



Partnerships for Sanitation for the Urban Poor: SADC Learning & Sharing Workshop Report

24th – 25th November 2009

VIP Hotel Maputo Mozambique

The Learning and Sharing session was hosted by Conselho de Regulação do Abastecimento de Agua (CRA), the Council for Water Regulation Mozambique; co-convened by the International Water and Sanitation Centre (IRC) and Building Partnerships for Development (BPD Water and Sanitation); supported by the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), IRC and BPD; with logistical support in Maputo from CoWater Consultores and WSP Mozambique. The session was conducted in keeping with the principles and objectives of IRC's Letter of Intent with the National Directorate of Water, Mozambique.

1. Background

Globally, despite an increase of almost 40% in the number of people served with improved sanitation over 1990-2004, the deficit of urban unserved is growing. According to current projections, the number of urban dwellers without access to improved sanitation will see an increase of almost 50% from 1990 to 2015.

The silver lining is that in recent years a number of promising approaches to urban sanitation have emerged, including community managed toilet washing and bathing complexes, component sharing, pit emptying enterprises etc. Furthermore a number of approaches proving successful in rural areas are now being tried in urban areas, for example CLTS and social marketing. These all have one thing in common – their success or failure hinges on much more than technological choice or sufficient financing – the relationships that underpin and maintain them are crucial.

Although relationships are clearly key, underlying partnerships in any sector, much less is known about sanitation-specific partnerships – for instance under what circumstances they are appropriate and how they prove effective or ineffective in differing contexts. Both BPD and IRC have worked on this topic in recent years and propose, together with a few key practitioners, to share their growing understanding of the role that partnerships can and cannot play in this field.

2. Purpose

Sanitation in informal settlements is a particularly complex field with a large range of stakeholders. Each has carved out their own niche and faces a very specific set of incentives and disincentives. Not surprisingly, talk of partnership abounds in the sanitation sector, yet the true challenges of creating and managing these partnerships remains relatively uncharted territory.



The Learning and Sharing Workshop sought to unravel this complexity. The workshop was led by BPD Water and Sanitation, IRC Water and Sanitation Centre and WSSCC. They were supported by resource people from South Africa, Malawi and the Netherlands. Participants included practitioners from public, private and civil society institutions and organisations, undertaking a role in peri-urban sanitation planning, infrastructure development and/ or ongoing service delivery, from Mozambique and other SADC countries with pressing peri urban sanitation challenges such as Angola, Malawi, Madagascar, Zimbabwe and Zambia. (Attendance register attached as Appendix A). The workshop was conducted in a participatory manner, ensuring ample room to respond to particular issues faced by participants and allowing wide sharing of experience.

The Learning and Sharing session built on successful collaboration between IRC and BPD in hosting a one-day Sanitation Partnerships Masterclass during the November 2008 IRC Symposium on Urban Sanitation. This class was well attended and well received and the facilitators took inspiration from its structure and content, and through collaboration with SADC stakeholders prepared the Learning and Sharing session.

3. Discussion Notes

The “notes and links” column in the table below refers to the workshop materials and additional urban sanitation resources distributed to all participants on flash disks.

Session	Comment	Notes and links
Day 1 – Tuesday 24th November		
Welcome from CRA – Snr. Manuel Alvarinho	Noted that the Government of Mozambique has recently extended the remit of Regulator to Sanitation from Water.	
	Regulation - not solely an issue of supply, coverage but quality, problem solution, service extension, ensuring service operates as a business.	
	Some questions for the Workshop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can't deal with peri-urban in isolation from overall urban situation: integration brings consistency - But context drives solutions – two major principles for peri-urban poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1 - treat poor as special market segment – user's preferences should drive activities o 2 - solutions should be “permanent but transitional” – need for dynamism in the interest of communities 	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If we focus on coverage do we miss the needs of the people? Coverage is a sector planning goal not a service one! We need a business orientation. - Don't do things others do better – that is why we want to enter partnerships. 	
Partnership squares – the issues in making partnerships	<p><i>Initial associations to the term “partnership”:</i> transparency, accountability, communications, reciprocity, trust, friendship, role allocations, mutual interest, synergy, honesty, conflict resolution, complementary skills/resources, clear obligations, shared understanding, clear arrangements, money, shared purpose, respect, exit strategies, clarity.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Reflection on the collaborative squares exercise:</i> learning by doing; build understanding over time; different starting resources – building together; sticking to roles/communication; hard to give, not to take; reflection (via silence); leadership (does it help?) but not in isolation; not just your part of the puzzle (you bring something and you get something); iterative process; shared vision/common goal; different decision styles; formalise to soon?</p>	
Introducing the team	<p>Facilitators: David Schaub-Jones (BPD) and Alana Potter (IRC). Resource people: Neil McLeod (EThekweni Metro municipality South Africa), Elias Chimulambe (Water for People, Malawi), Peter Ryan (IRC), Ditshego Magoro (WIN-SA), and Carolien van Voorden (WSSCC).</p>	
Setting the scene – aims and objectives	<p>Share experiences and viewpoints; Understand community, public sector & private sector viewpoints; Talk about – broaden understanding of urban sanitation; Learn about partnerships; Hear from other SADC experience; Explore ideas for ongoing collaboration.</p>	
Expectations – [participants pasted notes onto a sticky	<p><i>What I want:</i> wider experience of developing small scale private sector; political awareness/involvement, knowledge sharing, collaboration; pit latrines in slums...; discussion of</p>	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
board...]	<p>subsidies for the poor; sustainable solutions for the poor; exchange experience and make contacts; building sustainable (multi-sector, inc private) partnerships and collaboration; conflict generation and resolution; implementation of well meaning resolutions; challenge and evidence – other people’s solutions... eat prawns.</p> <hr/> <p><i>What I bring:</i> skills, time, knowledge, experience – of global S&H, pit emptying, decentralised sanitation systems, community participation.. inc in hygiene, responding to demand for WASH services, in urban Maputo, of policy support, technical experience, of network and coalition building, in strategic programming, in using GIS, of entrepreneurship in S&H, of CLTS in Muila Province, of dealing with peri-urban S&H problems, a passion for sanitation, willingness to learn and to be wrong.</p>	
Sanitation partnerships	<p><i>Introduction to partnerships for on site sanitation</i></p> <p>From the perspective of all corners of the service delivery triangle (policy/ decision makers/ service providers/ households); to explore the why; how; and when of sanitation and S&H partnerships.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Discussion circulated around</i> – is the future on site, is sewerage always “a bad thing” or can it be pro poor and affordable, what role might sustainable sanitation have, the poor status of sanitation (it is <i>solid waste</i> that becomes high priority when it becomes problematic) the institutional fragmentation and how this is different in each context...</p>	See David’s PPT
	<p>What are the challenges in each element of the partnership triangle?</p> <hr/> <p>Providers to policymaker/politician</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengths: delegation of responsibilities, existing laws, build on existing structures, clear sector policy - Challenges: how to coordinate, land tenure, sustainable financing funding and allocations, lack of understanding of sanitation as a business; lack of feedback to policy makers; enforcement of 	See also photos



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>laws/regulations.</p> <hr/> <p>Household or community to provider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengths: disgust as motivator; role of info dissemination; explain costs of poor sanitation; non existence of providers capacitates communities; clarity of roles from start; build mutual relationships; ownership by citizens build sustainability - Challenges: precarious tenure; non existence of providers; weak provider sector; new sanitation approaches (e.g. CLTS); conflicting agendas between providers and customers. <hr/> <p>Policymaker/politician to household/community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengths – variation in responsibility in different locations; accountability mechanisms; local taxation to support service provision; sanitation byelaws, sanitation as a human right; willingness to support on-site sanitation. - Challenges: unrealistic expectations; non-existent regulation/bye laws; focus upon sanitation/sewerage in well off areas; government focus on sewage (if it focuses on sanitation at all); little recourse for citizens; small scale providers outside policy etc framework. 	
<p>Demand creation</p>	<p>Would rural drivers of sanitation apply in urban areas; what elements of CLTS apply? Discussion centred around issues of applicability of CLTS elements to urban areas... it is about getting whole communities interested in basic hygiene, leading to basic sanitation...</p>	<p>See Peter's PPT</p>
	<p>CLTS in poor urban settings - debate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's a brilliant tool, but it's a tool as part of a programme. - It works better is supply and demand works together at the same time. <p>In urban/ peri urban context, are ODF areas possible?</p> <p>The problem is that urban informal settlements are too poor, and the drivers are not there. People feel</p>	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>temporary so don't want to invest – even themselves or the authorities. We need to pay attention to other things, not only poverty.</p> <p>While sanitation is low on the priority list, if we believe its so fundamental to poverty, then we should help people to make it a higher priority, and plan and conduct aggressive social mobilization campaigns. If there is opportunity, capacity and motivation (social marketing speak), we should be involved, why not? We should market this, if we believe in it then why not..?</p> <p>Easier to monitor in urban than rural areas.</p> <p>Leadership helps, but leadership is presumably fragmented in the peri urban context.</p> <p>In CLTS, do you see people moving up the ladder? If there's supply and demand why not?</p> <p>Relationship between housing status and subsidies:</p> <p>Of course land tenure is a constraint. Perhaps we need to be more flexible and not fixate on toilets. Communal sanitation blocks are also a way around this.</p> <p>For example, the WSSCC is bringing out a publication in January 2010 on an approach called targeted hygiene – looking at main transition routes of infection and therefore main behaviors but may not be toilets, but could be food hygiene or water quality. Have a more combined hygiene and toilet approach. And another one is a group focusing on an overall hygiene and sanitation behavior change package or sanitation promotion?</p>	
<p>Small town sanitation – thinking through the issues</p>	<p>Although small town sanitation is poorly understood, there is a general feeling that small towns allow scope for pro-active intervention that may not exist in larger and denser urban settings. Given that the majority of urbanization in the coming decade is expected to happen in such settings, this seems worth exploring further.</p> <p>In 2008 BPD and WaterAid did some background work on small town sanitation. A paper was prepared that looked at characteristics of small towns that are important to sanitation. The starting premise, obvious as it may sound, was that a small</p>	<p>See David's PPT</p>



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>town is a potentially large one a few decades down the line. Yet while the town is still ‘small’ (whatever that means) there are opportunities for intervention now – whether around urban planning, municipal by-laws, layout of bulk infrastructure or community education – that may not exist once a ‘critical mass’ has been achieved. Why is this? Well, population density is still usually quite low, land is still (relatively) cheap and available (with greater opportunity for urban planning and potential resettlement), sewage treatment works have typically not been built, etcetera.</p> <p>The paper used a framework that looked at the issues around small town society, economics, infrastructure, technology, population, management and administration, exploring what the implications of each are for sanitation per se. We used this same framework in the L&SS, giving participants two cases – based on real examples – to talk through and to come up with some possible intervention strategies. may be.</p> <p>Issues that arose included the tension between water interventions and sanitation ones, the difficulty in motivating small town authorities to proactively tackle the sanitation challenge, issues around poor sanitation contaminating water supplies and driving up the costs of water provision, the dynamic growth of small towns and the strains this brings (including on societal cohesion), the limits of CLTS-type approaches once an urban context starts to arise and the lack of administrative and technical capacity (and oversight) that happens in many small town contexts.</p>	
<p>Sanitation and the public sector</p>	<p>The Durban / EThekweni experience in public sector delivery in a dense and growing municipality.</p> <p>In the discussion afterwards it was noted that 7-10% of spending is on software.</p> <p>Community members do not have to contribute to hardware costs.</p> <p>Stepped tariff – the more you use, the more you pay. If you use >30m³ then the tariff cross subsidises</p>	<p>See Neil’s PPT</p>



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>that for the poor.</p> <p>Need to find an alternative to water flush toilets... SA is water stressed to the extent of Iraq and Yemen. Spends too much time moderating expectations.</p>	
Day 2 – Wednesday 25th November		
Video – Pit emptying in Dar	<p>The small scale “gulper” operation shown in the film from Dar Es Salaam illustrated its benefit in being able to get to difficult-to-reach locations, but also showed how difficult it can be to scale up small operations.</p>	See “Dar Gulper” Video
Video - Maputo	<p>Showed conditions in Maputo when sludge removal was done manually, then using machines. It illustrated the larger scale technology that has been developed in Maputo.</p> <p>It was observed that the two scales (Dar and Maputo) could usefully be put together to provide a service at scale. How might partnerships be constructed to do this...?</p>	File size too big for memory stick
Introduction to service providers	<p>Current donor spending is skewed heavily towards sewers and waste water treatment, while this as a market segment in urban areas is relatively small (and relatively wealthy).</p> <p>Also private providers more involved at early stage in the sanitation chain, the public sector more so later in the chain.</p> <p>Four things for closer attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding of the market - Ways to expand the market to include the poor - Turn narrow private goods into broader public goods - How to build partnerships between entrepreneurs and other groups. 	See David’s PPT
Private providers in Blantyre	<p>Elias talked about the range of suppliers, their scale and the partnership issues that arise in the provision of sanitation and hygiene services and products in</p>	See Elias’s PPT



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	Blantyre. In the discussion afterwards, questions ranged around type (60% composting, 40% VIP) and cost of latrines constructed, whether or not profit is made from the compost sold (yes),	
Financing Sanitation	First Carolien introduced the main elements from the WSSCC's primer on sanitation subsidies.	See Carolien's PPT and the Primer (pdf in WSSCC Resources)
	Then Alana presented a summary of a (to be published) report by Sophie Tremolet for the World Bank on financing sanitation.	See Sophie's PPT.
	Break out groups were held on an exercise considering three issues around output based aid.	See case handouts
	Group 1 – Summarised the multiple problems in the area including recurrent cholera. Output based aid to resolve part of problems... latrines full, no emptying etc... There is a municipality, there is a community, an NGO, latrine emptying services... but how to make these work together? Decision to subsidise; municipality should lead/manage process, contract latrine builders/emptiers, who will be subsidised based on effective outputs. NGO could act as independent evaluator of service level. One risk is lengthy transaction time...	
	Group 2 – Similar thought process to Group 1 but added that initial payment instalment may be needed for building skills etc of builders. Group 3. Similar issues emerged.	
OBA summary	Overall it's about relationship building, trust, and evaluation etc matters. Dealing with small scale contractors is a different matter from the larger scale matters dealt with in utilities. Builders can't accept delayed payment based on outputs... also should some output based payment relate to outcomes rather than outputs. Clear need in OBA is to assess relationship between partners, the risks, and to consider how to allocate these risks.	
SADC nodes	The presentation on the Southern Africa knowledge	See Ditshego's PPT



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>node was aimed at informing workshop participants about the initiative determine their learning and sharing needs and secure buy-in. The purpose of the presentation was also aimed at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying possible lessons for documentation • Exploring the idea of urban sanitation as one of the node thematic areas- COP • Determine knowledge and sharing needs on sustainable sanitation <p>The Southern African Node is a knowledge management hub for sustainable sanitation. The hub facilitates and coordinates capacity and skills development, knowledge sharing and collaboration. It will furthermore assist individuals and organisations from different disciplines within the SADC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participate in sustainable sanitation activities and innovations; - Document and share experiences on sustainable sanitation as generated by different stakeholders and; - Develop and maintain a sanitation portal that facilitates e-collaboration amongst stakeholders in the region. <p>The presentation highlighted the importance of knowledge sharing as a driver towards the acceleration of the MDG targets in a sustainable manner. Activities of the node will cover aspects of the sustainability aspects and implementation of sanitation in a holistic and systematic manner. The lessons and knowledge sharing will contribute to capacity and skills development within the region in all aspects of sustainable sanitation.</p> <p>The approach of the node is to work with existing networks and forums within the region. This is done to fill the gaps and avoid duplication. Namibia has been identified as a learning journey for the knowledge node. This will enable the node to provide support to Namibia towards implementation of their sanitation strategy. Lessons and knowledge from other SADC countries will be shared with Namibia through the node. This allows the node to</p>	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>be focused and impact on the work of Namibia through the experiences of SADC members.</p> <p>Ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitation of a Community of Practice to ensure learning and sharing on urban sanitation as a thematic area for the node • Depending on the status and needs of Namibia-actively engage the participants to share and exchange information on sanitation broadly • Node to participate and support the learning journey between Durban and Mozambique • Highlight learning and sharing expectations and emphasise the role of the node • Coordination and facilitation of learning and sharing activities on areas identified by participants i.e. demand creation, sanitation marketing, CLTS, etc. 	
WASH Coalitions	<p>Following a short presentation from the WSSCC on WASH Coalitions, Lucky Lowe from WaterAid Madagascar gave examples of the activities of their WASH Coalitions and potential for this in other SADC countries.</p> <p>The role of WASH Coalitions ranges from information sharing to the advocacy of specific policy changes, but they universally address a felt need for improved systematic communication, collaboration and joint action among the sector players in a certain country. As a vehicle for awareness raising and advocacy, most national WASH Coalitions have developed national WASH Campaigns.</p>	See Carolien's PPT and http://www.wsscc.org/
Partnerships	<p>Key lessons (BPD):</p> <p><i>Getting partnerships going:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships are rarely simple – they require a lot of work to set up and to maintain. - Partnerships must be tailor-made (though partnership processes can be somewhat standardised). - Treat partnerships as a means to an end - Partnerships are better thought of transitional mechanisms – allowing certain ways of doing 	See David's PPT



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>things to become institutionalised</p> <p><i>Be realistic about creative tension:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships often involve competition between partners – this is often not recognised. - Partners may compete between themselves for roles in the partnership. - Partners may also be in competition with the partnership itself. <p><i>Don't partner unless you must:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships are rarely voluntary. Partners must need each other. - Partnerships benefit from brokers that can be outside or inside the partnership <p><i>Start with the end in mind:</i></p> <p>Partnerships work best when the partners have thought carefully about why they want to work in partnership, what they hope to get out of it and how they will review this over time.</p>	
<p>Debate/ hot seat interview of the resource team</p>	<p>In this session, the resource people were interviewed provocatively. In keeping with the service delivery partnerships triangle, Peter Ryan represented households/ communities/ stimulating demand; Neil McLeod represented the public sector and Elias Chimulambe represented the private sector small scale providers. Questions are in Italics.</p> <p><i>Q to Peter: CLTS – what does that stand for again? Is there a community or lead or sanitation in an urban environment? Can whole slum areas become ODF?</i></p> <p>A: Yes, in some areas, CLTS can be applied and add and subtract as needed.</p> <p><i>Same Q to Neil: Yes, but SA is different, we were trying to sell something that people knew they wouldn't have to pay for, so it would never work.</i></p> <p><i>Was there ODF 10-15 years ago?</i></p> <p>Yes, and that resulted in health problems so we sent in the health people as a priority.</p> <p><i>How do you cover a whole community?</i></p> <p>In urban context we're doing communal toilets, so</p>	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p>no problem. In rural its one toilet one family. Getting there at scale is what we can do. The problem comes when large numbers of people move into the area.</p> <p><i>Elias, how is this playing out in Malawi? The price of toilets was questioned, what is your strategy to ensure you reach the poor who cannot afford your toilets?</i></p> <p>We've created an environment where providers are available and known by the community, but microfinance organizations are there to spread payments over time for very poor people.</p> <p>Peter: the question is what creates ODF areas – whether through CLTS or another means, it's the hygiene promotion that achieves that, not the funding necessarily. You can plant lots of toilets in urban slums and you can still get open defecation.</p> <p>We have men who build toilets and they pee against them because it takes too much time to go in and use them!</p> <p>People see their neighbors build toilets and they feel ashamed and they also want to have toilets and create a dialogue and access providers to help them build their toilets.</p> <p>Hygiene promotion and demand stimulation should always lead these projects, not as an adjunct to a sanitation project.</p> <p><i>How did you choose entrepreneurs? Were they existing or new?</i></p> <p>Elias: we had both existing builders and new ones. The difference between them is that the new ones are able to make business and do the transactions.</p> <p>Neil: We don't see it as our business to make entrepreneurs but we go and work with them and assess them against our standards and help them improve technical abilities and to a small extent business capabilities. When they've worked in our community, they then move into building houses but tend to stay in one community.</p> <p><i>What about the tension between individuals and</i></p>	



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<p><i>organizations protecting their turf and entering partnerships?</i></p> <p>People will protect their turf or share their turf depending on financial resources.</p> <p><i>Donors and financing institutions dictating the selection of partners. Is this a healthy situation?</i></p> <p>Elias: No, it's not, but what can we do about it? We should be working with donors.</p>	
<p>Summary</p>	<p>The following statements summarise the key lessons from the L&S session. Participants rated them on a 5 point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree and a country overview was presented back to the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban sanitation is a crowded environment, with lots of stakeholders. This makes collaboration more difficult than in other sectors. • People are interested in 'partnerships' for sanitation. But there are strong particularities in the way urban sanitation works that makes it harder to create sanitation partnerships than partnerships for water or solid waste provision. • Within the complexity of urban sanitation it is helpful to focus on three clear actors – the household, at which decisions around sanitation investment, sanitation practice and sanitation behaviour are made – the public sector, which for various reasons has a stake in improved sanitation, but which often struggles to meet its full potential in this role – and sanitation providers, who are in poor communities often informal entrepreneurs. • There is not enough work done on what motivates urban households around sanitation, given that urban communities are more complicated than rural ones. • There are good examples of the public sector investing in sanitation to reduce health costs or to protect the environment (for instance where tourism is threatened). Yet more work could be done on how to make the public sector more proactive in this line of thinking. 	<p>See issue ranking file</p>



Session	Comment	Notes and links
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitation entrepreneurs address various parts of the puzzle, but need more support from the public sector. • There are lots of public organisations with a role to play – more so than in other sectors. Champions vary – and partnerships are needed to help bring about more co-ordinated action. • Partnerships can have an impact on bringing sanitation entrepreneurs (and other providers) into the formal system of waste management. • There is no one blueprint, we could do with more tools and methodologies – specific to urban sanitation – that allow us to more intelligently build partnerships • Partnerships are however very hard work. We should not gloss over the difficulties of this. It would help to have more guidance on how to build and maintain them. • Dense urban informal settlements have specific aspects, needs and conditions, and are a very specific market segment. One solution may not fit all, but an integrated vision is needed across the entire urban area for progress to be possible. • Rather than focus on coverage against targets, we need to focus on partnerships that enable reliable service delivery across the whole sanitation chain. 	

4. Synopsis of participant feedback forms

Overlapping comments have been synthesised, but key recommendations and reflections from all participants are captured below.

What were your key objectives for participating? Did the programme fulfil your objectives?

Fairly focussed on

To learn and share experiences with all participants

To learn more about urban sanitation partnerships

Get feedback from other participants



*To learn how others are implementing their urban sanitation partnerships
Almost unanimous agreement that L&SS fulfilled objectives (and over 90% of all comments
throughout form were positive – not all repeated here ...)*

How do you think your work will benefit or change as a result of the L&SS? What actions do you intend to take as a result?

Various, including:

- Will include urban sanitation into the country sanitation delivery strategy*
- Will help me constitute an independent national authority for sanitation*
- Will seek ways to create more demand for sanitation*
- Will try to explore links to microfinance (for payment to private providers)*
- Will separate out demand for sanitation for vulnerable groups (old / women / children)*
- Will look to encourage local CBOs on urban sanitation*
- Will encourage more thinking around role of LG in urban sanitation (for non-sewered areas)*
- Knowledge gained will assist me to approach partnerships in a much more prudent and proactive manner*
- Has encouraged me to manage sanitation projects differently*
- Will organise field trip to Durban along with WaterAid & Vitens*
- Will look to re- evaluate our current partnership arrangements*
- Will look at social mobilisation and how to create demand*
- Will give more focus to behaviour change and hygiene education*
- I will use more frequently and systematically the WASH concept and network with new partners around sanitation*

Which aspects of the L&SS did you find most useful and applicable to your day-to-day activities?

Most attention paid to:

- Demand creation discussions (and CLTS) {many}*
- Financing exercise and financing mechanisms {many}*
- Partnership Lessons & Applicability {many}*
- Recognition of PPPs & private providers as playing an important role in delivery of sanitation services {several}*
- Experiences shared from interventions and research findings {several}*
- Case studies allowing visualisation of sanitation challenges {couple}*
- The formation of partnerships {couple}*
- One-to-one discussions it permitted*
- Collaborative square exercise ...*
- The Durban experience ...*
- Dar video ...*

What element of the L&SS was least important to you? Why?

- WASH coalition discussion {a couple, sometimes as not thought applicable in their*



country}
CLTS {as already aware}
Financing
Sanitation marketplace
Powerpoints were not all 'accessible'

Is there scope for follow-up between you and the organisers of the course?

Various, including

Would very much appreciate some sort of follow up {several}
I hope to follow up with WSSCC {couple}
Yes, around regional learning and sharing activities, publications and exchange of learning materials for wider dissemination by our networks
The issue of context in which partnerships can work needs follow up

What do you think could have been done differently to improve the L&SS? (Also was anything missing from the course programme?)

Field trip should be organised {several / many}
Social event should be organised {several}
Own practical examples shared – could each country present or give overview? {couple}
More lessons on urban sanitation from other countries
Interpretation? {couple}
More time – less crowded schedule – more days / 5 not 2 days {couple}
Too many topics on day 2 {couple}
Improve case studies and allow more time for them {couple}
Would have liked a session on how to bring about effective co-ordination
Would have liked a session on what necessitates formation of a partnership
Would have liked a look at role of utilities outside S Africa
Would have liked more on risk allocation and management through partnership
Need to go deeper on what drives urban sanitation demand
More on technical options and costs
More time for 'speed-dating'
More info sent before workshop
More time for group-work on scenarios

Do you have any comments on the logistics / management of the programme?

Overall very good {several}
Wonderful
Very well organised
Really appreciate the informal management that gave the opportunity to put people in contact with each other
Excellent organisation (but more group dinners)
None, except congratulations for a well-organised event
Participant info could have been sent sooner



What are three key messages from the L&SS?

Sanitation related:

Drivers of demand are crucial (and more work need doing on urban areas) {several}

Applicability or not of CLTS {couple}

Subsidies – various options {several}

Systems approach to sanitation is key {couple}

Three pillars of sanitation provision {couple}

Need to include LG (and rural approaches do not and therefore applicability limited) {couple}

There are several ways of engaging public and private sectors on sanitation {couple}

Clear that dignity approach loses health message

Huge amount to do to adapt total sanitation and sanitation marketing approaches to peri-urban areas

Need for community sensitisation and mobilisation

Sanitation offers opportunities for job creation

Partnership related:

Tailor-made solutions to sanitation are the key to success {several}

Applicability / limitations / principles of partnership approaches {several}

Partnerships not only about the money

No one size fits all

Building and sustaining partnerships is hard work

Sanitation situation complex but manageable

The existence of practical examples of partnership

Any other comments?

Suggestions around having more courses {several}

Regular L&SSs should be organised {several}

Let's keep the dialogue going through emails {several}

There is a need to build on this L&SS

English occasionally a problem – people spoke fast and acoustics were bad

Would love to engage BPD on development of action learning within SADC region

Need more workshops focussing on sanitation and bridging between government institutions

Politicians have to speed up the passing of sanitation policies within SADC region

Sharing of lessons should not end with this workshop – SADC lets have another means of sharing and learning (website / emails / publications / research) – BPD and others please co-ordinate



FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Countries	E-mails
Alana Potter	South Africa	potter@irc.nl
Antonio Menezes	Angola	antomeneses@hotmail.com
Artur Matavele	Mozambique	artur_matavele@yahoo.co.uk
Berta Macheve	Mozambique	berta@cra.org.mz
Carla Costa	Mozambique	carla@care.org.mz
Carolien Van Der Voorden	Switzerland	vandervoordenc@who.int
Cyprian Mazubane	South Africa	mazubanec@dwaf.gov.za
David Schaub-Jones	South Africa	davidsj@bpdws.org
Ditshego Magoro	South Africa	ditshegom@win-sa.org.za
Elias Chimulambe	Malawi	eliaschimulambe@africa-online.net
Elsa Macie	Mozambique	elsamacie@gmail.com
Fernando Namburete	Mozambique	fnamburete@gmail.com
Fernando Nhampossa	Mozambique	fernandonhampossa@gmail.com
Hery Rakotomananatsoa	Madagascar	herivelo2@blueline.mg
Jede Luka	Malawi	jluka@africa-online.net ; jluka@bwb.mw
Joram Chikwanya	Zimbabwe	jchikwanya@zw.saro.crs.org
Kathy Eales	South Africa	kea@iafrica.com
Lucky Lowe	Madagascar	LuckyLowe@wateraid.org
Mathias Mulagwanda	Tanzania	mulagwanda@hotmail.com
McDonald Theka	Malawi	m_theka2@yahoo.com
McLawrence Mpsa	Malawi	mgmpasa@live.com
Neil Macleod	South Africa	NAM@dmws.durban.gov.za
Patricilio Mucavele	Mozambique	mucavelepg@biobox.co.za
Paulino Mate	Mozambique	paulinomate@hotmail.com
Peter Ryan	Netherlands	ryan@irc.nl
Peter Hawkins	Mozambique	phawkins@worldbank.org
Ramy Rabenja	Madagascar	agetipa@agetipa.mg
Tedious Chanyowedza	Zimbabwe	tchanyowedza@ccare.co.zw
Westone Chibale	Zambia	westonechibale@yahoo.com