

*Library*IRC International Water
and Sanitation Centre
Tel.: +91 70 90 889 80
Fax: +91 70 90 889 84

COPENHAGEN, 23 - 25 October 1997

WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION SUB-SECTOR REPORT**INTRODUCTION**

The purposes of this paper are to:

- (a) present a preliminary analysis of gaps and overlaps in the various programs in the Water Supply and Sanitation Sector; and
- (b) report the results of a "brain storming session with the key stakeholders in the Water Supply and Sanitation Sub-Sector" that took place in Copenhagen 23 - 25 October 1997.

In the first part of this paper, the authors present the preliminary analysis and recommendations that were submitted to the Copenhagen meeting. They follow these with a summary of the process and the recommendations of the Water and Sanitation Working Group in Copenhagen.

Some conclusions of the consultants may be provocative. Some recommendations made by workshop participants may be controversial. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will consider the actions proposed by the Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) working group and others at a meeting in November and make recommendations to the Steering Committee of the GWP. Hopefully, the proposals of the TAC will lead to the creation of innovative approaches based on the experience of the International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade (the Decade) and agreements reached during some of the gatherings addressing water resource issues which have been held during recent years. The test of the validity of the recommendations (and the justification of the meeting in Copenhagen) is not the issuance of new proposals, but that their subsequent implementation will accelerate progress in increasing water supply and sanitation service to those presently lacking them.

BACKGROUND**Existing Service Delivery**

Water supply and sanitation services still do not reach large numbers of people in middle- and low- income countries. WHO and UNICEF report that in 1994 some 1,115 million inhabitants (25% of the total) did not have water supply, and 2,873 (66%) million of the total population of 4,071 million did not have the benefit of adequate sanitation services. Since 1990, progress in service provision has been

greatest in the Asia and Pacific (19% increase) and Western Asia (10%) Regions, less so in Africa (1% increase) and Latin America (no increase). Improvements in rural areas have been substantially greater than in urban areas.

Sanitation services show a less favorable situation. In the Asia and Pacific Region, the coverage dropped one percent, the Western Asia Region improved by 3%, Africa dropped 2 %, and Latin American coverage decreased by 6 % since 1990.

Past experience indicates that these numbers are probably conveying a more positive picture than warranted. Reports generally are based on facilities installed and do not reflect actual conditions and state of repair of systems. The level of service delivery may be considerably lower than reported.

Future Demand

Demand will increase significantly during the foreseeable future. Population keeps growing, and per capita demand increases with increasing economic expansion. At the same time, water resources remain stable in terms of available quantity, but may well decrease in terms of usable quantity due to deterioration of quality caused by pollution.

Urban demand in particular will grow with increasing migration from rural areas to cities. There will be many more mega-cities in the future, at a time when it is becoming increasingly clear that additional economies of scale are unlikely to help stretch available financial resources. Indeed, some reports indicate that large centralized urban sewer systems can cost more than smaller watershed systems. Alternative sewerage and on-site wet and dry excreta disposal systems are the most cost effective solutions in many, if not most environments in which low income groups find themselves. Institutional arrangements can be developed to provide sustainability and environmental safeguards.

Previous Conferences

Previous conferences reflect the importance assigned to water supply and sanitation in more general development efforts. A compilation of statements and resolutions on the topic of water published by UNDP in 1994 lists seven conferences both in preparation to and as a follow-up of the "United Nations Conference on Environment and Development" held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 3 - 14 June 1992.

In a departure from the previous conferences, the ministers participating in the Noordwijk Conference in 1995 designed their action program not in terms of functional sub-sectors, but on the basis of cross sector collaboration. The themes of the Noordwijk action program are:

1. Water and People
2. Water, Health and Environment
3. Water and Institutions
4. Water and Mobilizing Financial Resources

5. Water and the World

The final part of the program, "Water for the World", recommends the kind of support activities considered by the Global Water Partnership. It also recommends strengthening the efforts of the Collaborative Council for Water Supply and Sanitation.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Global Water Partnership are to:

Support integrated water resources management programs by collaboration, at their request, with governments and existing networks and by forging new collaborative arrangements.

Encourage governments, external support agencies and other stakeholders to adopt consistent, mutually complementary policies and programs.

Build mechanisms for sharing information and experiences.

Develop innovative and effective solutions to problems common to integrated water resources management.

Suggest practical policies and good practices based on those solutions.

Help match needs to available resources.

The generic terms of reference of this study call for a review and presentation of information needed as background by the Global Water Partnership (GWP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to be used by the working groups at the brainstorming session in Copenhagen. Working groups at the brainstorming session were to define and cost a program of technical assistance to accomplish Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) in countries requesting assistance.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF PRESENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

Participating Organizations

Many organizations provide technical assistance for water supply and sanitation activities in middle- and low-income countries. As the list below shows, they range from small local Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) providing volunteers to local communities, to large International and Regional Development Banks providing financial support for project preparation activities and training.

Of the two concerns, gaps and overlaps, gaps are unquestionably the more important. Overlaps do occur because many programs are interested in the same topics, or because programs work in the same country. As long as appropriate steps are taken to ensure adequate coordination, or to avoid the "reinvention of the wheel" particularly in the case of research activities, overlaps are probably helpful as often as they are wasteful. To avoid wasted efforts due to overlaps in the majority of cases requires (a) better communications, so programs can adjust and coordinate their activities; and (b) a taking charge of the coordination of programming activities within their countries by the responsible government agencies.

Evidence presented in a variety of reports and conferences reveals that significant changes have occurred during the Decade and since, mostly based on better understanding of the non-technical aspects of water supply and sanitation.

Nevertheless the basic problem still awaits a solution. How can the sector consistently expand and sustain services to the urban and rural low-income population? Hopefully, GWP will be able to identify and promote a technical assistance mechanism that will emphasize service to low income groups. The lessons learned during the Decade offer hope that a concerted effort will indeed make this possible. They reveal the following:

Focus on people must be a key element of planning, implementation and subsequent operation of water supply and sanitation systems. This is a move away from the past dependence on the "technical fix" towards empowerment of the user to make decisions about the choice of technology and method of operation and payment. The solution should be demand driven, i. e. based on effective demand. Users are capable of making the right choice if given adequate information on which they can base their decision

Example: Among many examples demonstrating that users indeed are capable of making the right choice if given the information needed is a UNICEF supported project in Honduras. The "Water Supply and Sanitation to Urban Marginal Areas of Tegucigalpa, Honduras" shows how a small community can organize itself and construct and operate water and sanitation services with limited assistance from outside the community

Technical Assistance (TA) should emphasize the collaborative aspects of development in which the community and agency are full partners in the decision making process. The role of the TA provider must be to provide information on options that permits the community to choose the one it can afford and sustain. Mobilizing the community becomes a primary function of technical assistance. To better express this change to a participatory approach, the phrase "**technical assistance**" (which to many represents the top down approach) should be replaced with "**development collaboration**" as a small but symbolic expression of the new partnership approach. NGOs and bilateral organizations are generally much more people-oriented than banking institutions.

Partial List of Organizations providing Technical Assistance

Collaborative Council	UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation Program
International Water Services Association (IWSA)	WB - Economic Development Institute (EDI)
International Water Quality Association (IAWQ)	International, Regional and National Development Banks
National and Regional Professional Associations	World Health Organization (WHO)
Water Utilities' Partnership in Africa (WUP)	United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
National / Local Non-Government Organizations	United Nations Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT)
International Non - Government Organizations	United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)
Bilateral Assistance Organizations	World Water Council
International Reference Center (IRC)	International Secretariat for Water (ISW)
International Development Research Center (IDRC)	International Rivers Network
International Water Resources Association (IWRA)	

These organizations provide very different kinds of support. Some are active primarily in the field (national and local NGOs). Others play a coordinating and promotional role (Collaborative Council), and still others emphasize research activities by middle- and low-income country researchers (IDRC). Yet others are primarily engaged with activities leading to funding of investments (International and Regional Banks). The specific sub-sectors in which these organizations are involved are listed in Annex "A" Table 1. The activities of principal interest of each of them are shown in Table 2. Readers of this report are invited to add to these lists by providing the GWP secretariat with information they deem important to complete or correct them.

Assessment of the Performance (Lessons learned) of Technical Assistance

An attempt to assess the successes and failures of each of the many programs would be a time consuming task that would not necessarily have added much to the deliberations and success of the workshop. The object of the workshop was not to judge the past performance of individual programs, but to determine gaps and overlaps and on that basis formulate proposals for the future. That task was accomplished by a "generic" assessment of success and failures of technical assistance programs and by an evaluation of experiences by participants of the workshop.

There is no single best solution to solve the many problems that have prevented universal coverage of water supply and sanitation. The variety of local conditions and abilities require a variety of solutions. In some situations, the conventional solutions now popular in high-income countries may be the right choice. In many others, simpler alternatives are more appropriate. A great variety of technologies already exist to provide and adequate selection of possible solutions from which the user can select the one most appropriate for local conditions. In every situation, however, it is the user rather than the designer who must determine appropriateness. Alternatives may range from rainwater catchment for water supply and ventilated pit latrines for excreta management to full piped water supply and one of several alternative sewer systems for wastewater disposal. The

The UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation program initiated activities promoting the use of alternative technologies. Many organizations and governments began adopting policies incorporating alternative technologies in sector technologies to increase water supply and sanitation service coverage in 1978. The program now concentrates its efforts on capacity building and knowledge sharing.

designer provides the choices from which the user selects. **Appropriateness can be defined as providing a socially and environmentally acceptable level of service or quality of product at the lowest economic cost.**

While many options are available, a search for a technical breakthrough should go on in wastewater disposal in particular. This might be similar to the one that led to the substitution of the jet engine for the piston engine. Marginal improvements in technology have at best marginal impacts. A breakthrough could radically alter existing approaches, increase benefits and reduce costs.

Historically, development in environmental services has followed a pattern of incremental improvements to technologies. Engineers discovered many of these when we had limited understanding of the cause and effect relationship between pollution, environment and health. Frequently, we have found we need improvements simply to correct damage caused by previous interventions -- although these had represented, in their time, the best available solutions. We must answer the fundamental question: what would scientists and engineers design, given present knowledge, if a city had no environmental infrastructure? Would the solutions be the same, or are there more effective, environment-friendly and less expensive solutions? What would ingenuity produce, unshackled from the constraint to use partial solutions that already exist? And how could such a solution be incorporated into and benefit from existing infrastructure investment? An organized effort to address this question should be encouraged.

Institutions and Planners are still lagging behind in the implementation of the approaches pioneered by the UNDP/WB programs and its partner organizations (bilateral assistance agencies). Sector professionals are a relatively conservative lot, and bureaucracies stifle individual initiative and innovation. However, changes have been made. Hopefully, the pace will accelerate as the lessons of the past few years are becoming better known. To progress more rapidly, it is important that all activities be part of a learning process that provides planners with feedback on the acceptability, success or failure of their approaches. **Future progress in implementing a more holistic approach to service provision using systems affordable to more of the lower income groups requires less new technologies or massive amounts of capital than a change in the mental attitude of those responsible for the sector.**

In the early years of the Decade, the Government of India changed its approach to the provision of urban sanitation services, mandating that cities of less than 100,000 inhabitants use alternative sanitation systems rather than sewerage. This was a rather drastic, and not necessarily the best solution, but it did accelerate service provision and reduced the need for scavengers.

Policies and Institutional

Arrangements need to be improved to take advantage of the possibilities offered by stakeholder participation and alternative technologies and systems, and to attract private sector participation and financing. Because the required changes are difficult for most Governments, **emphasis by technical assistance and funding organizations should be on collaborative efforts to encourage governments to adopt policy changes and institutional reforms.**

WHO has launched a number of initiatives designed to help improve policies, standards and regulations designed to protect environmental health and increase operational efficiencies. The Water Policy Reform Program of the Economic Development Institute has been particularly successful in facilitating the adoption of new policies and institutional approaches in the limited number of countries in which it has been active.

Mobilizing the Private Sector is not only a matter of increasing the flow of capital for infrastructure, but even more the mobilization of expertise. There are many examples where utilities have made expertise available on a commercial basis, for example through management, concession and similar contracting models. There are other examples of transfer of knowledge through volunteer and paid assistance through twinning, and more recently the transfer laterally from middle and low income country utilities to others who could benefit from their experience and expertise. This lateral transfer may well hold the key to future success because it

The Water Utilities Partnership (WUP) in Africa is a recent and seemingly promising effort for lateral assistance among utilities of a region now being implemented in Africa. The experience offers hope for a global expansion of such an effort designed to tap the expertise of successful utilities for the benefit of weaker ones.

is based on success in conditions similar to both. **Tapping the rich resources of expertise available from successfully managed water supply and sanitation utilities is essential if service delivery is to increase significantly in the near future.**

Collaboration is always high on the list of proposals at international conferences, but

During the Decade, ESAs developed a fairly high level of consensus on how to conduct business and aligned their policies reasonably well. In order to continue and expand collaboration to middle and low-income countries, they established the Collaborative Council. The Council serves a useful function but will succeed in the future only to the extent ESAs assign priority to collaboration.

rarely has a major impact on how External Assistance Agencies (ESAs) and Government Agencies do business. The lack of follow-up is not so much a lack of recognition of potential benefits, but rather a lack of incentives for those who bear the burden of making collaboration work. Workers properly spend their efforts on tasks given priority in budgets and work plans. Possibly even greater reluctance to participate in meaningful collaboration is the resulting requirement to give up some, albeit generally negligible, degree of independence of action. **Until managers**

make collaboration a priority with appropriate budget allocations and staff incentives, collaboration will remain the stepchild it now is in most organizations.

Capacity Building and Communications are other topics that find strong support, at least until decisions have to be made on the manner of doing it and on the wherewithal to pay for the effort. One of the problems is the complexity of the effort required; the many components included in a comprehensive capacity building effort and the variety of demands that communications have to satisfy.

The International Reference Center (IRC) has acted as the collector and disseminator of information for the water supply and sanitation sector. Its success has been varied, despite some excellent professional research and development work. Results have been disappointing when attempts were made to commercialize the dissemination of experiences around the world.

Capacity building has a good track record with some excellent programs focusing on middle and low-income professional needs. Among the institutions leading the effort in the technical aspects are WEDC in Loughborough and IJG in Delft.

Many organizations participate in these efforts, ranging from professional associations to topical institutes, research centers and universities. Judging their impact is just as complex as capacity building itself. **At a minimum, better communications among the institutions active in the field could improve overall effectiveness by identifying/resolving duplications and gaps. At its most effective, collaboration may be patterned after national collaborative networks of institutions designed to increase the overall**

productivity of its members, such as NUFFIC in the Netherlands. One potential source of collaborators overlooked to date is the various international associations of municipalities. Municipalities, in fact, "own" the problems of water and sanitation.

Sequential Upgrading of facilities is rarely practiced, although in some countries the approach has been accepted for planning purposes and initial designs permit future upgrading. Technologies and systems that make this approach possible include alternative designs for water distribution, on-site sanitation and off-site alternative wastewater collection systems. The importance of upgrading is twofold: **the approach permits immediate improvements in service delivery at costs that are affordable and, possibly more important, it assures the user that future improvements will occur whenever increasing incomes make improvements affordable.**

The impact of sequential upgrading becomes obvious when considering that collecting wastewater costs two to three times that of delivering the water. On-site sanitation reduces that cost to less than that of the delivery of water, and reduces the need for large quantity of water. The result: **more people can be served with the same funds, and the environment is better protected.**

Ex-Post Evaluation, i.e. a check on the performance and benefits provided by the facilities constructed after a period of operation, say 5 or 10 years, is essential if knowledge about what works and what doesn't is to be generated. Common practice at present is to evaluate (audit) projects after completion in terms of expenditures, quality of construction, implementation of financial and institutional covenants. Determining whether the predicted benefits have been delivered to the user after a period of operation is relatively rare.

Without post evaluations, it is virtually impossible to learn how to improve sector performance and identify and design research and training programs necessary to find more effective solutions. This is particularly true now, after the changes in the approach instituted as a result of the efforts made and lessons learned during the Decade. It is important to review now how effectively community participation has improved long term sustainability of service delivery, and how significantly appropriate technologies have reduced costs and facilitated operation and maintenance. Ex-post evaluation will reveal lessons essential to formulating approaches and methods needed to expand service delivery in the future. The information obtained can be used to design capacity building programs to expand the pool of professionals at all levels needed to plan, implement and operate the vastly expanded facilities required to provide service to those not now served. Such evaluations are an important part of a learning-by-doing process that, through iteration over time, provides the information required to more effectively plan future sector investments and operations.

Programs such as the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program with its regional units are in an excellent position to conduct such institutional and cross-country studies.

Integrated Planning for Infrastructure Services is another neglected aspect that is important for long term sustainable service provision. Proponents should estimate

The circular system recommended and used by Sheaffer in the 1980s emphasizes integrated design of water supply, waste water and rain water reuse within the community to reduce both costs and negative environmental impacts.

separately the cost of components, such as water supply, sanitation (wet and dry, centralized and on-site systems), drainage and solid waste collection. The implication of constructing one or the other separately or jointly should be clearly understood by the user. Demand for service is overestimated when consumers are allowed to choose water supply service levels without being faced

with the costs of disposal of the wastewater. Furthermore, urban planners and architects need to better understand the impact of in house water use and community layout on design and costs of water and sanitation infrastructure. **Delivering quantities of water which require sewer systems in the absence of funds for the construction of sewers is economically and environmentally unacceptable.** Proponents should provide the prospective user of services with the information necessary to make a decision about what facilities provide the best combination of benefits at an affordable price.

Strategic Planning is the next logical step for infrastructure planning and includes not only infrastructure itself but also housing and spatial planning. Housing, because water use and the generation of wastewater are very much a function of housing design (conservation and reuse). Spatial design (population density and location of industry/commerce pretty much defines infrastructure design. Parks and greenbelts can be important parts of wastewater and storm water treatment and reuse. At the very minimum, water supply and sanitation need to be planned at the same time to ensure the effectiveness of proposed investments, even when, or particularly when financial constraints prevent the construction of waste water collection system at the time water facilities are being built.

Integrated Water Resource Management is in its infancy in most countries and amongst External Support Agencies (ESAs) but receiving increasing and urgent attention. This is the result of an ever growing demand for water generated by increasing population and the resultant increasing domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial demand. To ensure an adequate supply in the future, approaches, technologies and systems developed for an environment of water abundance must be changed to respond to a new situation of water scarcity. With most of the past problems caused by human misunderstanding or misinterpretation of environmental conditions, it is reasonable to assume that human ingenuity will solve the problem once again. After all, the history of

The Middle East has suffered disproportionately from water scarcities. It is no surprise, therefore, to find that countries in the region are leaders in the development of institutions and technologies emphasizing the efficiency of water use and reuse. Israel is an example of comprehensive and successful water resource management, and other countries, for example Jordan, are following similar paths to resolve their water problems. Tunisia is continuously evolving its water master plan surface and ground water and to take water quality into consideration.

sanitary engineering is one of correcting what in hindsight was found to be the wrong solution with a new alternative which then in hindsight turned out to have been the wrong solution again, again, and again. **This time, the needed actions are not so much a search for new technologies, but the development of policies, institutions and practices that address water issues holistically rather than limited to sub-sectors. There may indeed be virtue in revisiting and "modernizing" solutions abandoned in the past, such as on-site sanitation, both to reduce water consumption and investment cost.**

Restructuring of Institutions is essential if integrated water resources management and strategic planning are to succeed. Sub-sectors, such as water supply and sanitation and irrigation and food security, will continue to plan their own activities and approaches with the objective of supplying good water supply and sanitation services, respectively sufficient food, for the "communities" served. Their strategic planning, however, must be based not only their own needs, but on providing the most effective multi-sector services required by the community. This could mean a change in the traditional approaches, and a reallocation of water to the sub-sectors, and that decision has to be made by an organization charged specifically with reconciling possibly conflicting demands for the common good. Strategic planning for water resources management, including water allocation, land use, water rights, legislation and regulations, cost recovery and pricing, and the promulgation of guidelines for the implementation of policies by sub-sector, would probably require the establishment of river basin or watershed authorities by government(s).

GAPS IN EXISTING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The limited assessment of existing programs and activities leads to an identification of topics that need to be addressed. This report emphasizes what is lacking, i.e. the gaps (lacking or receiving insufficient attention) in activities needed to accelerate progress in service provision. The list of issues below identifies such activities or actions needed in the various sub-sectors of water supply and sanitation. Traditional activities, such as centralized water supply and sewerage are not listed in the table because they are well taken care of by many organizations. The issue they present is whether they should be used in a particular situation, or be replaced with some other technology or approach more suitable in the situation under consideration. For example, in Table 3, water supply, waste water and sanitation are given a value of 2 in the appropriate technology (urban) row, not because the conventional technologies are not well known, but because they must be re-examined in light of today's better understanding of sustainability requirements. Can users afford them? Can they be made more cost effective? What alternatives are available? The table emphasizes those activities that are largely missing or still receiving inadequate attention.

Not shown in the table, but nevertheless a serious gap, is the lack of a method to familiarize those searching for assistance with the various organizations providing technical assistance. A central clearing house function could be of great help in bringing together "seekers and providers".

List of Issues/Activities lacking or receiving insufficient Attention

Awareness

- Behavior Modification through
 - Information
 - Education
 - Communication
- Stakeholder participation
- Corporate Citizenship

Policies and Regulations

- Appropriate legislation
 - water rights;
 - sanitation and pollution control responsibilities
- Policy formulation on:
 - Socioeconomic aspects:
 - Equitable allocation of fiscal resources and distribution of benefits:
 - Management:
 - Alternative Technologies:
 - Standards;
 - Allocation;
 - Appropriate scale;
 - Comparative Competition;
 - Participation of micro enterprises and micro credit organizations:
 - Incentive systems;
- Permits and regulatory framework;
- Focus on People through
 - Consultation:
 - Participation:
 - Community based planning;
- Monitoring, using
 - Performance Indicators:
 - Bench-marking
 - Ex-post Evaluation

Management-Institutional Designs

- Appropriate public-private partnership arrangements and commercialization of public organizations using:
 - management and lease contracts;
 - concessions;
 - community management of some or all services (e.g. by Community based organizations [CBOs]) ;

- contractual arrangements for utility assisted community management of facilities (wholesale/retails arrangements and/or Technical Assistance by utility)
- BOT and BOOT contracts;
- Institutional arrangements for the public or private management of on site systems (ground and receiving water protection and pit emptying), solid waste removal and storm water drainage;
- Appropriate institutional conditions to attract financing, such as
 - fiscal independence;
 - authority to enter contracts and set employment conditions and salaries;
 - legislation defining responsibilities and authority of service provider;
- Horizontal and Vertical Coordination at local, national and regional level within the sector and with other water related sectors;
- Integration of Health and Environment targeting people at risk;
- Revising the Role of Public Sector Agencies and promoting Public - Private Partnership;
- Community based Planning Organizations

Technology

- Integrated planning for water and wastes infrastructure services and spatial development;
- Sequential Upgrading keeping pace with economic development;
- Optimize the efficiency of use, reuse and recycling through:
 - housing emphasizing conservation and reuse
 - use greenbelts, parks, artificial wetlands;
 - urban-rural integration of water and waste use in metropolitan areas;
 - self-contained residential and commercial development;
 - industrial process design emphasizing conservation and reuse;
- Application of Alternative/Appropriate Technologies:
- Applied Research and Development leading to more effective Technologies and Systems;
- Capacity Building, including the development of appropriate curricula to train technologists in social and cultural aspects of water and sanitation service delivery;
- Collaboration with other actors in the sector and outside the sector in the planning of water and sanitation improvements.

Socioeconomic Aspects

- Cost recovery, pricing mechanism and tariff design (for water supply/wastewater disposal and water resource allocation) leading, inter alia, to an equitable allocation of resources;
- Service to all under both private and public ownership and management;
- Transparent systems for funding service to the poor;

- Demand management tools, including effective demand based pricing;
- Tradable permits for water abstraction and waste discharge;
- Appropriate financing for drainage and solid waste disposal.

Appended Tables

The tables appended to this report in Annex "A" provide an overview of technical assistance activities. Tables 1 to 3 are an attempt to present an overview of organizations active in the same sub-sectors (Table 1), activities by the same organizations in the various topics included in capacity building (Table 2) and gaps by sub-sector (Table 3).

CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS TO COPENHAGEN WORKING GROUP

Criteria to evaluate success of GWP

GWP has been formed to help better implement the integrated water management approach and other actions recommended for the water sector by the participants of the "International Conference on Water and the Environment" which was held in Dublin January 26-31, 1992. The GWP Objectives adopted by the partners previously have been presented earlier in this report for information. Any organization, but especially one that purports to overcome existing deficiencies, should establish criteria by which it can illustrate that its objectives have been met.

It is difficult; of course, to establish criteria that reflect only the impact of GWP, because there are many actors who deal with water resources development whose activities may contribute to the same objectives GWA pursues. Care has to be taken not to claim credit without acknowledging the contribution of others, particularly for suggestions 2 to 4 below. The GWP's approach, to work collaboratively with others, also implies a sharing of credit for success with others.

Criteria that should be considered include:

1. More effective cooperation between sub-sector organizations at national and international level as demonstrated by:
 - a) Adoption by countries of policies and regulations promoting integrated water resource management based on the principle of water as an economic good.
 - b) Implementation of institutional reforms facilitating integration of water resource development and management.
 - c) Improvements towards financial sustainability of the various sub-sectors. And
 - d) Project selection favoring multi-purpose approaches where economically and environmentally justified.

2. Adoption by governments of rational water resource allocation between sub-sectors that maximize economic and social development.
3. Establishment of national (international?) conflict resolution mechanisms and consequent decrease in water resource allocation conflicts; and;
4. Existence of a post evaluation system measuring the performance of water supply and sanitation investments

These are basic criteria that will need to be detailed for specific country conditions. However they are expanded and elaborated, GWP should develop a three-five year program of activities, or support to activities of others (similar to a corporate business plan), designed to achieve tangible results in resolving existing deficiencies in the topics, with performance indicators defining the above listed criteria.

Criteria for selecting specific Actions

The WSS working group established the priority among several actions by bringing to bear its collective experience, without establishing formal evaluation criteria. For the long term, such criteria are needed to ensure that actions of highest priority are implemented first, and that these actions lead to the greatest possible benefits at least cost. Unfortunately, this is far easier to say than to do. There is frequent discrepancy between effective demand for services based on identifiable and usually quantifiable short term benefits, and needs whose benefits accrue over a longer period of time and are not readily apparent or quantifiable in the short term. The most prominent example of this situation is the demand for domestic water supply with its immediately apparent short-term benefits, and the lack of demand for sanitation, whose benefits are not immediately apparent to the consumer or, at a minimum, not given high priority.

Demand alone is not therefore a good basis on which to determine priority actions. Included in the determination of priorities must be long-term impacts of actions, or inaction. Actions designed to overcome gaps not reflecting immediate user demand but representing the need for action to achieve long term benefits, for example environmental sustainability, have to include strong awareness building efforts to gain public support.

It is interesting to note that at a time when the water and sanitation sector is emphasizing Private Sector Participation (PSP), little or no effort is made to use the principal tools of the private sector to generate demand, marketing. For some reason, those active in the sector seem to believe that every potential user of services understands the benefits they will provide, and marketing is therefore somewhat disreputable. **Sanitation services in the low-income areas of middle- and low-income countries must be marketed if sustainable service delivery is ever to be achieved.**

The most urgent needs are not in the development of more technologies. The list of gaps and the tables of active agencies and existing activities in Annex A demonstrate this. Technical tools necessary to solve water supply and sanitation problems do exist. What is lacking are:

1. appropriate institutional arrangements to deliver services to peri-urban and rural poor areas, and the ability of designers work together with the community in the selection and implementation of systems the community can sustain for the long term;
2. policies and regulatory frameworks adequately supporting and guiding institutions and communities in choosing and implementing service delivery alternatives;
3. approaches which optimize the benefits of joint planning and actions in two or more water sub-sectors and other areas whose actions impact on water supply and sanitation, such as housing design, community planning, drainage, and others;
4. the capacity of professionals to innovate new approaches and work with the community so the users can select options appropriate to local conditions; and
5. ex-post evaluation systems providing information about how well implemented systems (technical and institutional) work, and permit designers to modify those approaches that have not performed to expectations.

Of special importance to GWP now is the provision of support to activities presently lacking or neglected, and the selection among them those which can be expected to result in improvements in the shortest possible time. This will establish the legitimacy of GWP. Another high priority item is the establishment of an ex-post evaluation system to assess performance of projects and systems five and ten years after implementation so appropriate lessons can be incorporated into future designs. Today, there is considerable information about project completion, but a scarcity of information about performance of sector investments after several years of operation. Without such information, corrective actions are virtually non-existent until another project comes along.

Criteria should also reflect national or regional conditions. Dry climates require approaches different from humid areas, hot from cold climates. What is a priority in one country may not be a concern in another country, although there are of course, some universal problems faced by most countries, such as cost recovery and institutional capacity. GWP may therefore consider adding "windows" bringing together groups of countries and professionals concerned with problems of arid climates, cold climates, etc., not only in water supply and sanitation, but in other sub-sectors as well.

The criteria forming the basis on which actions should be selected include:

1. urgency of need, for example the need to improve institutional capacity without which investments are not sustainable - the establishment of regulatory frameworks providing a favorable environment which enables institutions to efficiently perform their functions - the integrated planning of related actions in different sub-sectors and the design of systems providing service levels affordable to the user, which can be improved as the economic well being of users improves;
2. probability that proposed action will lead to substantial, quantifiable benefits;
3. capacity of organization proposing to implement action and cost effectiveness of proposed action;
4. persistency of problem to be resolved - previous attempts have failed for reasons the proposed action has been designed specifically to overcome;
5. orphan issue - - no or insufficient attention has been given the topic in the past because there has been little or no user demand because appropriate tools (technologies, software) were not available or the problem (or its seriousness) was not recognized; and
6. probability that actions will result in demonstrable improvement in the near term.

Once established, the criteria can be used to test the validity of the priorities established by the WSS working group, and to determine future actions.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF WSS WORKING GROUP IN COPENHAGEN

Sector Issues

The GWP is in its formative stages. Its success will depend to a great degree how well it defines its role, and how quickly it can contribute to the water sector's development. These topics were discussed at the Copenhagen workshop in four different thematic working groups. The Water Supply and Sanitation Working Group¹ discussed and debated at length the recommendations of the consultants' report. On the basis of these discussions, members developed a consensus on the gaps in sector technical assistance efforts and then attempted to determine the order of priority these gaps should be addressed. A first cut was made by the members of the Working Group by listing major gaps, then selecting first, second and third priority among them, and finally weighing first priority with 3 points, second priority 2 points,

¹ A list of the members of the Water and Sanitation Working Group is provided in Annex 3

and third priority 1 point. The resulting order of priority is shown in the table on the following page.

The group reviewed the outcome of this preliminary quantitative determination of priorities, decided to rephrase some of the gap/priority descriptions to reduce the somewhat artificial separation of awareness themes, to combine the public-private partnership with the institutional strengthening, and reexamine priorities based on the reformulation of the gaps/actions.

SECTORAL GAPS/PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

Gaps/Priorities	Total Points	Selections as first choice	Selections as second choice	Selections as third choice
Monitoring Indicators for Performance/Bench-marking and Post Evaluation	21	2	5	5
Appropriate Public/Private Partnerships (especially services to the poor)	14	1	5	1
Cost recovery and pricing (demand management tools) for water supply and sanitation	13	3	0	1
Urban environmental sanitation	11	3	1	0
Awareness among politicians regarding the value of water as applied to health and economics	6	2	0	0
Awareness among politicians regarding economic value of water	3	1	0	0
Promotion of water and sanitation among decision makers	3	1	0	0
Awareness and communication between task managers of ESAs at country level	3	1	1	0
Health targeting risk groups	3	1	0	0
Increased pace of consultation including integrated raising of awareness and acceptance	3	1	0	0
Institutional Strengthening (internal processes)	3	1	0	0
Behavioral modifications to maximize health benefits	1	0	0	1
Community and country-level collaboration at national and local levels	1	0	0	1

The Group then agreed upon the following five priorities for water supply and sanitation gaps (G1 to G5) and corresponding recommended actions (A1 to A5):

- G-1 Performance measuring / monitoring / benchmarking; performance incentive systems; and ex-post program evaluation.
- A-1 Establish task force to set criteria for measuring performance of utilities and design incentive schemes to improve their performance.
- G-2 Appropriate public / private partnerships to increase access to affordable water and sanitation services, particularly for the low-income population.

- A-2 Establish multi-regional of water supply and sanitation utility networks to facilitate the exchange of experiences and information.
- G-3 Cost recovery and pricing (demand management tools) for water and sanitation.
- A-3 Water suppliers must be responsible for ensuring appropriate wastewater disposal (preferably within the framework of integrated urban planning).
- G-4 Inadequate urban sanitation denies access to these services for a large and increasing number of people and increasingly pollutes the environment.
- A-4 Establish a network of centers with a hub or secretariat to provide generic and project specific services to organizations addressing urban sanitation problems.
- G-5 (a) Awareness of benefits of water supply and sanitation and options for delivery, and
(b) Coordinated awareness raising actions.
- A-5 Collaborative Council is requested to stimulate sharing of best practices identified by post evaluation and encourage focused cooperative action.

Detailed descriptions of these gaps and recommended actions are included as Annex "B".

Cross Sector Issues

WSS working group participants also agreed on a list of three gaps affecting other water sub sectors. Rather than to propose actions on these cross sector gaps, the participants preferred to present the identified gaps to the plenary session and formulate action proposals collaboratively with the other Working Groups. The priority cross-sector gaps identified by the WSS Working Group were:

1. Cross-sector water allocation and reallocation methods that are market driven and involve stakeholder participation.
2. Policy and regulatory frameworks that cross sub-sectors (i.e. environment and technology, WSS, irrigation and drainage).
3. Horizontal and vertical co-ordination across the water sector at local, national and regional levels.

The plenary session called to produce recommendations on cross sector issues produced spirited discussion, but in a spirit of cooperation between sub-sectors. Specific recommendations were not produced, but suggestions were made for the consideration of TAC members. For example, emphasis was shifted from the "anointment" of associated programs to the creation of networks for specific topics,

possibly guided/coordinated by a small unit either within the GWP secretariat or located with another participating organization, and several nodes located within sector institutions. It will be necessary to call on expertise (probably outside the sector) to develop this concept further. Critical issues in the development of networks include universality of access and quality control, which at first glance are not easily resolvable.

In summarizing the meeting, the Chairman of TAC suggested that the next steps for the GWP might be summarized under the following headings:

Actions:

- Identify and disseminate best practices and tools.
- Be an advocate for the sector.
- Provide technical assistance to build sector capacity.

Services to Provide:

- Information
- Synthesized knowledge.
- Expertise.
- Capacity Building.
- Research and Development.

Delivery Mechanisms:

- Services should be provided only when GWP has comparative advantage and adds value.
- It should provide a clearinghouse function, providing linkages and interactions between stakeholders, including governments and private sector, NGOs, financial institutions, and other service providers.
- It should work through reinforced networks or consortia that are inclusive (not exclusive). This would be the new interpretation of the meaning of "associated programs".

ANNEX "A"

Explanatory Notes

Tables 1 to 3 are an attempt to present an overview of organizations active in the same sub-sectors (Table 1), activities by the same organizations in the various topics included in capacity building (Table 2), and gaps by sub-sector (Table 3).

Table 1 provides an overview of the activities of different organizations, with similar rankings from 1 to 3, indicating the frequency of support activities (left number), and the relative importance within the organizations overall activities. No attempt is made to judge the effectiveness of the efforts by different organizations. There are, of course, many more organizations. Those listed here are considered to have substantial and relatively broadly based activities, while others, such as the many universities with sanitary engineering programs are not individually listed. It may be worthwhile to identify to list those with programs specifically designed for middle and low-income countries.

Table 2 provides a more detailed look at the activities of the same organizations in capacity building. Two groups can be distinguished on the basis of their activities, although the separation is not very strict, with many participating in both areas. The first group is primarily involved with promotion, for example the Collaborative Council; or financing, such as UNDP and the Banks. The second group, which includes NGOs, Professional Associations and Universities, are those which actually conduct the capacity building activities. Those in the first group are identified by a (x), those in the second by a (X). Of course, many of the organizations are both promoting and implementing activities.

In Table 3, the numbers represent an attempt to indicate the present status in the treatment in the topics listed. Number 1 indicates that the topic is generally well covered, 2 means that not sufficient attention is being paid, while 3 states that the topic is generally neglected and significant work remains to be done before the issue is adequately covered. There are few occasions where number 1 is listed, because topics well covered by definition are not included under gaps, and thus do not appear in the table. As an example, technical aspects of conventional water supply and sewerage are well understood and generally receive adequate attention at all levels, from the training of engineers to the operation of facilities, and are thus listed as 1. The problems that remain in conventional water supply and sewerage are more of an institutional and financial (cost recovery) nature, which have a ranking of 2 or 3.

1: EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES ACTIVITIES BY WSS SUB-SECTOR

	Water Supply	Waste Water	Sanitation	Drainage	Solid Waste	Service Provider	Regulatory Framework	Environment	Public Health
Collaborative Council	1 1	1 1	1 1	3 3	3 3	2 3	2 2	1 2	1 2
International Water Services Association	1 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	1 3	2 3	2 3	1 3
International Water Quality Association	2 3	1 1	2 2	3 3	3 3	1 3	1 3	1 3	1 3
National and Regional Professional Associations	1 2	1 2	2 3	2 3	3 3	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2
Water Utilities Partnership	1 2	1 2	2 3	3 3	3 3	1 1	1 1	1 2	1 2
National and Local Non – Government Organizations	1 2	1 2	1 2	2 3	2 3	1 3	2 3	1 2	1 2
International Non – Government Organizations	1 2	1 2	1 2	2 3	2 3	1 3	2 3	1 2	1 2
Bilateral Assistance Organizations	1 2	1 2	1 2	2 3	2 3	1 3	2 3	1 2	1 2
International Reference Center	1 2	1 3	1 1	2 3	2 3	2 3	1 2	1 2	1 2
International Development Research Center	1 2	1 2	1 2	3 3	2 3	2 3	2 3	1 2	1 2
UNDP/WB Water and (urban)	3 3	3 3	1 2	3 3	3 3	1 3	2 3	1 3	1 3
Sanitation Program (rural)	1 1	NA 3	1 3	3 3	3 3	1 1	2 3	1 3	1 2
WB – Economic Development Institute	1 2	1 2	1 2	3 3	3 3	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 3
International and Regional Development Banks	1 2	1 2	2 3	2 3	2 3	1 2	1 2	1 2	1 2
World Health Organization (WHO)	2 2	2 2	1 1	3 3	2 3	2 3	1 1	1 2	1 1
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	1 1	NA 3	1 1	3 3	3 3	1 2	2 3	1 2	1 2
United Nations Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT)	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 3	2 3	2 3	2 3	1 2	1 2
United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)	2 3	2 3	2 3	2 3	2 3	2 2	2 3	1 1	1 1
Universities and other Training Institutions									

Left Number indicates support frequency: 1 = often; 2 = sometimes; 3 = seldom

Right Number indicates importance within provider's activities: 1 = high; 2 = medium; 3 = low

TABLE 2: WSS CAPACITY BUILDING BY EXTERNAL AGENCIES

	ACTIVITIES									GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE					
	Training	Seminars/ Workshops	Study Tours	Extension	Dissemination	Awareness	Quality Control	Knowledge Generation	Post Evaluation	CIS	ECA	AFRICA	ASIA	LATIN AMERICA	MIDDLE EAST
Collaborative Council		x	x		x	x									
International Water Services Association		x	x		x			x							
International Water Quality Association		x	x		x			x							
National and Regional Professional Association	X	X		X	X			X							
Water Utilities Partnership	X	X	X		X		X								
National and Local Non-Government Organizations	X	X		X	X	X									
International Non-Government Organizations	X	X	X	X	X	X									
Bilateral Assistance Organizations	X	X	X		X	X	X		X						
International Reference Center (IRC)	X	X	X		X	X		X							
International Development Research Center (IDRC)	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X						
UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation Program	X	X	X		X	X	X	X							
WB - Economic Development Institute (EDI)	X	X													
Regional Development Banks	x							x							
World Health Organization (WHO)	X	X	X		X	X		X							
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	X	X	X	X	X	X									
UN Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT)	X	X	X		X	X		X							

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)	X	X	X		X	X		X							
---	---	---	---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE 3: HOW IDENTIFIED WSS GAPS ARE MET

	Water Supply	Waste Water	Sanitation	Drainage	Solid Waste	Service Provider	Regulatory Framework	Environment	Public Health
Policies and Regulations									
Legislation and Water Rights	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2
Policy Formulation	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
Permits and Regulations	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
Consultation and (urban)	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2
Participation (rural)	1	NA	1	NA	NA	3	3	3	3
Monitoring	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Management - Institutional Design									
Public-Private Partnership	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Institutions for: On-Site Facilities	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
Institutional Conditions for Financing	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	NA	NA
Horizontal/Vertical Coordination	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	NA	NA
Integration of Health/Environment	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	1
Community based Planning Agency									
Revised Role of Public Agency									
Technology									
Integrated Planning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sequential Upgrading	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Optimization of water use efficiency	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
Appropriate Technologies: urban	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2
rural	1	NA	1	NA	NA	2	3	2	2
Socioeconomic Aspects									
Cost Recovery	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3
Service to all (private/public supply)	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Transparent Funding	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Demand Management	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Tradable Permits	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Financing for Drainage/Solid Waste	NA	NA	3	3	2	2	3	3	3

Gaps addressed: 1 = usually; 2 = partially; 3 = rarely

ANNEX "B"

REPORTS BY WSS WORKING GROUP SUB-COMMITTEES

1. PERFORMANCE: MEASURING /MONITORING BENCH-MARKING/ PERFORMANCE & INCENTIVE SYSTEMS

What (Goal):

Improve the performance (practice) of utilities

How:

Establish a Task Force to set criteria for measuring the performance of utilities and designing incentive schemes to improve the performance.

Who:

GWP to coordinate a Task Force drawn from the institutions currently active in measuring institutional performance (monitoring/benchmarking/and incentive systems). The institutions include ADB, IBRD, Water Utilities Partnership, East Asian Water and Sanitation Network, etc.)

Actions:

Find out what is currently available; identify best practices; develop post evaluation methods; assess impacts on population and social, economic, and environmental

2. APPROPRIATE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR WSS UTILITIES, INCLUDING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK, AND SERVICE PROVISION TO LOW-INCOME AREAS.

Development Objectives

- improved coverage/increased access to safe, reliable, affordable WSS services;
- increased efficiency and effectiveness of WSS Utilities through modern and innovative management techniques - in particular to low-income areas

How

By means of:

- developing and strengthening WSS Utilities with sustainable autonomy;
- creating and fostering appropriate contractual and financial arrangements between WSS Utilities and community-based organizations, involving local private sector (microenterprises and micro-credit in low-income areas);
- attracting funding from private sector (international. and local);

Action

- Proposed GWP-Associated Program: the establishment of a multi-regional consortium of WSS Utilities and service provider networks
 - to foster collaboration between WSS Utilities and community-based organizations for exchange of information and experiences;
 - to build capacity in utility reform and development and regulation strategy;
 - to inform and document on institutional reforms and Private Sector Participation and regulatory options;

By Whom

Core partners:

ISW/SIE (International Secretariat of Water -- on microenterprises /credit)

Africa region: Water Utilities Partnership

Asia region: East Asia Water and Sanitation Network

Latin America region: interested parties

Mediterranean region: Mediterranean Water Agency Network

Support by EDI

When? (Duration)

FY98-99; first activity June '98

3. COST RECOVERY

Cost recovery is no longer the controversial subject it once was. To-day sector officials generally agree that without it services cannot be sustained. However while the concept is applied in water supply, it has been used less for sanitation. The result is that water supply service reaches more people every year, while the number without sanitation grows at an alarming rate. By ignoring the need for wastewater disposal, the sector is encouraging unnecessary water demand and consumption. This places stress on scarce water resources and increases pollution, with the consequent negative impact on the environment and health.

Objective

Sustainability of water supply and sanitation services.

Principle

Water suppliers must be responsible for wastewater disposal (preferably within a framework of integrated urban planning).

Benefits

Reduced water demand and wastewater disposal needs.
Reduced cost to the economy of deteriorating health and environmental conditions.
Reduced investment costs.
Attracting private investments.
Payment for new investments.
Increased affordability of operations and maintenance.

Action

GWP promotes principle beginning with recommendation to ministers' meeting in March.
Governments and ESAs adopt principle and begin to apply.
All integrate into awareness programs of the water supply and sanitation sector.

4. URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION (UES)

Definition

Urban Environmental Sanitation (UES) services to manage fecal wastes, gray water, commercial and industrial wastewater, as well as storm drainage and solid wastes.

Problem

1. Growing numbers of people without adequate sanitation services
 - absence of services
 - inappropriate services
 - non-functioning services
2. Increasing pollution of urban environment
 - health costs (morbidity and mortality)
 - economic costs (productivity losses, loss of property values, loss of business)
 - social costs (loss of privacy, dignity or self-esteem)

Basic Principles

1. Sanitation for all is a basic necessity required for safeguarding public health and environmental protection
2. Sanitation and water supply services should be considered jointly
3. Both private and public sectors should play significant roles in environmental sanitation
4. Sanitation investments should include, at their design stages, credible arrangements for sustainable operation and maintenance

Objectives

1. To increase access to adequate sanitation services, especially for the low-income communities
2. To reduce pollution of the urban environment

UES: RECOMMENDED SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

General

1. Help decision makers diagnose their problems and agree to resolve them
2. Collect/analyze/share information on sanitation options (institutional options, financing and cost recovery options, and water borne and non-water borne technological options)

Project Specific*

3. Assist in breaking down and analyzing selected problems, and exploring feasible options

* Iterative evaluation and analysis at each stage with wide dissemination of findings would be a helpful service to others groping with similar problems that goes beyond project-specific findings.

4. Help test successful approaches on pilot or demonstration scales to adapt them to *local conditions* (particularly institutional/partnership issues and the use of micro-enterprises and informal groups to reach the low-income population)
5. Assist local decision makers to plan and finance system-wide solutions
6. Monitor and evaluate the implementation of system-wide solutions

INITIAL STEPS

1. To establish a network of centers with a hub or secretariat to provide generic and project-specific services to organizations addressing UES problems
2. The network members will be drawn from existing special programs, organizations of local authorities, research and training institutions, NGOs, bilateral and multilateral organizations
3. Representative network organizations include, for example,
 - International Union of Local Authorities (Netherlands)
 - International Council for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI, Toronto, Canada)
 - Institut International de Gestion des Grandes Metropoles (Montreal, Canada)
 - Towns and Development (Netherlands)
 - Megacities Project (Los Angeles, USA)
 - UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program
 - Water Utilities Partnership
 - Water Aid
 - International Secretariat for Water
 - WEDC
 - IRC
 - WHO
 - WSS Collaborative Council
 - UNICEF
 - HABITAT
 - World Bank
 - ADB
 - IDB
 - DGIS
 - BMZ
 - DFID
 - DANIDA
 - SUAID/EAP

5. AWARENESS RAISING

In identifying the gaps, a number of issues were cited under the broad heading of awareness raising. It was therefore decided to consider the need for GWP-related activities in this area. The overall objective of awareness raising was to redress behavioral barriers to the provision of adequate/appropriate water and sanitation service and to shift current practices toward a more demand-led approach.

It was concluded that awareness raising was too vague a concept; specificity was required in identifying both the target groups and the functional tasks involved.

Four basic target groups were identified:

- politicians (national/local)
- donor agencies
- service providers (various levels)
- users (haves and have-nots)

The awareness-raising tasks varied between these groups, with four tasks being involved:

1. Education (e.g. to users on health and hygiene and importance of water)
2. Information Provision, relating to full range of service provision options; the costs involved (including opportunity and remaining externality costs); associated prices and in-kind payments
3. Appreciation/ advocacy effects of current behaviors; the value of water; the health, social, environmental and developmental benefits from water and sanitation, including raising appreciation amongst the 'haves' of the real costs of providing their services
4. Communication/Dialogue between groups/stakeholders of each other's positions.

Numerous agencies are already involved in such awareness raising activities (e.g. Collaborative Council, WSP, and WaterAid). But these agencies are poorly coordinated, there is very little ex post evaluation of the activities; generally poor dissemination of best practice and virtually no attempts to assess the conditions under which various practices are effective and appropriate.

It was recommended that a body such as Collaborative Council should be asked to take the lead in improving awareness raising activities by:

- a) Improving the networks of relations between agencies
- b) Developing ex post evaluation activities
- c) Improving best-practice experience sharing
- d) Institute an assessment (on-going) of conditions under which different awareness raising activities are effective
- e) Study further: nature approach and required action regarding awareness raising

The Collaborative Council would probably need help to ensure that the evaluation and assessment tasks are well designed and implemented.

Tied to awareness raising and networking amongst these actors, it was queried whether their communicative strategies and tools should be also be surveyed with a

view toward identifying opportunities for GWP outreach and collaborative communication and feedback activities.

ANNEX "C"

List of members of WSS Working Group

TAC MEMBERS:

1. Professor Judith Rees, London School of Economics
2. Professor Albert Wright, World Bank
3. Professor Peter Rogers, Harvard University

PARTICIPANTS:

1. Mr. Mohammed Fouad Djerrari, Water Utilities Partnership
2. Mr. Soutskhone Chanthaphone, Water Supply and Environmental Health Program, Laos
3. Mr. Gerry Whiteside, Water Aid
4. Ms. Laura Edwards, GWP Secretariat
5. Mr. Dennis Warner, WHO
6. Dr. Wanchai Ghoorprasert, Provincial Waterworks Authority, Thailand
7. Mr. Hans M.G. van Damme, Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council
8. Mr. Brian Grover, UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program
9. Mr. Jan G. Janssens, World Bank

CONSULTANTS:

1. Mr. John M. Kalbermatten
2. Mr. William J. Cosgrove