



Documenting lessons learnt from piloting Town Sanitation Planning and District Investment Planning approaches in 6 towns and 4 districts in northern Uganda, and developing a Town Sanitation Plan strategy

GIZ Contract Reference no.: 81209472

# Lessons Learnt Report

## Submitted to:

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH  
Reform of the Urban Water and Sanitation Sector Programme, Kampala,  
Uganda

## Submitted by:

Prit Salian,  
Zehntgasse 23b  
76646-Bruchsal  
Germany  
email: [prit.salian@i-san.co.uk](mailto:prit.salian@i-san.co.uk)

## Submissions:

First draft: 31.05.2017  
Final : 05.07.2017

Authors: Ing. Prit Salian, Mr. Ambrose Kibuuka & Dr. Charles Niwagaba

<b>Reviewed by</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of report</b>
Eng. Godfrey Byarugaba	Technical Support Unit-2 Team Leader, Ugandan Ministry of Water and Environment	01.06.2017	First draft
Ms. Diana Keesiga	Programme Engineer, Water for People, Uganda	06.06.2017	First draft
Mr. Phillips Okot	Sanitation Component Head, GIZ, Uganda	28.06.2017	Final draft

The consultants would like to thank all persons who have supported the development of this report, in particular Ms. Diana Keesiga (Programme Engineer, Water for People, Uganda), Eng. Godfrey Byarugaba (Technical Support Unit-2 Team Leader), Mr. Phillip Oboma (Project Assistant, GIZ), Mr. Martin Mukasa (Environmental Health Officer, WSDf-N), District Water Officers from Apac, Kole, Dokolo and Lira, and the STF members from Apac, Aduku, Oyam, Ibuje, Kamdini and Loro.

Special thanks to Mr. Phillips Okot (Sanitation Component Head, GIZ RUWASS, Uganda) for initiating this study.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Overview of the Town Sanitation Planning approach .....	2
3. Lessons learnt from TSP .....	2
3.1. <i>Success factors of TSP</i> .....	2
3.2. <i>TSP actions being undertaken on the ground</i> .....	3
3.3. <i>Unintended outcomes of TSP</i> .....	5
3.4. <i>Impact of TSP interventions</i> .....	5
3.5. <i>Promising TSP practices that can be maintained and replicated or scaled up in the future</i> .....	5
3.6. <i>Challenges faced in TSP</i> .....	6
3.7. <i>What should be done differently in future for better scale up of TSP</i> .....	6
4. Overview of the District Investment Planning approach.....	8
5. Lessons learnt from DIP .....	9
5.1. <i>Success factors of DIP</i> .....	9
5.2. <i>DIP actions being undertaken on the ground</i> .....	9
5.3. <i>Unintended outcomes of DIP</i> .....	10
5.4. <i>Impact of DIP interventions</i> .....	10
5.5. <i>Promising DIP practices that can be maintained and replicated or scaled up in the future</i> .....	10
5.6. <i>Challenges faced in DIP</i> .....	10
5.7. <i>What should be done differently in future for better scale up of DIP</i> .....	11
6. Harmonisation of the two approaches .....	12
7. Conclusions .....	13
Annex – List of Interviewees.....	14

## 1. Introduction

### Background

GIZ-RUWASS program is supporting the improvement of the Ugandan water and sanitation sector through various projects. Amongst these projects is the USAID and GIZ co-funded project 'Capacity development of Town Councils to design and implement integrated and sustainable town sanitation plans'. The objective of the project is to make use of Town Sanitation Plans as a basis for planning and prioritizing investments resulting in tangible improvements to sanitation services delivery in the six project towns. The project is being piloted in Aduku, Apac, Ibuje, Kamdini, Loro and Oyam towns of Northern Uganda.

The project has pioneered the development and implementation of town sanitation plans (TSPs) in the aforementioned towns with the aim to promote TSPs as an up-scaling model for urban sanitation improvement in small and medium sized towns. The TSPs seek to coordinate, integrate and improve various sanitation-related measures at the local level including coordination of town planning, sanitation marketing and behaviour change communication, involvement of the local private sector, fully-fledged stakeholder participation and law enforcement.

In addition to and unrelated to the aforementioned USAID-GIZ project, Water for People (WfP) Uganda has supported the development of District Investment Plans (DIPs) in over 80 districts across the country in collaboration with the rural water department of Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE). The aim of DIP is to provide an understanding of the resource gap, required financial resources and appropriate technological options to achieve 100% WASH coverage within a time frame in each district. The DIP focused at supporting District Local Governments through the 9 Technical Support Units (TSU) to develop District Investment plans. The process follows a bottom-up approach indicating the cost of reaching the unserved populations in each district from village level for better planning and allocation of the available but limited resources.

### Objective of the study

The objective of this report is to document lessons learned from implementing of the town sanitation planning (TSP) and District Investment Plan (DIP) approaches in terms of improving access to sustainable sanitation services.

Documentation of the lessons learnt focused on six project towns – Aduku, Apac, Ibuje, Kamdini, Loro and Oyam – for the TSP process and four districts – Apac, Dokolo, Kole and Lira – for the DIP. The study aimed at: a) identifying factors influencing success and challenges in the two approaches, b) determining processes, practices and interventions from the two approaches that could be harmonised, replicated and scaled up in the future and, c) presenting the overall outcomes/impact that the two pilots have had on the beneficiaries so far.

### Methods used for the study

The primary method for data collection was focused group discussions based on semi-structured questionnaires, and a modified version of the questionnaires were used for the key informant interviews conducted.

For the TSP, focused group discussions were conducted with the Sanitation Task Force (STF) members from the towns of Aduku, Apac, Ibuje, Kamdini, Loro and Oyam in their respective towns. Additionally, two key informant interviews were held with two representatives of International Lifeline Fund<sup>1</sup> and Sanitation Solutions Group<sup>2</sup>.

For the DIP, the methods used were focused group discussions with the Technical Support Unit–2 (TSU-2) Team Leader and the District Water Officers of Kole, Lira, Apac and Dokolo in their respective towns. Furthermore, two key informant interviews were conducted with the former Assistant District Water Officer of Apac (who was actively involved in the preparation of the Apac DIP), and with two representatives of Water for People in Kampala.

---

<sup>1</sup> A local NGO implementing BCC activities as per the TSP in Aduku, Apac and Ibuje

<sup>2</sup> A consulting firm building capacities of the private sector in the six towns

## 2. Overview of the Town Sanitation Planning approach

### Specific objectives of the TSP

- I. To improve the capacity of local governments in the six towns to plan and implement sustainable sanitation<sup>3</sup> interventions and promote integrated and participatory town level sanitation planning.
- II. To increase access to sustainable sanitation for households, public schools and health facilities in the six towns.
- III. To improve the management of sanitation services including transport, treatment and reuse or disposal of excreta in the six towns.
- IV. To improve hygiene conditions in households, public schools and health facilities.
- V. To increase private sector participation in delivery of sanitation products and services.

### Methodology of the TSP

The town council initiates the process by formally endorsing the strategy with a council resolution and commits to support its activities with the required human and financial resources. The town council appoints the STF – a multidisciplinary team comprised of town council staff and residents of different disciplines and experiences related to sanitation – to support the development and implementation of the TSP. The capacity of STF members for the TSP process is built through training and coaching in the five stages of strategic sanitation planning – Preparation, Assessment, Planning, Implementation and Monitoring, and Evaluation and Reporting.

A baseline assessment is conducted to establish the status of sanitation in the town. Data is collected, and an analysis of the existing sanitation issues and the main reasons and constraints associated with the issues is presented in the baseline report. The STF sets up a town sanitation forum comprised of key stakeholders in the sanitation sector to provide input via consultation to the development of the TSP. The STF presents issues identified in the baseline assessment to the forum for verification and buy-in, and in consultation with the stakeholders reviews the required hardware and software solutions that would be appropriate in the local context.

The resulting actions are listed in the TSP according to the short and long term goals along with objectives, targets and indicators. The final sanitation plans are presented at the second stakeholder forum for agreement, then forwarded to the town council for approval and endorsement. The town council embeds the TSP as part of the town development plan according to its planning and budgeting cycle. The town council selects one or more of the prioritised interventions from the TSP and depending on the available resources, implements the intervention(s). Regular monitoring of progress is undertaken as implementation of activities goes on. Based on the outcomes of the monitoring, the implementation of activities is evaluated to check progress, challenges and constraints. The results of the evaluation are presented to the stakeholders for further consultation and if the objectives are not achieved as expected, the actions in the TSP are reviewed and corrected.

## 3. Lessons learnt from TSP

### 3.1. Success factors of TSP

Since sanitation is a cross cutting issue, the [formation of a multidisciplinary and inclusive STF](#) is a crucial component of the planning process. The broad composition of the STF members provides a wider base for discussions, idea generation and informed decision making.

[Formation of a stakeholder forum](#) that involves several stakeholders plays a key role in WASH improvement in the towns. Consulting stakeholders in the planning process has led to increased participation and ownership of the community in sanitation related activities. By consulting with the end users, a bottom-up approach is used and

---

<sup>3</sup> Sustainable sanitation recognizes that sanitation is not just about toilets; rather, toilets are one element of a sanitation system or sanitation chain that has to be not only economically viable, socially acceptable, and technically and institutionally appropriate, it should also protect the environment and the natural resources. Sustainable Sanitation Alliance ([www.susana.org](http://www.susana.org))

more information and views are gathered. Additionally, the forum acts as an accountability platform, where the STFs activities are monitored.

A **holistic approach to sanitation** does not only look at toilets, but rather improvements along the entire sanitation value chain. It also involved solutions other than hardware investments, such as capacity building, formulation of the by-law and BCC campaigns, etc. Additionally, the planning process should consider the sanitation situation and its effects on inhabitants, environment and socio-economics in the entire town and not just piecemeal interventions.

Reviving, updating and restoring **holistic town sanitation by-laws** are critical for creating awareness, improving enforcement and up-scaling of standards. The by-laws and their enforcement agents are crucial tools that the town councils have to improve sanitary conditions in the town. The by-laws should cover all aspects of sanitation (if possible, including solid waste, greywater management and drainage) and must be extended to public and private schools, healthcare facilities and public places.

**Inclusive, Consultative, Collaborative approach** involving politicians and donors/ development agencies puts the needs of the towns at the forefront of activities, rather than the donor or development partner imposing the project on the town authority and the local population. The community easily listens to politicians and involving them in the planning process guarantees their commitment to the population. Involving politicians also ensures their backing during implementation of activities and endorsement of several crucial steps during the planning process, for example formulation and ratification of the by-laws, budget allocation, physical planning of town development, etc.

**Inclusive capacity development** is critical for sustainability. The capacity development activities should involve not only the town council officials but should also be extended to representatives of schools, religious institutions, other local NGOs that are supporting WASH related activities and local councillors. Within the capacity development, the exposure visits play an important role as an eye-opener to the ones involved in the planning process and helps build confidence and motivation to improve the prevailing situation.

**Private sector involvement** in the development and later in the implementation of the TSP is extremely important if the sanitation chain has to function. The involvement of the private sector in: providing low cost toilets, emptying and transport services, treatment and reuse/disposal of waste is a critical component of sustainability and must be given full emphasis.

**Lobbying for funds** is the final, but also important step in the TSP process. The TSP is useless unless the activities stipulated in it are implemented. Not all the proposed activities can be funded by one donor, but since the TSP has various activities identified in it, the donors can choose which one to implement according to the plan.

### **3.2. TSP actions being undertaken on the ground**

#### *Development of Six Town Sanitation Plans*

The TSPs have now organised the investment requirements in sanitation interventions (hardware and software) according to short, mid and long term targets, set until 2025. The plans elaborate the various interventions in households, schools, healthcare facilities and public places considering a holistic approach across the sanitation chain. The participatory planning process has taken in consideration that local priorities have been identified and solutions are derived by the local stakeholders. The STF members who represented a wide range of stakeholders were instrumental in providing comments, concerns and ideas on the improvements of the towns sanitation needs and have made the plans as holistic as possible.

Additionally, institutions such as schools and healthcare facilities are taking the responsibility to improve their situation according to the plan. Other stakeholders, such as National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC), having been engaged in the TSP development process, are coordinating their plans with the TSP. In most cases the STF members feel that the TSPs have provided a structured approach for the investments in the sanitation sector. In the next financial year 2018, the TSPs will be merged with the Town Development Plan.

### *Targeted BCC campaigns in six towns*

Several BCC tools were developed to aid the implementation of the campaigns. The tools were developed in close cooperation with WSDF-N and the STFs. Additionally, each of the STFs developed their Awareness Raising Strategy and implemented them in conjunction with local partners.

The awareness raising campaigns have had a positive impact on inhabitants in the six towns. There is increased public interest, participation and willingness to improve the level of sanitation. The radio talk shows have been flooded with response calls from inhabitants providing ideas on sanitation improvements. The Towns of Apac and Kamdini have reported a drop in cases of open defecation as a result of the BCC campaigns. The keep-the-town-clean monthly activity has been well received and voluntary participation in cleaning activities has increased.

### *Development of Six Town Sanitation By-laws*

Six By-laws have been developed and forwarded to the Attorney General for ratification. The development of the By-laws have been a contentious issue that has shown positive outcomes. The STFs developed by-laws and learnt the process and difficulties involved in the formulation of the by-law. The knowledge gained may be applied when developing a by-law in another sector.

Due to the awareness raised in the process of making the by-law, citizen groups are actively advocating and emphasizing clearing of sanitary lanes to be solely used for sanitary activities. Illegal dumping of faecal sludge in wetlands and open spaces in the towns of Apac and Aduku has stopped due to the arrests and impounding of the exhauster trucks by the law enforcement units. There is increased vigilance and reporting of illegal dumping activities by citizens.

The Town Councils are now encouraging the construction of standardised emptiable toilets developed under the project and there seems to be an increased investment in lined latrines in some towns, notably Apac. Apac by-law stipulates that lined toilets or septic tanks are a prerequisite for approval and receipt of the building completion certificate.

### *Design for low cost toilets*

The planning process identified the need for developing low cost sanitation toilet designs to fulfil the needs of the households and institutions. In close cooperation with the STFs, WSDF-N and the private sector, low cost, pre-cast, emptiable options for toilets were developed. These designs are now being implemented in 20 schools in the project towns. Currently, the toilets are priced at UGX 3 million but with higher sales, the price is expected to be as low as UGX 1 - 1.5 million.

### *Design for sludge drying beds*

Designs for sludge drying beds serving a cluster of three adjacent towns have been developed in close cooperation between WSDF-N and BORDA (Germany). Each of the towns have invested capital for buying land for sludge drying beds. The procurement aspect of construction is now being undertaken by the project.

### *Establishment of a Data Management System*

A data management system has been installed in each of the six towns to aid data collection and analysis. Additionally, this system was primarily used to compile the baseline information, but in the future, will be used as a monitoring system to assess the change in the situation. The DMS is also linked to the ministry server such that data upload can be done instantly. Additional training was provided to the Health Officers to handle the DMS.

### *Capacity development of STFs*

The STFs have undergone five modules of training course to aid the development and implementation of the TSPs. In addition, the close involvement of the WSDF-N in the training course has also ensured that the capacity of WSDF-N staff has been improved to further train prospective STFs from other towns. The trainings have focused on the various aspects of sanitation planning across the sanitation chain. The governance workshop was especially

useful to the STFs as it exposed them to ideas in engaging with the community and politicians effectively. The law enforcement training, on legal matters related to enforcement, was also well received.

### **3.3. Unintended outcomes of TSP**

#### *Improved solid waste management*

The Keep-Town-Clean campaign initiated by the town councils as part of the awareness raising strategy, takes place once at regular intervals<sup>4</sup> and has gathered momentum in the towns. The campaign involves communities, businesses, religious institutions and transport hubs (Boda boda stages) actively taking part in voluntary cleaning activities. This campaign although initially intended for sanitation has, as a first step, embarked on improved solid waste management in the towns. The participatory approaches used in the process identified solid waste management as a priority and thus this activity was taken up.

#### *Improved political motivation*

The participatory process involved in planning and the awareness raising activities have, in some towns, increased the political will to work towards improving sanitation. Sanitation, due to its current hype, has become a lobbying topic. The success in this issue also partly has to do with the training on governance and the exposure visits to Fort Portal conducted by the project.

#### *Closer connections and competition between towns*

The project activities and its results has created a competition between towns to improve sanitary conditions. For example, small rewards like winning the best communication strategy by Aduku has seen an increased motivation amongst the STFs.

The peer-to-peer learning activities has created closer connections between the STFs of different towns and has proved to have good knowledge exchange results. The STFs now share ideas and concerns, informally, amongst themselves. There seems to be a growing confidence in the town councils to improve sanitation activities.

#### *Improved demand for water supply*

Towns like Loro have benefited with a water supply system being built by the WSDF-N. Since to have a water connection one must have a toilet and handwashing facilities, the town board of Loro insisted to have piped water system to be installed to boost demand for sanitation. WSDF-Ns close involvement and commitment in the project made it easier for Loro to speed-up the process.

The close involvement of the water operators in the planning activities has seen better coordination between the STFs and the operators. NWSC has also included sanitation issues amongst their awareness raising activities such as radio shows and jingles. There is now an increased willingness to pay water bills due the BCC campaigns.

### **3.4. Impact of TSP interventions**

The evaluation of 'impacts' of a project looks at the long-term, deeper changes continued over time. Such an evaluation is only viable when the project activities have been completed and enough time has been provided for the required 'change' to take place. The TSP project has taken three and half years in its execution and while the implementation of intervention has only been effected in the last one year. Thus the impacts, either positive or negative, of the project on the lives of the beneficiaries at this given point is difficult to assess. A suitable option for evaluating the impact will be a post project evaluation in five and ten years from the end of implementation activities.

### **3.5. Promising TSP practices that can be maintained and replicated or scaled up in the future**

*Comprehensive baseline data collection* is necessary for informed decision making. The collection and management of data, to establish the current situation and to monitor progress of interventions is an important step

---

<sup>4</sup> In Apac, Kamdini, Aduku and Ibuje the cleaning activities happen every month, and in Loro and Oyam, they takes place every Tuesday.



in the planning process. The baseline will guide and help define priorities, objectives, targets, indicators and support the formulation of necessary interventions.

### **3.6. Challenges faced in TSP**

Low [involvement of the private sector](#) in sanitation activities of the towns. For the critical component of building standardised toilets and collection of faecal sludge, the involvement of the private sector has been very limited. This is partly due to the fact that there is not yet a market available for these services in small and medium towns. Additionally, due to the low income generation of the inhabitants, sanitation is a low priority for investments and this prohibits the construction and uptake of standardised toilets and emptying services. Additionally, the level of skills of local artisans is low.

Town councils' [resource allocation](#) towards sanitation is limited due to low local revenues. As sanitation related activities do not receive any funding from central government for urban councils, the town councils have to solely rely on local revenues, which is quite low. Thus conducting sanitation related activities competes with other priorities of the town and implementation becomes challenging. Additionally, there is an increasing difficulty in finding funding partners to support activities in urban sanitation.

[Low income levels of majority inhabitants](#) is a challenge that hinders the uptake and scaling up of standardised lined pit latrines, as they are currently perceived to be expensive. Inhabitants still prefer the unlined options as they can be easily erected with minimal resources by local masons. Thus advocating for standardised emptiable toilets is difficult and the progression from unlined to lined pits will not be easily taken up unless there is some financing or subsidies available for the transition.

[Time constraints for STF members](#) as they have several additional responsibilities within the day-to-day activities. These time constraints have caused delays in implementing some activities. The TSP process timeframe needs to be suited to the normal activity lists of the STFs to ensure their active participation.

The regular [transfer of town council staff](#) caused deficiencies in capacities of the STFs and has an impact on the sustainability of such a planning approach. However, the STF is comprised of several members such that whenever there is transfer of staff, an institutional memory remains and activities can thus be carried on.

Issues in [procurement process in local governments](#), for Town Boards. Since funding comes from the district local government, the implementation of the desired sanitation technologies is difficult as most projects are designed by the district. Additionally, there are issues of poor workmanship during construction of sanitation facilities, which are issued by the district local government and the town boards have limited say in matters related to district local government. Town Councils are more autonomous and have relatively higher authority over the procurement and oversight of construction activities.

### **3.7. What should be done differently in future for better scale up of TSP**

#### *Shorten the planning process and phase the implementation activities*

Long and time consuming planning process was a tedious exercise and took a lot of the staff time. Since TSP has to be based on evidence based decision making, the need for a vast amount of data is required and can only be conducted via a city wide survey of the sanitation situation. Such surveys take time and need adequate resources. Additionally, since the planning approach is holistic, there are many varying activities that need to be undertaken to complete the plan and not all town councils have the staff and resources to undertake all the activities. Approximately, 1800 hours of staff time (over 12 months) would be required to develop a TSP. It is recommended that the planning processes be shortened, activities not deemed crucial be eliminated and the activities be proposed in a phased manner.

TSP implementation activities should be closely aligned with the work schedule of the STF members in order to lessen the burden on the STFs.

Additionally, as a pilot project, GIZ has invested considerable resources into the process and subsequently developed numerous outputs that are generic and can be applicable to other towns. The outputs derived from the pilot can be used for scale up at a relatively cheaper costs and lesser time spans.

#### *Build local capacity to take up the process*

In comparison to other top-down consultant driven approaches, the TSP process could be financially expensive to undertake. Building local capacity to take up the process at a cheaper cost would be a more sustainable option in comparison to consultancy approach. Additionally, the cost associated with participatory planning is high, but the results are based on bottom-up decision making and thus could be considered more sustainable in the long run even if initial investments are high. Additionally, the cost is considerably lower if existing government structures are used. WSDF-N estimates that a TSP development for a town with population size of 10,000 inhabitants would cost approximately Uganda Shillings 21 million.

#### *Inclusion of water supply, solid waste management, greywater management and drainage in the TSP*

The TSPs do not consider investments in other associated sectors such as water supply, solid waste management, greywater management and drainage. For scale up, it is recommended that all these aspects are integrated in the planning process, but in addition it should be noted that, inclusion of additional sectors might make the process lengthier and the plans much more complex.

#### *Make the TSP smaller and concise*

The TSP is a lengthy document with many details. A smaller and concise document would have better readability.

#### *Town council implements TSP activities*

The TSPs need a good local partner to support implementation of some of its activities. The number of NGOs and development agencies in smaller towns are low and this could hamper the implementation activities of the TSP. The same could be easier in larger towns where the numbers of agencies are numerous and collaborative efforts to improve sanitation can be easily realised. Nevertheless, implementation through the town council authority would ensure sustainability provided the town councils have adequate capacity to undertake the activities.

#### *Develop a criteria for selection of towns*

This is an important step and should not be overlooked, but rather given careful consideration. Urban settlements are complex and dynamic entities, and are often difficult to analyse whether it is challenging or easy to work with them. The WSDFs could rely on their previous experiences with the towns to narrow down their options, but as a general rule of the thumb, the following pre-requisites must be fulfilled by the proposed towns to undertake the TSP process:

- Interest/motivation shown by the town (political willingness);
- Human capacities of town councils;
- Financial capacity of town councils;
- Organisational capacity of town council
- Population of the towns (larger towns show more promise due to higher capacities);
- Vibrant private sector.

#### *Streamline financing mechanisms and Incentivise TSPs*

The TSP identifies several hardware and software measures to be implemented over a ten year period. Implementation of these activities requires large funding requirements, which might not be easily available to the town councils based on local revenues. Thus there is a need for streamlined financing mechanism to fund at least the hardware interventions in households and institutions as well as to establish faecal sludge management

systems. Additionally, currently there is no national funding scheme available in urban local governments for sanitation improvements. In order to improve the situation in urban settlements, it is proposed that an urban sanitation fund be formulated to channel investments initiated by the TSPs. A part of the fund is also allocated to develop the TSPs in a holistic and participatory manner.

#### *Linking TSP with Town Development Plans*

The TSP and its activities should not be considered as stand-alone, but rather be always integrated into the Town Development Plans for legitimacy and accountability. A TSP sets criteria for planning. It streamlines and guides what needs to be done in the short, mid and long term and thus fits into the yearly planning of the town council. Additionally, TSP identifies gaps which are not stressed out in the planning process of local government and spells out the roles of various stakeholders.

#### *Change format of the TSPs*

Currently the TSPs are in a narrative format, but it should be adapted to which ever form that the STFs deem easy to develop and disseminate. An excel format of the TSP would be easier to update when changes are realised. Additionally, the data collection system could be developed electronically - on the phone. This reduces the effort that is required to transfer data from sheets into electronic format. The different indicators could be fitted within the multi-tab system. Data would be sent directly to the server saving both cost (no data entry systems) and time.

### **4. Overview of the District Investment Planning approach**

#### **Objectives of the DIP**

- To determine financial (Capital and Direct Costs) investments required to achieve water and sanitation for all.
- To ascertain the funding the government can leverage to achieve universal access to WASH.
- To identify key players (NGOs, private sector, CBOs) in the District that can contribute to WASH service provision.

#### **Methodology of the DIP**

Data is collected in the community, healthcare facilities and schools to show the gap in WASH services. With regards to community water, data is collected on the WASH facilities available, the functionality status of the facilities and access to WASH; for community sanitation, data is collected around the costs associated with CLTS and promotional activities like drama and radio shows; for healthcare facility water and sanitation, number of patients, water facilities available, existing sanitation facilities and waste management facilities like incinerators, placenta pits and waste pits; and for school water and sanitation, total enrolment, existing sanitation facilities, type of water facilities and menstrual hygiene facilities like washrooms and incinerators.

A database is created and analysis conducted to determine which population in the community is being served by the available water facilities, and gaps existing in the provision of WASH facilities in schools and healthcare facilities. Using the golden indicators of the Ugandan WASH sector, the population covered and those not covered is computed. Using the per capita costs of investment provided in the strategic sector investment plan for water and sanitation sector in Uganda, the required investment required to reach the unserved population is computed.

Different partners related to WASH provision in the district sit and see what their combined efforts would achieve. Where the efforts cannot meet the expected targets, advocacy and other campaigns can then begin to raise more funds for the district. Available levels of funding are brought, targeted coverage agreed upon and time within which to reach everyone agreed upon. Available annual funding from different partners is computed, compared with the required funding in relation to the time required to serve everyone, and from this computation of the deficit amount

of funding, if the agreed upon targets are to be met, is made. The DIP is then reviewed annually to check for improvements, if anything has changed, and for stakeholders to evaluate progress.

## **5. Lessons learnt from DIP**

### **5.1. Success factors of DIP**

#### *Data collection done by the district using existing structures*

This use of pre-existing staff for collecting data is vital for sustainability of the process. The VHTs, Health Inspectors/ Assistants and hand pump mechanics collect and verify the data before passing it on to the sub-county water boards, who in turn pass it on to the district water office. Hence there is rarely a need of additional human resources to collect and update data other than those already existing within the structure. These can be managed through the budget of the district to ensure financial sustainability.

#### *Participation of different stakeholders*

The active participation between the different stakeholders ensures that decisions are widely accepted. These stakeholders are namely: District Water Officers, District Education Officer, District Health Officer, District Planner, Chief Administrative Officer, politicians (LC 3 and LC 5) and hand pump mechanics. The different stakeholders meet at a workshop, agree on the decisions and fill the information into the DIPs.

#### *Bottom-up approach*

DIP formulation starts at village level, to parish level and finally the district DIP is generated. So, ideally, the formation is ground-up and ensures that the DIP is rooted to ground realities rather than a top-down planning process based on pre-existing assumptions.

#### *Technical Support Unit (TSU)*

The TSU supports district local government to develop the plans. This involvement of a government body ensures accountability that the DIPs are developed and monitored. Additionally, the training and support also ensure the sustainability and up-scalability of the approach. So the process is government driven with WfP only providing technical support to the process.

### **5.2. DIP actions being undertaken on the ground**

#### *Support to the Strategic Investment Plan*

One of the primary objectives of the DIP was to disaggregate the Sector Investment Plan (SIP) of the MWE from a national level to the investment needs at the village level. Currently there are about 80 DIPs prepared and an additional 34 with work in progress.

#### *Determination of costs to reach the unserved*

The DIPs have identified, in 80 districts, the costs required to provide WASH services to fulfil the Sustainable Development Goals. The DIP has identified the villages without access to water and has established ground realities that were not originally seen considering district water coverage figures. More precise information has been generated e.g. water coverage up to village level. Additionally, the DIP has also identified the functional and non-functional systems, and access shortfalls when the non-functional systems are removed. Consequently, DIP helped to identify how many new systems need to be put in place or renovated and how much it costs to reach the unserved population.

#### *DIP as a resource mobilisation tool*

The DIP makes it easy to identify the unserved population and back up the information with data for informed decisions. Additionally, it gives development partners the investment figures to reach the target population within a desired timeframe. The MWE's Rural Water Supply division is collecting the completed DIPs to lobby for funds from international funding agencies. In addition, of the 80 DIPs completed, most of the DIPs have assurances from the donor agencies to fund the investment needs as indicated in the plans.

### **5.3. Unintended outcomes of DIP**

#### *Ownership of the process by the districts and the ministry*

The Ministry of Water and Environment has shown a keen interest in the DIP approach and currently all ten Technical Support Units have been trained and are now undertaking training of the District Water Officers to develop the DIPs. The districts will use it as basis when writing project proposals to obtain funds. Information from the DIPs in the future shall feed into the five year development plan of the district.

#### *Increasing NGOs' and state accountability for resource allocation*

As the DIP process ultimately leads to the implementation plan, where NGOs and the state provide indicative budgets for investments in a particular district, the process ensures a certain level of accountability for resource allocation.

### **5.4. Impact of DIP interventions**

The evaluation of 'impacts' of a project looks at the long-term, deeper changes continued over time. Such an evaluation is only viable when the project activities have been completed and enough time has been provided for the required 'change' to take place. The DIP project has achieved some success in developing over 80 DIPs, but only one has been selected for investments so far. The consultants are of the opinion that more time should be provided for an impact evaluation to truly understand the effective 'change' the DIPs have been responsible for. A suitable option for evaluating the impact will be a post project evaluation in five and ten years to assess the change on the ground.

### **5.5. Promising DIP practices that can be maintained and replicated or scaled up in the future**

The DIP approach is already in the scaling up phase, with more than 80 plans ready and an additional 34 under development. The three most promising practices of the DIP process are: a) the simplicity of the plan template by using Excel based spread sheet, b) embedding the process within the existing government structures for data collection, analysis and compilation, and c) the buy in from the ministry to up-scale the process at a national level. It is advisable that any up-scaling process should learn from the DIP and adapt the three aforementioned factors within its strategy.

### **5.6. Challenges faced in DIP**

*Difficulties in collecting data* from institutions, such as schools and healthcare facilities. Information on schools and healthcare facilities is obtained from the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoE&S) and Ministry of Health (MoH) respectively. However, information systems in the two ministries are not regularly updated. Additionally, MoE&S mainly has data on Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Secondary Education (USE) schools, and not on private schools. As a result, some of the data has to be obtained from the ground.

Additionally, there is *limited cooperation* amongst the different departments in district local government since they consider their contribution to the DIP as extra work load which does not contribute to their performance. In most cases *existing data is inaccurate* and needs to be verified by the TSUs which entails time and resources. Although other departments collect the data, the *data is either aggregated or has different formats* that make it difficult for analysis and use for the purpose of the DIPs. Thus making the formulation time consuming and lengthy.

Donor agencies that are one of the primary funding source usually *have specific target* areas and sectors, that might not necessary relate to the required investment needs of the district, thus making funding the DIPs difficult. Additionally, donor *funding in the region* (northern Uganda) is reducing compared to previous years and thus most districts are receiving a greater portion of their funding from government, which is not sufficient to satisfy the main requirements of the WASH needs.

Budgeting in the districts is based on the *Indicative Planning Figure* (IPF) and not on the needs on the ground. So although the DIP planning is bottom-up, the funding is top-down. So most of the needs remain underserved. Additionally, the IPFs have been reducing every year despite the increasing population.

**Limited finance and human resources** for monitoring and reporting, and to ensure regular updating. The Water grant allocated to districts for data collection is not sufficient to facilitate updating DIPs. Additionally, due to the demanding roles of the district water office staff, extension workers are needed for data collection who provide voluntary services and need to be facilitated.

**Local governments are not lobbying for funds on their own.** They don't initiate projects and they rely mostly on government funding and donors that come with planned projects. The law provides that local governments can seek funding directly even without lobbying through the central government, but this provision is not utilised. However, some donors put their money in a basket funding and it's the central government which decides on how it should be allocated.

### **5.7. What should be done differently in future for better scale up of DIP**

#### *Consider population growth and inflation past the year of development*

The DIP does not consider population change and inflation. This is because if they are considered for all the years, the figures obtained would be considerably high. Additionally, since the DIP value is calculated for every year, then a projection is made for the next year. A population projection is made for the year of development using the average growth rate between 2002 and 2014 when the National Population and Housing Census was held. DIP value is based on dollar rate that changes year after year. DIP gives an indicative figure that can be a basis for funding, but in order to actually implement the given interventions, the values need to be reassessed based on population growth and inflation. The hike in prices might discourage some donors to provide the required investments.

#### *Consider urban WASH more prominently*

The DIP, due to its primary focus on rural water supply and sanitation, considers the urban councils such as town councils and town boards where NWSC does not operate as villages. This needs to be rectified as the investment needs in an urban setting, if the entire sanitation chain is considered, will be considerable high and should be further elaborated to know the actual costs of implementing everyone for ever strategy.

#### *Review the per capita investment cost*

The unit cost considered is based on projections done in 2009, and since technologies have evolved and costs have fluctuated, there is a need for it to be reviewed and modified according to new developments.

#### *Access to water sources*

Villages have different sizes (area) and population densities, and thus the issue of a water point per village may leave some population unserved due to the long distance to a water source. Additionally, some villages can only be served by piped water schemes due to lack of ground water or surface water sources, or they lie near lake shores, and thus considering a unit cost for drilling boreholes for such areas would not be appropriate. Therefore, it is recommended that the DIP provides water facilities based on the local context.

#### *Develop indicators based on Sustainable Development Goals*

In addition to providing information to the MWE, the collected data should also be provided to the statistical department for further records and analysis. As the monitoring mechanism of the SDGs will in the future be handled by the statistical departments, efforts should be made to modify the indicators of the DIPs such that reporting from local, to national and to global level is easily achievable, efforts are not duplicated and resources not wasted.

The DIP can prove to be a formidable tool to the statistical department in collecting vital information on water and sanitation status for monitoring the SDGs. Efforts should be made to present and promote this tool to relevant persons in the statistical department for further consideration.

Based on the resource available for monitoring SDGs, the funds can be utilised to further develop, improve and upscale the DIP.

#### *Develop toilet standards*

CLTS should define the required toilet technology, since there is always need for retriggering as the basic sanitation technologies (ordinary pit latrines constructed using wattle and daub), which have been promoted so far, are prone to collapse, difficult to clean and the users undergo relapse.

Additionally, as agreed by the 47th Session of the UN Statistical Commission, the global core indicator for SDG target 6.2 is the "Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a handwashing facility with water and soap". This indicator puts emphasis on safe sanitation systems and there is a need to define standards of sanitation systems, even in rural settlements.

#### *Develop a bottom-up reporting system*

Develop a reporting system right from village level to report to the district to ensure constant updating of data via an electronic reporting (use of mobile phones). For example, once a water source is broken, it is reported directly by the users to the district, including the necessary stakeholders for further consideration. Additionally, Sub-county water boards (a reporting structure) are being piloted in Lira to look at how the O&M of water sources will be done. However, the ministry has not supported the structure and it requires a policy to support its implementation.

#### *Institutionalising the DIP*

Government should institutionalise the DIP as a reporting tool and make it a requirement for districts to use as their investment allocation criteria in the aspect of water and sanitation. In this case government would facilitate the production of DIPs. Additionally, the commitment of district staff would increase if the DIP influenced how much IPF they get.

#### *Review the DIP annually in a participatory process.*

Via a stakeholder forum at the district level, the DIP should be annually reviewed and updated by political and technocratic bodies. Additionally, provision for such fora to take place should be made available by the district local governments. The political mobilisation for the DIP should be further elaborated, such that additional funds can be accessed via the state and development partners. Political support is vital for the success and up-scaling the implementation of DIPs

#### *Self-supporting DIP monitoring process*

Planning is not a static process and to ensure the sustainability of the monitoring of DIPs, the DIP should also include among its investments plan, a financial mechanism to facilitate its own review and modification. The funds for such process, e.g. data collection, review and decision making, can be accessed either by the donors or the state.

#### *Create model districts and fund them to see improvement*

Support promising districts to write proposals to donors to fund them as models. Once the project is successful, the DIP can then be rolled out to wider Uganda.

#### *Provision of access to water sources for the disabled*

Whereas persons with disabilities (PWDs) are considered in the provision of sanitation facilities for schools and health centres, no attempt to segregate data is made for the water sources. Some designs have been made in some regions to accommodate PWDs/ marginalised groups.

## **6. Harmonisation of the two approaches**

There are fundamental differences in the objectives of the two approaches, the DIP aims at providing the MWE with investment needs primarily in the rural water. Rural sanitation is only subject to awareness creation. The TSP aims at coordinated strategic planning at a town council level, focusing primarily at urban sanitation with a systems approach and defining investments only at the town council level.

Additionally, the funding sources are separated with the DIPs ensured funding from the state and support from donors, but the TSPs rely on donor funding, locally generated revenues and state funding for larger public infrastructure.

Harmonising the two approaches would essentially mean that the TSP becomes a part of the DIP, but if done so, the DIP needs to further elaborate on the urban context with regards to water supply and sanitation needs. Harmonising the two approaches would neither benefit the DIP nor the TSP significantly and would be complicated given the fact that the two processes are quite different. The only benefit currently perceived is if the baseline and monitoring systems from the two could be merged, the analysis would give a more complete picture of the urban and rural water and sanitation situation in a given district to the MWE.

Thus the consultants feel that harmonising the two approaches, currently and within the context of this assignment, will not bring any added value. And propose that planning and investment needs of urban and rural context should be kept separated until a unified water and sanitation policy is defined.

## **7. Conclusions**

Both approaches have presented a logical way forward to prioritise investments needs that are required to improve the water and sanitation service situation over a period of time. Both have their pros and cons in their approaches and several issues could be improved. But in both cases, the common crucial factor is funding or financing of WASH infrastructure and services. So then the question arises “do we plan to attract funds or do we plan because we have funds?” It is an open question with an open answer, “it depends” on the opportunities that lie ahead of us. Scanning for opportunities to finance the plan is as important as developing the plans. May it be DIP or the TSP, these plans will merely be paper tigers if none of the interventions highlighted in them are implemented.

So while we develop such plans, we must also look for opportunities and make concerted efforts to finance these plans, or else, the time and effort spent on developing the plans are a wasteful exercise and will only lead to frustration for the persons involved in the process. To expect, the district or local governments to lobby for funds would be a tall order. So we must start to think of ways to provide the local governments with an incentives based approach, where the best plans get funded. This would require a government – donor co-financed programme that would present a structured approach to financing infrastructure and service provision in Uganda.



## Annex – List of Interviewees

No.	Name	Designation	Organisation
1	Odongo Tom	Chairperson Head Teachers Association	Aduku STF
2	Oloro Denis	Law Enforcement Officer	Aduku STF
3	Otim Peter	Deputy Mayor of Aduku for Mayor Aduku (member of STF)	Aduku STF
4	Abih George	Senior Treasurer	Aduku STF
5	Okello Robby	Health Inspector/ Secretary STF/ Liaison Officer	Aduku STF
6	Akwang Nicholas	Town Clerk/ Chairperson STF	Aduku STF
7	Opio Roy	Physical Planner	Aduku STF
8	Kyomugisha Sheila	Branch Manager NWSC Aduku	Aduku STF
9	Obongi Tomson	Assistant Community Development Officer	Aduku STF
10	Kalimo Gerald	Health Inspector	Apac STF
11	Odongo Francis	District Engineer	Apac STF
12	Okol Patrick George	Senior Assistant Town Clerk	Apac STF
13	Ocan Joseph	Senior Human Resource Officer	Apac STF
14	Koli Beatrice R.	Senior Community Development Officer	Apac STF
15	Aleny David Omara	Senior Law Enforcement Officer	Apac STF
16	Ngura Moses	Senior Health Inspector	Apac STF
17	Onguu Patrick Elvis	Senior Assistant Town Clerk	Apac STF
18	Akora Sam Dennis	Head of Finance/ Town Treasurer	Apac STF
19	Freddie Odu Ojoko	Media	Apac STF
20	Omong Alex Tobby	Senior Assistant Town Clerk – Arocha	Apac STF
21	Ogweng Emmy	Planner	Apac STF
22	Ogwang Tonny	Deputy Town Clerk/ Chairperson STF	Apac STF
23	Janet Odongo	Senior Assistant Secretary/ Chairperson STF	Ibuje STF
24	Jawaso Alfred	Business man	Ibuje STF
25	Agum Jasper	Health Assistant	Ibuje STF
26	Ogwal Daniel	Environmental Health Assistant/ STF Secretary and Liaison officer	Ibuje STF
27	Abba Roy Denis	Head teacher	Ibuje STF
28	Eyoko Emmanuel	Health Assistant/ Liaison Officer STF	Kamdini STF
29	Ojera Francis	Water Operator	Kamdini STF
30	Geoffrey Kasozi O.	Water Board member	Kamdini STF
31	Okech Geoffrey	Senior Assistant Secretary/ Chairperson STF	Kamdini STF
32	Acar Fidelity	Health Inspector	Kamdini STF
33	Ogwang Sam Paul	LCIII Chairman	Kamdini STF
34	Etot Jimmy	Assistant Fisheries Officer/ Environmental Focal Person	Loro STF
35	Odoch Robert	Community Development Officer	Loro STF
36	Kaloro Salisbunny Achini	Health Assistant	Loro STF
37	Otucu Gody Marrush	Health Assistant	Loro STF
38	Ogo Dennis	Senior Assistant Secretary/ Chairperson STF	Loro STF
39	Ojok Eunice	Education Officer	Oyam STF
40	Ndahira Michael	STF member	Oyam STF
41	Aber Harriet	Health Inspector	Oyam STF
42	Aguti Joyce	Community Development Officer	Oyam STF
43	Mugenyi Silus	Health Assistant	Oyam STF
44	Vicky Ayepa	Town Clerk/ Chairperson STF	Oyam STF
45	Ajok Semmy	Town Agent	Oyam STF
46	Emmanuel Ojara Sunday	Senior Program Manager	ILF
47	Patricia Anango	Project Officer for Sanitation and Hygiene	ILF

48	Diana Keesiga	Programme Engineer	WFP
49	Cate Nimanya	Country Director	WFP
50	Godfrey Byarugaba	TSU-2 Team Leader	MWE
51	Hardson Omoko	Water Officer Lira	Lira District
52	Othembo Samson	Water Officer Kole	Kole District
53	Ongom Emmanuel	Assistant District Water Officer Apac	Apac District
54	Okello Nelson	District Water Officer Apac	Apac District
55	Owiny Freddie	Water Officer Dokolo	Dokolo District
56	Ekilu Peter	For District Health Officer	Dokolo District
57	Ogwal Alfred	Physical Planner	Dokolo District
58	Otim Moses	For Chief Administrative Officer	Dokolo District