Online Annexes to the following report:

"Review of the WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT): Improving the WASH BAT as a tool for planning and partnering for sustainability." By Henning Göransson Sandberg, Ricard Gine, Antoine Delepiere, Alejandro Jimenez and Guy Hutton. SIWI and UNICEF. 2020.

Annex 1: The list of stakeholders consulted as part of the in-depth interviews and country visits

Annex 2: The full list of recommendations included in the review, by section

Annex 3: The questionnaire sent to UNICEF country offices

Annex 4: The discussion guide for the in-depth interviews

Annex.5: The data available for each country carrying out WASH BAT using the 2.0 tool

Annex 6: The key OneWASH National Programme (OWNP) actions mapped against the WASH BAT activities following the workshop in Ethiopia

Annex 1. Stakeholders consulted

The section lists the stakeholders consulted as part of the in-depth interview

Bangladesh (8 WASH BAT workshops at subnational (Divisional) level, covering rural and urban water and sanitation, and WASH in schools and health care facilities)

Aklima Khatun, Hygiene Specialist at Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) and rapporteur for six WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Dipok Chandra Roy, WASH consultant at UNICEF Bangladesh and facilitator and coordinator for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Dr. Farzana Begum, Research & Policy Lead at WSUP and facilitator at five WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Dr. Israt Jahan Epidemiologist at the Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS) of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and rapporteur for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Dr. Soumen Sarker, Medical Officer at DGHS and rapporteur for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Eheteshamul Russel Khan, Project Director for the Government of Bangladesh and UNICEF WASH Project at the Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE) and advisor for four WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Mahfuj-ur Rahman, Equity and Rights Specialist at WaterAid Bangladesh and facilitator for one WASH BAT in Bangladesh

Md. Rahmatullah Faruque, National Coordinator for WASH and DRR at Terre des hommes and facilitator for four WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Md. Wali Ullah, UNICEF-Consultant (former Chief Engineer at DPHE) and facilitator for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Mir Mahadi Hossain, Senior Community Officer and Head of Community Program and Consumer Relation Division at the Dhaka Water Supply and Sewerage Authority (WASA) and rapporteur for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Mohammad Monirul Alam, WASH Specialist at UNICEF Bangladesh and overall strategic managed for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Mohammed Golam Muktadir,   Executive Engineer at DPHE and facilitator for two WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Sanjoy Mukherjee, Independent Consultant and facilitator for six WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Sayed A.H Sunny, Program Officer, Asia Arsenic Network Bangladesh and coordinator and facilitator for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Sk Jafar Shamsuddin, Development Planner and WASH Sector Specialist and lead facilitator for the WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Sohel Ahmed , Assistant Coordinator for M&E at the Environment and Population Research Centre (EPRC) and rapporteur for four WASH BATs in Bangladesh

Eritrea (1 WASH BAT workshop at national level, covering rural and urban water and sanitation, and WASH in institutions)

David Tsetse, WASH Manager at UNICEF Eritrea

Yohannes Debretsion, WASH Consultant at UNICEF Eritrea and coordinator for the WASH BAT in Eritrea

Ethiopia (1 WASH BAT workshop covering rural and urban water and sanitation at national level, and rural water at subnational level)

Jorge Alvarez-Sala, WASH Specialist at UNICEF Ethiopia

Kaleab Getaneh, Consultant at National WASH Coordination Office in Ethiopia

Richard Wilson, Water and Environmental Consultant for the OWNP

Pakistan (1 national WASH BAT, 1 district WASH BAT and seven WASH BATs at provincial level covering rural and urban water and sanitation, and WASH in schools)

Kamran Naeem, WASH Specialist at UNICEF Pakistan

Niaz Ullah Khan, Consultant and lead facilitator for the WASH Bats in Pakistan

Bolivia (3 WASH BATs at subnational (municipal) level, including one follow-up workshop, covering urban water and sanitation)

Edgar Paniagua, Consultant from the NUR University

Guido Meruvia, Swedish Embassy

Irma Peredo, WASH Specialist at UNICEF Bolivia

Luis Pereira, Consultant from the NUR University

DRC (1 WASH BATs at national level covering rural water and sanitation)

Stanislas Ifolo, Expert in charge of technical commissions and support for provinces in DRC

Vicky Miakala, Head of the hydrogeological studies unit in DRC

Ghandi Bukamba, Head of coordination in DRC

Jean Marie Sangira, UNICEF focal point for EE in DRC

Josselin Leon, UNICEF previous focal point for EE in DRC

Annex 2. List of recommendations

Recommendations related to the rationale for using the WASH BAT
1. There must be both a need and a demand for the WASH BAT for it to be successful.
2. It is critical that the key WASH stakeholders and the government fully understand the process and the time, effort and cost involved. Senior-level engagement, including workshop attendance, is crucial, and there is a need for thorough engagement at all stages (before, during and after the workshop). If the country coordinator for the workshop cannot identify a credible list of engaged facilitators and rapporteurs, as well as a list of participants to send invitations to, at least a month before the workshop is due to take place, a postponement should be considered.
3. The government must ultimately own the process and be willing and able to take the lead in the implementation of the workshop and the subsequent follow-up, supported by the key WASH stakeholders and technical assistance. When discussing the rationale for the WASH BAT, efforts should be made to link it to a national process or programme which is already ongoing or planned in order to feed into this, ensuring that outputs and outcomes are integrated.
4. Delays and postponements of WASH BATs are relatively common; therefore contingency plans need to be made when planning a WASH BAT.
Recommendations related to preparations for the workshop
5. The three-month preparation period needs to be better respected, with the coordinating organization, e.g., the UNICEF country office, having a role to play to ensure that this is adhered to. The leading government agency will need to be identified at the start of the preparation period, with a contact point in the organization willing to assist in the organization. Ideally, a timetable should be drawn up with milestones which would make following up easier.
6. The facilitators and rapporteurs need to be identified at least a month before the workshop, taking part in at least one online call which should cover the process, schedule, and roles and responsibilities.
7. To ensure the preparation process is on track, recurring biweekly calls around 1.5 months before the WASH BAT should be scheduled with, at minimum, the coordinating agency and the lead moderator, and ideally also the government representatives. These calls can be short, but they will still keep the planning top of mind for the coordinating agency and the government. In these meetings the logistics can be followed up, as well as discussing the contents, the building blocks, functions and criteria, to make sure that discussions during the workshop are relevant to the context.
8. Ideally, a core group should be formed with participants from the key sector organizations, including government departments, responsible for parts of the preparation process. This group can include the facilitators and rapporteurs, but this is not necessary. They should be part of the biweekly calls. The main task of the group should be to ensure that the WASH BAT is tailored to the country context and to the output which is desired. They should also review the sector legal framework before the workshop, and ensure that the key knowledge products and sector information are available before the workshop.

9.	While tailoring of the WASH BAT and the criteria covered is important, care also need to be taken not to deprioritize any issue relevant to the country. This may happen because the government or core group wish for a topic to be taken off the table, or because the coordination group attempts to streamline the workshop to save time. As far as possible, tailoring should not remove any function, criteria or issue, and adaptation should only happen if it is needed to be relevant to the context. Therefore, the lead moderator and the coordinating agency should be part of the core group tailoring the WASH BAT to the context.
10.	In order to specify the level of engagement and commitment for the stakeholders involved in the preparation process, including the core group, it might also be helpful to develop terms of reference (ToRs). This could include all the preparatory tasks, including for the lead moderator and the coordinating agency, table facilitators and rapporteurs. This could also be helpful to establish the milestones. While the CIG does highlight this, it is rarely followed closely, which means that a template ToR may need to be created to be adapted for each WASH BAT. The key milestones should include (but not be limited to) the final list of participants, details of the venue, the agenda, a session to review and adapt the criteria to be covered during the WASH BAT before the workshop, and the scheduling of a ToT for the table facilitators and rapporteurs. The ToR could also include the post-workshop activities, related to follow-up, monitoring and accountability.
11.	The level of engagement required of participants needs to be better explained before the workshop, including any preparatory material required for the participants to read such as a concept note, preferably in the local language. A concept note is currently being prepared in English, and will be available in the WASH BAT languages, but a shorter version to be translated more easily is advised. Similar explanatory documents on the enabling environment, functions and criteria could also be produced, so that participants can prepare themselves adequately for the level of discussion at the workshop.
12.	The coordinating organization, e.g., UNICEF country office, needs to ensure ownership is passed to the government for the workshop. Examples of successful ways of doing this are described above, in the case studies from Cambodia, Bangladesh and Ecuador, either through linking it to a national process (as a key activity feeding into the process) or to give over ownership of the workshop to a core group of key stakeholders to ensure that the content is adequate for the context and purpose of the WASH BAT. Ensuring that there is government demand to implement the WASH BAT should secure their involvement in the preparation.
13.	The key to a successful WASH BAT is that the right participants are invited and attend the workshop. Enough time and effort need to be spent on ensuring that the list drawn up is representative and adequate for the purpose. A short discussion of the representation of key stakeholders, women, youth and minority groups should always be included in the final report, with a specific section dedicated to this in the template.
14.	The expected output of the workshop needs to be defined during the preparation process, including the report structure, whether a summary document for the end of the workshop is desired, and the format of the activities and Action Plan. This should be included in the concept note to be prepared before the workshop.
15.	A ToT is strongly recommended, ideally the day before the workshop, regardless of whether the facilitators and rapporteurs have participated in similar trainings before. This should last at least half a day. A guiding document or PowerPoint training slide deck will be available on the online portal (www.washbat.org), in several languages, to accompany the tutorial there (available in three languages).

16. The ToT should include creating the files in the WASH BAT online tool, with all the relevant building blocks, functions and criteria defined. Thus, in the workshops, the rapporteurs will already be familiar with the tool and it will be set up with the most relevant information (however, this can of course change during the workshop depending on the discussions).
Recommendations related to implementation of the workshop
17. Facilitators, especially the lead facilitator, need to be experienced with the tool. Each workshop should make sure that local consultants or staff are trained adequately so that they are able to assist or lead any future WASH BATs. More effort should also be made to build the capacity of local staff in facilitation of workshops. This is also important in order to transfer ownership of the process to local stakeholders, if not already done.
18. The length of the workshop is a controversial issue. It is often seen as too long, but it should not be less than three days. Efficiency can be achieved through efforts before the workshops, e.g. greater tailoring of the workshop to the local context, explanation and translation (if needed) of key concepts, better prepared participants, facilitators and rapporteurs, and a well-crafted agenda with contingency plans. The workshop could also be split in two, but participants will need to commit to both workshops. Recommendations for how a split workshop could work should be elaborated in the CIG or in an annex.
19. Delays or overrunning of workshop sessions do happen and are sometimes inevitable, e.g. when senior members of the government attend sessions of the workshop on short notice. Contingency plans ensure that this does not need to delay the workshop too much. If participants are residents at the workshop location, for example, it is easier to continue the group work into early evening or start earlier the next day.
20. So as not to risk ignoring some critical contextual bottlenecks the workshop should have a session on the main challenges for WASH service delivery in the country at the start of the workshop (including, if applicable, CC and WRM issues). This may trigger discussions and issues which are not covered by the criteria, or which can tailor the criteria more closely to the context.
21. Having plans worked out for the next steps after the workshop ensures that any sessions which were not finalized during the workshop can be finalized afterwards, with some of the key participants engaged. This should be discussed in preparatory discussions with the coordinating agency, the lead government agency and the core group, if this exists. On the final day, a new session on the next steps after the workshop should be planned (time permitting).
22. Facilitators need to be mindful of the impact their facilitation might have on the outputs, e.g. if participants are instructed to vote on at least one activity from a particular function. This needs to be carefully considered at the start of the workshop with the key WASH stakeholders and the government, in order to ensure the Action Plan is as useful as possible for its purpose.
23. Facilitators need to ensure that they have ways to keep the participants engaged should they become bored. Recommendations include rotating tasks, e.g. reading of the criteria, writing of the bottlenecks and putting the sticky notes on the wall, or mixing sitting down and standing up during the exercises.
24. More clarity should be provided on the difference between a bottleneck and a cause, while keeping in mind that it is a fluid definition as a bottleneck in one building block might have several levels of causes, and these themselves might be perceived as bottlenecks in their own right. Hence a flexible approach is needed, with the facilitator and lead moderator prepared to bring clarity to a working group that might have lost its way.

25. The link between the Accountability Triangle exercise and the prioritization of functions needs to be better elaborated by the facilitator, in order for this exercise to provide added value. The Accountability Triangle exercise helps to explain the existing functions and accountability within the service delivery. This will clarify roles and responsibilities, as well as map all the actors involved in the service delivery in the different subsectors under review.
26. A WASH BAT slide deck should be available on the online portal (www.washbat.org) in languages other than English, and available in PowerPoint so it can be adjusted.
27. 'WASH in Institutions' is too broad a term and should be split into WASH in schools and WASH in health care facilities. These are treated separately in the majority of workshops, and by splitting them focus is kept on either subsector, which may also increase participation and engagement from the relevant Ministries and other key stakeholders.
28. It is suggested that three templates be developed:
a. A checklist at the end of each day for the facilitators to ensure that they are conducting a proper debrief and preparing adequately for the next day.
b. A template for a workshop summary or declaration of agreement, if the facilitators and coordinating group decide that this is desirable for the end of the workshop.
c. An evaluation form for the participants to fill out. This should take a maximum of three minutes as there is rarely a lot of time at the end of the final day of the workshop to carry out a substantial workshop evaluation. This should cover, e.g., the quality of the methodology, facilitation, logistics and content of the activities and Action Plan. Consideration should be given to doing this online, using Mentimeter or other similar apps, as it might have more engagement from participants at the end of the workshop.
Recommendations related to the online tool
29. An overall recommendation is to advise countries to implement a paper-based WASH BAT, filling out the discussions and outputs of the day after each day in the online tool. This will allow for a more interactive workshop, while also making sure that the discussions are captured as soon as possible so that no information is lost.
30. Enhanced security features should be introduced in the online tool to ensure analyses are not lost (e.g. when sharing an original, a copy is saved so that changes made or deletions by the new user do not mean the original is lost forever).
31. It should be easier to integrate parallel analyses in the system, when working on two files for the same subsector. The workflow in the tool should be identified in order to make this easier.
32. The online database of files needs to be reorganized in order to be useful. Recommended updates include:
a. To group all the reports in a file system (instead of a long list) by country, with each report associated by the country included. It may also be useful to include a function to group the report by subsector. While it is possible to sort the files at present, there are over 1,000 files so this option is untenable. Having one folder for each country should reduce the number of folders in this first stage to fewer than 35.
b. Autogenerate names for the files, to improve the structure of the files in the system. Options could be added to mark a file as e.g. draft or final.
c. Tagging test files or ToT files so that they can later be removed more easily and to avoid them being mixed up with the final files.

33.	To facilitate context-specific adaptation, it should be easier to modify the criteria. In order not to lose the connection to the original criteria, the tool could make it easier to modify them but keep the original criteria in the same row to allow for comparison with the original criteria and across regions and countries.
34.	The activities developed should always be linked to the bottlenecks, criteria and the building blocks. This could be clearer in the online tool (even if the report section does maintain some continuity). It should also be emphasized that the final presentation of the activities in the final report needs to be linked to the criteria and building blocks, as this is not always done. Countries should be encouraged to include those bottlenecks and activities developed during the workshop but not included in the Action Plan in the final report to ensure they are recorded (online and in the report) and can be easily referred to and implemented if there is an opportunity to do so at a later stage. This can be in the main body of the report, with a discussion about the final stage of prioritization, or in an annex.
35.	The budget section of the online tool could be simplified by including an option showing ranges for the timetable (e.g. short term, medium term, long term) and costs (e.g. low cost, medium cost, high cost). This could be set in dollars with equivalent figures in the local currency in case an approximate, or average, cost needs to be set during the workshop.
36.	It is not possible to allocate funds to several funding sources with a lump sum; this section should be adapted to make this possible.
37.	The stakeholders' section could be made clearer, by removing the need to manage stakeholders separately from the main analysis (in the 'administration' tab).
38.	An improved template, common across all countries, in Word or MS Excel to be used during the workshop and later for pasting into the tool would make reporting easier, as mostly countries fill out the output from the day's discussion at the end of each workshop day.
39.	Adding additional languages to the tool should be considered. However, as is proving for Arabic, it is a significant effort to translate all the software terminologies correctly. Hence, the value of translating the tool to new languages will have to be weighed against the cost and effort of doing so. Translation should not be committed to until a country has used the tool and decided that translation will help its application in the medium to long term, e.g. for regional application or for regular follow-ups.
40.	It should be possible to upload the final report (in MS Word or PDF format) into the online system; this should be encouraged for all countries and will help with cross-checking and record keeping.
41.	The data visualization of the automated report could also be improved, and this should also be possible to extract separately (something which is currently possible but needs to be made clearer). The system could easily generate tables or graphs showing the functions prioritized, the criteria prioritized and the scoring per function summarized. It may also be possible to improve the Gantt chart, making it more visually appealing. This will also make the tool more useful during the workshop as the data visualizations can be shown to the participants when relevant.
42.	The system would benefit from having a responsible person for each report, as well as one person (who could be the same person) responsible for all the reports for the country. This person could be from the coordinating agency or from the government, but ideally someone who took part in the workshop as a rapporteur, giving them experience with the tool.
43.	The online tool would benefit from a dedicated person responsible for the quality assuring of all files and reports, as well as making sure the database overall is complete and easy to navigate, e.g., that the final file is clearly labelled, with any test files deleted.

44.	To increase use of the generated reports and outputs from the online tool, more needs to be done to make countries aware of what can be done using the tool. The website includes a User Manual, but this seems to be seldom accessed. It may be useful to create a separate, short document or annex which focuses only on the outputs which the online tool can generate, including this in a PowerPoint training as well as part of the ToT.
	Recommendations related to outputs of the workshop
45.	The quality and level of detail of the Action Plan needs to be adequate for the steps that are to follow, ensuring that all activities included are **specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely**. It should be the responsibility of the lead moderator and table facilitators to make sure that the final activities and sub-activities are ambitious but realistic, have clarity in language and that they are easily linked to the bottleneck(s) being removed, also integrating major consensus reached during the sessions. For this purpose, various alternatives could exist to guarantee that the Action Plan is completed soon after the workshop. For instance, if a core group has been identified before the workshop, they could be made responsible for this. Alternatively, each table could nominate a small number of people responsible for the follow-up work. The lead moderator or the coordinating agency should be in charge of following up with the group to ensure that the Action Plan is finalized, as well as quality assuring the final output.
46.	Taking **time constraints** into consideration, the moderator and table facilitators should encourage, as much as possible, innovative solutions to prioritized bottlenecks. They might need to be developed further and refined after the end of the workshop.
47.	The **follow-up and monitoring of the Action Plan** should be agreed on during or shortly after the workshop, which includes the who (lead organization), the what (which activities need to be monitored) and the how (accountability mechanisms in place, set of indicators to measure progress, etc.). A session on follow-up for the final day should be developed, where the next steps and responsibilities are discussed. This can be prepared at the end of the second to last day, when the facilitators will know the types of activities prioritized, and accountable stakeholders can be identified. The benefit of having such a session during the workshop means the momentum of the workshop can be used to agree on the lead agency as well as on the accountability mechanisms that should be employed. An alternative approach is to entrust the monitoring of the Action Plan to the core group in charge of preparing the WASH BAT. Whatever the outcome, the commitment to follow-up and those accountable should be detailed in the Action Plan.
48.	If the **budget section** is incomplete or of poor quality, or if the timetable does not cover all main activities and sub-activities, the moderator should emphasize that these aspects will need to be worked out after the workshop, before implementation can start. In particular, the budget should be reviewed after the workshop by technical and financial experts in cooperation with decision makers, in order to prioritize funds.
49.	In order to improve the budget section, relevant stakeholders that have information and knowledge on sector finance management could be invited to the workshop, either taking part in the whole workshop or only in the final day. The preparation phase could also prepare relevant documentation on the sector finance information to improve the discussions and reporting.

50. A **declaration** should be considered for every workshop, using a template to be developed. The declaration should focus on the main activities developed for each of the subsectors and describe any commonalities between what the different groups developed. It is useful for the declaration to distinguish between short-term and long-term activities, with immediate next steps clearly indicated. The declaration does not need to include a detailed timetable or a budget, as these will be included in the Action Plan and final report, with further refinement needed involving decision maker and technical staff. The declaration should however include a short description of the WASH BAT methodology and the workshop, including the subsectors covered, the key activities agreed on, and the next steps, including the plans for follow-up and those accountable.

Annex 3. Online Survey Questionnaire

Guidance Notes

This on-line survey is part of a study on the WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (WASH-BAT), which seeks to assess three pivotal issues: 1) the WASH BAT process and the tool itself; 2) the WASH sector bottlenecks identified; and 3) the suitability of the tool to trigger action.

This survey is structured in four different sections:
- Section I: Context and General information
- Section II: The WASH BAT Workshop
- Section III: Implementation of the Action Plan (this section should not be completed if the workshop has been conducted in the last three months)
- Section IV: Final comments

This study will be completed by a selection of specific cases for a more in-depth study, based on one short interview. If you would be willing to share your thoughts and inputs during a second phase of the study, please let us know and we will contact you in the following weeks:

☐ Yes, I would like to take part in the in-depth study	Name: Institution:	Email:

In case of difficulty in interpreting or completing any of the sections / fields of this survey, please do not hesitate to contact Antoine Delepiere (Email: antoine.delepiere@siwi.org) and/or Ricard Gine (Email: ricard.gine@siwi.org).

Many thanks for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Section I: Context and General information

I.1 General Information	Country / Region					
	Year and Date of analysis			Total number of days of the workshop/s[1]		

I.2 Leading Agency	Name of the Leading Agency					
	Position of the contact person			Contact details (include E-mail)		

I.3 Facilitation of the workshop	Name of institution that facilitated the WASH BAT					
	Position of the contact person			Contact details (include E-mail)		
	Training of facilitators	Were facilitators trained? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Length of the training	☐ Half day ☐ 1 day ☐ 1,5 days ☐ 2 days or more ☐ Other (e.g., ToT)	When did the training take place?	☐ Immediately before the workshop ☐ The week before ☐ More than a week before
	Training of rapporteurs	Were rapporteurs trained? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Length of the training	☐ Half day ☐ 1 day ☐ 1,5 days ☐ 2 days or more ☐ Other (e.g., ToT)	When did the training take place?	☐ Immediately before the workshop ☐ The week before ☐ More than a week before

I.4 Participants and stakeholders[1]	Number of participants (if known, indicate number of men and women)	

Notes

[1] In case the implementation of the workshop has taken place in different phases, please provide the requested information for all phases.

	Number and type of institutions involved in the analysis	☐ Government Institution – National ☐ Government Institution – Sub-national ☐ Regulator	☐ Service Provider ☐ Non-governmental institution ☐ Others (please, specify):
I.5 Documentation	**Documentation available (please, attach one copy)**	☐ Concept Note and/or Agenda ☐ List of attendants ☐ Action Plan	☐ Report of the workshop ☐ File available in washbat.org (please provide the name of the files) ☐ Others (please, specify):
I.6 Scope of Analysis & Modality	**Total number of sub-groups / analysis**		

Scope of Analysis

(please specify number of subgroups / analysis conducted per WASH sector – jurisdiction)

National

	Urban	Rural	Peri-urban
Water Supply			
Sanitation			
Hygiene			
Schools			
Health Centres			
Institutions (others)			

Sub-national

	Urban	Rural	Peri-urban
Water Supply			
Sanitation			
Hygiene			
Schools			
Health Centres			
Institutions (others)			

Please specify the level and number of sub-national administrative units covered:

I.6 Scope of Analysis & Modality	**Modality**	☐ Full on-line software (data is inserted within the web-based tool during the workshop) ☐ Outside the software (the rapporteur is working in an Excel file and later (each evening or at the end of the workshop) he/she copies all data to the software version of the tool)　　☐ Off-line software screen based (data is inserted in the offline version of the tool during the workshop)

I.7 Comments	Please add any other information, clarification or comment relating to the context, scope or modality of the workshop:

Section II: The WASH BAT Workshop

<table>
<tr>
<td>II.1 Sessions included in the workshop</td>
<td>Did the workshop include the following sessions?</td>
<td>
☐ Accountability Triangle
☐ Enabling Environment
☐ Regulations
☐ Service delivery models
☐ Financing WASH
</td>
<td colspan="2">☐ Others (Specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2 Development of the Action Plan</td>
<td>Did participants develop and complete an Action Plan, i.e. a well-defined set of activities were prioritised, budgeted and at least one stakeholder assumed a leadership role in their implementation?</td>
<td>☐ Yes, one Action Plan was completed and finalised</td>
<td colspan="2">
☐ No, the Action Plan was not completed.
If known, identify why the action plan was not developed / finalised:
    ☐ Lack of time
    ☐ Lack of available information
    ☐ Lack of relevant stakeholders in the room
    ☐ Others (please, elaborate):
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3 Approval of the Action Plan</td>
<td>Did stakeholders with a lead role in the implementation of activities showed full agreement with the content of the Action Plan?</td>
<td>☐ Yes, all stakeholders showed full agreement with the Action Plan</td>
<td>☐ Yes, partially (only some stakeholders but not all of them)</td>
<td>☐ No, there has not been sufficient time since the implementation of the exercise

☐ No, any stakeholder was committed to the Action Plan

(No need to complete Section III, please move to Section IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4 Comments</td>
<td colspan="4">Please add any other information, clarification or comment relating to the implementation of the workshop:</td>
</tr>
</table>

Section III: Implementation of the Action Plan[2]

---

[2] Do not complete this section if the WASH BAT workshop has been conducted in the last three months. If more than one Action Plan were elaborated during the workshop, a separate table shall be filled in for each Action Plan developed (please copy-paste "Section 3" as many times as required).

III.1 Implementation of the Action Plan	**Role of the Government**	☐ The Government owned the Action Plan and supported the full / partial implementation of prioritised activities. | **Main activities**	**% of implement. (approx.)**	**Timeframe**	**Leading Agency** | |---|---|---|---| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |	Reasons that supported the practical implementation of the Action Plan (tick all options that apply): ☐ Available budget ☐ Definition of clear roles and responsibilities (leadership) ☐ Cost-effectiveness of proposed activities ☐ UNICEF support ☐ Others (please, elaborate):
		☐ The Action Plan was yet not implemented by the Government.	Reasons that hampered the practical implementation of the Action Plan (tick all options that apply): ☐ Budget / financing issues ☐ Roles and responsibilities were not clearly assigned ☐ Stakeholders were not committed to the Action Plan ☐ Lack of UNICEF support ☐ Others (please, elaborate): (*Move to Section IV*)
	Role of UNICEF	☐ UNICEF supported the implementation of the Action Plan by … (please, elaborate): 1. (Text 1) 2. etc.	☐ UNICEF did not support the implementation of the Action Plan
	Follow-up of implemented activities	☐ Implemented activities have been (at least partially) monitored and evaluated (please attach documents)	☐ Activities have not been monitored and evaluated at all. In this case, please detail why: ☐ Lack of human resources ☐ Lack of financial resources ☐ Others (please, elaborate):
III.2 Outputs and Outcomes of the Action Plan	**Please list up to 5 specific outputs and outcomes achieved through the**	1. (Text) 2. (Text) 3. (Text) 4. (Text)	

	implementation of planned activities	5. (Text)
III.3 Comments	Please add any other information, clarification or comment relating to the implementation of the Action Plan:	

Section IV: Final comments

	Please identify up to three key strengths and weaknesses of the whole analysis (related to the tool, the process, the facilitation, outputs, etc.)	Strengths 1. (Text) 2. (Text) 3. (Text)	Weaknesses 1. (Text) 2. (Text) 3. (Text)
IV.1 Overall overview			
IV.2 Comments	Please add any other information, clarification or comment relating to the WASH BAT or to this study:		

Thanks for your time in responding the questionnaire.

Annex 4. Discussion guide for in-depth interviews

THE WASH BAT PROCESS AND THE TOOL
Key questions: Is the tool useful and supportive for both preparing and implementing the workshop? Are tool features suitable for the purpose of supporting a collaborative development of an action plan? Is the tool flexible enough to be applicable in different contexts?

Rationale for the WASH BAT	**Does the context influence the implementation process of a WASH BAT?** - What was the rationale for implementing the WASH BAT? Any pre-identified bottleneck (e.g., low coverage, low service level, poor coordination, lack of regulation, etc.)? - Who participated in the decision of implementing a WASH BAT? - Which were the sector needs and demands? Which was the role of UNICEF in the identification of needs and demands? - How many WASH BATs were implemented? Did all workshops share same scope and approach?
Preparation	**How the preparation of the workshop affects its implementation (positively or negatively)?** - Which actors participated in the preparation of the workshop? Which roles and responsibilities? Who assumed a lead role? Which institution funded the WASH BAT? Fill in the following table

Main preparatory tasks	Ministry of Water	UNICEF	Service Provider	NGOs	Other (please, specify)
Lead Agency					
Funder					
Identify the scope and main stakeholders, and develop terms of references					
Identify moderators, facilitators and rapporteurs					
Participation in preparatory meetings and consultations					
Validate WASH BAT agenda					
Logistical arrangements (venue, invitations, transport, etc.)					
Training of facilitators and rapporteurs for the workshop					
Other tasks (please, specify)					

- How much time in advance was the workshop prepared? Did they use the template agenda included in the Country Implementation Guide?
- Which were the criteria employed to select participants? Was it easy to engage enough participants and ensure adequate representativeness?
- Which information was provided to participants in advance?
- Were available documents (e.g., the Country Implementation Guide, the check list, the schedule and chronogram of the process) useful to guide the preparation steps? Which part of the guide was the most relevant?
- Were facilitators trained? Which was the length of the training? When did the training take place?
- Were rapporteurs trained? Which was the length of the training? When did the training take place?

	- Please, detail main strengths and weaknesses of the preparatory phase of the WASH BAT. What went well and what could have been done differently to improve the preparation of the workshop?
Implementation	**How the methodology and implementation of the workshop supports the elaboration of a concrete action plan?** - How many days did the workshop last? Which sessions did the workshop include (accountability mapping, enabling environment, financing WASH, etc.)? Was the Accountability Mapping session included? (please share the final agenda of the workshop) - How many people attended the workshop? From which organizations? Any important stakeholder that did not attend the workshop? Why? (please share the final list of attendants) - Who facilitated the sessions? How many facilitators and rapporteurs? How were sessions facilitated (theory versus practice)? - Was the exercise conducted on-line or off-line? Who entry the data? Did the chosen modality hampered the implementation of the exercise? - How was the WASH BAT action plan elaborated? Did the Leading Agency prepare a summary report of the whole workshop? (please share the report) - Please, detail main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation phase of the WASH BAT. What went well and what could have been done differently to improve the implementation of the workshop?
The tool	**Is the tool supportive for conducting the exercise and the elaboration of the action plan?** - Which were the strengths and weaknesses of the tool, in relation to the implementation process? - Which tool features were used during the diagnosis (e.g. generation of reports, merging files, off-line on-line synchronisation)? Which features did not work properly? **Is the tool flexible enough to be applicable in different contexts (e.g., emergencies, fragile states, etc.)?** - Does the current version of the tool adequately cover all different contexts in your country? Which building block / Criteria would require a review? - Did participants add new functions / criteria? - New criteria are being prepared in relation to emergency contexts, climate change, and linkages between WASH and WRM … do you think they are useful? Any other water-related topic is missing?

THE SECTOR BOTTLENECKS

Key questions: What is the commonality of bottlenecks surfacing across countries implementing WASH BAT? What are the main sources of inefficiency in the WASH sector (by sub-sector)?

WASH Bottlenecks	**Which are the WASH sector bottlenecks?** - Which bottlenecks were correctly identified and agreed during the diagnosis? - Which were the main sources of inefficiencies, by sub-sector / level?

THE OUTPUTS AND THE OUTCOMES

Key questions: Is WASH BAT an adequate tool to identify the sector bottlenecks, i.e. to diagnose the sector and build consensus about the situation in the sector? Is WASH BAT an adequate tool to take action - plan, prioritise, implement - to improve service delivery?

Outputs	**Is there an agreement on the action plan and the way forward?** - Did the workshop end with an Action Plan, i.e. a well-defined set of activities were prioritised, budgeted and at least one stakeholder assumed a leadership role in their implementation? - Did stakeholders with a lead role in the implementation of activities showed full agreement with the content of the Action Plan? - Which concrete actions were agreed? Did the government endorse the action plan? - How the leading agency implement the plan? - How UNICEF support the implementation? - Which were the next steps, as agreed in the workshop? **How is the WASH BAT action plan implemented in practice?**

	- Which concrete recommendations were included in the government strategy? Were financing issues important determinants in the final prioritization of actions? - Which was the budget allocated to each approved recommendation? - Who was in charge of implementing each recommendation? - How and who monitored and evaluated the implementation of each recommendation? **What are planned or expected future activities?**
Outcomes and Impacts	**Which are the concrete outcomes of the WASH BAT exercise on WASH services delivery?** - How many actions from the action plan have been implemented (completed / ongoing) one year after the date of the workshop? - Is there any visible impact of the actions? Give some examples… - Has there been a significant gap between the estimated budget and expenditure? - What outcomes are expected over time (and have not yet had time to be realised)? (and what level of confidence do you have?) - Is there a need to implement a new WASH BAT analysis?

OVERALL OVERVIEW

		Strengths	Weaknesses
Overall overview	**Please identify up to three key strengths and weaknesses of the whole analysis (related to the tool, the process, the facilitation, outputs, etc.)**	4. (Text) 5. (Text) 6. (Text)	4. (Text) 5. (Text) 6. (Text)
Comments	Please add any other information, clarification or comment relating to the WASH BAT or to this study:		

Annex 5. Ethiopia's OneWASH National Programme (OWNP) activities inspired by the WASH BAT

The below table shows the key OWNP actions mapped against the WASH BAT activities.

Subject		One WASH National Programme Phase II Programme Document	WASH BAT actions and recommendations
2	**Urban master planning**	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Development of integrated city-wide water supply and wastewater master planning prior to feasibility study, design and construction of infrastructure Moving towards long term goals: Complete development of master planning for all towns of the country	**City (or clustered) wide planning**. For urban and water and sanitation services, moving towards planning that includes larger administrative units, such as the entire cities, woreda-wide plans, or clustered-kebeles, was identified as a possibility to make better use of economies of scale and achieve more sustainable progress. **Urban sanitation**: City wide sanitation master plan.
12	**Urban planning**	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Enforcement of planning and shift towards watershed management and catchment protection. Incremental basic service delivery infrastructure that is in tandem with urban growth. Moving towards long term goals: Full enforcement of urban, rural and industrial physical plans that include comprehensive watershed management and protection.	
3	**Technology innovation and mix**	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Technology shift to reduce failure rates, improve resilience in the face of changing climate, demographic shifts, environmental impact of rapid urban, industrial and agricultural development, arid area encroachment, refugee areas, competition for limited water resources, etc. Include "risk-informed planning" and tailor to meet the diverse needs within Ethiopia.	**Service delivery models**. The concept of service delivery, in particular for sanitation, but also for water, would benefit from a thorough exploration and definition in the Ethiopian context. This would facilitate the definition of roles and responsibilities in existing service delivery models, as well as identification of options for new service delivery models. **Urban sanitation**: Develop sustainable service delivery model.
4	**Procurement and implementation**	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Streamlined procedures, contracting at scale involving international tendering and supply chains. Maximum use of national manufacturers, suppliers and contractors, while not precluding international suppliers and competition. Promotion of international/national collaboration, learning from procurement models such as eight towns work (UNICEF/DFID). Strategic bundling (i.e. lots within the same geographic areas) use of a mix of procurement methods including design-build, and emphasis on contract management to reduce lengthy implementation delays and contractor-consultant non-compliance.	**Urban water**: Inclusion of sustainability factors in planning, M&E plan. **Rural water** (subnational): • Advocate for and develop an investment plan that build on innovative financing mechanisms and attracts private sector and donors; and • Prioritise the incorporation of business models into the policies and guidelines.

11	Sustainability feasibility studies	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Sustainable development studies and designs; affordability and appropriate levels of water and sanitation services, environmental and health impact, urban sanitation, rural water and hygiene, arid areas **Moving towards long term goals**: Water supply systems based on resource studies, proven business models, economy of scale, service standards, community engagement, etc. Complete integration of urban sanitation and environmental protection, including SWM, industrial solid and liquid wastes	
5	Capacity development	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Capacity development for improved delivery of WASH services at all levels including high level of services from water utilities, strengthening NWCO and RWCOs and forming Zonal WASH Coordination Offices. Develop efficient programme communication strategy and sharing of good/best practices	**Capacity development**. The Ethiopian WASH sector needs increased capacities across all areas. This relates not only to opportunities to take part in trainings, but more broadly to issues of human resources management, salaries, exchange visits and involvement of young professionals.
13	Technical assistance	**Short-to-medium term actions**: TA (including post-construction) units at regional level with sub-offices distributed at approx. zonal level (to coincide or pre-empt clustered utilities) to support both urban and rural WASH development and operation, including on-the-job training **Moving towards long term goals**: Fully functioning and sufficient TA units so as to ensure rapid WASH development, value for money, sustainable business models, etc.	**Urban sanitation**: Development of a comprehensive capacity development plan for sanitation. **Rural sanitation**: Development and implementation of a capacity development plan. **Rural water**: • Strengthen implementation of capacity development activities (national level); and • Review the HR strategy with standards for deployment and plans for needs assessment-based capacity building (subnational level).
6	Clustering	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Voluntary clustering for economy of scale, improved O&M and use of national /international KPIs for urban large and small towns, satellite villages and MVWS schemes; ahead of formal sector reform **Moving towards long term goals**: Established national/regional utility regulation. Formal country wide clustering – it is anticipated that there could be around 100 publicly owned utilities with each including large and small towns, satellite villages and MVWS schemes and responsible for water supply, sanitation and solid waste	**Regulation**. It was clear that there is a strong interest and government commitment towards the establishing a regulatory body for the WASH sector. There was a keen interest in exploring the meanings of and possibilities for regulatory functions in the WASH sector; a momentum that should be further built on. **Urban sanitation**: Establish a regulatory agency and revise regulatory framework. **Urban water**: Independent regulatory body. **Rural sanitation**: Strengthen stakeholder platform to do joint planning, monitoring and review. **Rural water**: • Establish and rollout a regulatory authority (national); and • Review system for definition of roles and accountabilities with clear guidelines on implementation and monitoring (subnational).

7	Advocacy	**Short-to-medium term actions**: BCC for water security, sanitation awareness and hygiene; engagement at all levels (government, utilities, DPs, CSOs, private sector, communities) and learning from refugee areas water safety and sanitation procedures to inform overall rural and urban WASH practices. Introduction of sanitation micro-plans (currently being developed under UNICEF leadership but not yet published)	**Rural sanitation**: Advocacy on public health importance of rural sanitation based on research and evidence for increased budget.
14	Sector budgets	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Ring-fenced sector CAPEX and OPEX budgets for WASH in schools and health facilities; water supply and sanitation services to/from property boundary increasingly becoming obligation of utility or WASHCO. **Moving towards long term goals**: All construction and operation of facilities within schools and health facilities (including retro-fit of existing buildings) fully covered by sector budgets. Water supply and sanitation services to/from property boundary being obligation of utility or WASHCO.	**Financing.** All the sub-sectors would benefit from increased levels of financing, as well as strategies for identifying innovative financial instruments for the sector (i.e. blending finance, climate finance, etc.). Some sub-sectors also need to improve its absorption capacity in order to accelerate the progress achieved in the previous years. **Urban sanitation**: Dedicated and allocated public budget for urban sanitation + donor funding (Sanitation Fund; Levy for sanitation). **Urban water**: Reduction of non-revenue water (NRW), regular revision of tariffs and enabling cross subsidies (Master Plans). **Rural water**: - Maximise Funds mobilisation (national); and - Improve budget utilisation of official development assistance (subnational).
16	Monitoring and evaluation	**Short-to-medium term actions**: Updated regional WASH inventories of installed systems, planned systems and data storage and dissemination. MOWIE MIS established. Moving towards analysed sector data that is effectively utilised to orient investments and track performance of service delivery (functionality) in real-time. **Moving towards long term goals**: Regional WASH inventories, data storage and dissemination. Comprehensive and fully implemented WASH data base and updating systems.	**Private sector engagement**. Private sector actors were considered as key stakeholders to further advance water and sanitation service delivery. There is a need to incentivise their engagement through the development of sustainable business models, as well as to strengthen their capacity to engage in the water and sanitation sector. Coordination between government actors in public health, water supply and job creation would be crucial. **Urban water**: Inclusion of sustainability factors in planning, M&E plan. **Rural sanitation**: Review and improve monitoring and evaluation. **Rural water** (subnational): Review existing monitoring framework and develop new indicators to be included in national WASH inventories and harmonise with other national management information systems.