



## **Final Report, Governance, Water and Sanitation Programme (PROGOAS) Beneficiary Assessment, Phase III (2015-2018)**

**Date: 31.12.2018**

**Author: Xadrique Fernando with Roy Cordova and Riff Fullan**

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements.....   | ii  |
| Acronyms.....   | iii |
| Executive Summary.....  | iv  |
| 1. Introduction.....  | 1   |
| 1.1 PROGOAS: background.....  | 1   |
| 1.2 Objectives of PROGOAS III.....  | 2   |
| 1.3 Beneficiary Assessment: concept and principles.....                             | 2   |
| 1.3.1 What is the rationale behind BA?.....   | 2   |
| 1.3.2 Four essential aspects that distinguish a BA from an external evaluation..... | 3   |
| 2. Methodology.....   | 4   |
| 2.1 Introduction.....   | 4   |
| 2.2. Preliminary activities.....  | 4   |
| 2.3 Methodology refinement.....   | 5   |
| 2.4 PO training.....  | 5   |
| 2.5 Field observation.....  | 5   |
| 2.6 Field observation modes.....  | 5   |
| 2.7 Data interpretation.....  | 6   |
| 2.8 Validation Workshop.....  | 6   |
| 2.9 Final report.....   | 7   |
| 3. Assessment Findings.....   | 8   |
| 3.1 Sustainability of community based water facility use.....                       | 8   |
| 3.1.1 Equity in access to quality water.....  | 8   |
| 3.1.2 Local water management/service provision.....                                 | 10  |
| 3.1.3 Lessons learnt from sustainability of community-based water facility.....     | 14  |
| 3.2 Sanitation and hygiene.....   | 16  |
| 3.2.1 Sanitation facilities.....  | 16  |
| 3.2.2 SANTOLIC (Community-led Total Sanitation).....                                | 16  |
| 3.2.3 Lessons learnt from sanitation and hygiene.....                               | 20  |
| 3.3. Water, sanitation and hygiene governance.....                                  | 21  |
| 3.3.1 Community engagement in planning and monitoring.....                          | 21  |
| 3.3.2 Lessons learnt from WASH governance.....                                      | 23  |
| 4. Conclusions and Recommendations.....   | 25  |
| HELKETAS Internal Reference Documents.....  | 28  |

---

## Acknowledgements

---

The objectives of this Beneficiary Assessment (BA) have been achieved by the contribution of a significant number of people, actors and government institutions during various assessment stages through fieldwork facilitation or provision of relevant information.

### 1. Peer Observers

First of all, the Facilitator team (National Facilitator and Co-Facilitator) convey a great deal of gratitude to Peer Observers (POs) who have tirelessly worked through the whole assessment process from methodology adjustment during their training session, field test, field observation and daily data processing to the validation seminar. Noteworthy still is their collaboration during the preliminary report drafting because they provided necessary feedback when Facilitators requested them.

### 2. In Communities

**a) Community leaders.** Secondly, to various leadership levels in the communities which have been observed in Mecubúri and Nacarôa districts in Nampula, and Chiúre and Mecúfi in Cabo Delgado, we would not forget to express our great appreciation for their commitment in facilitating the data collection process, and for their assistance in compliance with several locally-agreed procedures as well as for their own inputs.

**b) Local governance bodies.** Thirdly, we address our recognition to various community governance bodies, mainly the Local Consultative Council (CCL) and CAS (Water and Sanitation Committees), for their availability during the Focus Group Discussion moments, thus providing precise information in their specific groups.

**c) Communities.** Fourth, although it has been an intense agricultural season in rural areas, many villagers have been receptive and open during their meetings with POs, providing realistic testimonies and their understanding in a representative manner. For this reason, they would not miss our deep credit.

### 3. District Governments

Lastly, all the CTD (District Technical Committee) and SDPI (District Planning and Infrastructure Service), for their selflessness and flexibility to work with interviewers, they deserve an unmeasurable regard in this assessment report.

---

## Acronyms

---

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>BA</b>           | Beneficiary Assessment   |
| <b>CAS</b>          | Water and Sanitation Committee   |
| <b>CCL</b>          | Locality Consultative Council  |
| <b>CCPA</b>         | Administrative Post Consultative Council   |
| <b>CDC</b>          | Community Development Council  |
| <b>CEGOV</b>        | Centre for Training in Public Administration, Local Governance and Local Authorities |
| <b>CTD</b>          | District Technical Council   |
| <b>DPEF</b>         | Provincial Department of Finance and Economy   |
| <b>DPOPHRH</b>      | Provincial Department of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources                   |
| <b>FGD</b>          | Focus Group Discussion   |
| <b>HH</b>           | Household  |
| <b>ODF - LIFECA</b> | Open Defecation Free Community   |
| <b>PESOD</b>        | District Socio-Economic Plan and Budget  |
| <b>PO</b>           | Peer Observers   |
| <b>PROGOAS</b>      | Governance, Water and Sanitation Programme   |
| <b>SANTOLIC</b>     | Community-led Total Sanitation   |
| <b>SDC</b>          | Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency   |
| <b>SDPI</b>         | District Planning and Infrastructure Service   |
| <b>WASH</b>         | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene  |
| <b>WSS</b>          | Water Supply Systems   |

---

## Executive Summary

---

This report embodies findings from the PROGOAS (Governance, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Programme) Beneficiary Assessment, which was focused on collecting the perspectives and understanding of the PROGOAS III intended beneficiaries, about its results, whereby the programme has implemented an exit strategy, consisting of transfer of competencies and responsibilities to local actors.

The programme, which was implemented in eight districts earlier, namely Eráti, Mecubúri, Muecate, Nacarôa (Nampula), and Ancuabe, Chiúre, Macomia and Mecúfi, (Cabo Delgado), in the first two phases - PROGOAS I and PROGOAS II – was phased down to four districts, namely: Mecubúri and Nacarôa, in Nampula, and Chiúre and Mecúfi, in the province of Cabo Delgado.

### Goal and Objectives of the PROGOAS BA

The ultimate goal of the PROGOAS BA was to contribute to assessing the impact of the project by gaining insights from key project stakeholders' perceptions grouped into:

- a) *primary stakeholders*: comprised by community members, CCL members and CAS members;
- b) *secondary*: only covering CTD and SDPI.

Specifically, this BA aimed at getting to know the views of project stakeholders on:

- The effectiveness of good governance mechanisms introduced by PROGOAS (Planning Fairs and Public Hearings);
- The sustainability of water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) services including the functioning of user groups and service providers of water and sanitation services;
- Primary beneficiaries' internal governance, relationship that these bodies have with the population and the local government and their ability and interest to use the good governance tools introduced;
- Secondary beneficiaries' technical and financial ability and interest to use the good governance tools introduced and its potentiality for replication.

### PROGOAS BA methodology

Methodologically, the assessment comprised six stages as follows: the methodology refinement for actual implementation, carried out between two Facilitators hired by HELVETAS, a National Facilitator and a Co-Facilitator, and a Backstopper from HELVETAS; PO identification and training, which also involved field testing; the field observation carried out by POs assisted by Facilitators; then data analysis by the National Facilitator; a validation workshop about the BA findings; and lastly the final report preparation.

The BA was based on a systematic observation process; that is, exploratory interaction between project household members and POs, through guiding questions, focus group discussions, namely women groups, CAS and CCL, which then terminated by listening to general understanding in brief community meetings. At the same time, the Facilitators interviewed the District Technical Committee (CTD) and SDPI (District Planning and Infrastructure Service) in each district, to allow triangulation of all information for the final report.

The BA research was organised around three main observation areas, namely: Sustainability of community-based water facilities; Hygiene and sanitation; and WASH Governance.

## Main PROGOAS' BA findings

Overall, there is enough evidence from the BA that PROGOAS has contributed to improve its beneficiaries' lives by enhancing WASH facilities availability and developing governance mechanisms. The main assessment findings in the three BA observation areas that guided the field assessment, and are summarized here:

**1. Sustainability of community-based water facility use.** The BA Peer Observers have observed that in general participants who were interviewed in the PROGOAS beneficiary communities of Nampula and Cabo Delgado said that they do feel they have equal rights to use WSS and that they have improved their lives. There were exceptions in some communities of Mecúfi and Chiúre (Cabo Delgado), where they mentioned that access to WSS is directly dependent upon household (HH) economic position, since it depends on money each HH contributes daily to its functioning and maintenance. The observers have noticed that once WSS funded by PROGOAS are managed and maintained by local governance bodies, the Water Supply Systems are perceived as sustainable.

Where PROGOAS WSS are still operational, though the programme has finished, communities perceive them as sustainable because it has transferred WASH governance mechanisms, processes and maintenance systems to those beneficiary communities in coordination among local organizations (CAS), private initiatives (artisans) and government offices (SDPI).

The number of women CAS members holding leadership positions is still meagre comparing to their male counterparts, even though there is gender balance in overall CAS membership.

**2. Hygiene and sanitation.** The Peer Observers perceived that a large number of HHs in beneficiary communities observed in this process have adequately clean and well maintained latrines with privacy, a factor that qualifies them as Open Defecation Free (ODF - LIFECA) communities. Several communities have also adopted other hygiene and sanitation facilities such as opening garbage holes, building dish layers for their dishes with local material, thus contributing to the reduction of diseases which arise from poor hygiene and sanitation habits.

POs have noticed that not all beneficiary communities with clean and well maintained latrines with privacy have been recognized as such with the *flag system*. Despite this, it seems that these communities have been motivated by the flag recognition system to keep their latrines cleaned and well maintained since it was mentioned to the observers.

The recognition flag system to beneficiary communities with clean and well maintained latrines with privacy has a profound social impact on communities; indeed, they have shown its efficacy in getting HHs motivated to keep clean and well maintained latrines. Additionally, the POs were able to observe that there are several other communities with clean and well maintained latrines as well but do not have the recognition flag system in their communities; since HHs in these communities have expressed to the POs their interest of being recognized with flags, it might be right to assume that the recognition flag system's influence has also motivated HHs of other communities to keep clean and well maintained latrines with adequate privacy.

Since PROGOAS is over, it is worrisome how this not met demand of people to obtain the flag system will develop; will it go beyond the social recognition to social and HH awareness of hygiene and sanitation importance? Or will the HHs be frustrated and not keep their hygiene and sanitation good practices?

**3. Water, sanitation and hygiene governance.** The assessment has found out that WASH governance mechanisms and processes initiated through PROGOAS are locally owned, especially with the CAS vigour of monitoring water supply and sanitation operation and maintenance; and the CCL, a law foreseen body working as a bridge between communities and District Government authorities, through the Planning Fairs, as well as providing feedback from district government to the communities.

The Planning Fair and Public Hearing tools allow greater and inclusive participation, thus promoting all players' transparency and accountability. The Public Hearing governance mechanism has shown its importance and local acceptance as the majority of households in beneficiary communities participate in the needs identification processes and decision making about WASH, which is highly valued by the community members as POs were able to verify.

The Planning Fairs developed and driven by HELVETAS have ensured an adequate linkage system between rural communities and District Governments, based on CCLs, CTDs and SDPIs by which community members have the possibility to participate in community's demands and project prioritization so they can be considered at District levels in the PESOD.

Planning Fair's efficiency can be measured from two distinct views, but with equal importance: the government and the people's side. On the government side, the Planning Fairs are, unequivocally, a great governance mechanism that allows base participation and orderly demand/project prioritization from community level up to the district level where final decisions are taken in the midst of the formulation of the PESOD according to legal regulations and budget. The mechanism seems to be very effective.

On the people's side, the Planning Fairs seem not to be considered a very effective mechanism to get their demands fulfilled; indeed, their participation and opportunity to prioritize their demands and present them to the official officers is well appreciated by the people, as it was observed by the POs, but the fact that most of the time their demands and projects are not complied by the District Government and inserted in the PESOD causes some frustration, as POs were able to ascertain; finally, the lack of proper feedback leaves community members with the question mark of the Planning Fair's usefulness and effectivity to assure their demands are met on time.

If Planning Fairs are not effective for everyone, there is an important and real risk of their sustainability, since people tend to be very sensitive when it comes to measure participation and involvement with tangible results.

**Recommendations.** Based on the BA's methodology and scope, the PO's observations, and the fact that PROGOAS has finished and there is not a fourth phase, the following recommendations can be suggested:

#### **1. Sustainability of community-based water facility use.**

- Local government authorities and community leaders need to keep a regular gender sensitisation and capacity development program from women's and men's (masculinity) perspectives and approach in order to obtain a gender balance in leadership positions in CAS.
- Actual and future CAS members require ongoing capacity, counselling as well as technical assistance services; local actors should be prepared so it can regularly offer this under appropriate market conditions. At an initial glance, it looks that the most suitable actors would be the SDPI and the artisans.
- The artisans, as private sector actors, need to be well prepared and motivated to offer and attend operation and maintenance as needed and required by the CAS; water facility use sustainability depends on its economic and market growth. Hence, it is advisable, if possible,

that a study be conducted on the artisan's actual motivations and conditions so an artisans' strengthening plan can be developed and implemented with emphasis in market and motivation criteria.

## **2. Hygiene and sanitation.**

- Since the recognition flag system has proven to motivate HHs to keep clean and well maintained latrines with adequate privacy, the flag system requirements and procedures should be written down and passed on to local community leaders, so they are the responsables to grant this recognition to the HHs as they comply.

## **3. Water, sanitation and hygiene governance.**

- Public Hearings are very important mechanisms accepted by community members and leaders as well as official authorities, hence it has to be encouraged at all levels and in all kinds of infrastructure bidding; it should be legally and rightfully promoted;
- Planning Fairs have proved to be more effective to district governments than to the people themselves, since not all the demands/projects prioritized by the people can be met, since it is not possible to attend all of them; however, since people engage actively in the planning process, it is understandable that they hope their demands are met. Ways to improve effectiveness for the people need to be considered in the participation and prioritization planning process, so it will not become eventually a discouraging process. It might be important to consider assigning an important percentage of the PESOD budget to each and all localities so there might be more possibilities that a community obtains public funding for their demands/projects prioritized.
- Additionally, the Planning Fairs should consider attending to the following two common beneficiaries perceptions: (1) communities need to be informed regularly about the state of their affairs of their needs submitted at government level, so that they can be more motivated and enthusiastic to attend the Planning Fairs; (2) CCL members have expressed that their participation in the Planning Fairs should have some monetary incentives from the District Government or any other funding partner, of course any action on this needs to consider its sustainability.

---

## 1. Introduction

---

### 1.1 PROGOAS: background

PROGOAS (Programme for Governance, Water and Sanitation) was a project funded by SDC (the Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency) and implemented by HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation in eight districts of two provinces in northern Mozambique namely Cabo Delgado Province: Mecúfi, Ancuabe, Macomia and Chiúre; Nampula Province: Eráti, Mecubúri, Muecate and Nacarôa) and it was carried out in three separate phases between March 2009 and June 2018 (PROGOAS I, II and III). In the third phase coverage was reduced to four districts, namely: Mecubúri and Nacarôa, in Nampula, and Chiúre and Mecúfi, in the province of Cabo Delgado.

The main objective was to improve the living conditions and health of rural populations in beneficiary provinces, while ensuring the participation of men and women in local governance systems as well as the provision of responsive and sustainable quality water and sanitation services.

**Implementation of PROGOAS.** Each phase of the programme comprised three years. Phase one (PROGOAS I) started in 2009 by engaging with CDCs (Community Development Councils) through supporting them in elaborating their community development plans and implementing activities, which did not necessitate external support. Activities which required funds were directed to the district government. This proved to be difficult as the CDCs had no legal mandate and were not recognised by the government.

Phase two (PROGOAS II), which started in April 2012, strengthened the linkage between the district planning process and the local councils, resulting in the discontinuation of CDCs, given that their sustainability could not be guaranteed following completion of the project. This phase started to work more with the local councils, already in the local government structure, mainly at Locality level (CCL) and focused on building their capacities. Furthermore, the instrument of a Planning Fair was piloted as well as Public Hearings for overseeing water infrastructure projects.

**Planning Fair:** a local governance mechanism, whereby communities identify their needs to submit to district government in the form of requests, for further approval, following government priorities.

**Public Hearing:** a dialogue held at Pre-Construction, Provisory Delivery and Definitive Delivery phases of water points, giving communities a space to share their viewpoints on various aspects and give feedback on the construction process. Public Hearings reinforce transparency and systematic building inspection as well as ensuring local ownership to guarantee sustainability of water points.

PROGOAS III was marked by a transfer of responsibility for the realisation of the Planning Fairs and Public Hearings from HELVETAS to the local governance structures as well as organising the local private sector to ensure the maintenance and availability of spare parts for water points. It changed geographical coverage, from eight districts to four (Nacarôa, Mecubúri in Nampula; Chiúre, Mecúfi in Cabo Delgado) to allow broad coverage in these few districts and to ensure a more systemic implementation.

## 1.2 Objectives of PROGOAS III

This BA was focused on the two main areas of PROGOAS III activities, namely good governance mechanisms and the effectiveness of WASH services. It concentrated only on PROGOAS Phase III objectives and districts of intervention for three reasons. First, it sought to concentrate attention on the more interesting aspects of PROGOAS' development over the years since it came up with new ways to positively influence WASH governance in Cabo Delgado and Nampula based on lessons learnt during the first two phases. Second, it wanted to avoid covering too much of the same aspects that the previous evaluation exercise already covered. Third, it intended to understand how far PROGOAS interventions had an impact. For this it was important to analyse the global intervention of the programme over the three phases. It was therefore necessary to focus only on the districts where all three phases have been implemented.

**Outcome 1:** gender equitable community priorities reflected in local development plans and budgets and their implementation monitored by men and women actively participating in consultative councils at all levels and accountable towards their constituencies;

**Outcome 2:** district services, gender-balanced community-based committees and local artisans jointly securing sustainable use of water and of sanitation and hygiene facilities by rural families;

**Outcome 3:** systems, processes and tools used to support (a) citizen's participation in the planning and monitoring of public resources and (b) sustainable community use of water and sanitation, documented, disseminated and used to secure sustainability at the district level and to influence policies and projects at the provincial and national level.

## 1.3 Beneficiary Assessment: concept and principles

BA is an approach focused on improving learning about the relevance and effectiveness of a project and its results, based on a fair representation of intended beneficiaries' (hereafter beneficiaries) perspectives. BA is the systematic incorporation of the beneficiaries' assessment of development actions linked to planning, monitoring and evaluation. For the World Bank, BA is the systematic investigation of people's values and behaviours in relation to a project, in this specific case, PROGOAS, seeking to gauge the future or the current progress that seeks economic or social change.

### 1.3.1 What is the rationale behind BA?

BA's main assumption is that the beneficiaries of any development processes - in general - have little opportunity to be heard by the actors who finance and execute programs and projects. Similarly, and equally important, those responsible for financing and implementing projects in general do not have the opportunity to listen to recipients as they should because of lack of opportunity, will or vocation.

For this reason, SDC considers the participation of beneficiaries in the PROGOAS cycle processes and national strategies essential to their institutional commitment "by improving the orientation of their results, learning and effectiveness through more sensitive programming, including accountability."

Therefore, SDC has embarked on PROGOAS BA as an approach to increase sensitivity and accountability to citizens who are direct or indirect beneficiaries of its interventions. The participation of beneficiaries and the opportunity to express their feelings and values contribute substantially to the achievement of socio-economic and political development objectives.

### 1.3.2 Four essential aspects that distinguish a BA from an external evaluation

| Beneficiary Assessment  | External Evaluation  |
|---|--|
| Focuses on the beneficiaries' or clients' understanding, perceptions and feelings   | Is based on the vision and findings of an external evaluator   |
| Emphasises downward accountability, focusing its efforts on beneficiaries   | Is usually based on upward accountability, that is, the funds and their results, with greater emphasis on the funder                                   |
| Is a process where the main evaluators are the same beneficiaries   | Is a process where the main evaluators are external-non beneficiary- experts   |
| Is bottom-up, conveying beneficiaries' real feelings which can influence the future interventions according to the actual points of view conveyed | Tends to be top-down because, with the results, the project funder implements their activities without necessarily assessing beneficiaries' real needs |

#### How should this report be read?

First, the introductory chapter presents the fundamental concepts about the three PROGOAS stages and their implementation modalities. As this report is about beneficiary assessment, its concept and principles come next. In the second chapter, we present the BA's methodology - all six BA phases as it was done in PROGOAS, from methodology refinement to the preparation of this report.

The third chapter presents the BA findings on the three PROGOAS BA research fields. First, we begin by discussing the results, usually disaggregated by province and district where the results do not match from the beneficiaries' perspectives. Each field ends with the lessons learned, where the achievements are presented, i.e. the positive aspects that can be replicated in future, if a similar project might be implemented. The achievements are followed by suggested improvements, that is precautions to be born in mind in future.

Finally, in addition to the conclusions of each chapter presented in the form of lessons learned, the general conclusions are presented, culminating with the recommendations.

---

## 2. Methodology

---

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology which has enabled the achievement of the Beneficiary Assessment PROGOAS III (2015-2018) goals. It describes the six stages implemented that comprised the whole assessment process, namely (I) methodology refinement; (II) PO training; (III) field research; (IV) data analysis; (V) validation workshop; and (VI) the final report preparation. It should also be noted that the key actors in this process were the Facilitators hired by HELVETAS and Backstoppers from HELVETAS, Peer Observers, and local governance bodies such as Water and Sanitation Committees (CAS), Local Consultative Councils (CCLs), and District Government representatives, namely the CTD and the SDPI.

### 2.2. Preliminary activities

#### a) Identification of Peer Observers

Within the viewpoint of key players in this assessment, the POs were selected with the least prejudice criterion, since they were focal actors of the whole assessment process. To this end, it was ensured that individuals were identified by Facilitators from communities where the observation was carried out because they themselves represented the local beneficiaries. In order to avoid bias, and to ensure their effective participation, in addition to being identified in the observed communities, the stratified random sampling criteria were observed and stratification was done according to the following:

- Overall gender balance;
- Possessing elementary reading and writing skills in Portuguese;
- Availability for the entire BA training & research period; and
- Successful completion of the training.

Therefore, they played a central role in the adjustment of the assessment question guide; they at large assisted in the pilot evaluation phase – a field test to adjust more the observation guiding tools - they conducted the actual evaluation in the field and focus group discussions (FGD); they were central in coding and categorising data for processing along with the Facilitators; they contributed to the whole preparation process of the preliminary report where necessary; and, above all, they were focal actors on the preliminary findings validation workshop.

#### b) Community sampling

At this stage communities were identified for practical field observation. Their selection was based on stratified random sampling and the stratification was done through the list of communities where PROGOAS was implemented. It was also based on time necessary and road accessibility from the district capital to the communities, and the entire time bound BA was allocated, delimiting in a number of six communities for each district, summing up to 24. There were circumstances where some communities with greater geographic coverage were split into A and B to be dealt with as two communities. In all districts which have been observed, the process only approached PROGOAS III components, including water management mechanisms, sanitation and governance systems, mainly SANTOLIC, LIFECA, Post-ODF, Flag System, Planning Fairs and Public Hearings.

## 2.3 Methodology refinement

At this first methodology stage, a Backstopper from HELVETAS, the National Facilitator and a Local Facilitator refined the BA methodology and its tools during two days. They thought through on the following stages, including PO training, the field observation guideline tools and data processing and interpretation methods. The Facilitators' essential role was to coordinate the entire assessment process, starting from PO training, fieldwork, data processing, validation workshop preparation and alignment, and finally the preparation of the final report.

## 2.4 PO training

The POs had an intensive five-day training session, which was aimed at getting them to be familiar with the BA concepts, rationale, objectives and processes, as well as to inculcate in them capacity to adequately implement the assessment methodology, in accordance with the established procedures. As key actors in this assessment process, the Backstopper, Facilitators and POs discussed the guideline draft content which was then adjusted based on POs' inputs. The field test (pilot study) was then carried out for 1 ½ days, where specific questions were tested in a community which was not observed during the actual fieldwork. Some remedial work concerning formulation of guiding questions and other field methodological shortcomings were addressed before the following step.

## 2.5 Field observation

**POs.** Through the observation (assessment) each pair of observers was made up of a male and a female person, complying with district intercalation, i.e. in Nampula, each PO from Mecubúri was paired with another from Nacarôa, while in Cabo Delgado, the PO from Chiúre matched with a colleague from Mecúfi. During the observation, one of the POs worked as an oral interlocutor with beneficiaries, while the other was the note taker and, at a later observation, they swapped the roles.

Through the first fieldwork week, all POs in Nampula worked in Mecubúri District for six days and then in Nacarôa in an equal number of days, while in Cabo Delgado they observed first in Chiúre and culminated in Mecúfi District. POs of each province went with a Facilitator who coordinated the whole process and a HELVETAS representative who facilitated in community contacts and provided guidance for community access.

## 2.6 Field observation modes

**First day: Individual interviews.** Each pair of observers visited in the morning four separate households –randomly selected previously- and when they had all convened, interview results were discussed and processed between afternoons and evenings, involving POs and their Facilitator. This means that 60 families were visited in each district, thus comprising 240 households overall for the two provinces. Randomly selected samples ensured the balance between male and female household participants in a manner to have a balanced and gender representative feedback.

**Second day morning: Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).** Each pair of POs carried out discussions with groups of women specifically, Water and Sanitation Committees and Local Consultative Councils, grouped according to gender criterion or their level of involvement in a local water governance body. Thus, each PO facilitated the discussion, in so far as the other took notes, without actually participating to the discussion, though occasionally they could assist each other, where necessary.

**Second day afternoon.** A Community Meeting was held where HHs from the previous day and other members of the local community could participate and get feedback from POs, who themselves would get clarifications and supplemental information, where some aspects still remained fuzzy. While the POs carried the above described activities, the Facilitators also sought to interview representatives of District Technical Commissions and District Planning and Infrastructure Services.

## 2.7 Data interpretation

The assessment was based on a qualitative approach, i.e., collection and interpretation of feelings and perceptions which are non-quantifiable realities. To complement this, some questions were based on a scale of 1 - 4, classified in Very Poor (1), Poor (2), Good (3) and Very Good (4) in order to generate some quantitative results. Interpretations were based on coding and categorisation, namely getting response trends as an indication for data interpretation and in several cases based on the aforementioned scale, though some tables illustrating some tangible and numerical aspects feature in the report.

What is worth highlighting is that this assessment was delimited to PROGOAS III, and its interpretation was based on three observation guiding subjects and their respective sub-categories, namely: (I) Sustainability of Community-based Water Facility Use, which observed the equity in access to quality water and local water services management / provision; (II) Hygiene and Sanitation, addressing sanitation, SANTOLIC (Community-led Total Sanitation) and (III) WASH Governance, which shed light on community involvement in matters concerning water points and sanitation planning and monitoring. Finally, some testimonials for each subject were incorporated in the report to substantiate the findings.

## 2.8 Validation Workshop

This workshop was methodologically prepared by Facilitators, with logistical assistance from HELVETAS. It aimed to get participants' feelings about the preliminary BA report, collect more inputs to feed the same report from various stakeholders as well as to validate, on a consensual basis, the same findings.

To this end, in addition to HELVETAS itself and the Facilitators, all the POs, as well as representatives of local governance bodies (CAS, CCL and Artisans), district government delegates, namely CDT and SDPI, and finally DPOPHRH from Nampula participated in the event. The workshop was also intended to explore inputs from a DPEF from either of the PROGOAS III beneficiary provinces, but due their time incompatibility, they did not attend the event.

The event covered two days, and during half of the first day, the objectives of the workshop and the methodology were presented and a discussion on the presentations followed. The results were then presented by the POs, in a form of their practical testimonies experienced in the field, based on Facilitators' guidance. The first part of the day culminated in delving into the preliminary findings by the whole plenary.

As for the second part of the first day, participants had group work: four groups were set in local government bodies' representatives (CAS and CCL), District Governments (CTD, SDPI and DPOPHRH-Nampula) delegates and finally HELVETAS with the implementing partner (AMA). The group work addressed three key issues for all of them equally. In the first, covering preliminary assessment results, they were asked to point out issues they found particularly surprising or interesting about the results, what the participants did not agree with from the results and what was not fully addressed by the report. In the second question, on the lessons learnt, the groups had to

shed light on what should be replicated in future and what should change in water provision, sanitation and community planning. Finally, the groups made contributions on their own commitment, as actors, to ensure the sustainability of PROGOAS interventions.

The agenda for the second day was more internal, confined among the Facilitators, observers and HELVETAS, and lasting only half the day, where the results of the work groups were validated, agreeing on essential aspects that should feature in the report and others that could be left out. Because the HELVETAS perspective as a key player in PROGOAS implementation is invaluable, and the BA prioritises perspectives of the main beneficiaries of the project, on this specific last day it assisted in aligning several issues for validation such as places and WSS built by PROGOAS. There were no major discrepancies in findings from the BA and HELVETAS perspectives, neither with the remaining invited participants, which provides a strong validation of the PO-driven results.

## **2.9 Final report**

The final report is a result of different data processing stages and methods such as daily processing between POs and Facilitators during the field work; the analysis and interpretation of preliminary data by the National Facilitator within a two-week period; the incorporation of inputs and contributions from the above-mentioned validation workshop; a final review from HELVETAS and a final refinement by the Facilitator.

It should be noted that some parts of the results are discussed respecting disaggregation into province and districts. The rationale behind this approach is that in some aspects, several communities or districts sometimes present peculiar results so that, once generalised for all communities or districts at large, the final assessment findings might be diluted or distorted.

## 3. Assessment Findings

### 3.1 Sustainability of community based water facility use

#### 3.1.1 Equity in access to quality water

Water supply systems discussed in this chapter only refer to the communities visited by this assessment. PROGOAS has also benefitted other communities in WASH but, since this BA has not covered all of them, they are not presented in the following data.

##### a) Nampula Province

Table 1: Households benefiting from WSSs financed by SDC and HELVETAS and WSSs visited in Nampula

| District        | HH   | WSS <sup>1</sup><br>Type               | Built WSS<br>(2013-2016) | Rehabilitated<br>(2016) | Operational            | Breakdowns |
|-----------------|------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| <b>Mecubúri</b> | 4105 | 7<br>Boreholes                         | 6                        | 1                       | 7                      | 0          |
| <b>Nacarôa</b>  | 4334 | 9<br>Boreholes<br>& 1 SPS <sup>2</sup> | 7 Boreholes              | 2                       | 9 Boreholes<br>& 1 SPS | 0          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | 8439 | 17                                     | 13                       | 3                       | 17                     | 0          |

Source: data collected from fieldwork and validation workshop

In Nampula province, this BA observed 120 households, 60 from each district. Out of 8439 households in the twelve communities, which benefited from PROGOAS, Mecubúri has a smaller number of beneficiary households (4105) compared to Nacarôa, with 4334, as shown in Table 1 above. The assessment visited 7 boreholes in Mecubúri, where one was rehabilitated and the rest built during PROGOAS III, while in Nacarôa, 2 boreholes were rehabilitated including a small piped system and 7 were built. The evaluation found out from the beneficiaries themselves and from on-site observation that all PROGOAS-supported water supply systems operate very well in both districts.



An illustration of a borehole built in PROGOAS context

A discussion with women was informed that they feel that time for fetching water has soundly reduced and waterborne diseases have also, comparing to the past before the PROGOAS WSSs in their communities were built. As a result, they use the extra time for farm work and for other domestic activities such as taking care of children, hygiene and running small businesses. They further informed that before PROGOAS implementation, men and women were responsible for fetching water, while at present this task is for women and children. The reason is that before the construction or rehabilitation of WSS, water points were farther away and in places that exposed women to risk or vulnerability. But now these men are exempt from reinforcing this task.

However, despite the above changes and 100% of the communities visited by the assessment with clean water, as well as significant contribution to reducing waterborne diseases, only 25% of the communities, one in Mecubúri and two in Nacarôa, have access to enough water for all family necessities and other daily household chores. The reason is that communities are large and the WSS are not enough to cover all the communities' household water needs.

### b) Cabo Delgado Province

Table 2: Households benefiting from WSSs financed by SDC and Helvetas and visited in Cabo Delgado

| District      | HH   | WSS Type  | Built WSS (2014-2016) | Rehabilitated | Operational | Breakdowns |
|---------------|------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| <b>Chiúre</b> | 2926 | Boreholes | 4                     | 0             | 5           | 0          |
| <b>Mecúfi</b> | 3076 | Boreholes | 13                    | 0             | 8           | 5          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | 6002 |           | 17                    | 0             | 13          | 5          |

Source: data collected from fieldwork and validation workshop

In Cabo Delgado the BA observed the same number of households and following the same district disaggregation criterion. Chiúre has a smaller number of PROGOAS beneficiary households, about 2929, while Mecúfi households are 3076. The observation visited 4 boreholes in Chiúre and 13 in Mecúfi. In both districts all boreholes have been built under PROGOAS scope. Mecúfi has five boreholes with breakdowns which have never been repaired up till now.

The five breakdowns in Mecúfi happened two years after their construction because of the saline soil and water which have accelerated the degradation of the boreholes.



*Children drawing water from one of boreholes constructed by HELVETAS in Samilala B community, Chiúre District*

Beneficiaries' perspective is different from the case of Nampula because while some WSSs are not operational, where a few are still operational – in Chiúre – access to water depends upon the amount of money paid by households. Therefore, the right of access to water in Mecúfi is in question because many community households get water depending on their monetary capacity.

The widespread beneficiaries' feeling of life improvement in both provinces is that water shortage has not yet been fully tackled. More so, water from the boreholes is not adequate for drinking in many communities especially in Mecúfi because it is salty. Households there can use water for other domestic activities, but not for drinking. Alternatively, they get water for drinking from two sources. First, sometimes, especially during the wet season, some households said that they resort to digging small wells around their homes for drinking because these small wells are not deep and water is not very salty. As the alternative for other households, and especially during summer, the majority have to walk about 12km to fetch water from rivers, then SDPI provides them Chlorine to put in their water buckets.

### **3.1.2 Local water management/service provision**

#### **a) Nampula**

In Mecubúri district, 5 communities out of 6, representing 83%, indicated they are aware that CAS is the owner of the water supply system built through PROGOAS, while in Nacarôa, although CAS are adequately functional, 100% of the households attribute the WSS to communities. In addition to being responsible for borehole maintenance, the CAS ensures the collection of monthly household contributions, fostering community sanitation and hygiene practices, and management of the WSS.

Beneficiaries share the feeling of common satisfaction with their water management systems because, having a locally established water governance body there is rigour in collecting household contributions and ensuring management processes; this arrangement supports borehole sustainability, given the continuous CAS commitment for maintenance and management and, therefore, households are informed about who they can turn to, in the event of a breakdown.

As for Mecubúri, in a single community the borehole has never experienced a breakdown, while in the remaining communities breakdowns did not last for more than five days. In Nacarôa 50% of these WSSs have never had breakdowns, but the ones which have experienced it, lasted only for a week.

Regarding the money that households contribute every month, whereby amounts and modalities are generally decided through a consensus in community meetings, only some households of a community in Nacarôa expressed their displeasure for contributing with 20mt each because, for them, this amount is difficult to earn. But the overall feeling is that this amount can be regularly acquired and it is plausible to contribute with because it ensures WSS maintenance in the event of major breakdowns, since they hardly get assistance outside their communities for this purpose.

The relationship among the three stakeholders responsible for water, sanitation and hygiene management, namely CAS, SDPI and artisans, is largely perceived as conducive, since there is an environment of noble cooperation and networking in many action lines among them. For instance, when communities inform the CAS about a borehole breakdown they inform the SDPI, who in turn agree with the artisans on possible solutions. SDPI may not have necessary spare or money, but they provide advice or technical support.

The only exception is for Mugela community in Nacarôa, where the assessment noted dismay because artisans charge unnecessarily large amounts of money from households when they are solicited to repair a borehole, despite there being some funds regularly collected by CAS. This practice, besides hurting households, causes other actors' discontent which affects cohesion.

#### **b) Cabo Delgado**

In Chiúre district, all households visited under this assessment are aware that communities own the water supply systems built through PROGOAS, whereas in Mecúfi, two communities are not aware of who the owner is.

CASs perform the same roles as in Nampula, with an exception of sensitising households for good family and community sanitation practices. The contribution to borehole repairs is made in a form of instant payment for water consumption because each family pays 1mt for each 20-liter canister paid on community agreement. Two of the three communities feel harmed by this amount and mechanism. Contribution amounts and modalities are also decided at community level, like in Nampula. The duration of breakdowns (i.e. time between a breakdown and repairs of the remaining 8 boreholes) varies from a day to one week.

The table above shows that five boreholes are non-operational and, amazingly, they are all in Mecúfi District. The reason of not working until this BA is major breakdowns described as follows. Two boreholes in Ngoma Community have been vandalised, leaving one without the pump and the other without the rod. In Muária, both boreholes operated by manual traction and in this community water dried under the surface. In Natuco the cylinder broke down. Therefore, households in these communities deem these breakdowns unaffordable and they end up attributing them to SDPI.

In Mecúfi, monetary contributions vary, with 3 communities paying between 1-2mt per drum and another half of communities between 10-20mt per month, amounts regarded as fair. Each borehole breakdown lasts on average a week. As for WSS lifespan, all communities in this district believe that water boreholes may last longer, but they also expressed concern about their sustainability because there is much consumption pressure given high household demand for only few boreholes available. In general, there is a consonance among the CAS, SDPI and artisans, and these have made

significant endeavours concerning water and sanitation. They work together sharing solutions to WSSs either seeking together technical solutions or getting new parts for repair.

Beneficiaries' perception that WSS belong to CAS stems from the fact that this water governance system is responsible for collecting households' contributions for maintenance, repair of the same WSS and ensuring such water sources are protected and kept clean. Where water sources are not operational, they are responsible for community sanitation only, hoping to work at WSS any time they will be repaired by any partner or government.

Governments of the four PROGOAS beneficiary districts, through their respective SDPIs, have shown satisfaction with PROGOAS because they face enormous challenges to get water to communities. They had learnt with apprehension that the programme was coming to an end because at least some communities were benefiting from PROGOAS WSSs that could be made available by government itself.

Their relationship with CAS is favourable because they are often in touch, especially when the CASs seek their assistance. But generally what causes inadequate linkage between these two parties is that SDPIs lack means of transport to move to all communities to work with people.

Table 3: CAS Composition in communities observed in Nampula and Cabo Delgado

| Province            | District | No. CAS | Men | Women | Total (Men/Women) | Women in Leadership | %   |
|---------------------|----------|---------|-----|-------|-------------------|---------------------|-----|
| <b>Nampula</b>      | Mecubúri | 6       | 36  | 36    | 72                | 1                   | 17% |
|                     | Nacarôa  | 10      | 36  | 37    | 73                | 1                   | 10% |
| <b>Cabo Delgado</b> | Chiúre   | 6       | 31  | 29    | 60                | 2                   | 33% |
|                     | Mecúfi   | 6       | 36  | 36    | 72                | 1                   | 17% |
| <b>TOTAL</b>        | 4        | 28      | 139 | 138   | 317               | 5                   | 18% |

Source: Data collected from BA fieldwork and validation workshop

As the table above depicts, the numerical discrepancy between male and female CAS members is negligible in both provinces. At least gender parity has been fulfilled in this particular water governance body. The evaluation also learnt that during their work in this body, in addition to being numerically equal with men, women feel highly regarded by men and their initiatives are well-accommodated by their male workmates.

However, despite this impressive fact, in a numerical framework where the imbalance between women and men is minimal, only 5 (five) women, merely representing 18%, hold a leadership position in CASs, for 23 male members holding leadership.



Photo: a woman (with her husband), CAS member in Popué community, Mecubúri district

The other aspect worth mentioning is that all the communities and households observed under this assessment scope are acquainted with and have mastery over the Public Hearing processes. As their participation is effective, there are visible results from these local governance mechanisms,

namely the contribution to decisions on the exact projects location and adjustment, in accordance with the community reality, funds and actors involved in the process, the functioning and the lifespan of any WSS (in the specific case of PROGOAS) where they can benefit from.

Since the Public Hearing started to be implemented, the beneficiaries' participation has improved, which has raised their satisfaction, given that this mechanism is also used in communities for other projects beyond water and sanitation. This mechanism is an indicator of good governance, transparency, inclusiveness and a yardstick of local governance body's accountability, which is a source of confidence between stakeholders and beneficiaries.



### 3.1.3 Lessons learnt from sustainability of community-based water facility

#### a) Achievements

1. Based on feedback given to POs, PROGOAS seems to have largely attained positive changes through the provision of clean water and the reduction of waterborne diseases, despite a few cases chiefly in Cabo Delgado. It has also fostered equal rights of access to

water, except in Mecúfi, where access is subject to daily amount of money each family contributes with.

2. From beneficiaries themselves, PROGOAS came up with a well thought through criterion of household contributions for WSS maintenance, by letting the communities themselves define the mechanisms and modalities of such contributions. This ensures a common understanding and acceptance in most of the beneficiary communities.
3. Since in many communities visited by this assessment WSS breakdown repairs vary between only a day and week - except in some Mecúfi communities where breakdowns are long-lasting – this means that community monthly contributions following locally decided criteria ensure enough and available money for CAS functioning.
4. Assessing from community satisfaction level, it is worth concluding that the programme has ensured the transfer of water management governance to local communities through the creation of CAS in all communities, without exception, which has contributed to community satisfaction. In only a small minority of cases did BA interviewees complain about CAS functioning. In terms of linkages with district authorities, the Public Hearing tool further has the potential to support transparency, inclusion and good governance, and to inspire confidence at all intervention levels and to the beneficiaries.
5. WSS management and maintenance are entrusted to a local body, the CAS, and the contribution mechanism for this purpose promotes sustainability of the water systems programme financed by SDC. Consequently, contribution for WSS maintenance should continue, and the modalities and criteria should be determined by the communities themselves, after ensuring that these criteria and modalities are consensual.
6. The number of male and female CAS members is balanced and women work comfortably with men without any constraints since their contributions are accommodated in CAS tasks.
7. Despite the fact that PROGOAS has come to an end, the body that addresses water and sanitation in communities in question still prevails and its interventions are visible - CAS. Whether or not the CASs can be improved and sustained – especially in the absence of any kind of project support – remains to be seen, but they offer hope for community driven operation and maintenance of WSSs.

#### **b) Necessary improvements**

1. Although visible stride has been made in life improvement, beneficiaries are still challenged with WSS to satisfy family needs at large in communities where PROGOAS has worked.
2. Despite the gender balance in CAS, women in leadership positions in these bodies remains at less than 20%, which is far from ideal. This should also be considered in a cultural context where the prior right of men to speak in public arenas before women continues to be a factor, making a quick transformation in gender roles difficult.
3. Artisans cost for their undertaking should be transparent, when they are requested to intervene in any situation of WSS damage. But in order to their effort to be fully effective SDPI would handle responsibility for monitoring them.

4. To avoid the situation of, for instance, a community which benefited from a borehole that only operated one day in Cabo Delgado or the water quality in the borehole isn't good enough for human consumption (salinity), PROGOAS could have provided for technical supervision of the WSS to verify the functioning.

## 3.2 Sanitation and hygiene

### 3.2.1 Sanitation facilities

In the observed households this assessment witnessed that a significant number of them in Mecubúri and Nacarôa have had latrines for approximately two years in the first district and three in the latter. But most of households said that in order for their latrines to keep up for the length of this time they have carried out rehabilitation once or twice. Moreover, some households still endeavour to comply with sanitation practices as well as ensuring privacy for their latrines.



*Demonstration of a well-constructed latrine with tip-tap*

In Cabo Delgado, most of beneficiaries interviewed, especially during community meetings attested that their latrines have not lasted more than two years.

### 3.2.2 SANTOLIC (Community-led Total Sanitation)

Table 4: SANTOLIC, LIFECA (ODF) and flag system in Nampula

| Mecubúri District | SANTOLIC | LIFECA (ODF) 2016 | Flag System |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|
| Nacuvite A        | Yes      | Yes               | No          |
| Nacuvite B        | Yes      | Yes               | No          |
| Natore            | Yes      | Yes               | Yes         |
| Popué 2 Sede      | Yes      | Yes               | Yes         |

|                         |             |              |              |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Momane A                | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| Momane B                | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| <b>Subtotal</b>         | <b>100%</b> | <b>100%</b>  | <b>50%</b>   |
| <b>Nacarôa District</b> |             |              |              |
| Namaketho/Murerame      | Yes         | Yes          | Yes          |
| Chicuala                | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| Mugela                  | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| Teterrene Localidade    | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Munana                  | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| Mercurcune              | Yes         | Yes          | No           |
| <b>Subtotal</b>         | <b>100%</b> | <b>83.3%</b> | <b>33.3%</b> |
| <b>Grand Total</b>      | <b>100%</b> | <b>91.5%</b> | <b>41.65</b> |

*Source: data collected from fieldwork and validation workshop*

In Nampula, all communities which have been observed have adopted locally led sanitation, since they have all adopted sanitation especially building latrines using local materials or techniques. They practice domestic sanitation and they have traditional dish platters. Regarding the elimination of open defecation, all the six communities visited in Mecubúri are free from this practice, while only one in Nacarôa is not yet free from open defecation (LIFECA). Although in these communities many households have made heroic efforts to have latrines and other forms of sanitation, few communities, three out of twelve (two in Mecubúri and one in Nacarôa) have benefited from the flag recognition system.

A community is declared an ODF (Open Defecation Free) when all the households have built their latrines and all household members use them adequately.



*An ODF sign placed at the entrance of a community*

Table 4: SANTOLIC, LIFECA (ODF) and flag system in Cabo Delgado

| Chiúre District    | SANTOLIC    | LIFECA       | Flag System  |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Milamba            | Yes         | 2015         | Yes          |
| Nacivare           | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Samilala B         | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Manica             | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Meculane-sede      | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Katabua-sede       | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Subtotal total     | 100%        | 16.6%        | 16.6%        |
| Mecúfi District    |             |              |              |
| 3 Fevereiro        | Yes         | 2016         | Yes          |
| Múaria             | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Murripa            | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Natuco             | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Nanguasse          | Yes         | No           | No           |
| Ngoma              | Yes         | No           | No           |
| <b>Subtotal</b>    | <b>100%</b> | <b>16.6%</b> | <b>16.6%</b> |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>16.6%</b> | <b>16.6%</b> |

*Source: data collected from fieldwork and validation workshop*

Regarding sanitation, this province has almost the same sanitation results in Nampula, as far as flag system is concerned. But comparatively in Cabo Delgado the majority of observed community households are still lagging behind as far as ODF is concerned, comprising less than half. The reason is that the soil is not appropriate since it is in the costal side.

### ***Requirements for household flag recognition***

*By the principle, under PROGOAS, a household could be recognised through a flag when it had a latrine always kept clean, with privacy and, especially, when it had a sanitation system like a tip-tap or a water bucket, where the latrine users wash their hands.*

As for the flag recognition system in communities declared LIFECA (ODF) households observed by this assessment which have been recognised said that having a flag on their latrine is as a symbol of honour. They feel socially more visible and as good examples to be followed.

But this BA has found out that recognition through flags has not covered all households within communities which have been recognised through flags. More so, most of communities declared ODF have not benefited from this recognition system. But observation has learnt from these non-flag households and communities that they are aware of the flag system from neighbouring households and neighbouring communities. Their latrines are also of good quality to deserve flags like other households or communities, and they also aspire the same social reputation, exemplarity and honour with flags on their latrines.



*A picture demonstrating a recognised latrine through a flag (left) and an unrecognised latrine (right)*

The following points can be made based on what has been observed and the feelings attested from visited communities. On one hand, the flag recognition system is playing its role because (1) it keeps up households' motivation to have latrines in good quality and (2) it is replicating to more households and communities since they also have quality latrines in order to be recognised. On the other, the flag system still fails to have a broad coverage in that most households within recognised communities or the majority of communities declared ODF are still not allocated flags.

### Testimony



*"I am very happy because my family has a locally made dish tray and all the family members contribute to maintenance and hygiene on the house patio, as you can see: thank project teachings. With this canopy, dishes remain clean long after washing them, thus contributing to disease reduction" - CAS member, Chiúre district.*

## 3.2.3 Lessons learnt from sanitation and hygiene

### a) Achievements

1. Observed beneficiaries were happy once PROGOAS has raised their awareness to adopt good hygiene and sanitation practices. In addition, they have become central players in such practices without requiring a direct hand from the programme funder or any government actor.
2. The system of hygiene recognition by flags has not effectively been widespread. However, most of the observed communities have knowledge about the flags, the principles and requirements behind it. The lesson had from the beneficiaries is shortage of rigorous milestone between latrine flags and those without. Households with flags have demonstrated stimulus to maintaining prominence in sanitation and flags have become a symbol for social reputation.
3. SANTOLIC was a well-planned system by PROGOAS because communities themselves still adopt sanitation and hygiene mechanisms, although the majority of communities in Cabo Delgado have not been declared LIFECA (ODF).

### b) Necessary improvements

1. Gaps in sanitation and hygiene remain significant, to a greater degree in Cabo Delgado province, where most of communities or households still rely on open defecation.
2. The use of tip-tap for hygiene in latrines has not proved sustainable because physical buckets either disappear earlier or they're stolen in some cases (and the POs did not have an opportunity to observe any household with a functional tip-tap). As an alternative, the

communities opted for buckets or clay pots in their latrines, replacing the tip-tap. Therefore, it might be more practical not promoting tip-tap use.

3. Where the soil is totally sandy, the case of Cabo Delgado communities and households are not able to handle the construction of family toilets, HELVETAS and its implementing partners could consider the construction of public toilets so as to minimise the open defecation challenge.
4. The discussion with SDPI reached a conclusion that they still hope the strategy of slabs marketing by artisans - so that households are sensitised to use them – to be revitalised because it could promote construction of more sustainable latrines.
5. Although many observed communities have latrines, and almost half of them have been declared LIFECA, there is a need to improve latrine physical structure by widening the doors and increasing the height of the walls.

### **3.3. Water, sanitation and hygiene governance**

#### **3.3.1 Community engagement in planning and monitoring**

During its execution, the field research showed that overall, the PROGOAS beneficiary communities in both provinces have experienced a substantial climb of the ladder in participation of all social strata, especially women, young people, the elderly and people with special needs in planning, monitoring and use of water, sanitation and hygiene services, according to the criteria established by the programme and mechanisms agreed upon locally.

This has yielded visible benefits among others, the inclusion and transparency in decision making processes which allows rich and comprehensive inputs, the representativeness of needs of all societal layers and, consequently, their engagement in local efforts to tackle communal water, sanitation and hygiene governance related challenges.

The above has been enabled because all community leaders have a place in the CCL, playing their noble duty of liaison between communities and district governments. As an indicator of inclusive participation efficiency promoted by CCL, by this assessment beneficiaries had attended community meetings (Planning Fairs) very recently, through May and June 2018. To beneficiaries' knowledge, among the key tasks carried out by CCL, the most notable are community support in identifying and surveying local needs on Planning Fairs and subsequently channelling them to the CCPA till they are submitted to District Government. Finally, feedback from district authorities to communities flows through the same governance structure, where finally the CCL are end vectors to communities.

However, despite feeling that their needs are effectively delivered to district authorities, communities expressed their apprehension on how they are handled. First, it takes a long time for district government feedback to reach them (normally six months or more after submission). This feedback is sent to communities when households are decontextualized from their own needs and when they have already grown despondent. Second, in general, needs submitted to District Governments hardly result into satisfactory ending to the communities. Third, the mechanism for needs-selection and incorporation in government priorities among communities is never made clear to allow them to be aware of their flaws which hinder them from being included in the District Socio-Economic Plan and Budget (PESOD).

Planning fairs are a good tool, but the drawback is on how the needs are dealt with. The CCLs work hard to represent their respective communities through submitting locally identified needs to district government. But, according to their point of view, they are challenged with minor needs such as means of transport, communication facilities (mobile phones) to facilitate communication with district for follow-up reasons. The CTDs have also expressed the same challenge, though they are open to involve CCLs. However, a complaint from CCLs is that hardly have they had access to how PESOD preparation is in progress, reason why they only get the community results when PESOD has been prepared.

The reason is that community needs sent to district government go through a selection process so that priorities for government can be met. Then the district government submits such selected priority needs at provincial level for another screening. Therefore, it is normal that communities do not have an idea of the whole root of their needs. The planning fair governance mechanism assures community based participation and hence creates expectations in the people that their demands will be heard. However, most of them end up in the process not being prioritized and eventually there is the risk of people being recurrently frustrated and therefore not participating any more in the planning fair.

**Testimony**

*“It is a challenge to be in CCL because of lack of elementary means to work effectively, but also to represent both communities and government. Pressure is from both sides. But anyway, I am happy to be a young person who is part of the CCL in this community. We have worked together with the villagers collecting our needs and then referring them to competent authorities. We have our challenges and several times we are not always most welcome by our community because we usually fail on our mission to meet community mandates, while everyone looks at us as their recourse of needs satisfaction.”*

### **3.3.2 Lessons learnt from WASH governance**

#### **a) Achievements**

1. The PROGOAS beneficiary communities share the feeling that water, sanitation and hygiene governance is a totally localised mechanism (communities are WASH autonomous) because with CCLs where local leaders make part, WASH interests are adequately addressed. However, their frustration is that their needs are not adequately attended at government level, though the CCL endeavour to transmit local needs.
2. In WASH decision-making processes, all social strata participate, which represents inclusivity and transparency.

3. Public Hearings at various WASH project stages, including the construction or rehabilitation of a water supply system, ensure transparency, accountability, trust among the various parties involved and they are a good indicator of cohesion among district government and all other governance levels, as well as conferring beneficiaries the responsibility of quality monitoring and terms fulfilment.
4. Public Hearings are beneficial because, since communities do not have effective mechanisms to follow-up PESOD contours, they constitute a single mechanism that allows community participation and monitoring and it further ensures transparency in all project processes.
5. The Planning Fairs have proven a more appropriate mechanism for community participation during needs identification at all social levels.

**b) Necessary improvements**

1. From CCLs more commitment was expected, mainly speeding up tracking community needs from higher authority levels, better interaction with the district government in addressing locally identified needs and, more importantly, as direct PESOD monitors.
2. CTDs should take responsibility for training CCLs in matters relevant for their duties. One of the major advantages from this training would be their ability to keep up with PESOD and being cognisant of factors that normally influence on whether or not community needs are prioritised and the timely collection of the district feedback to the community. Thus communities could learn from them to design adequate projects to avoid giving district government a burden of dealing with inadequate need plans.

## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the POs' observations on community perceptions, retrieved through beneficiary HH interviews and FGDs, the following conclusions emerge from the BA research:

**1. Community Life Improvement.** PROGOAS has contributed to improving the lives of beneficiary communities. Through the water points financed by the programme, waterborne diseases have reduced with clean water, along with reduction in water point distance to households. As a consequence, families, particularly women, have more time for other domestic chores. However heroic be the endeavour in addressing this issue, water is still in short supply to fully satisfy many consumers in their respective communities. As for the sanitation and hygiene component, the challenge still remains with ensuring open defecation free status in majority communities, though many households have latrines with minimal acceptable hygiene and privacy conditions, as well as adopting other domestic and community sanitation and hygiene practices.

**2. PROGOAS Results Sustainability.** The programme implementation strategy addressed its intervention robustness earlier, basically by empowering communities on local governance responsibility as follows:

- It has established the CAS for WSS maintenance which is also responsible for households monthly contributions, a strategy that ensures a fair mechanism and, above all, timely solutions when breakdowns happen;
- PROGOAS has contributed to the empowerment of CCLs to handle Planning Fairs, as a community participatory mechanism, and more importantly, they operate as a bridge between government and communities in that they convey community needs to government, and then channel government feedback to communities.

**3. Inclusive participation.** Until PROGOAS III, PROGOAS has ensured participation of all social strata and households in community needs identification through Planning Fairs, though the degree to which they contribute to planning, especially at the district level, is unclear. Additionally, Public Hearings allow beneficiaries to garner a standpoint for project monitoring and evaluation in an inclusive manner and with backed-up viewpoints.

**4. District Governments and Community Governance Linkage.** PROGOAS promoted a system of good linkages between community and district governance, vectored by local councils at the community level, and CTD and SDPI, at the district, working in tandem for a common benefit.

**5. CCLs are challenged** with inadequate technical and material support, which might compromise their performance and sustainability. The technical support referred to concerns capacitating them with some the ability to return information on community plans and needs, at the post and / or district level, so that they are able to clarify the reasons for certain priorities. Material support refers to transportation and communication allowances, and maintenance on their travels to the crucial planning sessions.

## Recommendations

In case any other similar project comes up in future, the following aspects should be addressed before actual move towards implementation.

**1. Gender Equality Awareness.** Project implementer (HELVETAS) should seek additional effort to raise beneficiary communities' awareness the need to address gender balance in local governance bodies, such as CAS and CCL, in a manner to ensure rich and balanced decisions.

**2. Foresee Each Local Governance Body's Mandate.** All beneficiary community governance bodies should clearly be instilled with their roles and tasks as well as linkage mechanisms between them and other actors in order to allow sound responsiveness and articulated effort, operating with consistent framework provided for in the terms of reference guidelines.

**3. Planning Fairs; district planning and priority needs.** Planning Fairs are a good participatory mechanism because they allow communities to have an opportunity to make decisions on what is locally commendable as far as needs are concerned, without government or any other entity imposing formal priorities. In terms of effectiveness and efficiency, the Planning Fairs on the government side are proved to be very effective and efficient since they allowed the local participation and orderly demand/project prioritization from community level up to the District level where final decisions are taken in the midst of the formulation of the PESOD according to legal regulations and budget.

However, from the community HH the mechanism has not been effective in terms of assuring that prioritized demands were met, since the District Government, despite the good participation, cannot guarantee that all communities' demands will be attended; in addition, feedback from government to communities are not appropriate, leaving the communities without proper information about their demand prioritized. Furthermore, it is not clear how many community needs resulting from Planning Fairs are satisfied by the government. Therefore, bringing together CCL and CTD for planning process and accountability might be challenged by the facts abovementioned because, though CCLs are foreseen by law, they identify themselves more with communities than with government. Hence, though Planning Fairs deserve continuity, these drawbacks should be approached first.

CCL as local governance mechanism, and CTD and SDPI should be brought together for a common understanding and seek a cohesive and permanent work environment so that the former can be fully empowered to operate as community need watchdog and the later can be open and accommodative. This could overcome all hitches related with shortage of PESOD monitoring capacity, delays in availing feedback to communities and adequate skills to identify and address suitable needs for district attention.

Hence, it is important to develop ways to improve effectiveness for the people in the participation and prioritization planning process, so it will not become eventually a discouraging process. It might be useful to consider assigning an important percentage of the PESOD budget to each locality so there might be more possibilities that a community obtains public funding for their demands/projects prioritized.

**4. Public Hearings.** This mechanism should be encouraged and extended to all projects, because it represents a more local democratic mechanism for community participation in local development needs identification. Public Hearings give beneficiaries the possibility to monitor quality and fulfillment for the project they benefit from and, it allows all social strata, such as women, the elderly and youth to be part of decision-making for the same.

**5. Flag recognition system.** The flag recognition mechanism is working because it keeps being an incentive to many households to have quality latrines. Besides, it has motivated many other communities to keep their latrines clean and well maintained since their expectation is to be socially recognised. In other cases, some of the latrines which had been allocated flags, their quality has

diminished and it is poorer than those without flags. It might be advisable to turn the recognition flag system to community leaders so they become the responsible people to grant and renovate the HH with the flags.

**6. Feedback to communities and their transparency.** As aforementioned, additional effort should be put in place for both parties - community governance bodies and District Governments – to raise their awareness that feedback to communities should not only cover needs which have not fallen under government priority, but also explanation should be given to applicant beneficiaries. Furthermore, if need be, some illustrations of other communities whose needs are successful should be provided so as to be a source of inspiration for improvement and learning for future realistic priorities.

---

## HELVETAS Internal Reference Documents

---

- Cooperação Suíça para o Desenvolvimento. (2018). **Programa de Governação para Água e Saneamento (PROGOAS) em 8 Distritos das Províncias de Nampula E Cabo Delgado - 2009 – 2018**. Relatório da avaliação do fim do Programa. Maputo.
- Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation (2018). **Programa de Governação, Água e Saneamento (PROGOAS III), Cabo Delgado, Nampula –2015/ 2018**. Relatório Anual de 2017. Moçambique.
- Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation. (2015). **Programa de Governação, Água e Saneamento (PROGOAS II & III) Cabo Delgado, Nampula –2012 / 2018**. Relatório Anual 2015. Moçambique
- PROGOAS (2009 - 2018). **Lessons Learnt from 9 Years Supporting Good Governance Practices and Promoting Sustainability of Water and Sanitation Services**. HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation.
- República de Moçambique. Governo da Província de Nampula. Centro de Capacitação em Administração Pública, Governação Local e Autárquica (CEGOV) (2018). **Planificação Distrital. Manual Prático**. Nampula.
- Swiss Development Cooperation, (2015). Government of Mozambique. **Governance, Water And Sanitation Programme In Nampula and Cabo Delgado (PROGOAS III)**.
- Xavier, H., Morand, N., Bispo, S. CAPEX (2018). **Governance, Water and Sanitation Programme (PROGOAS) in Nampula and Cabo Delgado**. Experiences and Learnings. SDC/HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation.

### Online Sources

- [http://www.eawag.ch/fileadmin/Domain1/Abteilungen/ess/schwerpunkte/ehpsy/RANAS  
\\_Methodological\\_Fact\\_Sheets.pdf](http://www.eawag.ch/fileadmin/Domain1/Abteilungen/ess/schwerpunkte/ehpsy/RANAS_Methodological_Fact_Sheets.pdf)
- <https://www.ranasmosler.com>