Annual Report 2017
Good water governance includes effective collaboration and integration of WASH, IWRM and ecosystem management and restoration.
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Executive Summary

Watershed started in January 2016. Its first year was largely spent organising and setting up the country teams, and getting a common understanding on the focus of the programme. This report reflects on the second year of implementation.

During 2017, the priority areas for all the CSO partners in each of the countries (Kenya, Uganda, Mali, Ghana, India, Bangladesh and The Netherlands) became clear. Several capacity strengthening sessions took place, reaching more than 1,000 people from more than 100 CSOs across six countries and internationally.

The first outcomes from policy and influencing activities became tangible during 2017. The capacity of most Watershed partner CSOs to do evidence-based lobby and advocacy had clearly improved.

Compared to the baseline done the previous year, more than half of the 22 CSO partners have moved up a step in one or more ladders.

The Bangladesh team reported that the local government Union Parishad Standing committee on WASH now has female CSO members. Representation on the committee is important as through the committee they have been able to create water management groups and increase the budget for small-scale water management by the Local Government Engineering Department.

In Uganda, the district meetings have almost all been dialogue sessions in which local communities and local government jointly look at problematic basin issues in an integrated way. One key result is that government agencies from WRM and WASH sectors now collectively look at water service issues in the Mpanga and Semuliki catchments (see video).

Ghana partner CSO, Hope for Future Generations, collected stories with the Ghana WASH Journalists Network in Tarkwa Nsuaem on the challenges of maintaining WASH facilities. The articles from these visits were published in print and online media.

Engagement in the Tampada basin in India resulted in the commitment of: Panchayati Raj institutions1 to the constitution of Village WASH committees in five villages; and of the service authority to conduct regular water quality tests and to secure funds for the renovation, operation and maintenance of water supply systems in six villages. The sharing of public water points’ quality status information generated by the programme partners triggered a commitment from the PRI to test all water points in four Panchayats every year.

In the Netherlands, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acknowledges the need to set targets for each of its policy priorities such as sustainability and social inclusion, and to align WASH and IWRM. The thinking on how to translate policy goals into targets is still at an initial phase. The Watershed Consortium is aware of upcoming policy changes in the Netherlands and the importance of continuous policy influencing of the new Minister and members of parliament on the relevance of the SDGs and the role of CSOs in the countries supported by Dutch development cooperation.

One of the main challenges for the country teams was properly documenting the process of change in policy briefs and other evidence-based documents. The major challenge to be addressed in 2018 is to clarify the advocacy and policy influencing activities. These could be more focused; more consistent in following up the organisations involved in capacity strengthening activities; and improve the outreach to non-traditional partners, that is, those outside the water sector.

---

1 Panchayati Raj Institutions are the basic units of local administration in India. The system has three levels: Gram Panchayat (village level); Mandal Parishad or Block Samiti or Panchayat Samiti (block level); and Zila Parishad (district level).
1. Reflection on the Watershed Theory of Change

All the country teams have chosen relevant pathways of change (QIS ladders) to monitor the progress of their planned outcomes. Most of the Watershed partner CSOs have, in different ways, improved their capacities in evidence-based lobby and advocacy. As illustrated in the diagram, in 2017, the focus of tracking progress was mainly at district level CSOs. Bangladesh, Kenya and Mali have also monitored progress in involving government.

See Annex 1 for the scores by partner and by country. The QIS ladder scores are useful for showing patterns at programme level. The QIS ladder narratives give more detail on the changes achieved by each CSO partner. In addition, the partner CSOs have used the Outcome Harvesting methodology to identify many more outcomes at government and CBO level.

Main takeaways

- Compared to the baseline done the previous year, of the 22 CSO partners: 13 have moved up one step in one or more ladders; one moved down a step; and eight did not move. However, capacity strengthening has led to increased understanding of topics, and they are more critical now about scoring themselves.
- Most of the progress made is at the first and second levels of expected outcomes of the CSO capacity development pathway of change. As expected, a few CSOs have moved beyond these levels.
- In six countries, CSOs have recognised the importance of integrating WASH and IWRM. CSOs in three of these countries are demonstrating they know how to put this into practice.
- The CSOs in all the countries understand the importance of generating evidence for policy influencing. In five of the countries, CSOs already show they know how to do this. Three of them are already collecting and using reliable evidence to inform their policy influencing messaging.
- Social inclusion is only monitored in three countries, but CSOs in two of them show that they are working towards social inclusion. In Kenya, while one CSO is involving socially marginalised groups, further progress has not been made as the baseline of this CSO is at the same level as the previous year.
- None of the countries monitors the level of legitimacy or representativeness of the partner CSOs. The CSOs’ Capacity Self Assessments show that most of them consider themselves representative of their constituency, member organisations and/or target population.
- Bangladesh, Mali and Kenya monitor changes at government level and have noted progress mainly in the recognition of the importance of accountability and transparency in WASH budget allocation and expenditure.

In 2017, most teams started to mobilise civil society organisations and re-activate platforms and networks. Whether the strategy and assumptions will be successful will only become clear in the years to come when these platforms strategize policy issues and lead advocacy issues. If the initiative and leadership only remain with the Watershed partners, the effort may not be sustainable in the long term. Furthermore, given that policy influencing strategies were still being developed in 2017, it is still too early to test what works and what not.
2. Reflection on dialogue with government partners and space for CSO engagement

In 2017, the teams prioritised CSO capacity development and understanding policy issues at local level above engagement with government at national level. On the assumption that policies are developed and implemented under the leadership of government and its agencies, the number of times that CSOs succeed in getting their points on the agenda, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage\(^2\), is a measure of their success in engaging government in their advocacy issues.

The experiences so far show that there is the opportunity in all countries to increase the space for CSOs to advocate WASH and WRM issues. The strategy and framing of these issues have mainly stayed close to the language and mandates of the government partners, and have made use of existing government-led spaces. The Netherlands team was able to create space for WASH and WRM activities in the Dutch Parliament by having one Member of Parliament adopt the SDG 6 indicators.

### Outcome Harvesting\(^3\) in Kenya:

At the East African Water Integrity Forum in May 2017 in Ethiopia, the Kenya WASREB CEO representative committed to reactivate the national steering committee and to include the Water Resources Authority (WRA) as a member of the committee. On 10 July 2017, five officers from the County Ministry of Water and Irrigation and the County Department of Public Health participated in a planning meeting and carried out a baseline survey between 11 and 14 July 2017. The purpose of this baseline survey was to gauge the status of community participation in WASH/IWRM in Kajiado County before the commencement of the Watershed Project. Respondents were drawn from Water Resource User Associations (WRUAs), Government and other stakeholders.

\(^2\) Annex 3 contains a report on the six Dialogue and Dissent quantitative harmonised outcome indicators.

\(^3\) Annex 4 shows the data resulting from the Outcome Harvesting in Kenya and Uganda.
3. Progress with policy influencing and advocacy initiatives

In 2017, the Watershed teams were still in the process of developing detailed policy influencing strategies. A few examples of successes achieved in 2017 are described below.

In Mali, two networks were mobilised and activated. The first to be created was the Alliance Citoyenne pour l’Eau et Assainissement, with 36 CSO members. The Alliance members committed to work together on monitoring water quality and advocating for waste management in 13 municipalities (communes) in Bamako, Segou and Mopti. The other one was a regional platform in Mopti with 20 CSOs and media organisations on water, hygiene and sanitation whose objectives are: to monitor adherence to local policies, budgets and information/data sharing; and, to hold the regional government to account. Mali’s National Water Policy (PNE) and National Sanitation Policy (PNA) are both being revised, and Watershed partners have been included in the revision process. They are emphasising three aspects, the role of WRM in sustainable WASH; the need to increase government budget allocation; and, the need for transparency in the WASH sector.

The international Watershed team, the African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation (ANEW) and End Water Poverty (EWP) jointly organised an East African Civil Society meeting to gauge interest in a regional advocacy agenda and to determine common advocacy topics facing countries in East and Southern Africa. Civil society organisations from over 10 countries attended and agreed that a common agenda and common action is needed to hold governments accountable at the national, regional and global levels to ensure that the SDG 6 targets are achieved by 2030.

In India, the Watershed CSO partners conducted participatory assessments in 20 villages and surveyed 770 households and 1,545 water points in Odisha and Bihar. Their findings on water point functionality and water quality were disseminated to local government representatives, Village Water and Sanitation Committees, Village Development committee members and self-employed masons. This led the local governments (Panchayat) in five villages in Tampada Basin to allocate resources for the renovation, operation and maintenance of water supply systems. Further, local area development funding was allocated to the Legislative Assembly for renovating the water supply in one village; Panchayat funds were allocated for repair work; and action has been initiated in four villages.

In Bangladesh, there are examples of public policies or norms being adopted. These will contribute to sustainable WASH for all in the country. The Bhola Sadar Upazila Parishad and Dhania Union Parishad (local governments) invited the CSO Water Management Citizen Committee (WMCC) to become a member of its WASH Committee. This is significant because, since 2011, the revised Local Governance Act formally requires each sub-district to have a WASH committee consisting of five to seven members, one of whom represents civil society. However, in Bhola, CSOs were not represented in the WASH Committee. The Watershed Bangladesh team, together with local and national level CSOs and national WASH networks, carried out numerous initiatives such as dialogues and petitions aimed at policy influencing. Key to the success of the Bangladesh team is its focus on a relatively small geographic area: Bhola.

From Outcome Harvesting in Uganda:
In mid-June 2017, the Directorate of Water Resources Management produced a popular version of the Semuliki catchment management plan (CMP) and distributed more than 200 hard copies plus soft copies to state and non-state actors within the Semuliki catchment (20 districts plus their counties and sub counties). On 23 May 2017, during the IWRM/WASH dialogue session in Kampala, seven CSOs, representatives of the technical support unit of the Directorate of Water Resources Management and district local government officers representing Mpanga and Semuliki catchments, developed a plan to streamline WASH/IWRM integration. The purpose was to: guide CSOs and the government to articulate linkages between WASH and IWRM; build stakeholders’ capacity in integrating WASH/IWRM; and, jointly advocate for the integration.

Annex 4 shows the data resulting from the Outcome Harvesting in Kenya and Uganda
4. Specific attention to social inclusion: gender and marginalised groups

Social inclusion of vulnerable groups in WASH and WRM services is acknowledged as a priority issue by most stakeholders in Watershed. To date though, it has not yet led to calls on policy changes or the implementation of measures to address inequalities. However, some small steps have been taken by the Watershed teams in 2017.

One important reason for the gap between the conceptual understanding of social inclusion and real change in behaviour is that the root causes of social exclusion in WASH and WRM are sometimes interwoven with a general culture of exclusion. For example, in the Kenyan Masai culture, the excluded comprise women, People With Disability (PWDs), People Living with HIV and AIDs (PLWHAs), the elderly and children. Women are considered culturally subordinate to men. The youth do not have a voice as they rarely own livelihood assets such as land and livestock. In general, PWDs are unable to access consultative meeting venues, and hence their participation is limited. The first step has been to analyse who is excluded and why they are excluded.

A second reason for the gap is that as marginalised people rarely participate in meetings and platforms, they are rarely consulted on their priorities and are often overlooked in policy making fora. In addition, there is often a gap between policy and practice in working with and for marginalised groups. In Bangladesh, DORP and GWA-B Watershed partners created more space for women. As a result, the local CSO and NGO network included more women members – of 38 CSO members, 13 are now female compared to eight previously. More women in the network meetings enabled them to raise their voice. The larger percentage of women (now about 30%) gave them the confidence to speak. Local CSO and NGO Networks also ensured representation of different groups in their networks including Colli, Beda, fishers, PWDs, boatmen and nomadic boat dwellers. These marginalised group started demanding services from the Union Parishad and the Department of Public Health Engineering, resulting in the allocation of a latrine and tube well to the village. This small example shows that excluded people can be empowered by including them in the right fora to voice their needs. Despite these successes, we also found that an obstacle for some of the more marginalised groups to continue investing in WASH support and meetings is that this time is unpaid and they are dependent on daily wages.

In Uganda, the partners questioned if service authorities and service providers actually knew who the marginalised groups are and where they are located. Through the sub-county dialogues, technical local government staff were also tasked to profile the unserved villages and share the lists with the District Water Officers (DWOs) for inclusion in the district investment plan. This points to a third reason of exclusion: the structural lack of knowledge about the marginalised – who they are, where they live, what issues do they face, how they can be included, and how their demands can be addressed. The policy influencing strategies developed under the Watershed programme will outline how to progress in this area.

Leave no one behind: public finance and taxation are critical sources of funding for the poorest and most vulnerable
5. Progress with the Learning Trajectories

The Watershed Learning Trajectories (LTs) are an important vehicle for the capacity development of all CSOs in the programme, including the four core Consortium members. The past year has shown that webinars and on-line email discussions around the five key themes have not reached as many of the Watershed colleagues in the countries as was intended. The main reasons for the low participation level were connectivity and time issues. Much more effective were the two to three day training and workshops in the countries with the full country teams and the partner CSOs. However, consistent follow-up to these training sessions will need to be done to ensure that the skills and knowledge are being used by the CSOs. See Annex 6 for the full report of activities.

**Data for Evidence:** The Kenya team has started to use the methodology on Data Research to fine tune policy influencing strategies for WASH/IWRM and has used it with stakeholder groups in Kajiado and Laikipia for joint agenda setting.

**WASH and Water Security:** The Netherlands team has mapped current policies and practices around WASH/IWRM alignment and discussed these with MFA, I&M and Dutch NGOs. Another key product was the report on WASH and Water Security Integration and the role of civil society. The evidence in the report was used in several policy influencing meetings such as the DGIS webinar for water experts in various EKNs across the globe. The paper explains: why integration is difficult, giving 25 examples of how to achieve integration at different governance levels; how to use different parts of WASH (like frameworks, policies, legislation, institutional structures, financing and programmes and technologies) to further integration; and, how CSOs play a pivotal role in the integration process.

**Social Inclusion - Leave no-one behind:** Technical support was provided to the teams in the Netherlands and Bangladesh to increase the partner CSOs’ understanding of the problems of the vulnerable/excluded groups so that they can highlight these groups’ specific needs in meetings with governments. From Bangladesh, we have learnt that although inviting the excluded groups to the meetings is a first crucial step, they are unlikely to continue investing in this unpaid work regularly as they are dependent on daily wages.

**Finance:** The focus of the Finance learning trajectory has been on training partners to talk about finance and to understand budget tracking. This has been done with CSOs at national level in India, Bangladesh and Kenya. The International team made particularly good progress. Its outputs showed that civil society and their networks are playing a more active role towards SDG 6 monitoring and implementation. Its highlight was the co-publishing of a paper with Water.org on financing for WASH which was used as a background document to the High Level Ministerial Meeting at the World Bank early 2017.

**Policy Influencing:** The capacity of CSOs in Kenya and Ghana to plan strategically and execute their advocacy work in finance as well as WASH and IWRM integration was built. The local Watershed partners have used the training they received as a template/model to train local government and community-based organisations to be more effective advocates at the sub-national and national levels.

---

5 https://www.wetlands.org/publications/wash-water-security-integration-role-civil-society/
6 https://www.ircwash.org/resources/financing-wash-how-increase-funds-sector-while-reducing-inequalities-position-paper
6. The outputs

The main objectives of collecting and tracking the country outputs is to be able to monitor how realistic the planning is and to track the thematic focus across the programme. Typical outputs listed under knowledge and research include informative and evidence-based products such as data reports, simplified language versions of laws, case studies, pictures and research papers. Outputs listed under lobby and advocacy mainly include communication products to inform target audiences on certain issues: news items, blogs, articles and videos.

Overall there are no big differences between the planned and achieved outputs. A listing of the achieved outputs by country is in Annex 2.

Several regional and international capacity strengthening sessions involving more than 1,000 people from more than 100 CSOs across six countries and internationally took place. Most of the training for CSO and CBO staff, and the grassroots organisations in particular, was in the areas of social accountability and IWRM/WASH alignment.

Most of the training and capacity building activities for Watershed partners was on organisational skills (using digital platforms, outcome harvesting methodology) and creating and using evidence for policy influencing.

The Netherlands team reports increased capacity among the Dutch Water NGOs in advocacy and influencing Members of Parliament and the Dutch Government. The International team focused on developing the capacity of CSO regional networks to jointly generate evidence for policy influencing.

The International Work Package initiated in 2017, in partnership with several CSO international and regional networks a Global Review of Accountability Mechanisms for SDG6. The Report will be launched towards the HLPF 2018. It includes an analysis of more than 1200 respondents from 26 countries. Findings have been validated in each of the countries by government bodies, CSOs and other stakeholders. In many countries the study has opened the space for dialogue around SDG 6.

Photo credit: Patrick Mwanzia. African sub-regional meeting focused on Civil Society Organisation participation in SDG 6 advocacy. It was held at the Royal Tulip hotel in Nairobi, Kenya, on 27-29 November 2017 and was sponsored by The African Civil Society for Water and Sanitation (ANEW) with support from End Water Poverty and Watershed. During the meeting, representatives of CSO organisations from more than 10 countries in East and Southern Africa identified the main challenges in achieving the SDGs in the region and prioritised key messages and other inputs for a common lobby and advocacy strategy for strengthening citizen participation in SDG 6.

A 2 day training took place involving CN-CIEPA/Wash Mali, CAEB and RJEPA for the management and the use of the project dashboard (Wetlands.mali.akvoflow.org). It focused on: creation of a survey on the dashboard; assigning surveys to a phone; inspection of surveys or data collected; the water quality test; the explanation of the parameters. This training allows staff to be familiar with new technology to collect information on the ground. As a result CAEB will use these Akvo tools to assess water quality and make results available online.
7. Reflection on the countries’ contexts

The High Level Political Forum’s focus on SDG 6 in July 2018 has stimulated CSOs to engage with governments on accountability mechanisms for reporting and monitoring progress towards SDG 6. Last year, 2017, was a favourable year to initiate the discussions and engage with more CSOs and countries that are not directly engaged in Watershed.

During 2017, the political context in the Netherlands was largely dominated by the general elections. The elections were followed by a relatively prolonged political formation process in which the Minister for Development Cooperation could not issue new political statements or commitments and MPs’ active involvement in national politics was largely deferred until the new governance agreement was presented at the end of October. The Minister reiterated the Dutch Government’s continued support for civil society’s space and role in national development processes. The implications of the current policy priority on water are still not clear.

In Mali, the security situation in the sparsely populated north remain fragile. Positive strides have been made over the last four years under the Ibrahim Keita government toward re-establishing order and confidence in the country’s political and judicial processes. According to the World Bank’s World Governance Indicators, between 2012 and 2017, Mali improved its score for ‘Government Effectiveness’ from -1.1 to 0.9 as well as its score on ‘Control of Corruption’ from -0.7 to -0.6. While these changes are moderate, they nevertheless signal gradual improvement. The work with CSOs in the north of Mali continues and Watershed team members’ travel is limited, cautious and monitored.

---

7 The Global Review of National Accountability Mechanisms for SDG 6 was led by CSOs in 27 countries under the umbrella of End Water Poverty, Watershed Consortium, Coalition Eau and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC). The study took place between October 2017 and March 2018.
8. Cooperation

8.1 At Consortium level
The lead Consortium partners in each country are performing well and delivering on time, but the nature of the cooperation is different in each country. Some partners either do not adhere to their activity plans or execute their activity plans too independently. In these cases, Work Package leads are reluctant to take a strong managerial approach with staff that belong to other organisations. With the exception of Kenya and the Netherlands, there is little joint reflection across the Consortium beyond the preparations for the annual meetings. This is not necessarily negative, as Consortium partners are starting to focus more on the countries where they have a physical presence and clearly add value.

8.2 Between Consortium and CSO partners
CSOs have done the capacity self-assessments, have received training and have trained other CSOs. Non-contracted CSO partners started to be involved in several activities and the programme is expanding fast in the intervention areas. In general, there is still a lack of involvement of expert organisations outside the water sector in each country (i.e. developing and implementing advocacy strategies).

8.3 How do the CSOs view the partnership
In their words:
“this partnership has made learning and experience sharing among CSOs much easier.”
“It has provided an opportunity to access a broader range of resources (not only monetary) and expertise.”

Civil society organisations play a pivotal role in achieving SDG 6 by holding governments accountable

“As an advocacy programme, Watershed has given the participating organisations a stronger voice, enabling them to move or influence policy together.”
“The implementing CSOs tap the rich experience of Consortium partners but contextualise the experiences to suit their countries’ contexts.”

8.4 Cooperation with DGIS and embassies
The relationship with DGIS in 2017 was mostly with the colleagues working with the Netherlands and International Work Packages. Apart from being an important target for advocacy in itself, DGIS is also the manager of the programme. Its less hands-on approach in 2017 and a more balanced partnership were highly appreciated by the Watershed management team.

In Kenya, the 2018 annual plan was discussed with RNE before it was submitted. In India, the meeting took place at the end of 2017. In Ghana, two meetings were organised with other strategic partnerships. In Bangladesh, Mali and Uganda, the RNE received all the relevant documents and was invited for crucial meetings. Overall, there is a perceived lack of capacity in the embassies to engage systematically with the strategic partnerships.

8.5 Other cooperation (such as with other strategic partnerships)
A meeting with SNV was held at managerial level in 2017 to seek synergies in the countries where we work. A similar meeting will be held in 2018. No concrete action points have emerged so far.
9. Lessons learnt and best practices

In the last quarter of 2017, the Watershed team met in Dhaka, Bangladesh, to: analyse progress to date; assess the main gaps; and shape the direction of the programme in 2018. We agreed to: give greater emphasis to documenting the stories of change; build knowledge case studies that showcase IWRM/WASH integration and governance issues; develop sharper and more focused country policy influencing strategies; further consolidate knowledge management for each learning trajectory; and leverage additional funds where opportunities emerge.

The teams in the whole Watershed programme needed time to get into the issues and concepts of Watershed. These only became clearer during the third quarter of 2017 which was the appropriate point at which to develop effective advocacy strategies that have a shared understanding and vision for the sector. The advocacy strategies will make it easy to identify potential partner organisations and to support policy influencing. These are now priorities for the first quarter of 2018.

We need more innovative approaches to capacity development. In 2017, most skills transfers were based on three-day capacity strengthening sessions. There has been limited follow-up or coaching of the CSOs and the individuals who took part in many of the training events. Follow-up is critical if new knowledge is to be used and skills implemented. Follow-up needs to be built into the planning for 2018 and beyond.

Through outcome harvesting and other monitoring methods, the teams all report stories of achievements, from capacity strengthening of CSOs to policy influencing. These have not yet been documented, and lessons from one country are not easily accessible by others. We need compelling stories to be able to articulate what is happening. In 2018, we will organise a Consortium level writing week at Wetlands, Ede, to drive the production of written outputs. It is expected that the methodology of the writing week can then be replicated in each of the countries at least once a year.
Annexes

Annex 1: Progress with Theory of Change (QIS outcome scores)
The Progress with Theory of Change (QIS outcome scores) are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via
https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0

Annex 2: Planned and achieved outputs 2017
The Planned and achieved outputs 2017 are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0

Annex 3: MFA Dialogue & Dissent quantitative outcome indicators
The MFA Dialogue & Dissent quantitative outcome indicators are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via
https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0

Annex 4: Outcome Harvesting data
The Outcome Harvesting data are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0

Annex 5: Work Package watershed annual reports 2017
The Work Package annual reports 2017 are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0

Annex 6: Learning Trajectories report
The Learning Trajectories report are not attached to this document and only available in the dropbox folder which is accessible via https://www.dropbox.com/sh/z7q6bfzn0u9zze7/AACHaoCtVo5fADye54S1Omu8a?dl=0