup> Data provided by WATL to DGAS via the WASH Sector Planning Tool.

<sup>38</sup> The DGAS CAP Guidelines (Water Guidelines) provides that at least 30% of management roles are women.

<sup>39</sup> Women's group, Asulema, Bazartete, Liquica.

fishponds, vegetable gardens etc. This raises two key issues for sustainability. Firstly, there is increasing global evidence that where water facility are located close to the home (or there is a HH connection), and/or where water is being used for economic benefit, there is greater commitment by those HHs to ensure the maintenance of the water system, including payments for it's repair.<sup>40</sup> Secondly, where some HHs within a community are using greater amounts of water, and others less, this can lead to discontent, leading to reluctance when equal payment is required across all households, or some people get reduced service. To manage the use of water by HHs across the community requires leadership and most GMF members mentioned that they established rules for the use of water. In one community, the head of the GMF had recently installed a fishpond.

#### Monitoring the outcomes of GMFs:

The capacity and functionality of the GMFs supported by WATL have been monitored a number of ways:

Indikadores	KATEGORIA		Observasaun
	Ativu	Pasivu	
Enkontru Regular			
Kolleta/Halibur Osan			
Rai Osan			
Jere/Uja Osan			
Promosaun Saude			
O & M ba Sistema			
Feramentas be'e/Tools Kit	Iha	La iha	
Treinamentu/Kapasitasaun	Iha	La Iha	
Arkiva ka Record			
<b>TOTAL</b>			
<b>%</b>			

- In both Liquica and Manufahi, WATL has supported the formation of a municipality level "Ekipa BESI" which undertakes "Joint Sustainability Monitoring". A section of this includes monitoring of the GMF functionality – refer **Error! Reference source not found..** The data from this monitoring includes both WATL funded and GoTL funded systems. Records of this data were not available to review during the evaluation. It was not clear, during the evaluation, as to how this data is being used by the Ekipa BESI in terms of analysing the capacity and functionality of GMFs, and in planning activities to address any shortcomings.
- WATL also supports the A-GMF to collect data

on a range of criteria linked to the functionality of its member GMFs (discussed in next section).

<sup>41</sup> The indicators include: the GMF has clear roles and responsibilities, rules & regulations in place, GMF hold internal & community meetings, collects funds for maintenance, undertakes maintenance of the water system

and promotes sanitation & hygiene (Refer to Figure 2). From April 2014 to March 2015 the A-GMFs have collected a data from a sample of GMFs, 50 in Liquica (approx. 40%), and 25 in Manufahi. The total number of GMF that are members of the Liquica A-GMF is 127<sup>42</sup>. It was reported that in Liquica, the A-GMF would "renew" the GMF structure in communities where the

**Figure 2 A-GMF Monitoring of GMFs**

Pergunta	Liquica (50)		Manutahi (25)		kategoria
	#GMF	%	#GMF	%	
Funsionamentu Estrutura no Knaar sira	15	30	3	12	La funsiona
Regulamentu	12	24	5	20	La funsiona
Enkontru Regular GMF	14	28	4	16	La funsiona
Enkontru Regular GMF ho Komuidade	12	24	3	12	La funsiona
GMF mak koleta fundu manutensaun	8	16	7	28	La funsiona
Manutensaun ba Sistema Bee	2	4	4	16	La funsiona
Halo Promosaun Ijene no Saneamentu	19	38	11	44	La funsiona

<sup>40</sup> For example refer to: Belo C et al (Dec 13) GMF Study – Timor-Leste BESI; Burr P & Fonseca C (2013) WASH Cost Working Paper #8, Applying a Life-Cycle Costs Approach to Water.

<sup>41</sup> This includes both GMFs of projects supported by WATL, and those funded by GoTL and other agencies.

<sup>42</sup> 127 GMF members include GMFs of some GoTL funded systems. WATL is working with the A-GMF to identify membership given there are no member fees. 60 GMFs participated in the 2015 AGM and 80 GMFs participated in the 2014 AGM. This level of information was not available for Manufahi.

GMF was no longer functioning. Figure 2 shows analysis of where indicators are not being met. The A-GMF intends to strengthen these areas within the GMFs (see below).

- WATL employs a Sustainability Officer (SO) in each municipality who collects sustainability data (including data relating to GMF functionality) from each project area (usually at the hamlet level), up to two years after water system completion. Currently the SOs undertake data collection independently of the A-GMF, however it was reported that the program is currently in the process of establishing a system where the SOs work with both the A-GMF and the Municipal Government. The program is also adapting the collection of sustainability data, through use of the M-Water system. There is some sensitivity from DGAS (and to an extent DAA in Liquica) that M-Water is duplicating the DGAS SIBS system. This is further discussed in EQ 5 below.

In addition to the WATL supported assessment of GMFs, the DAA FPAs (Previously known as SDFs) also have the responsibility, and a framework, to assess the capacity of the GMFs, and to provide support to those GMFs in the areas identified.<sup>43</sup> The FPA is also on the Ekipa BESI, and thus there is an opportunity to align the system.

There was limited evidence on how all the monitoring data being collected above is being systematically used to focus support for GMFs to manage their water system, or to measure change in capacity of GMFs to monitor their systems.

#### Capacity of GMFs to maintain water systems

As noted above, the number of HH served by WATL supported systems is often small, with 25c/HH/month being the common user fee. For a community of 20HH, this results in approximately \$5/mth total, or \$60/year to maintain a water system. As noted in the Joint Technical Review (JTR), the cost of maintaining the system is likely to be greater than the GMF funds available. From FGDs, the Treasurer explained that generally while most people were paying, some were not (note all systems visited were functioning and recently built). The Liquica A-GMF data for 2015 showed that of the 50 GMFs assessed, 13 GMFs had over \$100 accumulated (max being \$400) and 9 GMFs had not collected any funds.<sup>44</sup>

The WATL team reported that there is evidence of an increase in spending by GMFs on maintenance activities – in the 2012 A-GMF annual report, 40 GMFs had recorded a cumulative total funds of US\$849.75 but spent \$9 on O&M only US\$9. In the 2015 A-GMF Annual Report, 50 GMFs had raised a cumulative total of US\$3382.15 and spent US\$748 on O&M<sup>45</sup>. Over the past few years there has been increase in local shops selling maintenance products, which may have contributed to the increase.

As noted above, in the GMFs interviewed, there were a number of houses that were not contributing. In FGDs, GMF members suggested that a HH would be willing to contribute funds when there is a breakdown, however in general this requires strong community leadership, and a reasonably stable community.<sup>46</sup> The collection of funds for community events such traditional cultural ceremonies,

---

<sup>43</sup> The DGAS Sub-district Facilitators Manual provides both the outline of responsibilities of FPAs (SDFs) to monitor GMF functionality and the framework in which to do this.

<sup>44</sup> WATL Liquica and A-GMF Liquica Annual Report 2015.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> As all six communities visited have their systems built reasonably recently, they had not had to contribute to make repairs to breakdowns, however, the GMFs felt that HHs would contribute, if required



religious ceremonies is well instituted in both rural and urban communities in Timor-Leste, and thus it is plausible, that communities can gather funds at a point in time, if required (and within means).

Within the DNSA Rural Water Supply Guidelines, where a major repairs (beyond the capacity of the community to repair) is required the GMF can contact the FPA and/or the DAA and request support.<sup>47</sup> In reality this support is not uniformly applied across the country, it is generally limited to the supply of materials (if these are available) and depends largely on the motivation of the GMF, the motivation of the FPA and the motivation of the DAA manager.<sup>48</sup> WATL staff reported that they provided support in facilitating linkages between the DAA and the GMFs around maintenance. The A-GMF report for Liquica shows that there has been some contact – while the data is difficult to interpret, it shows that 28% of GMFs had a positive contact with the Authorities around addressing problems with their water system.<sup>49</sup> As noted above, the DNSA Guidelines, also state that assistance is for systems of a certain size (over 20HH).

#### A-GMFs (Liquica and Manufahi)

The Association of GMFs have been formed in both municipalities (districts)<sup>50</sup>, with key activities for both including:

1. Undertaking an assessment (data collection) of all water systems and their GMFs.
2. Reforming (if GMF is no longer functioning, or never existed) or strengthening GMFs that are functioning.
3. Providing technical assistance to support repairs (Liquica)
4. Selling sanitation products (Liquica) – concrete toilet pans are produced from a mould and soap case is produced by members.

The evaluation team assessed that the capacity of the Liquica A-GMF was far greater than that of the newly formed Manufahi A-GMF (formed 2014). The WATL team has training planned for both A-GMFs over the remainder of 2015 including training in leadership, financial management, facilitation skills, and planning, monitoring and reporting. There is a risk, particularly in Manufahi, of limited capacity, in terms of skills, access, resources, of the A-GMF to provide technical support to GMFs. Globally, models for the provision of technical services to communities for their rural water systems, tend to involve those who have technical experience (refer IRC Triple S reports<sup>51</sup>).

There was no evidence of the A-GMF in either Liquica or Manufahi municipalities engaging with DAA around repairs to community water systems.<sup>52</sup> The A-GMF in Manufahi was reasonably new and thus their main focus had been on data collection (refer below). There was evidence that the Liquica A-GMF had supported GMFs to make repairs in 2007 and 2008, however while there was limited evidence of more recent support (i.e reports etc), the WATL team believed that maintenance support by the A-GMF had occurred recently.

---

<sup>47</sup> DNSA (2011) Rural Water Supply Guidelines. The guidelines provide a diagram to reflect the areas of the water system where the community could contact DNSA for support.

<sup>48</sup> The DFAT funded BESIK program includes support to strengthen O&M components, including trialing different options to O&M.

<sup>49</sup> Liquica A-GMF Report 2015.

<sup>50</sup> Elections for members re held every 2 (Manufahi) or 3 (Liquica) years

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.ircwash.org/projects/triple-s>

<sup>52</sup> The A-GMF Reports do not contain any data on how the A-GMF has assisted with maintenance, but does contain data on the “relationship” between the A-GMF and the GMFs assessed.

A number of WATL assessments and reviews undertaken over the past two years have included discussion and recommendations relating to the A-GMFs. The JTA in 2013 recommended that due to the poor financial sustainability of A-GMFs WATL should refrain from growing its support and to develop a clear and achievable exit strategy.<sup>53</sup> A study undertaken by WATL in March 2014 that considered options for the operation and maintenance of rural water systems, recommended that the role of A-GMFs be considered an option as a service delivery provider in the context of Timor-Leste.<sup>54</sup> The review by the DFAT CS WASH fund monitoring team also raised concerns about the sustainability of the A-GMF. Both PLAN and WV in discussion with WATL are considering supporting the establishment of A-GMFs in the municipalities where they work.

The evaluation team further considered the options being proposed – and there are clearly challenges ahead. DGAS was clear that they are concerned about an expectation that the Government will provide the A-GMFs with funding, once NGOs no longer provide funding. National Government (DGAS) does not necessarily view the A-GMF as a key player/partner in strengthening the sustainability of rural water systems. To an extent, DGAS sees the A-GMFs as duplicating the work of the FPAs – particularly for activities 1-3 above, which are all responsibilities of the FPA or the District Technical Officer.

At municipal level, there was a greater level of understanding of the role that the A-GMF could play. In Liquica, SAS had co-signed an MOU with WATL and the A-GMF regarding their activities. The A-GMF in Liquica has a more difficult relationship with the DAA (municipal level) than the A-GMF in Manufahi. Similar to national level, the DAA staff interviewed in Liquica, felt that the A-GMF is replicating the work of DAA – supporting GMFs, collecting data etc. However the DAA staff also recognized that as WATL supports water-systems (and GMFs) at a sub-village level, that the workload for DAA to be able to support this level of engagement is not possible within their resources. In Manufahi, the A-GMF has a room within the DAA office, and from interviews with DAA staff, the A-GMF is seen as a resource or partner to DAA to engage with GMFs across the municipality. The difference in relationship appears to be based on history, personalities and a different approach in both municipalities. The WATL CD, and Liquica PM are both aware of the challenges that exist and the DNSA concern is further discussed in EQ4 below.

In terms of financial sustainability, the A-GMFs do not have a ‘business model’, and as noted in previous reports they are dependent on WATL funding, i.e. operating along the lines of a local NGO. A business model requires a transition from focusing on “activities” to a focus on service provision. This will require an assessment and understanding of what the demand for services is, and the willingness (including the means), to pay for those services. This is a process, will need a medium term strategy and will likely require some adjustment within the A-GMF, in particular a professional approach to providing services.

In reality, it will be a significant challenge for the A-GMFs to become financially sustainable. WATL currently funds the A-GMFs approximately USD9,000 per year (USD750 per month) and both GMFs identified the need for greater funding during the evaluation. The \$750/month provides for transport allowance (10-12 members), motorbike fuel & running costs - all members are volunteers, however

---

<sup>53</sup> Harvey E, Grumbley A, Da Silva J (2013) Joint Technical Review: WaterAid Timor-Leste (Internal Document).

<sup>54</sup> Lockwood H (2014) O&M Programme to Support the Service Delivery Approach - *Summary Report*

receive a monthly travel allowance. Regarding developing a business model, the following three options were discussed with the WATL team:

Community demand for A-GMF services: The evaluation found that while all the communities visited had heard of the A-GMF, they reported that they not had any assistance from (note all had water systems completed less than 2 years earlier, and thus had not experience breakdown).

A more detailed study would need to be undertaken around demand and willingness to pay for membership fees (given funds raised by the GMFs each year, this would likely be a small fee) and service fees for maintenance support. As noted above, given the small populations being served by water systems (particularly those supported by WATL), individual GMFs are likely to raise limited funds, and thus any regular contribution to the A-GMF will be limited.

Alternatively, the A-GMF may not collect member fees, but collect fees for undertaking repairs. They would likely be competing with others who have plumbing skills (and it was not clear that the A-GMFs had technical skills). A key question is whether the A-GMFs are best placed to provide technical services for maintenance and repairs of rural water systems. The A-GMF would need to professionalise in order to effectively supply the services. WATL has had initial discussions with BESIK regarding the A-GMFs being part of a pilot study on different options to support O&M of rural water systems.<sup>55</sup>

In Liquica, the A-GMF sells sanitation products (toilet pans and soap), to households, however both the sales, and the profit from these sales are minimal.

DGAS demand for A-GMF services: While there was recognition of the capacity building support that the A-GMFs provide to GMFs, there is currently limited interest by DGAS in funding this support. There is an opportunity to further investigate a relationship between DNSA and the A-GMFs linked to the initial discussions of the A-GMF model being considered as one of the options for a service delivery strategy that is being developed by BESIK and DNSA (Refer to Harold Lockwood's report).<sup>56</sup>

Another possible area for A-GMF support to Government is to formally collaborate with the FPA regarding both support to GMFs and data collection. An opportunity may arise, if WATL is involved in testing/developing a national asset management system, as data collection requirements would expand, provide an opportunity for dialogue with DAA, DNSA and DGAS. DGAS and the DAA for Liquica both expressed concern that the A-GMF duplicates some of their activities particularly support to GMFs and data collection. As noted above the same concerns were not expressed in Manufahi.<sup>57</sup>

The A-GMF is contracted by WATL to provide targeted support to the GMFs for a period of time post construction (e.g. 2-3 years). Another option is the A-GMF is contracted to undertake specific training and/or monitoring for the WATL program. This funding source would clearly only be available for the period that WATL was implementing in the municipality. This would be recognising that there is a period of time for more intensive support to communities to manage their water systems, at the same

---

<sup>55</sup> Pers comms with Alex Grumbley, WATL CD; Refer Lockwood H (2014) O&M Programme to Support the Service Delivery Approach - *Summary Report*

<sup>56</sup> Currently the approach being trialled involves NGOs/companies being contracted providing support to the larger systems. The A-GMF provides an alternative where support is provided across a district.

<sup>57</sup> In Manufahi Municipality, there has been limited collection of SIBS data by DAA from communities with less than 35% of communities covered in June 2012, as compared to 60% coverage in Liquica, and an overall coverage of 70% at the same time.

time strengthening access to, and the capacity of both local plumbers, and DAA, for longer term repairs and maintenance of water systems.

Looking at the three options above shows the importance of a clear discussion with the A-GMF (and stakeholders) around a realistic business model for the A-GMFs.<sup>58</sup> This will need a realistic assessment of the services that can be provided by the A-GMF, and matching that with demand for those services, willingness to pay and clear mechanisms of how this could occur. It will be important that any model reflects other service providers, particularly the government, given that a concern expressed is that the A-GMF replicates the role of the DAA FPAs (SDFs). It is plausible that the workload would allow both the FPAs and the A-GMFs to work together, however this will require negotiation with a willingness to change approaches.

A capacity development strategy would need to be developed for each type of service with clear support (from WATL) to transition. This would need to be based on a realistic capacity assessment of the A-GMF, with the likelihood they would change from a volunteer organization. There has been some experience of associations professionalising and these could be further investigated as case studies.<sup>59</sup> As these case studies show, professionalization has required some ongoing financial support, i.e. organizations can not immediately be sustainable.

The evaluation team also discussed whether in reality, there would be added value, given the level of work, and the risks, for the A-GMF becoming an independent organisation. Currently, the A-GMFs are key in WATLs implementation strategy, providing post construction support to GMFs<sup>60</sup> and there is a planned transition of data collection to the A-GMFs. An alternative to the A-GMFs becoming financially sustainable is that the A-GMF continues as part of the WATL implementation strategy. The A-GMFs would provide intensive support to GMFs, aimed at building their capacity to manage their water systems, for a specific period of time. GMFs would then be in a position to manage their system and to access the private sector and Government support as required.<sup>61</sup> Ideally at the same time both WATL and the A-GMF engage closely with the government systems for strengthening the sustainability of WASH and local service providers to maximise the access to these providers by GMFs over a period. This will require a clear capacity development strategy and capacity outcomes being measured to monitor progress, and identify where further or different types of support is required.

In summary options for discussion with the A-GMFs are as follows:

- The A-GMF develop a business model for a sustainable organization for example either a membership agency that provides services relating to water and sanitation for a fee; or an organization that provides specific maintenance services for a fee ( It would need to assess whether the activities it undertakes can transition to services (e.g. training of GMFs, maintenance support) and whether there would be a demand and willingness to pay for these services.

---

<sup>58</sup> A business model requires an assessment of what fees can they expect to charge and what is the cost for the A-GMF to effectively provide these services. Does the demand & the willingness to pay for these services, then match the costs?

<sup>59</sup> Honduras, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Uganda to an extent. Refer [http://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/084-201502triple-s\\_bn01defweb\\_1\\_0.pdf](http://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/084-201502triple-s_bn01defweb_1_0.pdf)

<sup>60</sup> WATL funds its NGOs partners for WASH project completion and not ongoing support to those communities – this role is taken on by the A-GMF.

<sup>61</sup> The GoTL (DNSA & DGAS) has expressed that they have a system to support community management of rural water supply through the FSDs.

- The A-GMFs seek funding support for their organisation, undertaking specific projects such as post-construction support and possibly data collection. To an extent this is also a business model, however likely to be heavily dependent on WATL, although it is possible that the Government of TL or other agencies agree to funding.
- A hybrid of these, would involve charging for some services, and seeking donor funding for others.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Identify options for collaborative model for monitoring of GMFs (and the water systems) across the different monitoring being undertaken (Ekipa BESI, A-GMFs, FSDs and the WATL SO). There is a risk of different data being available, which can then devalue the data being collected. There is a further related recommendation under EQ 5.
2. As part of recommendation #1 under EQ1 (above) further assess the capacity of GMFs to manage small water systems. This could be through research water systems that are at least 4-5 years old, and understand how they have managed collection of funds, undertaken repairs, managed any conflict etc. This could include an assessment the role they have played in ongoing motivation for improved sanitation practices (Recommendation #2, EQ1).
3. WA to undertake a review with the A-GMF and Government regarding the role the A-GMF plays (or could reasonably play) in terms of sustainable service delivery. Together develop a system with clear roles for the A-GMF and the FPA (DAA) to maximise sustainable services. Based on this review, look at options available. These options may include, but are not limited to:
4. If the review shows that the A-GMF do form (or can reasonably form) a critical part of the sustainability of rural water services, WATL with the A-GMF should develop a clear advocacy initiative to work with national Government (across the various Ministries) in terms of recognising the value of the A-GMF model.
5. Look at options for the A-GMF to become financially sustainable. Based on the above review, develop a business model for the A-GMFs, and a related capacity development strategy. This is likely to require a significant investment in the A-GMF, and the risks and assumptions will need to be identified and monitored;
6. The review may conclude that the A-GMF is not necessarily a sustainable organization itself, in that the GoTL believes that in the long term, there is duplication of the support provided by the DGAS model. However, it is likely the medium terms support to GMFs, does meet WATL's needs, of providing more intense support to GMFs than is possibly under the DGAS model. The A-GMF is also proposed as a key component of WATL's data collection (M-Water) strategy. To maximise sustainability of rural water systems, with this approach, WATL would need to engage closely with the DAA (including with the proposed decentralisation system) and DHS; and with the private sector, to support a streamlined transition from the system A-GMF support to the longer-term mix of private sector and DAA support.
7. The BESI program is focusing its support to DGAS around the strategy for O&M of rural water systems, and thus it is possible that there is a changing context. WATL is well suited to bring its learning to dialogue around options, however it is equally important, in doing this, that WATL critically looks at the A-GMF model.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> The WATL CD was clear of the need for WATL to engage in learning, and critical reflection, around the appropriateness of the A-GMF model.

---

## WASH Rights (Citizen Action)

The evaluation undertook a session with the WATL Policy and Advocacy team on the changes as a result of their work, progress towards these and any recommendations.

The planned outcomes of the Policy and Advocacy component of the WATL program were described as follows:

1. Community members have the confidence and mechanisms available to resolve their concerns regarding access to WASH facilities and services within their community.
2. Community members are confident to monitor the quality of WASH projects and ensure transparency in their delivery.
3. Communities display ownership and have leadership and capacity to manage their water system and to maintain improved sanitation.
4. National WASH policies are developed based on a sound evidence base.
5. Planning for and budget allocation to WASH projects is linked to achieving national targets.

To achieve these changes WATL approach is to work with a range of NGO partners at municipal (district) and national level. The focus of this work to date has been on #2 and #3 – i.e. supporting partners to build community members confidence to monitor the quality and transparency of WASH projects (particularly water projects); and through support to the A-GMFs builds community leadership and capacity to manage their own water system (described above). WATL uses the Citizen Action approach for the second component (#2) of the advocacy strategy.

Citizen action is defined by WATL “as citizens being able engage in ongoing negotiation and dialogue with service providers and governments – holding them to account for provision, or lack of provision for water and sanitation services”<sup>63</sup> The WaterAid approach to Citizen Action includes a number of phases, in summary<sup>64</sup>:

1. Scoring service provision, i.e. assessing what it is like, if possible against government policy. This often involves score-cards to measure service, and may involve mapping where services exist, and where communities that do not have access to services.
2. Identifying realistic mechanisms for community action
3. Support mechanisms for higher-level influence to assist/resource local service providers meet quality commitments outlined in government policy, including budget analysis.

To date, WATL’s work has focused on the initial phase of assessing and scoring service provision, this has focused largely on the quality of service provision provided under the GoTL National Suco Development Program (PNDS).<sup>65</sup> There has been no mapping undertaken of who has access to services, and who does not.

WATL is supporting two partners, one in Liquica (*Sub-comisaun Justisa e Paz* - SCJP) and one in Manufahi (*Luta Ba Futuru* – LBF) to support communities to monitor the delivery of rural water supply

---

<sup>63</sup> WaterAid (2006) Bridging the gap: Citizens’ Action for accountability in water and sanitation.

<sup>64</sup> This is drawn from WaterAid (2008) Stepping into Action: 2<sup>nd</sup> Report on Citizen action for accountability in water and sanitation.

<sup>65</sup> The *Programa Nacional Desenvolvimento Suco (PNDS)* is implemented by Ministry of State Administration, involves community selection and implementation of community projects funded through Government funds.

infrastructure. Both partners commenced their activities in early 2014, with the intention of monitoring Government funded rural WASH. As there were no large scale rural water systems (PDID) being implemented in Liquica (or in Manufahi), and thus the only government funding being spent on rural water supply was via the PNDS funding source.

PNDS is supported by government facilitators however is a community management grant process, and thus the NGOs were supporting community focal points to largely monitor other members of the community. Within PNDS Guidelines, the Planning and Accountability Commission (*Komisau Akontabilidade no Planeamento* – KPA), a group selected by the community and from the community, has the role of monitoring the quality of the work, “*ensuring projects are developed and implemented based on core PNDS principles and agreed processes, and that any complaints are properly addressed in a timely manner*”.

In addition, the Asia Foundation has been contracted by DFAT to monitor the overall community process for PNDS – by selecting a sample of PNDS projects. Feedback is provided through regular meetings to the PNDS team.<sup>66</sup> At the time of the evaluation, neither WATL nor the partners had met with the Asia Foundation regarding collaboration on monitoring implementation.<sup>67</sup>

There is a slight difference in approach between the SCJP (Liquica) and LBF (Manufahi). SCJP is focusing on monitoring government funded rural water programs, to date implemented by PNDS. LBF work with a number of sucos, supporting them to identify their priorities and identifying options for those communities to advocate for those. LBF has coordinated closely with the sub-district administrations (3 sub-districts) and with PNDS coordinators in each sub-district. LBF also engages with the Ekapa BESI – DAA, DHS and District Education. With SCJP, the funding support from WATL has focused on monitoring rural water programs, thus their focus for this program has been on four sucos (across 3 sub-districts) where PNDS is providing funds for rural water systems.

The two NGOs, LBF and SCJP, have identified community focal points that are supported to undertake the community training and monitoring. Both NGOs have used community score cards<sup>68</sup> – key criteria are assessed by household in the locations were involved in the project. While this could be seen as duplicating the activities of the KPA (a community elected group), the NGO partners reported that the KPA itself was not necessarily monitoring adequately, and often was linked to the people involved in the Project Implementation Team (*Ekapa Implementasaun Projetu* – EIP). For example in Suku Guico, Aldeia Vatuvei-Liquica, SCJP, found that poor quality pipes (including old pipes) were used for a water system, while the budget submitted, funded and posted on the notice board had the costs of new pipe. They also found that in some communities the process of engaging women not being followed, resulting in few women involved in any of the prescribed committees. LBF have found that generally the priorities for PNDS funding tend to be set by the village leadership e.g. xefe suco, and thus LBF feel more work is required to support a more consultative process in deciding priorities. LBF mentioned that they would like more support on promoting citizen action. LBF provides direct support to communities, and based on its citizen action work, then advocates with municipal level agencies.

---

<sup>66</sup> Pers comms: Manoj Nath, PNDS adviser.

<sup>67</sup> Since the evaluation, both WATL and The Asia Foundation have been engaged with the Prime Ministers Office around social auditing.

<sup>68</sup> The NGOs were both developed the “Citizen Action’ score-cards with support from WATL. They differ from the Community Feedback Tool being used by WATL directly. The Citizen Action scorecards have more of a focus on coordination, consultation and accountability.



Specifically due to the nature of PNDS, there is a risk that the citizen action, is focusing on one group in the community (i.e. trained by the WATL partner) which is monitoring another group in the community. The NGOs, rather than the community members primarily led discussions with the authorities regarding poor implementation.

In addition to the score-cards being implemented by WATL partners on the PNDS program, WATL has developed a community feedback tool (CFT) which it has used on its own projects in Liquica and Manufahi. This is implemented by WATL along with their partner NGOs, and this year it is planned that partner NGOs will implement the CFT on each other's projects, rather than their own, for greater transparency and independence.<sup>69</sup> WATL is finalising a submission to BESIK to expand the use of the community feedback tool across all water projects in Liquica. This would be in partnership with DNSA and DAA. In terms of the evaluation findings, it was too early to tell if there has been improved delivery of services linked to the outcomes of the CFT findings.

**Box 1: Timor-Leste Strategic Development Plan – WASH Targets**

- By 2030 all citizens in Timor-Leste will have access to clean water and improved sanitation.
- By 2020, 75% of Timor-Leste's rural population will have access to safe, reliable and sustainable water and 40% of rural communities will have significantly improved sanitation facilities.

WATL has supported the establishment of the *Plataforma Nasionál BESI TL* (PN-BESITL). PN-BESITL is a consortium of NGOs involved in WASH activities, to support policy engagement at national level, particularly around National WASH policy and engagement in planning and budget allocations for WASH projects. The evaluation team was not able to meet with PN BESITL due to time constraints, thus the information is drawn from team members experience.

The PN-BESITL member NGOs have experience in the implementation of WASH projects, however have had less experience in engaging on national planning and budget monitoring processes. The assessment by the WATL advocacy team is that the program is in the initial stage of supporting PN-BESITL to undertake high-level influence and budget analysis, and this is a focus for the following year. The TL Strategic Development Plan (SDP) sets the target - refer Box 1. The SDP proposed that to achieve this 80 water systems should be built each year (2011-2015).

Overall the evaluation found that:

- In both Liquica and Manufahi, the work of SCJP and LBF was viewed positively by the Municipal Administrators. The Liquica Municipal Administrator mentioned that when problems arose it was best to let him know of any issues prior to going to the media.
- In terms of Citizen Action the evaluation team discussed options with the implementing partners (SCJP and LBF) for the capacity to monitor services and to advocate for change, to be transitioned to the community groups established, so that it is not NGOs advocating on behalf of communities, but communities groups themselves have a greater voice.
- The focus on PNDS has pros and cons – on the positive side, it is a new program, proposed as a key mechanism for community development by the GoTL (and donors), with currently 30% of these projects are small scale water supplies. Thus WATLs support for monitoring has the opportunity to influence good practice within PNDS. However, ideally there is a possibility of duplication –firstly of the systems set up within PNDS for communities to monitor their systems and hold the

<sup>69</sup> This is a challenge in Manufahi, where there is one major partner, LBF.

community implementation to account, and secondly, with TAF who are also monitoring PNDS.

- The Citizen action program is currently focusing on the assessing the quality of services delivered, rather than who has access to services overall.
- At this stage the PN-BESITL is at an early stage, and thus there are no clear links between the community based monitoring and the advocacy activities at national level. There have been clear statements by the GoTL, through the TL Strategic Development Plan, on the desired level of services for rural communities (refer Box 1).

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the Citizen Action approach to determine in addition to monitoring WASH program implementation, that it is worth supporting the PN-BESITL (possibly with Municipal Government) to map the extent of rural water supply coverage. This would identify communities with no access to an improved water system. The DAA has much of this information through it's SIBS data, and has previously used this for submitting annual plans. For this reason, this aspect of Citizen Action, may involve identifying options to advocate for service providers to undertake their roles (as per phase 3 of the CVA strategy). This may link with the greater level of accountability to communities that the newly appointed Prime Minister is calling for.
2. Review the monitoring of PNDS (and PDID programs in the future) to ensure building the capacity of community groups, and not duplicating activities through a possible collaboration with TAF.
3. Monitor how community feedback tools for WATL, Government and other programs leads to improved service delivery of rural water projects and community capacity to resolve concerns regarding their water systems (#1 of the Citizen Action strategies listed above). This may require developing a mechanism to feed results back to service providers (including WATL).
4. There is an opportunity for the PNBESI-TL to use the TL Strategic Development Plan targets for rural WASH (or national WASH) as a basis for their policy dialogue, with monitoring of the sector (Government and agencies) around progress towards this target. This ideally would link to community mapping.
5. The policy and advocacy outcomes are in their early stages, with a highly motivated team. Developing a system for monitoring progress towards advocacy and policy outcomes, will support the team to be responsive, to adapt strategies if necessary and to share learning in this area.

### EQ 3: SANITATION MARKETING – MEETING DEMAND CREATED BY CLTS?

***To what extent has sanitation marketing improved so that sanitation hardware supplies better meet the demand created by CLTS? What has WATLs role been in this change?***

### Summary of key findings

- WATL has supported three partners in Liquica district to different extent over the 2010-15 period. It has been challenge with low sales, levels, low profit margins for the supplier and expensive transport costs. In addition the cost of building a toilet (super structure and the pit) by households adds significant costs to the pit.
- In Manufahi, one community visited, located on the main road to Same (the capital), all HHs had built bathrooms (I.e. toilet & washing area) for approx. \$200. There is a hardware store in Same town, however access to sanitation products across most of the municipality would be a challenge.
- A range of challenges were identified by the team, mainly product selling price, given the high costs of transport, cement and sand.
- Product development was raised by WATL's partners and staff, and WATL is trialling an option of the SaTo toilet pan – a light, low water use, low smell, and reasonably priced pan.

In Liquica municipality, WATL has worked with partners (and suppliers) to integrate the supply of sanitation products for sale with sanitation promotion in communities, including those who are ODF. WATL provides funding and others support to A-GMF, CTK and Malaedoi. There are also hardware shops providing construction materials that also provide sanitation products – including ceramic toilet pans.

CTK and the A-GMF are both selling a simple concrete pans for \$5. Malaedoi has more expensive products and can build the toilet (at a cost), however they also sell a small \$5 pan. From anecdotal reporting, aside of purchasing cement, the most common toilet product purchased are the concrete toilet pans from CTK and the A-GMF, however even so the amounts purchased are not significant.<sup>70</sup>

Malaedoi (sales company - Prolink) have developed a range of toilet product options, ranging in price from \$5 to around \$150, and trying market segmentation.<sup>71,72</sup> Malaedoi had trialled providing credit to customers, however this was not successful, with re-payments not being made.

In Manufahi municipality sanitation products are provided by stores (located in the capital, Same) – there are not specific sanitation marketing activities being undertaken. As noted in EQ1, in one community all HHs had built a bathroom (incl toilet) for approx. \$200 each.

Drawing on the evaluation team discussions and recent research by Empresa Diak the key challenges facing sanitation marketing are:

- The willingness to pay in comparison to the cost of the products. Note: while the cost of the toilet pan has been the focus of much of the sanitation marketing work to date, the ED research found that other costs including the superstructure and the pit significantly increase the cost of

<sup>70</sup> Anecdotally from Jyoti Bhushan, WATL Liquica- approximately 5 concrete pans are purchased each month. For CTK, in 2014 they sold 62 units, and 2015, 45 units.

<sup>71</sup> Market segmentation aimed at increasing sales, through marketing to those formally employed (primarily by government) as particular target.

<sup>72</sup> The development of products by Malaedoi draws on market research undertaken in 2010-11 with IDEO and IDE, supported by BESIK. Malaedoi recognises that the quality of products produced could be improved for a more professional finish.

the overall toilet. A study in 2009, found the willingness to pay for a toilet was approx \$20-30. The evaluation found a great range in willingness – with Solurema bairro, Manufahi HH's spending around \$200 total on their toilets (washing room & toilet) compared to Manggaet bairro where they basically said they could not afford to buy any materials. The ED research affordability is complex and involves both willingness to pay and access to cash, and while Solurema and Manggaet bairros are in the same aldeia, it was clear from observing the village that the spending power (& likely income levels) were significantly different.

- Limited access to water. Note, WATL uses an approach whereby sanitation promotion is undertaken prior to the water system being built, thus communities are fully aware that they will have a water system in the near future.
- Householders have aspirations for the toilet they would like – thus marketing needs to focus not so much on the technical aspects of the toilet but would people like about having a toilet. The overall toilet product (including the superstructure) needs to deliver this.
- A common belief by community members that while they can build a basic toilet they require assistance (primarily mentioned from the Government) to improve their toilets.<sup>73</sup>
- Transport costs are commonly identified as increasing the cost of supplying sanitation products – both in terms of transport costs for any imported components and/or the cost of transporting to communities – either by the supplier, or by households themselves (confirmed in the ED research)

Product is a key issue, as raised by WATL partners and staff and sanitation marketing research (ED and UTS). ED (2014, p.13) noted that there is a need for toilet products that are “tailor made, affordable, with low water consumption and easy to transport”. Based on their research ED, assesses that “smartly” subsidising specific components of the value chain as well as promotion will have, at best, a limited impact towards the existing sanitation goals (2014 pg37). ED identifies the need to “create the sanitation market” as a key area for external assistance (2014 pg 37).

In simple terms, a product needs to both meet the aspirations of rural Timorese households, and with the full costs being within the possibilities of a household to purchase, and reasonably easy to do so. This will require a sound social marketing campaign. To date, there has not been any real social marketing, appealing to the aspirations of East Timorese.

WATL is currently in the process of importing a toilet pan, known as “SaTo, which is produced cheaply in Bangladesh. This toilet pan and has the benefit of requiring a smaller amount of water, with reduced smell and has a low weight, thus easy to transport.<sup>74</sup> The cost of pan itself is approximately \$1.50/pan, however WATL has recently calculated the costs of ordering and shipping to Timor-Leste dock-side at approximately \$2.50/pan and thus estimate the wholesaler to sell at \$4.00/pan, with the onward retail price of \$6.50/pan. WATL aims to determine whether this product meets demand requirements (price, clean looking, uses less water, easy to clean).

Linking communities involved in building/improving toilets to suppliers has been undertaken through coordinating suppliers, to bring a sample of products to communities, with support from WATL. While this has generated interested, interest has not resulted in many sales.

---

<sup>73</sup> This arose in community interviews by the evaluation team. The Independent Completion Review of the BESIK program (Willets, Crawford 2013) had similar findings.

<sup>74</sup> The current shipment is being shared with other WASH partners including BESIK and PLAN

Although there are shops that supply products, there is limited actual marketing of sanitation product (ED report). It is understood that BESIK is currently developing a marketing strategy, including marketing that it the responsibility of HH to improve their toilets.<sup>75</sup> The ED research notes that a sanitation marketing strategy is a priority (2014).

The ED and UTS research provides a range of recommendations, which have been considered in providing the recommendations below.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It would be worthwhile to gain an understanding the motivations, income levels, supply chains relating to sanitation for Solurema Bairro in Manufahi. Here households spent approx. \$200 each to build their bathrooms – these appear to meet their aspiration for some they put pieces of tiles in, painted them, lights and a number “extras”. The learning from this could be useful for the marketing of the SaTo product – see below.
2. WATL should engage with BESIK to further develop the four ‘P’s approach to Sanitation Marketing<sup>76</sup> – in relation the trialling the “SaTo” toilet. The four P’s are simplified to an extent, and SaniFOAM framework provides a more detailed list of what needs to be considered. The following is a summary of key approaches recommended:
  - The full cost (price) including the cost of super structure and the cost of materials for the pit.
  - Easy to build – a short film on building a toilet, including the superstructure, with clear costs. As much as possible, look at options for reducing costs of all aspects of the toilet.
  - Actual marketing of the product, this will require a significant investment, thus unlikely to be possible for this initial importation of the SaTo, however formative research could involve those who have purchased a SaTo, along with others to understand what appeals to rural East Timorese, and what they are prepared to pay (total for toilet).
  - In the interim (i.e. prior to a marketing strategy being developed & implemented) it may be worth pulling together through a workshop some “ideas” people<sup>77</sup> to design a “sales pitch” for the SaTo. It may be worthwhile investigating the option for sales agents (ideally people with natural “salesperson” skills, supplemented by training on a sales technique)– if possible from the sub-district, however that may not be possible. The cost of social marketing, including sales agents could be an area that is subsidised, as once a product “catches on” the need for sales agents may reduce.
  - Establish a system for “real-time” monitoring of the supply and demand for the SaTo, to provide learning for the continued development of sanitation marketing, and possibly further development of the SaTo toilet.

---

<sup>75</sup> The Government does have a plan (refer SDP) to subsidize improved toilets for vulnerable HH. There has initial development of strategies with support from BESIK and UNICEF, however budgets have not yet been made available.

<sup>76</sup> A number of these activities will be expensive, and learning will be relevant for national level.

<sup>77</sup> Those who are already working in marketing of products, those involved in communications in TL – e.g the telephone companies advertising people, Marie Stopes International, multi-media and advertising companies, communications people with development programs. They could be encouraged to participate as pro-bono, or if they are selling a service, that there will be future work in developing a marketing campaign.

- Understanding spending capacity, and times of the year where there is additional income – e.g. coffee harvest season in parts of Manufahi & Liquica.<sup>78</sup> Worth investigating with any micro finance opportunities organizations whether there is a product they have, however by in large MF funds are borrowed in order to purchase assets or goods that generate an income, which is not the case with a toilet.
3. It is important that this trial is designed properly (by all partners) to ensure that the sector can adequately learn from this initiative – e.g. limited locations so as to measure response, target ODF communities with water, possibly aim for communities with greater income levels, develop a simple marketing plan (drawing on ED research findings) and design/use simple marketing tools.

#### EQ 4: APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY – WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS

##### ***To what extent has the most appropriate technology been used in the design and construction of water supply systems?***

The evaluation did not look specifically at this strategic objective, as given time constraints the evaluation term visited six sub-villages. WATL undertook a Joint Technical Review in 2013, where it was recommended that a Technology Applicability Framework (TAF) assessment of the two main technologies in use be undertaken to assist in identifying the focus of efforts to achieve better sustainability.

#### EQ 5: STRENGTHENING EFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO WASH

##### ***To what extent has WATL and its partners influenced Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) to increase and be more effective in their response to WASH. To what extent has WATL influenced the work of other major actors in the sector?***

###### **Summary of key findings**

- At both national and municipal level, WATL is seen as a trusted partner.
- This solid base to the relationship provides a base for WATL to build on the partnership and seek solutions to issues that arise.
- Government staff raised that WATL does not always follow GoTL systems/ guidelines. This is often due to WATL using their own organizational systems, or trialling an approach.
- As described above, there are challenges with the A-GMF model, however it was clear that there was respect for WATLs overall approach and thus there is opportunity for debate – possibly for the A-GMFs to be part of the Service Delivery/O&M trials.
- WATL is seen as a major player in the sector, and seen by others as such. It has been influential in coordination and is actively engaged in policy debates.
- WATL is working closely with other international NGOs to share learning and approaches to WASH – including gender and social inclusion.

<sup>78</sup> It maybe worth investigating micro-finance options, however as micro-finance is paid back with interest, it is generally better to an income earning activity.

WATL is seen by Government agencies at national and district (municipal) level as a trusted partner. As evidenced through meetings at national and municipal level<sup>79</sup>, a range of WATL staff are respected for the support that they provide to the WASH sector. These positive relationships provide a solid base for WATL to work with government in seeking solutions to the challenges in the sector.

WATL is seen to be a contributor to the policy debate, particularly with regard to sanitation. GoTL felt that WATL is active in the sector, including support to raise awareness around key WASH issues. WATL's support in socialising the Sanitation Policy (NBSP), particularly in Liquica and Manufahi municipalities, and support for key WASH events at municipal and national level were cited as evidence of WATL engagement.

Two key issues that were raised, primarily as being duplication of Government activities: the activities of the A-GMF and the proposed M-Water monitoring system. Both are further discussed below. Additionally, the Liquica DAA raised the concern that WATL works with sub-villages (small communities).

Regarding influencing sector strategies for more sustainable water services, the support to the Ekipa BESI in Liquica and Manufahi has contributed to developing an understanding by the members of the Ekipa, as to the ongoing support that is required to keep systems and services functioning. However in both municipalities, even with the increased understanding by the Ekipa BESI, there was limited evidence of resources being provided by municipal agencies (include the DAA) aimed at sustainability of rural WASH.

WATL has signed a MOU with both the Liquica and Manufahi DAA (SAS). In both Liquica and Manufahi, the Municipal Administrators were complimentary about WATL's work in their municipalities. Both were positive about the increases in access to sanitation, due to support from WATL. Across all interviews with Government, WATL's role in both the policy and implementation support to the sanitation sector was recognised. This is an achievement, in a nation where water is seen as priority and sanitation is rarely mentioned.

WATL has been active in engaging with the BESIK program and through this with DNSA, regarding improving sustainability of rural water supplies. As described in the O&M Study<sup>80</sup> there is an opportunity for WATL to engage in piloting the A-GMF approach to improving sustainability of rural water systems, however as discussed above, it is important that the role of the A-GMF is clearly thought through. This engagement has not occurred yet as there have been some delays to the implementation of the "O&M Pathways" initiative being undertaken by BESIK and DNSA.

Discussion with DGAS, DNSA and to an extent with the Liquica DAA, reveal challenges to the A-GMF model being considered as part of a national strategy to improve sustainability. Concerns were raised in all meetings, however primarily at national level, that included a belief that the A-GMF is replicating the work of DAA (particularly of the *Fasilitador Postu Administrasaun*) and concerns by DGAS of an expectation that DNSA (DGAS) would provide ongoing support to the A-GMF.

---

<sup>79</sup> Department of Environmental Health (MoH) and the National Directorate for Water & Sanitation (DNSA) and at municipal level

<sup>80</sup> Lockwood H (2014) O&M Programme to Support the Service Delivery Approach - *Summary Report*



The concerns expressed are not new, and will take considerable strategic and realistic thinking about the 'business model' of the A-GMFs (refer discussion above), and an ongoing process of engaging DGAS and DNSA, around a role that the A-GMFs can play, and the appropriate relationship with Government. The WATL Country Director is highly respected by DGAS and DNSA, providing a supportive environment for this discussion to take place.

Regarding the A-GMF, their role may be better suited to a links to a sub-national level of government. As a first step in decentralisation, Timor-Leste is in the 'pre-deconcentration' phase where-by structures are being established in order to commence devolving some responsibilities from National to municipal level, however this possibly will take some time.<sup>81,82</sup>

A second concern raised by DGAS/DNSA relates to data collection, in that NGOs (including WATL) are seen to be duplicating the data collection that DNSA undertakes. This emphasises the importance of good communications between WATL and government counterparts, to avoid misunderstanding. The DNSA MIS system known as SIBS, while facing some challenges, measures coverage & functionality/status) of water and sanitation, however it does not have a specific asset management system. WATL has been in discussion with BESIK (and DNSA) regarding testing an approach to registering water systems (as the basis for an asset management system) in Liquica.

Government agencies in general reported that communications with WATL were positive, and they felt informed about WATLs work. It was expressed that WATL could engage more in the DAA implementation systems. Some specific examples of where Government staff felt that WATL was not using DAA systems included assessment of GMF capacity, verification of ODF status within communities and by DAA, the approach of working at bairro, rather than aldeia level.

WATL has worked with DAA around program planning, particularly community identification. In terms of building the capacity of DAA, WATL has primarily worked with DAA around the Ekipa BESI, and due to DAA workloads there has been limited opportunity apart from BESI visits to take a more comprehensive approach to strengthening their capacity around rural water systems. Discussion with both Liquica and Manufahi Program Managers identified that municipal Government particularly DAA, were under-resourced, had limited focus on rural water systems and thus tended to contact WATL when they needed assistance with resources, rather than develop a stronger capacity development relationship. In Liquica, the Program Manager, initially based himself in the DAA office for one day a week aimed at supporting DAA, however was rarely approached for support.

---

## INFLUENCING OTHER WASH ACTORS

WATL is seen as influential in the WASH sector, and are active in coordination and policy discussion groups. WATL has taken the lead in the Sanitation and Water for All work and is active in the Sanitation Working group and the WASH Forum. There are a number of examples where WATL has been innovative and worked with other agencies, particularly the BESIK program to gain interest in these innovations. A more high level example over the period is the interest in Sanitation, with WATL, initially active in linking Dr Kamal Kar to the activities in Timor-Leste, and then with BESIK supporting Dr Kar's visits. More recently WATL has been involved actively researching and sourcing alternative sanitation products, which has the potential to change the nature of sanitation marketing in Timor-

---

<sup>81</sup> The timeline and process for decentralization is being developed by government

<sup>82</sup> One district Oecusse is undergoing a fast track decentralisation as Special Zone.



Leste. On a more local level, the Menstrual Hygiene activities with adolescent women, demonstrate more global initiatives can be developed for implementation in the context of Timor-Leste.

WATL has engaged UNICEF on the Sanitation and Water for All Initiative, encouraging a shared approach to advocating for change, and in doing so, successfully engaging the relevant Directorate Generals.

WATL is also working closely with other NGOs in the sector – particularly PLAN, WV and CARE and sharing approaches used with those agencies – for example approaches to Gender and Disability (PLAN), working with A-GMFs (WV). This has resulted in these agencies adjusting their approach to WASH. One of the main reasons for uptake and dissemination of these approaches was through empowering local organisations, such as the DPO (RHTO) and the A-GMF, to take ownership of the approach and lead on communicating what works for them gives the idea greater currency and validity for the local context. WATL and CARE have implemented a joint program linking WASH and improved water resources management.

The current approach by the WATL leadership team is to be supportive as possible in their policy dialogue rather than adversarial. This approach has contributed to a greater willingness by Government counterparts to engage with WATL on a range of approaches. WATL has piloted WASH initiatives relevant to Timor-Leste and supported the discussion of these across the sector, generating interest. Through working with others, they have increased the scale that new ideas can be implemented, and to a large extent leveraging funding and other resources that the multi-lateral and bilateral programs bring to the sector.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It will be important for WATL to meet with DNSA & DGAS, and also DAA regarding the M-Water system, and how, if at all, they would like it to work with their MIS. There may be options for collaboration, where either M-Water data can be modelled to contribute to SIBS or alternatively, there is a regular meeting where data is shared. If WATL is involved in supporting DNSA to test/develop an Asset Management System, this could provide an opportunity for greater collaboration.
2. It is worth identifying where WATL is not completely following GoTL guidelines or approaches, and either explaining clearly why it is not the case, or adapting the way that WATL works. At times, it would require a minor change to follow their systems (e.g. assessment of GMF capacity). Where using a different approach to government (e.g. the A-GMF, supporting WASH in small communities) it is worth explaining why this approach is, and how it benefits the overall sector. Learning from these approaches, may be useful for policy dialogue, and assessing policy choices.
3. There are opportunities for WATL to further strengthen its Citizen Action work in WASH, particularly working in partnership with others. WATL should, as possible, continue its approach to policy dialogue that is supportive in nature and not adversarial.

## EQ 6: STRENGTHENED CAPACITY TO DELIVER WASH SERVICES – PARTNERS, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR?

***To what extent has WATL strengthened the capacity of local NGO partners, sub-national Government and the private sector to ensure services are delivered at scale in an equitable and sustainable manner?***

### **Summary of key findings**

- The evaluation did not cover an extensive review of capacity building activities.
- NGOs were appreciative of the support provided, and tended to draw extensively on the support provided.
- The model in Manufahi where one national NGO sub-contracted others worked well, but clearly would require an NGO with reasonable capacity to be in that role.
- Both the Ekipa BESI (made up of various Government departments and a member of the A-GMF) were appreciative of the support that WATL provided, and were clearly engaged in the role that the Ekipa BESI can play.

The provision of sustainable and equitable services is discussed in EQ1 above. This evaluation is unable to provide detailed findings on capacity development, due to the broad focus of the evaluation. Thus in this section, the findings highlight feedback from partners, sub-national Government and WATL staff. Any specific assessment of capacity development will require a separate review. Information was drawn from interviews with a range of partner organizations including HTL (Dili and Liquica), Malaedoi (Liquica), NTF (Liquica), SCJP (Liquica) LBF (Manufahi), LBM (Luta Ba Mudansa) and FBF (Feto Ba Futuru).

WATL has developed capacity development plans, which are being tracked by the Advocacy and Policy team.

Overall the NGOs appreciated the support that WATL teams were providing them - and for the WASH NGOs this was primarily in terms of funding and technical support. The evaluation team explored the “soft-ware” aspects of WASH delivery such as increased gender and equity, hygiene promotion and behaviour change around sanitation. It was clear that the staff from partner NGOs draw on significant support from WATL staff in the implementation of all aspects of the WASH project. WATL is implementing a range of capacity development initiatives. There is a structured approach to strengthening capacity to deliver gender equitable WASH services, through a training program (in partnership with IWDA). The approach to strengthening access to PWD and WASH is less structured however there has been ongoing engagement with the Disability sector in TL, and additional support from CBM.

In Liquica, WATL funds partners directly, and from the meeting with the NGOs, it was clear, that those with head offices in Dili, tended to look to WATL for guidance, across all areas of program implementation. In Manufahi, WATL works with one partner (LBF) for WASH activities, with LBF then contracts three other local NGOs – one to work on women’s engagement (Feto ba Futuru), a second (Fuan Nabilan), along with the DPO (RHTO), promoting access for those with a disability and a third NGO (LBM) working on the engagement of children in WASH activities. LBF appeared to have a highly

collegiate relationship with WATL, and there was clear evidence that LBF providing support to the other NGOs sub-contracted to it. WATL staff found that this model worked well, and was positive step towards NGOs taking the lead from WATL.

There was some concern expressed around control of construction materials, particularly regarding delays in delivery of materials. WATL is responsible for sourcing and transportation of construction materials. WATL advised they are transitioning to a system where each partner has a small material purchase fund. For example LBF procured 4 of 8 projects themselves this year (compared to 2 projects last year).

In addition to NGO partners, WATL is working directly with two community associations – A-GMF. The A-GMF capacity is being built through a mentoring process, supporting them to take on the key aspects of their role. This mentoring is provided by both the advocacy and policy team and WATL program coordinator in each municipality. There are clearly significant capacity development needs for the A-GMFs to be in a position, where they would be providing the support envisaged. The role of A-GMFs and related capacity support are discussed in EQ2.

WATL has focused on building the capacity of sub-national government to monitor sustainable and equitable government through support to a BESI team at district (municipal) level. The BESI team is coordinated by the head of DAA, and involves FPAs, CWSDO (from DAA), the DPHO (DHS), the CDO from the Municipal Administration and a representative from the Ministry of Education. In both districts (municipalities) an MOU has been signed between the BESI team and WATL for financial and technical support. In discussions with the BESI team, they appreciated this support to monitor sustainability and it was evident that they did have an increased awareness of the issues faced. The BESI team in Liquica commenced activities in 2012. In Manufahi, the BESI commenced in 2015. The BESI team developed their verification format themselves, with some guidance from WATL.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Regarding the Ekipa BESI, a possible capacity development strategy could focus on the community/project assessments that are undertaken and use these to identify where there are gaps in knowledge, approaches, systems etc. Strategies to address these could be developed, with ownership by the Ekipa BESI with WATL either supporting directly or facilitating support via the BESI program (if BESI is better placed to provide this support).
2. Establishing a participative (and empowering) approach to monitoring capacity development activities with partner NGOs would be useful. There are some interesting approaches available, including on-line systems.
3. Regarding the A-GMF capacity, the recommendations are discussed in EQ2.

### EQ 7: UNIVERSALLY ACCESSIBLE WASH INFRASTRUCTURE - COLLABORATION WITH DPOS

***What have been the outcomes of collaboration with Disabled Peoples Organizations (DPOs) to demonstrate effective responses to universally accessible WASH infrastructure?***

As noted in EQ1 above, WATL has a partnership with CBM to strengthen the WASH and PWD

strategies and outcomes. This partnership extends to TL based DPOs.

The evaluation team did not meet with the DPOs, however as noted in EQ1 above, there was clearly a commitment by WATL to invest in accessible WASH infrastructure. As noted above, while there has been a focus on the facility, the environment around the facility often results in challenges to access. Many of the communities were unaware of the rationale for the ramp, which is a lost opportunity regarding increasing access, as the route to the tap-stand may not be maintained for ease of access. Additionally, it is a lost opportunity to have open discussion around awareness of holistic needs for PWD.

WATL supports partners to use participatory activities to identify if there are people with a disability living in the community. As appropriate, they will then provide specific support to link people with a disability, to disability services offered by DPOs. This approach has a wider benefit than increasing access to WASH infrastructure, as it may be an opportunity for broader empowerment of people with a disability in all aspects of their lives.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Look at options for WASH programs to take a more holistic view of access to WASH facilities, e.g. paths to toilets, and to water points. As noted in EQ6, look at options for further building the attitudes and perception of NGO staff around PWD as active citizens. An opportunity for this may be through workshop sessions that bring DPO and NGO staff together to discuss how they may ensure greater access, but also involvement of PWD.

## CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the WATL program against the Timor-Leste Country Strategy resulted in a number of positive findings over the 2010-2015 period.<sup>83</sup> These include:

- 89% of water-points reported to have full functionality, 2 years after completion.
- 17,121, additional people (approx. 2630 HH) have access to water through WATL supported construction of 123 water systems over the period from 2010-2015
- WATL has supported the establishment of 117 GMFs in the period 2010-15.
- Of the 117 sub-villages (bairros) where projects have finished, 94 have declared ODF (80%)
- 62% of GMFs had more than 30% of women in management roles, and 8% had women in technical roles.
- 92% of households from ODF communities were assessed to be using their toilets two years after construction (2014 data)
- MHM activities show great potential for empowering young women, and as basis for greater awareness of their reproductive health

---

<sup>83</sup> The numeric findings have been sourced from WATL monitoring data.

The WATL program has been innovative in areas such as Citizen Action, Sanitation Marketing, Menstrual Hygiene Management. WATL is seen as a trusted partner in the WASH sector by National and Municipal Governments, and influences other WASH agencies. The WATL team consists of professionals passionate about their work.

The evaluation revealed a range of lessons learned including:

- Looking at triggering options for improving HWWS (or Ash) rates.
- Considering options to work more within DGAS systems for the delivery and sustainability of rural water systems. This includes considering options to strengthen DAA in Liquica and Manufahi in specific areas, including data collection and use of data.
- Consider a range of options around the future of the A-GMFs.
- Further work around strengthening the capacity of partners, resources available and systems being used to promote both gender equity and social inclusion. This includes a more holistic view of working with PWD.
- There are options to further understand key practical aspects of sanitation marketing (building on the extensive research that has been undertaken) through the introduction of the “SaTo” pan. It will be important that sufficient monitoring systems are in place to gain useful information to drive future sanitation marketing initiatives.
- Further develop the Citizen Action activities, looking beyond the quality of water systems build. Further develop the linkages between the various stakeholders with the Citizen Action strategy.
- Strengthen WATLs monitoring systems – both at the community level and for high-level indicators.

84

## LIST OF ANNEXES

**Annex A: List of detailed recommendations**

**Annex B: Water Aid Timor-Leste Strategic Plan 2010 -2015**

**Annex C: Terms of reference**

**Annex D: Lists of Meetings**

**Annex E: Evaluation Plan**

---

<sup>84</sup> This is underway with the introduction of M-Water