

Rural Sanitation Operational Research
NLLAP 64
***“Enhancing and Accelerating Rural Sanitation
Programme in Ghana***
-
Evidence Based Approaches”.

29 June 2017

Dr. John Pinfold (OPM), Zach White (OPM), Nii Nodal (Maple),
Mawuena Dotse (Maple), Kwame Asubonteng (IRC) and Vida Duti
(IRC)



Oxford Policy Management





Agenda

Time	Item	Participants
9:00-9:15	Arrival and Registration of Participants	All
9:15-9:30	Prayer/ Welcome/Introduction/ Acceptance by Chair	Chair: Kwaku Quansah & Facilitator: Kweku Tsekpetsse-Akuamoah
9:30-9:50	Opening statement & Overview of Operational Research on Rural Sanitation	Niall -UNICEF
09:50-10:20	Presentation on Research Methodology	Nii Laryea/ Kwame Asubonteng
10:20-11:00	Presentation of Study Findings	Nii Laryea/ Kwame Asubonteng
11: 00-11:10	Tea/Coffee & Cocoa Break	All
11:10-11:50	Ranking of Issues emerging and Group Discussion on the Session	OMI & All
11:50-12.20	Moderated Discussions on outcomes of Session and the Group Discussions	Facilitator & All
12:20-12:50	Wrap-up and summary of emerging issues	OMI/All
12:50-13:00	Closing Remarks from Chair Person	Chair Person
13:00-13:45	Closing Prayer/Lunch /Departure	Facilitator /All



Objectives

Purpose

- Share the outcomes of the research and
- Elicit stakeholder perspectives on approaches used and how to improve and accelerate rural sanitation in Ghana.

Specific Objectives of the NLLAP

- i) To discuss with stakeholders the enabling environmental factors associated with good and poor progress in rural sanitation;
- ii) To discuss the best evidence based approaches to accelerate rural sanitation in Ghana.
- iii) To deliberate on the most effective ways of promoting the adoption and adaption of evidence based approaches to enhancing rural sanitation through WASH dialogues, programmes, advocacy and policies

Output

Participants are expected to leave the event with:

1. Knowledge on evidence based rural sanitation implementation programme and approaches in Ghana gained.
2. Strategies and recommendations for improving and accelerating rural sanitation in Ghana, determined



Methodology and Study Design

Desk Studies

- History of approaches to rural sanitation in Ghana;
- Pre independence: 1800s:
 - (focus was on water and later, health & hygiene education, voluntary checks)
- 1910s (sanitary branch, pan & pit latrine – both being insanitary, (sanitary inspectors regarded “od” as public and statutory nuisance > summons)

Desk Studies

- Post-independence (increased population, central gov't requested chiefs and local auth. to provide land and facilities);
- Response to idwssd/creation of cwsd/a
- NGOs & CWSA adopted “pilot project” approach
- since the late 1990s/early 2010, clts with “no-subsidy” approach with variations

- **Where are We?**

Key Informant Interviews

- National & Regional level consultations (kiis);
 - WAG, GC, WB-CWSA, SNV, Plan Ghana & Ide;
 - Others – TREND, APDO, (CONIWAS, WVI)
 - What were the key issues for consideration?:
 - Assess the key factors for the development of the WASH sector;
 - Identify bottlenecks that constrain sector progress;
 - Identify gaps in existing sector funding and propose priorities for networking for additional funds;
 - Establish resource and cost of bottleneck removal;
 - Link bottleneck removal to increase in WASH coverage and broader development objectives
- >Where are we now? Completed, Report submitted**

Adapted WASH-BAT

- Use of UNICEF monitoring data for selection of 2 regions & 6 districts:

Status Region	Good Performing	Average Performing	Poor Performing
Northern	Mion	Zabzugu	East Gonja
Volta	Kpandu	Ho West	North Dayi

WASH-BAT cont'd

- Sampling was based on high performing, moderately performing and low performing district in each region;
- Performance was based on the ODF conversion rate as well as the absolute recent progress with regards to the number of ODF communities.

Focus Group Discussions

- Selection of local consultancy firm & training on conduction of qualitative data collection at community level
- Selection of 5 communities per district
- 2 ODF communities
- 2 communities (triggered but not attained ODF status/may not achieve status SOON)
- 1 triggered but slipped OR contending with challenges e.g. collapsing pits, rocky soil etc.

Where Are We Now?

- Gratitude to Other WASH Programmes



Findings from Other Stakeholders on Current Approaches on Rural Sanitation

Where Are We Now?



	Demand Side Approaches	Supply Side Approaches
Global Communities	CLTS with MMDA field facilitators (previously PO)	Latrine Artisan training, marketing of plastic slab, facilitation to access of low cost materials, use of VSLAs and indirect subsidy.
iDE	Door to door sales promotion by recruited sales agents	Market research. Training of Latrine Artisans and support to developing enterprises. Recruitment and training of sales agents. Credit through enterprises and mobile payment. Supply chain strengthening.
Plan	CLTS with. PO field facilitators.	Latrine Artisan training
SNV	CLTS with MMDA field facilitators (previously POs)	Training of Latrine Artisans and marketing of SafiLatrine. Use of VSLAs and credit unions. Establishing SaniMarts.
WaterAid	CLTS with mass media promotion, focus on entertaining. Field facilitators from POs	Training of latrine artisans. Material subsidy to persons with disabilities.
CWSA/WB	CLTS. MMDA field facilitators (previously consultants/POs)	Latrine artisan training. Planned re-introduction of subsidy.
EHSD/UNICEF	CLTS with MMDA field facilitators. Combined with mass media promotion and advocacy through church networks.	Latrine Artisan training. Initiating sanitation marketing

Approaches	Strategies Used	Remaining Barriers
Supporting effective CLTS implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Focus on strengthening MMDA staff involvement in CLTS process –Emphasis of empowering and networking natural leaders –Intensive post-triggering and post-ODF follow-up –Broader supporting BCC (mass media, engaging religious and traditional leadership) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Large number of previously triggered communities not ODF –Few enforcement mechanisms available to EHO/As –Challenges in applying model in dense and socially fragmented communities –Resistance to constructing ‘basic’ latrines and few options in difficult soil conditions –Limited MMDA funds and resources for transport
Household access to finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation of VSLAs and credit networks - Provision of credit through sanitation enterprises - Use of mobile repayment options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High cost of borrowing - Mismatch between willingness to pay and high construction costs
Lowering construction costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engaging directly with higher up the supply chain - Subsidy - Support to latrine artisans beyond training on technical options to developing enterprises 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scalability of subsidy or models or directly facilitating access to materials - Enterprise development models at early stages of development
Promoting suitable technology options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening MMDA staff’s technical options - Latrine Artisan training - Development and marketing of specific latrine options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability concerns for basic latrines - Limited low-cost options for areas with high water tables or challenging soils
Supporting effective monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct financial support to RICCS and DICCS for monitoring - Timely verification and certification of ODF communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited MMDA funding to for monitoring



Findings
District Enabling
Environment
Assessment
(WASH-BAT)

Summary of Results

Background and Context

- The UNICEF programme is currently being implemented in five regions and a total of 57 districts. Central, Northern, Upper East, Upper West, and Volta
- The districts selected for the research (6 No in Northern & Volta Regions) are all implementing a GoG/UNICEF rural sanitation programme.
- The programme uses the framework of the Rural Sanitation Model and Strategy (RSMS) and Environmental Sanitation Policy 2010.
- The approach used is predominantly community led total sanitation (CLTS) as it is based on demand promotion; through community-level action; using a no- subsidy principle.
- In most of the programme districts training programmes has been conducted for latrine artisans.
- UNICEF provides financial and technical support directly to the Programme Assemblies for implementation, and additional support at the regional-levels and national-levels predominantly for monitoring and the provision of technical assistance.

Background and Context -Cont'd

- Whilst the transfers to the MMDAs are for implementing programme activities,
 - the salaries of the Environmental Health Unit (EHU) staff and other resources (such as vehicles) are provided by the districts themselves, and it is
 - the Environmental Health Officers or Assistants (EHO/As) who mainly act as the field facilitators for CLTS.
- ❖ In 2012/13 a large number of communities triggered, though this 'mass triggering' of communities had limited success.
- ❖ Between 2012 and August 2016, 240 communities declared open defecation free (ODF) which equated to roughly a 9% conversion rate of those triggered.
- ❖ The low conversion rate led to pause in triggering new communities, a re-evaluation of the approach, and subsequently the introduction of the "incremental approach" in 2015/16.

Background and Context -Cont'd

- ❖ The incremental approach encourages MMDAs to re-focus on fewer already triggered communities, get them to become ODF first and then use natural leaders from those communities to trigger the next set of communities, making the next batch of communities ODF, and so on.
- ❖ **The incremental approach has led to a rapid acceleration in progress; between August 2016 and January 2017 a further 285 communities were declared ODF.**
- ❖ In all of the UNICEF Programme regions progress is driven by a few high performing districts; **9 of the 57 districts** in the programme account for just under half of the new ODF communities since August 2016.
- ❖ **Three districts from the Northern Region (Mion, Zabzugu, and East Gonja) and three districts from the Volta Region (Kpando, Ho West, and North Dayi)** were selected for the research –
- ❖ Sampling based on high performing, moderately performing and low performing district in each region;
- ❖ An adapted version of the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Bottleneck Analysis Tool (WASH-BAT) was used to conduct the **Enabling Environment Assessment at the District levels**

Overview of Results

- Fourteen thematic elements in the WASH-BAT and six Enabling Environment elements were covered in the district workshops.
- District level workshops conducted in March 2017 in the six GoG/UNICEF rural sanitation programme districts
- **Figure 1** gives a **Summary of the enabling environment assessments** in the six districts

Overview of Results

- ❖ Generally the Northern Region districts were consistently better than those in the Volta Region.
- ❖ Most districts all have in place most of the elements in the strategy, planning, monitoring and co-ordination areas.
- ❖ There is more variation with respect to institutional leadership particularly in the Volta Region.
- ❖ Broadly the budget and budget implementation are a greater constraint; while most districts include some sanitation specific budget lines, the Environmental Health Units (EHUs) in the MMDAs receive little to no funds for rural sanitation activities from MMDA budgets.
- ❖ The supply side and private sector development areas were also consistently raised as clear bottleneck areas.

Key enabling factors that differ across successful and unsuccessful districts (4 No)

- **The level of senior leadership, and ownership of CLTS by Environmental Health Unit (EHU-DEHO), and District Assembly (DA-DCD)** – *Critical to facilitating prioritisation of sanitation and staff motivation.*
- **Recognition of staff and community efforts** – *Strongly related to the degree to which ODF is an outcome that is owned and prioritised and where success is celebrated.*
 - *DA manifests this through annual reporting and reviews.*
 - *Regional level is reflected in league tables, FOAT assessments, and the level of supervision by the REHSU.*
 - *Community level is influenced by behaviour of field staff and local leadership.*
- ❖ **Fund availability and release** – *This predominantly pertains to the extent and speed to which external funds are released. MMDAs reported that internal funds are not made available for rural sanitation activities.*

Key enabling factors that differ across successful and unsuccessful districts

- ❖ **Innovative advocacy, locally tailored ways of working with communities**
(either by effective use of local media and/or engaging local leaders such as traditional leaders, religious leaders, etc)

Enabling factors that do not contribute significant variation among districts (5 No)

- **Accessible and affordable materials for latrine construction** – Generally noted as a challenge in all districts, but doesn't explain the difference in the performance among districts.
- **Presence of trained latrine artisans** –important for high quality latrine construction but it isn't a powerful factor because all districts reported similar training practices
- **Coordination, and support to EHU within DA and particularly by DCD** – through broad-based support and better DICCS performance. Some questioned the need for these mechanisms because DA department teams work closely as a matter of course regardless of DICCS or DP programmes.
- **Coherent policy and strategies** – Difference exists in how sanitation is prominent in medium term development plans (MTDPs) and annual action plans (AAPs). The disconnect does not however affect performance because current implementation is not dependent on the presence or absence of these planning and strategy documents

Enabling factors that do not contribute significant variation among districts (5 No) –Cont'd

- **Monitoring and use of data for planning and reporting** – All districts are monitoring rural sanitation via the GoG/UNICEF programme monitoring framework with verification by RICCS as per the revised ODF protocol.
 - Three (Zabzugu, Mion & Kpando) of the six districts reported they have begun using the BaSIS for monitoring.
 - Many districts reported that these monitoring data are not extensively used for planning and remedial action purposes.
 - The sustainability of monitoring was questionable because it is dependent on external funds.
 - Too many different systems currently in use (e.g. DiMES, BaSIS, RING monitoring, UNICEF programme monitoring)
 - Monitoring as a factor for EEA requires more investigation before any suggestions can be made on rationalising sanitation monitoring system.

Supporting Actions Influencing Enabling factors

- **Leadership and recognition** is a big motivating factor for front line staff
- **Follow-up by more senior staff and rotating of field staff coupled with facilitation qualities**
- **The visibility of results (ODF league tables)-** is an important factor motivating district staff at all levels (including the senior level staff) in the Northern Region and Kpando in Volta Region.
- **Follow-up visits from regional level (mainly RICCS)**
- **Regional ODF reviews –innovations by districts implementing CLTs .**
- **Publicity -.**

Supporting Actions Influencing Enabling factors

❖ Engaging support from local leaders outside the DA

- Where the **traditional leadership** structure (Chief, headmen etc) is strong, they are generally respected by the community and therefore people are more likely to follow their advice.
 - (e.g. E. Gonja) have started building on this by triggering traditional leadership with regional support. the Regional office plans to support other northern districts in the same way using a network of **natural leaders** as a central part of the incremental approach.
 - **Religious institutions and leaders** also play an influential role on their respective congregations (both Christian and Muslim) though this factor came out more strongly in the Northern Districts. For example, Zabzugu uses mosques to send message to the community and regional support for engaging FBOs.
 - There are also other options for **other local leadership** in building a broader momentum behind sanitation. For example Kpando had engaged the support from elected leaders, taxis drivers, local market and police.
- **Resources**-Though there are allocations to rural sanitation activities in AAPs and to a lesser extent the consolidated budgets, no districts reported using internally generated funds (IGF) or district assembly common fund

Supporting Actions Influencing Enabling factors

- **External funding for Rural Sanitation:**
 - Rural sanitation delivery in all the districts is entirely dependent on external funds. There are doubts on how programme can be scaled-up and how the institutional structures (e.g. the DICCS and RICCS) established for monitoring activities can be sustained.
 - Few reported delays in release for external funds (mainly UNICEF) but North Dayi experience serious difficulties in moving funds through the DA systems.
 - Common anecdotal reports of field facilitators not receiving their T&T.
 - Transport cited as major bottleneck in six districts though UNICEF funds for fuel available

Supporting Actions Influencing Enabling factors

- **Private sector/supply chain**
 - training of artisans on latrine options in most districts a
 - where these artisans were not active three main reasons were given: a) preference for artisans from the community; b) low demand; and c) that the artisans were not given any training on business development.
 - In E. Gonja, where SNV had supported the development of latrine options and trained local artisans, the districts had kept in touch with trained Latrine Artisans and monitored progress on sales.

Supporting Actions Influencing Enabling factors – Cont'd

- **Private sector/supply chain**
- **supply of materials,**
 - Most latrine options require common construction materials (cement, sand , iron rod, vent pipes etc). Material are locally available but the total construction cost increases with the cost of transporting these inputs to the location.



Conclusion

- ❑ **These are OMI's tentative findings**
- ❑ **The findings will be revised** based on your inputs and feedback from you as sector stakeholders **to shape the next stages of the research and in enhancing our recommendations**
- ❑ **The findings will be enriched by our community level research** which focused on the dynamics of programme implementation, and the enablers and challenges at the community level.
- ❑ Your comments are most welcome on all aspects of the presentation .



Group work

Challenges and Success Factors

- 1. Ranking the following in relation to your work as Stakeholders**
- 2. Present experiences of how these Challenges have been addressed/overcome**
- 3. Identify the role of various stakeholders (DPs/NGO, MMDA, Local leaders, community members/beneficiaries)**
 - Monitoring
 - Financing Rural Sanitation beyond external funds
 - Private sector (latrine artisans, sales enterprises, and material supply)
 - Construction Cost
 - Suitability and affordability of technologies for durability and sustainability of latrines
 - B) Leadership and institutional arrangements
 - Innovative Advocacy
 - Planning and Investment
 - Policy and practice