
STAKEHOLDER VALIDATION OF CONTEXT ANALYSIS - WATERSHED PROGRAMME, GHANA

An Outcome Brief

INTRODUCTION

Following a context analysis for the Watershed programme supported by IRC, Simavi, Wetlands and Akvo, the partners invited key stakeholders in the WASH and WRM sector where the findings were discussed and validated. A validation session¹ was attended by over fifty (50) key stakeholders from varying backgrounds in the Sector. This outcome brief summarises their expectations, major observations and suggestions relevant to the subsequent phases of the Watershed programme.

STAKEHOLDER MIX AND KEY EXPECTATIONS

The Stakeholders cut across government Ministries, Departments and Agencies, private sector organisations, Print and Electronic Media, Civil Society Networks and Coalitions, Research and academic Institutions and Bilateral organisations and Local NGOs among others. While some had little knowledge and needed information, key expectations common to most stakeholders -most of which was presented in the form of questions, centered around six (6) main themes as follows:

Expectations Presented as Key Questions & Suggestions



- WASH Financing is Low - How will the Watershed Programme contribute to resolving this?
- Ghana has its targets for WASH and WRM - How will the Watershed programme establish a link or align with these?
- How can lobby and Advocacy be used to trigger and sustain better WASH investment?
- What is the link between Watershed WASH and Health?
- What will be the link between the Watershed programme and sustainability as well as services in schools?
- What is the Watershed all about - land, water and people?
- In-depth understanding of the roles different actors are expected to play for successful watershed programme;
- Deeper understanding of the multiple-levels of advocacy required within the Watershed such as Community, District, Regional and National.

¹ The Validation session took place at Coconut Grove Regent Hotel in Accra on June 09, 2016

Watershed

empowering citizens

A CATALOGUE OF OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Stakeholders made critical observations and suggestions to deepen some findings, modify specific areas and add further clarity to the issues or meanings. These are reflected as follows:

- Clarity required on the role of research and academic institutions;
- Provide options for involving lower level educational structures and other well-organised groups;
- Build the capacity of traditional authorities in WASH and WRM to facilitate their role in the delivery of the Watershed programme;
- Strengthen or highlight the role of suppliers of spare parts. This area is a major challenge i.e. stocking of pump parts is a problem in the face of high breakdowns;
- Critically look at the capacity (skills) of the District Assemblies. It should not be a blanket approach but rather tailor-made to facilitate their responsiveness; and
- Livestock should be seen as a major source of destruction which also affects water bodies. Same with Fulani herdsmen.

MAJOR GAPS IN THE CONTEXT ANALYSIS

A few gaps were identified that required further information to help bridge. Some of these were perceptions about the primary and secondary targets. While the targets presented were based on the outcomes of responses, what the stakeholders suggested (some of whom were not respondents during the context analysis) were based on perceptions. These are reflected as follows:

- Traditional authorities should be considered primary target rather than secondary since their role in WASH and WRM delivery is critical especially for community ownership and sustainability;
- Consider other Bilaterals and multilaterals as targets or allies since UNICEF and the World Bank are not the only major funders of WASH - Strategically this will make lobby and advocacy comprehensive;
- Consider the roles of User networks at the community levels when developing capacity for engagement with duty-bearers at the local levels;
- At the national and regional levels, consider the role of GWCL as they are central to major water challenges in urban areas re: poor water quality, limited water access, etc;
- Focus lobby and advocacy on the Ministries rather than just their directorates - EHSD within MLGRD and Water Directorate within the MWRWH.
- There is an *SDG philanthropy platform* that could serve as a major opportunity for lobby and advocacy around WASH and WRM financing;

Watershed

empowering citizens

- Consider innovative and non-traditional sources of funding such as leveraging household capacity to pay and celebrities (especially footballers and others) willing to support essential social services;

NEXT STEPS & CONCLUSIONS

- Local governments generally were considered critical to the success of the Watershed programmes hence they should form part of the subsequent phases of work. They have sufficient resources under different projects but the skills and commitments need to be established ahead of any support.
- To avoid expending on non-existent problems, it will be essential to undertake baseline studies prior to actual intervention. This should be followed by building required capacities to facilitate understanding of the project and accelerate delivery;
- For any chronic challenges and failure of local level leadership to demonstrate strong commitments, the local governance service (LGS) should be involved;
- An in-depth understanding of the relationship between bureaucrats, political and traditional authorities in the eventual areas for intervention will be critical for the success of the watershed programmes.
- The programme should build institutional capacity - CSO networks and coalitions so they will in turn use that to empower community groups to effectively engage with duty bearers on a fairly consistent basis