



Madagascar WASH Sector Service Provision: Bottleneck Assessment

[DRAFT] Final Report

January 2014

Peter Ryan WASH Consulting

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
Madagascar WASH Sector in Crisis	1
WASH BAT – a sector diagnostic and more	2
Objectives	3
Structure of the report	3
WASH BAT conduct in Madagascar	4
2. Enabling Factors in the Madagascar WASH Sector.....	6
National Level	6
Community and Service Provider Levels.....	7
Sustainability Check.....	8
Overall	8
3. Bottleneck Removal.....	10
Co-ordination and Planning	10
Sustainability and Scaling Up	13
Sector Finance	15
Private Sector	17
Society and Culture	19
4. Next Steps.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Priority Actions	22

Acknowledgments

Particular thanks to Silvia Gaya, Rivo Noelson, Sitraka Dimbisoa Rajaonalison, Jo Ravalomanda and the rest of the WASH team at UNICEF Madagascar; and to Andrew Trevett at UNICEF HQ in New York for his help and guidance.

The commitment and inputs of the Secretary General, the Director General and all of the Directors at the Ministry of Water are also gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, special thanks to the many members of the Madagascar WASH sector who gave freely and enthusiastically of their time and knowledge.

Of course, responsibility for errors and omissions rests with me alone.

Peter Ryan, Antananarivo, January 2014.

1. Introduction

The Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT) is a response to the needs of the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector to better diagnose and solve to the key challenges it faces. The tool has its roots in another tool, the Marginal Budgeting for Bottlenecks (MBB) tool, which was developed for the health sector more than 10 years ago¹. The aim of the MBB tool is to assist countries in developing appropriate strategies to accelerate progress toward the health and nutrition Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In a step-wise approach, the tool identifies hurdles or “bottlenecks” hampering the delivery of health services, investment required to remove these bottlenecks, and the health outcomes achieved. The tool has proven to be particularly useful in helping ministries of health prepare results-oriented national health strategic plans, expenditure programs and health budgets. In the recognition of the health improvements associated with improved WASH services, the MBB tool contains a WASH component. This component has been applied in several countries. However, the WASH component is not highly detailed and does not incorporate recent developments in WASH sector diagnostics, including the important role of strengthening the policies and knowledge that make up what has been termed the ‘enabling environment’.

WASH BAT Methodology Description, UNICEF 2013 (unpublished) Page 6

Madagascan WASH Sector in Crisis

The WASH sector has fallen into crisis in Madagascar. Less than half of the population has access to safe drinking water, while new figures show that only one in ten Malagasy has a hygienic place to defecate – a figure which is dramatically lower than previous estimates, indicating (if the figure is correct) that the country languishes near the foot of the global sanitation coverage table.

Given recent announcements about the apparent major reduction in government finance for the sector next year (to a level of one third that for 2013), add to that the reticence of donors to engage in the country in the years period following the 2009 coup, then the use of the word *crisis* is appropriate.

The position of WASH sector participants historically has been, in the face of such dismal figures, to press try and ahead with proposals, finance and programmes for scaling up capital investment in infrastructure. The rush to scale has often been unsuccessful, partly because of the lack of support given to communities who have largely been left on their own to manage water supplies infrastructure and sanitation facilities once implementing organisations have departed the scene. This lack of sustainability is a critical feature of the Madagascan WASH landscape, one that has been separately analysed and reported in parallel².

¹ The MBB tool was developed by UNICEF, the World Bank and the Ministries of Health in several countries.

² See Madagascar WASH Sector – Sustainability Check; a report for UNICEF by the same author, January 2014.

WASH BAT – a sector diagnostic and more

The lack of progress in reaching WASH targets led to sector participants developing a number of sector diagnostics tools with the aim of creating a better understanding of problems and therefore paving the way to solutions, as is indicated in the WASH BAT methodology paper³:

“Since 2006, the WASH sector applied its own bottleneck methodology on the African continent, known as the Country Status Overviews (CSO). These studies identified the ways in which investments can be made to overcome systemic bottlenecks in the sector, from policies and strategies to outputs, service uptake and use. The CSO tool was developed by the World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme and has been rolled out in Africa through a partnership of organisations including AMCOW, UNICEF, WaterAid and others. More recently, the GLAAS global initiative⁴ and also initiatives in other regions have developed – known as MAPAS in Latin America and Service Delivery Assessments in Asia. These collectively underline the importance of sector diagnostics and improving the enabling environment as important steps in a process to accelerate WASH sector progress.

In the second application of the CSO exercise in Africa in 2011 (AMCOW, 2011), a total of 27 indicators were defined under three service delivery cycles, with three building blocks per cycle, and three assessment areas per building block, covering:

- ‘Establishing’ delivery cycle includes the building blocks of policy, planning and budget.
- ‘Enabling’ delivery cycle includes the building blocks of expenditure, equity and output.
- ‘Sustaining’ delivery cycle includes the building blocks of maintenance, expansion and use.

As well as the approach of the CSO, the WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool ... also integrates the approaches and concepts of other recent tools and initiatives in the WASH sector. These include:

1. The Service Delivery Approach (SDA) has been the thinking underlying the development of the WASHCost methodology implemented by the IRC International Centre for Water and Sanitation (Moriarty et al., 2010, Potter et al., 2010). The SDA emphasises two key aspects: (a) the *level* of WASH service is attained from any given action; and (b) the actions that lead to *sustained* service delivery.
2. Enabling environments assessments have been carried out by the Water and Sanitation Program (WSP) in several countries, in the context of defining national programmes to scale up sanitation and hygiene interventions (Rosensweig, 2008).
3. MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) was initiated in 2010 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to focus attention on off-track MDG targets as well as off-track countries (UNDP, 2011). The MAF uses a bottleneck approach, and has been applied in the WASH sector.
4. On-going internal initiatives of sector agencies. For example, as part of its system to define and monitor programmes, UNICEF has defined indicators areas that focus on key sector bottlenecks. Four type of bottleneck are distinguished, focusing on the enabling environment, supply factors, demand factors and quality factors, and each country can

³ WASH BAT Methodology Description; UNICEF New York 2013, unpublished – the text here is slightly abridged from the original, for reasons of context

⁴ The UN-Water *Global Level Assessment and Analysis of Drinking Water and Sanitation* (GLAAS).

choose indicators that best answer to their needs. For its own monitoring and reporting purposes, the World Bank Water and Sanitation Program has defined a scoring system for a range of 'intermediate' outcomes which increases the program's focus on resolving key sector bottlenecks.

Hence, the WASH-BAT has drawn on these methodologies and proposes a comprehensive set of enabling factors operating at different levels of the service delivery system, which stimulate the tool user to think through which are the major constraints on sector progress in their own setting and the requirements and consequences of removing them.

Objectives

The overall aim of the WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT) is to increase WASH sector resources and efficiency to achieve more scaled-up, sustainable and equitable outcomes. This is achieved through:

1. Facilitation of dialogue with sector partners. The implementation of the recommendations of the tool assures decision makers including financiers that both existing and new expenditures are being evaluated in terms of how they optimally contribute to WASH sector aims.
2. Emphasis on utilizing limited sector resources to their best ends, in particular on the removal of major barriers to WASH sector development. The tool provides a rational, evidence-based approach for formulating an investment strategy that meets multiple sector aims of efficiency, equity and sustainability.

The tool essentially facilitates the user to:

- Assess the key enabling factors for the WASH sector to develop;
- Identify bottlenecks that constrain sector progress;
- Propose (sequenced) activities for the removal of bottlenecks;
- Estimate resource requirements and costs of bottleneck removal;
- Identify gaps in existing sector funding and propose priorities for utilization of additional funds; and
- Link bottleneck removal to increases in WASH coverage and broader development objectives.

The application of the tool is expected to be a collaborative effort, involving a range of WASH sector stakeholders and external partners. The tool is also defined to cater to different types of user and hence provides flexibility in scope, focus and informational outputs. This may involve focus on specific components of the tool, or application in varying levels of detail”.

Structure of the report

In this report, we summarise the methodology and present the outcomes of the WASH BAT analysis as follows:

- the conduct of the methodology as used in Madagascar is set out in the remainder of this Chapter.

- The key enabling factors within the Madagascar WASH sector, as identified in the WASH BAT process, are highlighted in Chapter 2.
- Then in Chapter 3, we identify the bottlenecks as identified and the activities recommended by WASH BAT participants to remove them.
- Finally, in Chapter 4, the recommended next steps are presented.

WASH BAT conduct in Madagascar

To enable disaggregation of the tool outputs and to meet the needs of different potential users, the WASH BAT is modular, facilitating distinctions to be made in both data entry and tool outputs. The main components are as follows:

- Two sub-sectors: water supply and sanitation & hygiene.
- Two jurisdictions: urban and rural.
- Four levels: national; sub-national administration; service provider and community & household level.

The process is carried out in a workshop setting, with sector personnel discussing and agreeing (or agreeing to disagree!) on the inputs into the model, which is a complex Excel spreadsheet. In other settings, the process has been undertaken in a continuous five day session. However, when preparations were being made to undertake the WASH BAT in Madagascar, it became clear very early on that conducting a five day workshop was not going to be appropriate. It was felt that there were three factors involved, as follows:

1. The WASH sector in Madagascar is not particularly coherent and co-ordinated; so to expect the jump forward in this regard that is implied, by asking everyone to attend for five consecutive days, was felt not to be logical.
2. The GLAAS process was just being undertaken at the same time as preparations were being made to do the BAT. While there is considerable overlap between these two processes, indeed there is a good body of evidence to suggest that they could in the future be formally linked, it was clear that it would not be feasible to ask sector colleagues to get engaged in another sector wide process when they had just spent a lot of time and effort on GLAAS.
3. Most importantly, WASH BAT guidance rightly stresses the need to have senior figures from relevant agencies involved, including from the line ministry/ies, the Ministry of Finance, donors, INGOs, civil society, utilities, the wider private sector... The expectation is that decision makers will attend, and so decisions could be made within the BAT meetings, instead of requiring consultation in all the various agencies afterwards, and the loss of momentum and co-ordination that would inevitably follow. In the Madagascar context, it was simply not reasonable to expect the highest level staff from sector partners to attend for five days, certainly not consecutively.

For these reasons we decided split the process into constituent elements but without losing the participative element (indeed with the aim of strengthening it).

As noted above, the BAT is modular and sequential in structure and has been constructed so that different parts in effect could be done at different times and can be added together, albeit with a lot of care in the prior preparation. There are four modules and there are four “levels” of analysis too

(these can usefully be considered as viewpoints): the national level, sub national (regional) level, local (i.e. community) level and the service providers' level.

In essence therefore the choice was to consider which of the potential analyses were most appropriate in the local context, and when they should be carried out.

It was agreed with the Ministry of Water to conduct the WASH BAT as follows:

1. Enabling factors. This is a discussion and scoring of these factors, split into any number of the above sub sets as is desired. It was judged that it was not necessary for the entire sector to be involved in this; certainly it was felt that senior level staff were unlikely to want to do so. This scoring was therefore undertaken by way of a preparatory event, in a workshop carried out in the Conference Room at the Ministry of Water HQ building in Antananarivo, on 5th November 2013.
2. Bottleneck analysis. This is the identification of bottlenecks that have given rise to the (low) scores identified in the previous step. Best practise indicated that this was most effectively combined with the steps to identify the *causes* of the bottlenecks and the discussion of *activities* to remove them. Initially, this was undertaken at the national level only; the service provider and community levels were conducted afterwards. It was agreed that the regional level would not be undertaken. All relevant sector actors were invited to take part in these activities (one or the other, or both, according to their institution).
3. Costing and financing bottleneck removal activities. In the event, this was done in outline, as the outcomes of the first parts of the analysis were heavily policy orientated and also due to timescale pressures. The figures are not presented here but can provide an input into next steps as required and deemed to be helpful.

So, steps 2 and 3 were undertaken at the *national* level in a workshop held at the "Titan" meeting hall at UNICEF Antananarivo, on 7th and 8th November 2013, while these steps were also undertaken for the *service provider* and *community* levels, in a one day meeting held at the Ibis Hotel, Antananarivo, on 19th November 2013.

In the remainder of this report the results are presented for each level separately, but findings and outcomes are combined to yield a composite output.

2. Enabling Factors in the Madagascar WASH Sector

The first stage in the WASH BAT analysis assessed the features of the sector which are drivers of success or failure in meeting sustainable WASH service delivery targets. This was done by scoring groups of factors at different “levels” in the sector, as indicated in the previous Chapter to be the national level, the community level and the level of service providers. The analysis allows for differentiation between urban and rural areas, and between sanitation & hygiene and drinking water. The following text addresses these levels in turn.

National Level

The scores are shown overleaf for each main factor. With a maximum of 6, it can be seen that none attain a sufficiently high score to merit a green condition indicator (5.4+). The table, instead, is comprised of a large number of factors scoring between 3-1 and 5.3 (yellow), and 3.0 or less (red)⁵. It is noteworthy that the factors towards the top of the table relate to matters of policy and institutions, while those lower in the table relate to elements that impact more directly on service delivery.

That being the case, it is clearly visible that the institutional and policy factors higher in the table score generally at a reasonable level while many of those relating to service delivery lower in the table indicate significant concern. It is also immediately apparent that sanitation & hygiene scores worse than drinking water, and those for rural areas are worse than those for urban areas.

Scores at national level	EP urbain:	EP rurale:	AH urbain:	AH rurale:
Cadre juridique approprié	4	4	3.6	3.6
Politique de WASH approuvée et utilisée	4.4	4.4	4	4
Cibles de WASH sont réalisées et pro-pauvres	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.8
Les normes sociales	2.4	2	2.4	2.2
Le leadership institutionnel	3.4	2.4	3.6	3.6
Coordination des acteurs	4	3.6	3	2.8
Plan d'investissement	2.6	2.2	0.8	0.8
Programmation (plans du travail)	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.6
Revue annuelle	3.6	3.6	1.4	1.2
Secteur et la surveillance des services	4	3.4	3.6	2.6
Analyse de l'équité	1	1	0.4	0.4
Budget et l'adéquation des dépenses	2.4	2.2	0.4	0.4
Budgétisation nationale	1.6	0.6	1.2	1
Utilisation du budget	3.4	3.4	0.6	0.6
Décentralisation	2.4	2.2	3.4	3.4
Promotion et mise à l'échelle des services	2.2	2	3	1.4
Développement du secteur privé	2.6	2	3.2	1.2
La chaîne d'approvisionnement et de services	2.4	1.2	1.8	0.6

Note: EP: Eau potable (drinking water); A&H: Assainissement et l'hygiène (sanitation and hygiene)..

⁵ So, in black and white print outs or copies of this report, red will show as dark, yellow as light shading.

Community and Service Provider Levels

The same method was used for the other two levels addressed, being rural communities, and service providers. Owing to their different nature, the different range of factors was analysed for those levels; the results are shown and then discussed, in turn, below.

Scores pour communautaires rurales	EP	A&H
Les normes sociales	3.2	2.6
Participation locale	3.4	1.4
Gestion des services (pour la gestion communautaires)	3.2	0.6
Financement abordable	2.4	0.4

A clear differentiation is visible between the results for the drinking water assessment and that for sanitation and hygiene. Nonetheless, those for drinking water are hovering around the red zone, while those for sanitation are firmly in it. So, it can be deduced that, against all criteria, problems exist, the most clearly shown being simply a lack of finance to do what is required. Deficiencies in management, little or no support for communities and a lack of a supportive cultural and traditional backdrop for successful and sustainable WASH service development, are all areas of concern.

The final “level” that was considered is that of the service providers. The scores from that analysis are presented below.

Scores des fournisseurs de services urbaines	EP	A&H
Plan d'expansion et de la maintenance	3.2	0.8
Les pratiques de gestion	3.8	3.2
Le développement des capacités	3.6	2.6
Procédures de gestion financière	3.8	3.8
Outils pour améliorer la fourniture des services	2.2	2.4
Le suivi et l'évaluation de services	1.6	1.6
Services financièrement durables	2	1.6
La durabilité environnementale	3.4	2.6
L'abordabilité et la disponibilité des services	1.2	1
La chaîne d'approvisionnement et de services	0.8	1

In this instance, the participants were asked primarily to concentrate on the environment and performance of service providers in the urban context, although in the case of urban areas outside Tana, the major towns are small by comparison – so the context in the capital as often seen as quite different from other “urban” locations. Despite this, there remain clear general lessons that can be drawn. Incentives for improving the supply chain, in fact, for the private sector as a whole in the provision of enhanced services are largely absent: the environment for that sector to take up the mantle required is in need of urgent attention.

Demonstrably, this is most marked in the area of sanitation & hygiene, where poverty of expansion plans, capacity shortcomings, lack of tools for service delivery improvement, poor M&E, absence of models for scaling up and diversification, environmental shortcomings and – most of all – poor service level affordability, and the absence of the necessary supply chains - are all in need of urgent consideration.

Sustainability Check

This view of the issues at the community level are supported by the initial findings from the Sustainability Check⁶ – a research activity to identify current service levels in both rural water supply and in terms of the durability of Open Defecation Free areas.

The analysis shows that over a quarter (27%) of water services were not functioning on the day of the survey visit, and that on average, systems are functional for only nine months a year.

While many of the basics are often in place in the form of a contribution in cash or kind to construction; a gender balanced WASH Committee and payment for the water as a contribution to operation and maintenance costs. However, communities receive little or no support from local government, which in turn receives little from regional government – so the vital chain of support is not present. This, when allied to huge distances to obtain spares and the increasing populations served by infrastructure, means that the future picture for rural water service sustainability is bleak.

In terms of sustaining open defecation free areas, the analysis showed that less than half of communities that have been declared ODF remain so now, only a quarter of those initially “triggered” in CLTS processes are ODF. The levels of toilet availability and usage, and particularly of handwashing, vary from low to extremely low. The implications for health, education and wider development are clear, and ominous.

Overall

So, it is clear that there are many areas, at all levels, of the Madagascar WASH sector that require attention. These can usefully be coalesced into five main axes, which are summarised below.

1. Co-ordination and planning: while the institutional leadership was shown as moderate in this analysis, it did emerge that there are two serious sector shortcomings: a lack of formal sector leadership and the fact that the sector is not a learning one. These items therefore also feature later in the analysis. The lack of decentralised (or de-concentrated) capacity to the regions and communes was seen as critical – so however good the institutional capacity at the centre in Antananarivo, this counts for much less when the resources away from the capital are considered.
2. Sustainability and scaling up: although the ultimate aim of the sector is stated as being to reach greater levels of coverage, there is an absence of the current state of the art sector knowledge on two critical issues that form the basis of getting there. These revolve around the transformation of concepts central to the sector, from providing *infrastructure* to scaling up and sustaining *service delivery*. A near absence of real support for communities when their water service is interrupted is emerging from the analysis, while the low level of ODF sustainability points to a critical absence of follow up and resources for facility improvement by community members, after triggering has been completed and the first wave of construction of latrines has been completed

⁶ See *Madagascar WASH Sector – Sustainability Check*; a report by UNICEF for the government of Madagascar, by the same author. January 2014. Available from Min Eau or UNICEF.

3. Sector finance: the analysis indicated a critical shortcoming here, comprising a lack of finance to allow for programmatic intervention at a meaningful level to allow scaling up, a lack of absorptive capacity (the budget utilisation heading). This is compounded by a lack of consideration of equity, meaning that where programmes are being undertaken, considerations the ultra-poor are in danger of being excluded.
4. Private sector: a lack of engagement, lack of relevant skills, the absence or immaturity of markets for involvement, and the absence of a credible supply chain were all major contributory factors. The near absence of a vibrant private sector from the WASH sector is seen as a fundamental weakness.
5. Society & culture: it was observed that wider society is not engaged in WASH, that the fact that the low rate of sanitation and hygiene coverage is, essentially, a national emergency does not receive anything like the recognition and support it requires. This is reflected in a lack of support from local traditional leader and from more modern cultural elements, like use of media and celebrities. The fact that professionals see a sector in crisis is not reflected in wider thinking.

3. Bottleneck Removal

So, having identified the problems and their root causes in the previous section, the WASH BAT analysis moved to actions to confront them. We turn to this in here.

The main activities of the sector that are required to meet the need identified in the previous section are identified in detail here, using the main headings of the bottleneck analysis but combining the analyses carried out for national, community and service provider levels, as there was considerable overlap. There is no separate section for capacity development – this is not considered separately in the BAT analysis as capacity issues are considered to be critical across the whole range of issues in the sector.

For ease of reading, the analysis has been further grouped into the main headings mentioned above, of co-ordination and planning, sustainability and scaling up, sector finance, private sector, and society & culture.

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
Co-ordination and Planning		
<p>Co-ordination des acteurs Government does not have a sector-wide approach to WASH, with government agencies and donors harmonized and supporting its implementation.</p>	<p>There are a number of co-ordinating mechanisms but, in combination, they do not add up to provide the benefits of a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp). The failure of the current sector processes to make serious inroads in coverage terms and the dramatic collapse in government funding for WASH in 2014 means that this is now vital. It is worth noting too, that the Min Eau (Director of Finance) presentation at the Joint Sector Review meeting about the location of donors’ activities gives further evidence for the need for this step to be taken.</p> <hr/> <p>The political environment is poor at the moment</p>	<p>Institute SWAp implementation process through advocating within government and across the sector, indeed into the health and education sectors too.</p> <p>This step requires the buy in of all WASH sector actors, especially including donors and so requires a well-considered set-up process, over a period of some years, utilising the experience of other countries that have gone down this route.</p> <hr/> <p>Ensure adherence of donors to Paris declaration by</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
	and governance remains weak. Conditionality are (still) retained by donors, many of whom do not adhere to the demands of the Paris Declaration.	clarity of actions and responsibilities in sector review documents and then through their full engagement in SWAp processes when that is implemented.
<p>Décentralisation Decentralisation (deconcentration) in Madagascar remains in its infancy, so sector actors in levels from regional to communities themselves do not have sufficient capacity and are not guided and supported in playing their roles.</p>	<p>There is critically insufficient institutional capacity at all levels outside the capital’s central government structure.</p> <hr/> <p>Ineffective prioritization of the sector in the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRD 22) which many WASH BAT participants felt to be outdated.</p> <hr/> <p>Existing laws are not implemented in the ground.</p> <hr/> <p>Absence of capacity means absence of advocacy strength, resulting in (among other things) a lack of budget, in turn leading to antiquated infrastructure, lack of necessary maintenance and renewal.</p>	<p>Strengthening capacities (principally financial, human resources and material and, in some cases, technical) as far down as Commune level – this is fundamental to making any serious progress in sustainable WASH service provision. This requires a full study and evaluation of sector capacity which should be carried out urgently.</p> <hr/> <p>Review PRD22 and make recommendations accordingly for incoming government.</p> <hr/> <p>Conduct diagnostic and then ensure effective application of the law including local traditional by-laws.</p> <hr/> <p>A thorough review of capital, capital maintenance and O&M is costs needed (in line with WASH Cost⁷ principles) in order to confirm the full picture of sector finance needs. This will lead to a strategy and business plan for the sector. All main sector actors should undergo WASH Cost training.</p>
<p>Plan d’investissement Annual (or multi-year) work plans for WASH are insufficiently developed, reviewed,</p>	<p>Current implementation is only partial – so only partial information is available to sector actors; additionally, some sector actors are not</p>	<p>Sector wide planning forms part of the SWAp mandate discussed under the <i>co-ordination and planning</i> heading above.</p>

⁷ WASH Cost was a study funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to address issues of costing in the sector globally. Amongst other things, it recommended a universal structure of costing in the WASH sector, in order that all costs – not just the main capital and operating costs, are addressed. A simple, free, training programme is available.

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
<p>implemented, and evaluated based on the available budget.</p>	<p>transparent and do not have a sharing mentality, so there is an information log-jam.</p>	<p>Disseminate the planning document widely, including by posting on the website of the Ministry for donors to engage and respond. Wider dissemination will help to ensure accountability and ensure adherence to commitments in the MOUs of external partners.</p>
	<p>The plan does not indicate priorities so it is effectively an inflexible tool. Note also that the document is not validated and not yet endorsed by the PTF (Partners Technique et Financiers).</p>	
	<p>Only Tana has a strategic urban sanitation plan for its communes and peri-urban areas.</p>	<p>Finalize the drafting of an urban sanitation strategy for other urban centres.</p>
	<p>Five year plan exists but not disseminated,</p>	<p>Disseminate the FYP with information and triggering.</p>
<p>Revue annuelle Annual review does not sufficiently monitor WASH sector activities and outcomes, and does not have sufficient participation from stakeholders, to enable setting of new actions and targets.</p>	<p>The current context of the political crisis is not conducive for an open review system. Also, frequent change of officials in the Ministry means that continuity is difficult or impossible.</p>	<p>Actors need to advocate for continuity of service of high quality staff and, wherever possible, for the de-politicisation of Ministry activities. It is noted that there is a need for active and vigorous discussions of the allocation of resources to WASH which is acknowledged as a political issue.</p>
	<p>Bad timing, overlap and inadequacy in scheduling of the Review process.</p>	<p>Time the Annual Review to occur after April each year.</p>
	<p>Lack of accountability, partial compliance in reporting and lack of dissemination – in particular the recommendations of previous Reviews not applied/followed up</p>	<p>Implementation of a Technical Advisory Group, reporting obligations of sector actors and holding them to account. This group should be part of the SWAp mechanism and accountable to it.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
<p>Analyse de l'équité There is no periodic analysis by government or civil society organizations to assess equitable service outcomes of WASH programmes, and to address whether or not equity criteria been applied in funding decisions.</p>	<p>There is a lack of reliable, credible and disaggregated data/info on equity and, moreover, the need for data <i>and action</i> on this issue is neglected.</p>	<p>Implementation of a system for independent (civil society led) monitoring of the achievement of equity and human rights. The Min Eau Management Information System should be revised to include equity issues specifically and be included in reporting mechanisms as a matter of course. If Technical Assistance is needed then it should be provided. As a high priority, a study of equity of WASH service provision should be undertaken in 2014. Ensure that <u>all</u> WASH planning documents specifically provide details of equity related matters.</p>
<p>Sustainability and Scaling Up</p>		
<p>Promotion et mise à l'échelle des services Tools for promoting WASH have not been specifically adapted before being used at scale through a national programme.</p>	<p>Donors are reluctant to provide increased resources, particularly funds for capital programmes, due to the political context.</p>	<p>The sector has no role in resolving the political crisis (it is hoped that the 2013 Presidential Election process will lead to that conclusion) but it can and should redouble its advocacy efforts in order to attract new priority, commitment and finance for the sector. This can be based upon the promise of sector governance enhancements (SWAp and deconcentration / decentralisation), and using the evidence gained from existing coverage figures, the outputs from the sustainability check study, the results of the equity, capacity and cost requirement studies which are mentioned in this analysis as being urgently need. The sector can also get cleverer in the way it</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
		<p>conducts its domestic and international advocacy, in order to be more effective. The sector needs a special meeting urgently; to develop a unified action plan for advocacy and conduct this together, rather than individually, as this approach has patently failed.</p>
	<p>Poor quality plus a lack of support for local people means that when the inevitable failure occurs, their willingness and ability to solve the problems are limited.</p>	<p>The recommended actions to accelerate the deconcentration / decentralisation process and to conduct a study of capacities will start to address these fundamental issues.</p>
	<p>Infrastructure increasing fails due to age and lack of maintenance capacity. Also, poor management and lack of training of community members and local agencies.</p>	<p>Adopt approach based upon service delivery (all sector actor need to make themselves aware, and sign up to, the paradigm shift in the WASH sector globally, from infrastructure provision to sustained service delivery).</p> <p>This commentary relating to current global sector thinking points to another critical issue for the WASH sector: it is not currently a <i>learning sector</i>, so innovations (like WASH Cost, Triple S, and developments in terms of treating the entire sanitation chain as a value chain...) are slow to reach the ground.</p> <p>The sector actors have it in their power to resolve this quickly through an analysis of learning requirements and the implementation of the findings in terms of a Resource Centre Network, series of sector learning events, attracting young professionals etc.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
	<p>The fact that neither water system provision and maintenance, nor sanitation provision, emptying and composting/reuse are activities which are attractive to the private sector is a serious sector shortcoming.</p>	<p>The main issue of the engagement of a vibrant private sector is dealt with in the relevant sections below – but it also reflects upon the issue of a learning (and effective advocating) sector.</p>
<p>Sector Finance</p>		
<p>Budget et l'adéquation des dépenses Financial flows to WASH are insufficient to meet national targets, and do not sufficiently include software costs, maintenance funds, disaster risk management and climate change.</p>	<p>Finance for water services is simply inadequate because of the scale of need and the reliance on donors who are reticent to invest more at the moment due to the political situation.</p>	<p>Need to keep on top of the task by an adequate database, by ensuring sustainability of what is in place, by engaging a capacitated private sector and by actively seeking additional donor support when the political crisis is ended.</p>
<p>AND</p>	<p>Finance Is for S&H is not sufficient at any level to meet needs; this is compounded by a lack of demand at the household and individual level.</p>	<p>The sector understands this issue and must continue to advocate and mobilise: to spread information by communication = triggering <u>at all levels</u>.</p>
<p>Budgetisation nationale et la comptabilite des structures et des couvertures Budget and expenditure data is not sufficiently differentiated to show separate values for WASH, poor/vulnerable groups, domestic spending and official donor investment.</p>	<p>Financial flows for sanitation do not include the costs of adequate software. The reason: it is not a priority for the government as (among other things) they are not aware of the need: no diagnostic of sector needs and no exploitation of existing studies</p>	<p>S&H needs stronger links with health sector too. The national and local media needs to be co-opted. There needs to be a restoration of discipline and enforcement of existing laws by corrective measures.</p>
		<p>Ensure that sector costing adheres to WASH Cost principles and explicitly includes necessary expenditure/ responsibility for software elements. Information / advocacy at PTF for understanding the impacts of poor sanitation and hygiene, specifically.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
	<p>The budget does not include funds for WASH service maintenance /management - technical and financial partners do not commit enough funding to WASH O&M, capital maintenance and replacement.</p>	<p>Ensure sector wide (and beyond) adherence to the principles of WASH Cost – provide all main sector actors with WASH Cost training and then ensure that all sector plans and monitoring include these elements.</p>
	<p>Mismanaged budgets, lack of deconcentration, bad governance, absence of accountability, poor management, and lack of credible plans for urban areas.</p>	<p>Establish a performance based management system in urban WASH. Spread the development of schemes and models of management, noting that the process for the Greater Tana area is underway. This needs to spread to all other urban areas.</p>
	<p>Financial resources are insufficient as the sector is not prioritized. There is a widespread gap in understanding of the value of the WASH sector by policy makers and politicians, due to lack of effective unified advocacy and lobbying. There is insufficient capacity within the sector in document production and editing.</p>	<p>Strengthened advocacy with policy makers, politicians and donors, stressing that the sector is the most vital foundation of progress across all sectors – education, health, economic development (using, for example, the recent Economic Valuation of Sanitation studies by WSP and others). Strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Water and of wider sector planning in advocacy and the production of documents which “sell” the sector to advocacy targets. Conduct an analysis of advocacy and publishing capabilities and make an assessment of training needs, alongside the required technical, human and material resources. Write a new country framework paper which sets out the value of WASH in the context of poverty alleviation, economic development, education benefits for children, health impacts...</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
<p>Utilisation du budget A low percentage of domestic budget and official donor commitments earmarked for WASH is utilised.</p>	<p>Information does not flow between donors and government on programmes and finance. Some felt that there is an imbalance of external agencies and areas of need across the country.</p>	<p>Better information sharing needed at all levels will help this, including a better assignment of the share for each region between donors and government: SWAP process. The Min Eau should publish a comparison of donor activity by region in the Annual Review.</p>
	<p>There is a profound misunderstanding of procedures from government staff and partners, giving a very low level of no transparency. For example there is no publication of public expenditure reviews.</p>	<p>The WASH sector and the Ministry of Finance should request the Government to publish the results of public expenditure reviews.</p>
	<p>Low budget utilisation is not only a function of the <i>spending</i> capacity by Government but also reflects <u>very limited</u> disbursement by some donors when compared to their allocations/promises.</p>	<p>Each donor needs to reflect on its performance in this area and the Annual Review needs to publish the ratio for each one. The SWAp system recommended here will also help to resolve this highly unsatisfactory position.</p>
	<p>Budget too centralized in the Ministry which prevents distribution (of information); this arises from a lack of political will, rather than the means.</p>	<p>Implementation of effective deconcentration; donors need to work with government to make decentralisation a working and positive reality for Madagascar.</p>
<p>Private Sector</p>		
<p>Développement du secteur privé Private sector development and partnership programs for WASH are largely not present. AND La chaîne d'approvisionnement et de services</p>	<p>Insufficient local knowledge and competence: the private sector is not sufficiently formed and, where it is formed, does not have sufficient interest, then knowledge to play a significant role in the sector (both water and sanitation).</p>	<p>While there is an undoubted need to promote the WASH sector to the private sector (addressing procedures, stressing the importance of WASH and its potential for profitability, looking for innovative technology and processes) this needs to be based on a thorough scoping and understanding of the current situation and capacities.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
<p>National supply-chains for hardware and services for WASH systems are not sufficiently present and so do not meet the needs of rural communities and households in terms of both availability and price.</p>	<p>The current market is unformed and seen as unprofitable for the private sector; the supply chain limited and not well structured.</p>	<p>The above study and advocacy effort needs to include a market definition stage for all aspects of WASH service delivery, through the entire sanitation chain and all elements of water service/infrastructure provision, maintenance and replacement.</p> <p>The steps to be undertaken include a needs assessment and an analysis of available resources and must take into account international experience in this area, which is significant and growing.</p>
	<p>There is no apparent political will for the engagement of the private sector in WASH to any great degree.</p>	<p>The involvement of the private sector is somehow seen as a non-essential add-on to the business of policy setting. The sector must be engaged as an equal partner at all levels, as a matter of course.</p>
	<p>Availability of financing, especially for start-up – and providing guidance for sector entrants.</p>	<p>There is a need to identify the possible formulation of incentives, maybe even as a short term measure to engage the private sector in WASH service delivery. This will include facilitating access to finance and providing subsidised or free training, or tax breaks, to market entrants.</p> <p>Also, public institutions need to play their part in making private sector engagement in WASH attractive, including through planning and budgeting for extension of existing sanimart practices, highlighting the potential commercial advantages.</p> <p>There is also a need to make market rules transparent, and to provide guidance, for sector entrants.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
	<p>Diversification: there appears to be little consideration of the range of possible sector developments that might interest the private sector, while also having a major beneficial impact upon WASH service delivery.</p> <hr/> <p>Sustainability. The absence of the private sector from much of the WASH sector is a major contribution to its service sustainability problems.</p>	<p>Need to investigate (in technical and market terms) and disseminate relevant technical developments which relate to the length of the sanitation value chain, which may be of interest to the private sector and/or to the creation of public private partnerships.</p> <hr/> <p>In addition to the steps set out elsewhere in this section, coordination and review processes need to be put in place for rural actors (like masons and carpenters) to be part of the wider data gathering process on functionality and sustainability.</p>
<h3>Society and Culture</h3>		
<p>Les normes sociales Too much emphasis is placed upon communities to carry out roles for which they are not suited, and for which they often do not have time and energy, simply because external agencies have been unable to devise and implement suitable alternatives, and donors have been unwilling to fund them</p>	<p>The WASH sector here (and elsewhere) has promoted the community management model by default, as there has been no seeming alternative. The CM model has largely failed in the provision of water supply, partially for lack of support for communities but also because of the emphasis upon infrastructure provision and maintenance as against sustained service delivery.</p> <hr/> <p>Communities cannot afford to fund ongoing O&M and major maintenance, leave alone capital replacement of water infrastructure; often they cannot afford to replace their sanitation facilities either.</p>	<p>Each element of the WASH sector needs to play its role based upon a realistic appreciation of capacities and willingness; yielding a split between policy maker, funder/implementer, regulator, provider and user.</p> <hr/> <p>Donors need to recognise that if there is to be a service culture as against an infrastructure provision culture, then they will need to get involved in part-funding ongoing costs.</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
<p>Social norms and national leaders (e.g. government leaders, religious leaders and national personalities) do not provide enabling environment for improved WASH Services, because WASH (particularly S&H) is not considered a priority.</p>	<p>In a similar way to RWS, CLTS is being provided in an isolated and un-co-ordinated way, with seemingly little back up to communities post triggering and so with a very poor success rate. As with RWS, communities are being left to do things that are beyond their capacity largely because outside agencies have been unable to provide the necessary backup, through private sector development, local government capacity...</p>	<p>Sanitation provision in rural areas cannot continue to be based upon implementing CLTS programmes in isolation from the marketing and support mechanisms required. A unified approach to rural sanitation provision must be agreed upon which goes beyond simple CLTS triggering to include marketing and ongoing support.</p>
	<p>Exaggerated claims of rural ODF coverage undermine the entire sector and the communities that are supposedly being served.</p>	<p>Independent verification of all CLTS/ODF claims must be made. Only communities should claim ODF status, not triggering agencies.</p>
	<p>The sector does not target opinion formers at the traditional level and those of “celebrity” status, it does not specifically faith leaders and nor does it target specific groups, particularly women and children as change agents. This means that these targets do not have the awareness and the tools to intervene, so the nation and sector is missing a major opportunity to provide appropriately packaged information on the huge impact of poor sanitation and hygiene to a wider group of people who could make a significant difference.</p>	<p>Plan specific campaigns and actions that focus upon particular advocacy targets as follows: Traditional leaders in addition to other administrative authorities: sanitation supports traditional Malgache culture and traditions. Faith leaders to use their influence regarding hygiene and sanitation particularly. Identify and target more modern opinion formers and appropriate celebrities with a view to engaging them as sanitation ambassadors (see the example of recently retired cricketer and national hero Sachin Tendulkar in India, who has accepted an offer to become a sanitation ambassador for UNICEF).</p>
	<p>The technocratic focus of sector stakeholders (for example, concentrating on CLTS) and the advocacy</p>	<p>Develop tools to generate the evidence that other sectors and opinion formers (see above) need to</p>

Enabling factor& bottleneck summary	Root causes of the bottlenecks	Activities to remove the bottlenecks
	<p>targeting of political, administrative leaders and technocrats means that this wider advocacy target audience is missed.</p>	<p>allocate the importance of the cause of sanitation and hygiene. Note also that women and children are advocacy targets and opinion formers – all evidence creation and advocacy/marketing material need to focus on these sections of the population.</p>
	<p>There is no mass campaign to confront the fact that S&H is now a national emergency.</p>	<p>Undertake a marketing study, and then develop fund and implement a national mass campaign to promote sanitation & hygiene and the use of clean water – this should use celebrity, traditional and faith leaders, national leaders and focus upon women and children, and the issue of equity.</p>
	<p>The practice of community management of water supply infrastructure has become the norm but fails when the community is unsupported and when the supply chain is not in place. A similar observation applies regarding sanitation. Households are encouraged through CLTS programmes to build and use latrines. But little follow on support is given and sani-marts (the sanitation supply chain) are very rarely available.</p>	<p>There are many actions elsewhere in this report that will impact positively on water service functionality outcomes, and therefore long term service provision. However, it is the responsibility of the Min Eau to ensure that it explicitly monitors the successes and failings of different management and maintenance techniques and processes. All sanitation and hygiene sector interventions must include follow up with communities post CLTS implementation and need to include sanitation marketing and supply chains in their work.</p>
	<p>No real consideration has been given to an appropriate local small scale business model for sanitation: sanimarts are not the norm.</p>	<p><i>See section relating to the private sector.</i></p>

4. Next Steps

Introduction

The analysis has been a rich one, providing a sound and comprehensive understanding of the problems facing the WASH sector in Madagascar. It has rooted this understanding in the political, technical and financial reality of the country, it can be seen that the recommendations that emerged from the process therefore can have real value in providing – in combination – a way forward for the WASH sector.

This is above and beyond the more superficial outputs from such analyses as CSO and GLAAS which are diagnostic and strategic in character, and serve a more limited agenda.

Because of the richness and diversity of the recommendations for action, there is a need for the next steps to follow, priority activities are suggested below. A meeting should be held between key sector actors as soon as is practicable, to agree and flesh out the initial actions below, which agency/ies is/are responsible for their implementation, and to set out an action plan and costing for their implementation.

Priority Actions

These are identified below, following the headings used throughout this document:

1. Co-ordination and planning:

The key issue here is to institute steps towards **adoption of a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp)**.

This requires two processes:

- a. Identification of the steps that have been undertaken in other countries where successful WASH and other sector SWAPs have been implemented;
- b. The setting up of an inclusive process of discussion and decision of what is to be included and its implications and benefits/costs.

This is a process which should be led by the Ministry and should be firmly rooted in government. With uncertainty about the political situation in the early part of 2014, the donors and other sector actors need to unite to help drive this forward.

2. Sustainability and scaling up:

The Sustainability Check report reinforces the belief of BAT participants that there are major concerns about this issue. No significant attempts to scale up can be carried out while coverage is undermined by a growing sustainability crisis. Lack of sustainability is a function of an infrastructure led mind-set. So, it is recommended that a sustainability strategy is developed for the sector in a new paradigm of service delivery, and that all actors contribute and then adhere to it. The production of this **Sustained Service Delivery Strategy** becomes a fundamental need for 2014; UNICEF has agreed to lead on this process, supported by WaterAid.

Scaling up requires co-ordinated action by all parties to establish a timed and funded plan. This should be a central part of the SWAp development process, building on plans in place and taking account of the work on sustainability. However, a critical feature from the WASH BAT process is the observation that equity and poverty issues are not considered. It was specifically indicated that an **Equity Study** needs to be conducted. This should take place in 2014.

The lack of **Decentralisation/Deconcentration** is also a vital consideration to be taken forward in the coming year. While this is an issue that is much wider than solely in relation to WASH, it is a central one for the WASH sector, as it has a direct bearing on support for communities in managing their WASH services, and in supporting the private sector to gain traction in WASH service delivery and support.

3. Sector finance: the WASH BAT analysis resulted in a raft of recommendations in the area of finance, from advocating for more finance when the envisaged political upturn arrives after the election, to management issues like adherence to WASH Cost principles in across the sector and the setting up of a (transparent and disseminated) database and performance management system, and seeking for greater budget utilisation – in part through deconcentration. It is recommended that the sector identifies a **sector finance champion** or guru, perhaps within the SWAp set-up mechanism. This person would have the task to push forward the raft of recommendations and to report on their progress, being accountable for this progress.
4. Private sector: the development of this sector is vital to progress being made in the provision of sustainable WASH services at scale, but its engagement is by comparison currently weak. A **private sector capacity and needs development study** is needed which focusses upon current strengths and weaknesses of the private sector nationally and across the country, and makes a comparison with countries where the private sector has become fully and productively engaged. This study should provide recommendations on the way forward. WaterAid has made some analysis of this issue, perhaps it could lead on the managing this study.
5. Society and culture: in common with other poor nations, an unrealistic burden is placed upon rural communities to manage their own water supplies, while a lack of post-sensitisation support for their sanitation and hygiene practices mean that infrastructure and behaviours are short lived. As noted in 1 above, the WASH sector needs to evolve rapidly to a **service delivery culture**, and move away from one of providing infrastructure.

Finally, the lack of engagement in advocating to their fellow citizen on the need for WASH (particularly S&H) of national leaders, traditional and faith leaders, and modern celebrities, is striking. A **national campaign on S&H** is required to highlight the issue and to focus on behaviour change in S&H, targeting women and children particularly, and ensuring that equity and poverty issues are to the fore. This should be informed by technical issues but not led by them, instead using the influence of whatever individuals and groups are felt to be helpful. The first step is to scope this campaign out; given that S&H has the status of national emergency, this is probably the highest priority issue to be taken forward in 2014.