

Application Before Evaluation and Replication

A search of the community participation and
health education documentation related to
UNICEF's Water and Sanitation Programmes

David Drucker

UNICEF

April 1983

WET/235/83 (1326L)

UNICEF reports water supply and sanitation projects in 80 countries.

The available reports at Headquarters in New York consist of "country profiles" and annual reports in which the water and sanitation projects are included. The project documents indicate where community participation or education components are part of the project design. The Water Section (WET) at UNICEF maintains box files which mainly consist of hardware matters although there is some community material. Generally the operational details of each programme and project are not ordinarily located in New York. Such documentation apparently resides in the UNICEF offices in the particular countries. Any in-depth scrutiny of this material would require personal exchanges with the UNICEF Country Representative (listing enclosed) or the project staff on the job (there are over 100 of these world-wide - listing also enclosed).

Headquarters staff are familiar with the programmes from country visits and from the discussions with field staff when they come to New York and some detailed documentation does exist here but it is difficult to identify, locate and retrieve. Specifically the community development aspects of programme are usually deeply embedded (indeed obscured) in the technical documentation. There is as yet no systematic country-by-country, project-by-project, incorporation of community participation activity and no regular process for monitoring or auditing this aspect of the programmes and projects. (Which is I suppose one of the reasons for the fugitive nature of the documentation.)

There is a knowledge network (mailing list enclosed) for dissemination of community participation happenings, and a variety of descriptive material to be gleaned from Newsletters, Media articles aimed at a general public, and papers prepared for meetings - mimeographed or published in development and professional journals⁽¹⁾.

There is a Senior Policy Specialist (Community Participation and Family Life) in New York who serves as a global adviser but not specifically in relation to Water concerns.. She (Mary Hollnsteiner) is very much involved with advocacy, staff development seminars and workshops, and with much interagency relationships and administrative responsibilities. As an advisor, she travels widely on an on-demand basis, and in promotion as opportunity presents itself or is initiated.

(1) For example UNICEF's multi-disciplinary journal Assignment Children, Issue 54/60 2/1982 Community Participation: Current Issues and Lessons Learned.

The highly commendable efforts of the Headquarters advisory staff and the work of many excellent field workers (much of whose community focussed activity seems to go undocumented and undistilled for policy and programme development purposes) is not supported operationally by sufficient institutionalisation, manpower or resources to realize its outstanding potential in establishing community participation as a major demonstrably effective hands-on aspect of UNICEF's input to development. A tapping of this potential could provide a breakthrough towards people-oriented methods of social planning and programme implementation.

Water and sanitation projects (like all but emergency programmes) are originally planned by UNICEF to co-incide with the four or five year government planning cycles of the countries concerned. UNICEF plans are commonly on-going from planning period to planning period. Documentation is provided - as programmes come under review by the UNICEF Board at Headquarters, as country level plans of operation are formulated with governments, during the procedure for mid-term reviews by government and UNICEF co-jointly, and as preparation is made for replanning for the next cycle.

Much of this documentation especially of grass-root detail remains at the country offices, community participation is there too embedded in much larger areas of concern and the reporting system generally makes it difficult to quickly respond to requests for hard information. For example "Date project was initiated" and "Date completed or project completion date"⁽²⁾ are a problem to respond to in a meaningful way in relation to community participation specifically.

So too, funding is also not community aspects specific. Total figures are available⁽³⁾ for overall funding but are not broken down to serve our present purposes. The sources of funding where it does not come from UNICEF's budget can be identified project-by-project but here again the donor usually supports the overall project and it cannot be said what funds go to the community aspects discreetly.

"Evaluation" of programmes and projects are not part of an institutional and regular procedure for an aid agency like UNICEF who naturally want expenditures to go as much as possible to field operations. Certainly the methods and approach to evaluation would not satisfy purists or social science academics. However, commendably field personnel do provide evaluation material, usually oriented to an administrative need when consideration is being given to the expansion or continuation of a programmes, or to meet the interests of a donor agency, or sometimes because there is an it-would-be-nice-to-know-effort by a member of the field staff.

(2) Items 3a, 3b in the consultation request in COWATER's letter dated March 16, 1983.

(3) See the enclosed "digest" country-by-country.

The evaluation materials deal very largely with technical aspects of water supply and sanitation programmes (pumps, drilling, water systems, etc.) and sometimes seek health status impact. Where there is attention to community and health education aspects there is the state-of-the-art difficulty of determining exactly what is being evaluated⁽⁴⁾.

Nevertheless UNICEF is now in the process of trying to retrieve, place on computer and evaluate all that it can identify as evaluation. It has called for reports and materials originating from its field offices so that it will become available at Headquarters. This effort is currently in process and incomplete. In the last few months, Randy Wilson of UNICEF has attempted to collect all evaluations of water/sanitation projects. Of the 50 or so reported carried out in the Annual Reports (1980-82), only 14 have been collected to date. (Abstracts and relevant evaluations were sent in Koblinsky's material.) (See enclosed printouts, as requested in COWATER letter of 16 March 1983, Item 4.)

-
- (4) See discussion in Consultation Document: "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION: The Nature of training as an integral process in development planning and implementation of Water and Sanitation Programmes." D. Drucker, UNDP/UNICEF 1982.

There are very important issues involved here. Evaluation is a difficult task technically and usually an expensive one in terms of time, personnel and money. Very solid indicators, at least, can be provided by competent field visits and some key managerial monitoring. See for example:

(a) How a set of pictures ".....Greater than the hole - some pictorial observations" D. Drucker, UNICEF/Burma, June 1980, must cast real doubt on the health objectives being met, however successful the technical input may be.

(b) as reported in COWATER Item 4 letter 16 Mar 1983. The failure to manufacture and deliver medical kits for Community Health Workers will jeopardise the very foundation of the Primary Health Care programme, "Community Health Worker's Kit Replenishment Workshop", Aslam and Drucker, UNICEF/Burma, May 1980.

(c) "The case for village level planning", Drucker, UNICEF/Burma, February 1980 which gives a "what to see and what to make of a field visit, guide". Success and Replicability of projects are determined in the developing world by detailed planning and good daily management processes. Little of this 'process' usually surfaces in usable form from our present linear and sampling type reporting and evaluation methods.

PROGRAMME DIGESTS

Our first and major source of information has been to turn to

UNICEF: Water and Sanitation Activities (WET/1000/81)
dated 30 November 1981 (second edition of a set of
programme digests extracted from the country profiles).
(Copy attached.)

"The digests attempt to summarize current UNICEF inputs in national drinking water supply and environmental programmes as of July 1981. Those programmes which remain unchanged have been listed as of July 1980."

An analysis of the programme digest

The digest summarizes current UNICEF programmes in 80 countries.

Each country presents its programme under the following range of headings.

- Current health problems faced by children and women;
- Priority Needs of Children;
- Responsible/Co-operating agencies. (This gives some indication of special funding sources.)
- Objectives;
- Beneficiaries;
- Funding;
- Programme Activities: Water supply;
- Environmental Sanitation;
- Improvement of Maintenance of Handpump tubewells;
- Training.
- Health Education/Project Support Communication
- Linkages with other programme sectors;
- UNICEF supplies (and equipment)
- Improvement of logistics;

- Project support staff;
- Local Production:
 - Shallow Handpump Wells
 - Deep Handpump Wells
 - Piped systems
 - Rainwater collectors
 - Groundwater distribution systems
 - Surface water treatment systems
 - School facilities.
- Studies
- Research and Development
- Monitoring and Evaluation.

There is also a heading Community Participation. These are the range of headings, not all these headings appears in each country summary.

39 do not have a community participation section.

6 more have a heading but the entry remains blank.

35 of the 80 provide some community participation information

The information provided illustrates the problem of defining even on a rough and ready basis what might or should be considered as community participation.⁽⁵⁾

12 of the 35 which provide some information provide a word, or just a short sentence, which in the main amounts to the mobilizing of unskilled labour, or in one case merely "selection of sites".

These countries are:

Afghanistan	Jamaica
Angola	United Republic of Cameroon
Bhutan	Mexico
Democratic Yemen	Morocco
Maldives	Mozambique
Swaziland	Sudan

(5) See comments in consultation document.

For example: "Rural People will be involved in carrying out these activities and in the maintenance of hydraulic works". (Cameroon)

- 23 programmes in the digest have community participation information a little beyond a cryptic statement.
- 12 of these remaining 23 also mention 'labour' as a major aspect of community participation (i.e. two-thirds of the 35 have a labour component).
- 6 of the 12 above add 'maintenance' as the community participation activity.
- 8 in all (the 6 above + 2 others) mention maintenance.
- 6 mention finance as community participation.
- 2 mention "promotion") meaning mainly "health education"
5 mention "co-ordination")
- 13 mention the channel or organizational structure through which the community participates.
- 11 of the 80 mention 'planning' (if we very broadly interpret this) as a part of community participation activity.

These countries are:

Bangladesh, Cuba, Egypt, Guatemala, Jordan, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Syria, Tanzania.

- - - - -

- 4 of the 11 mention a community survey or information gathering activity.

These countries are: Jordan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Syria.

- - - - -

- 2 mention Monitoring as a community function.

These countries are: Jordan and Egypt.

- - - - -

- 1 mentions Evaluation as a community function.

This country is Jordan.

- - - - -

The eleven identified as having a community function in planning might fruitfully be examined in more detail by writing to the country offices; in-depth information is not available at the New York Headquarters Office (i.e. material beyond the national planning level).

There is additional information that can be extracted from the digest, which indicates some community work. For example, under a heading Research and Development-

"Studies into developing ways and means to increase community participation in the planning, implementation, and maintenance of water systems will be undertaken" (Indonesia).

under a heading Project Support Communication (P.S.C.)

".....selected projects to stimulate and maintain community interest and participation in planning and implementation of development efforts....." (Sri Lanka).

There is also a great deal of material from Nepal P.S.C. which has been reviewed in the consultation document.⁽⁶⁾ In addition, of interest for the present purposes are the programmes which include information under the heading Health Education.

- 40 of the 80 programmes do not have a Health Education heading.
- 2 have a heading but the entry remains blank.
- 38 do have a Health Education heading, which is followed by some information.
- 28 of the 80 programmes have both a Health Education and and Community Participation heading, (although 2 have no health education and 4 no community participation information actively entered) which means that only 22 supply some information of both kinds.
- 12 provide some health education but no community participation information.
- 10 provide some community participation but no health education.
- 27 have neither a health education nor a community participation heading at all (and 2 more have a heading but no information, meaning 29 of the 80 in the digest remain uninformative on both aspects).

(6) IBID

Materials collected from UNICEF files regarding Health Education have been forwarded under separate cover by Marge Koblinsky.

Since the 1981 digest there has been increased activity stimulated by Mrs. Yansheng Ma and Ms. Muriel Glasgow who deal with the non technical aspects of the Water Section of UNICEF. As we have noted previously it is still not possible to give systematic attention project-by-project to community activity. However we have been led to a number of current reports and accounts of workshops.

Note:

It was the intention to send with this paper a full bibliography of materials and an annotation commenting on each. However a momentary slip in communication has resulted in the bulk of the material being sent separately and ahead of time. It is therefore not possible to give a full listing here.⁽⁷⁾

(7) May I ask on receipt of the documents that COWATER make a bibliography of those received, append a copy to this paper and send copies of the bibliography to UNICEF and Mr. Drucker.

Appendix I

Related to the materials which have been forwarded are the accompanying notes from Marge Koblinsky:

UNICEF Hygiene Education (HED) and Community Participation (CP)
in UNICEF Water and Sanitation Project.

UNICEF is highly decentralized with materials developed at country-level for projects remaining at the field office. The New York office received country profiles and annual reports, and little else. However, we are able to scare up a few materials relevant to our topic of interest. Attached are the following documents:

- A) UNICEF Policy Statements relevant to the topic:
Comment: . Not useful except for later documentation.
- B) Ms. Muriel Glasgow and Mrs. Ma on what has been done and what will be done in WET/SAN re HED and CP.
Comment: This is a good overview showing that little has been done in the past in this field - at least from Headquarters and probably also at the field level.
- C) Staff list - New York - Field.
Comment: All international posts are named - no local hires. At the international level, only Marguerita Cardenas of Pakistan is really a health educator in WET/SAN. Others, such as sanitarians, may be doing educational work, but their primary task is sanitation. I have checked (in green) persons who have knowledge, interest, or are primary in relevant programmes to us (Murial Glasgow assisted). There are actually very few, but should you need to write for information, I thought you should have the whole list.
- D) Project or Country reports or proposals.
Comment: After examining the Digest for countries of interests the files were examined for substance; some projects or country documents are included but they are at national level with little substance. (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Burma)
- E) Evaluations of WET/SAN Projects.
Comment: Presently on-going by Randy Wilson. I have includes those which are relevant. (Imo State, Burma, Sudan)

F) Programme Project Guidelines.

Comment: Although your project proposal leads one to think you already have project guidelines, I enclose a few example of others I thought of interest for their comments on how to develop and utilize the participatory approach in WET/SAN projects. (UNICEF "Towards a Programme Guide", D. Drucker. Ref. Grover, HEW Heli Perrot).

G) Workshops on HED/CP in WET/SAN projects.

Comment: To stimulate activity in this area, country-level workshops are being held. The Sudanese report is a good example of a workshop aimed at attracting interesting government officials towards this activity. Muriel Glasgow was instrumental in organizing this workshop. (Sudan, Benin, Ethiopia, Thailand)

H) Process of developing participatory approach in WET/SAN projects.

Comment: Only two such documents are available, but they are interesting in that they supply information on groups or peoples involved, tactics used, etc. Muriel Glasgow is now discussing having such process documentation done at the country level on projects of interest. (This may be a long way off, as topics must be selected and countries chosen.) (Imo State and Philippines)

I) Training materials at community level.

Comment: Only two examples of training materials for community level workers in WET/SAN projects could be located. That for Imo State is important as it is considered a very successful(?) programme in HED/ (Imo State and India Handpump Caretakers)

J) Water/Sanitation Projects and Health Impact.

Comment: Finally the McJunkin paper and one other (McJunkin and Kawate)

K) Discussion with Mary Hollnsteiner and relevant papers selected by her.

From the above materials on HED, I find the following most important:

Sudanese workshop.

To draw national officers into this activity.

Process documentation (Imo State - Surigao City Philippines)

To assist building a picture of how "successful" projects are developed.

Notes from Discussions with
David Drucker and Muriel Glasgow
Re Training Materials

1) Decision-makers package

It was emphasized that the participatory approach to WET/SAN projects must receive the commitment of the officials. To do this, the films might include clips from projects where the participatory approach is believed to be on-going. They include:

Philippines - Surigao City, Mindanao

Water project - Mothers' Clubs

Available information: Process documentation by
Muriel Glasgow (H)
Evaluation by Awal (E)
Contact: Abdul Awal - UNICEF, Manila
City Health Officer - Surigao City.

Mexico - Chiapas

- Latrine project (written about by D. Drucker in his CP paper, Mary Elmendorf in her IBRD Eight Country Study.
- Water Project
No material available at Headquarters.
Contact: V. Bosnjak, UNICEF Representative, Mexico

India

Handpump Caretakers - 3 tiered
Info: Booklet available under (I)
Contact: M. Bevacqua, Sr. Programme Officer, New Delhi

Upper Volta

Mrs. Ma observed an NGO project she considered successful.
Info:
Contact:

Philippines

Irrigation project of Ford Foundation.
Info: "Bureaucracy and the Poor" (D. Korten and F. Alphonso, 1981. Sent for)
Contact: Fran Korten, Ford Foundation, Manila. (Moving to Jakarta office in June)

Nigeria

Imo State

Info: Project document (D)
Interim Report (E)
Process documentation (H)
Training Materials (I)

Contact:

East Africa

SIDA and UNICEF are joining together on a major six country project to following pollution from source to the home, HED is a component. This project s just beginning. Headquarters has no information!

Contact: J. Skoda, Regional Water Adviser
UNICEF, Nariboi, Kenya

(The six countries include Somalia, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Botswana +)

2. Technical Package

There was a great deal of discussion regarding this package as the lay-out of modules so obviously maintains the 'participation of the community as a component that can be added to any project (just as a latrine or water supply is), and not an approach.

Recommendations

- a. The three films segregate the technical and participation aspects, and if used separately would defeat the purpose of trying to introduce this approach to WET/SAN projects. It was recommended that two films be made showing all aspects (planning, implementation, post-implement) from the view of the villagers and the second from the view of officials. The contrast may make obvious to technicians that villagers' attitudes are different and must be heard prior to their effectively participating in any project. Cultural factors determining demand and hence sustained success for WET/SAN projects might be shown, including village level economics and power structures (can villages afford to operate and maintain systems, and who benefits), ownership patterns (whose responsibility is the facility once implemented), and linkages with agencies to maintain systems (e.g. in India, handpump caretakers have a three-tiered maintenance scheme that operates via post-care communication). Institutional determinents of success might be shown in the second film, including coordination between sectors (health, agriculture, housing, etc.) and a team approach to respond to villagers' requests (including social motivations as well as engineers).

b. Modules for training

Module 1 emphasizes the link between water, wastes and health, but there are several other linkages that might be brought out in the module that may prove more attractive to villages, such as water for cattle, homegardens, beautification, ablutions, and irrigation. A wider perspective may be valuable in motivating villagers.

The differing perceptions and hence need for water and sanitation between officials (e.g. health) and villagers require emphasis and could be depicted by size of an idea (i.e. as in maps showing countries sized by their relative populations). A villager may not be concerned about diarrhoea, as he feels it a normal occurrence, whereas the health official sees such disease as a major killer of children. These two perceptions might be brought out in idea bubbles and juxtaposed for emphasis.

Module 3 relates transmission pathways, again as seen from a health officials' viewpoint. Instead, the community's perception of disease might be depicted and followed by their treatment pattern. Links with health officials might then be characterized not to show superiority of western medicines, but support during illness.

Module 4. It might be logical at this point to introduce project planning and preparation, prior to the institutional and financial aspects. Again project preparation should include both the community and agency needs, plus a modus operandi for continual interaction pre, during and post implementation.

A module on the financial aspects need to include those expenses, to be borne by the village (i.e. water fees, maintenance for parts and caretakers, entertainment of drilling crews). Both short and long-term expenses need to be brought out.

Module 5 might bring out institutional aspects from both the agency and village side. For the latter, this means management or organization at all phases, including for the long-term. The need for a continual interaction of agency and villagers should be shown during planning implementation and post implementation. Each phase has different needs for interaction; this may mean different personnel on the agency-side (e.g., motivators at the planning stage, engineers and motivators during implementation, and maintenance crews post-implementation).

Module 6. The modules 5 - 13 are technical in content, whereas module 15 contains only health information (what is intended is not understood for No. 15). Again by segregating these aspects, you reinforce the present state-of-the-art. Each technical module might contain information on:

- village criteria
(what is needed for them for implementation and maintenance).
- health aspects
What are the measures re health that go with each technology (e.g. distance between latrine and drinking water source, resultant stagnant water as mosquito breeding area).

3. User Participation Package

- Technical information should be written up in lay language for community workers so that options are understood and can be communicated with villagers. Drucker's Burmese paper D) brings out that villagers are rarely aware of alternatives available and are usually only brought in at the point when a facility is in place and they are expected to maintain it, pay for it, and provide labour to install it.
- It is understood under "Guidelines" that the suggestions on the training of community workers means in the use of the guidelines, not in training, in general. This latter is a very large field that has already received a great deal of attention.
- Who is UNCHS and why are the instruments for motivating, organizing and communicating users separate from the Guidelines? These tasks would appear to need close collaboration, and 'sequential' rather than simultaneous attack!