



African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation
(ANEW)

Analysis of Water and Sanitation Policies
and Status of IWRM in Africa
&
Advocacy capacity assessment of
African civil society on water supply and
sanitation

[REPORT]

African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation
(ANEW)

**Analysis of Water and Sanitation Policies
and Status of IWRM in Africa
&
Advocacy capacity assessment of
African civil society on water supply and
sanitation**

[REPORT - DRAFT FINAL]

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Overview of the context and the study process.....	5
3	Methodology.....	6
	a) Analysis of Water Sanitation Policies and Status of IWRM in Africa	6
	b) Capacity Assessment Tool and Plan	7
	c) Limitations and Challenges	8
4	Background Policy Context.....	9
	a) International and African commitments to action on water and sanitation	9
	b) Policy Challenges	11
	c) Civil Society role in addressing the policy challenges.....	11
5	Findings – Watsan Policy Analysis	12
	a) General Findings – policy analysis.....	12
	b) Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape at National Level	13
	c) Government Interventions to Meet Watsan MDGs	13
6	Findings – Advocacy Capacity Assessment.....	16
	a) Overview	16
	b) Organisation Background	16
	c) Challenges to Equitable Access to Water and Sanitation Services	18
	d) The Role of CSOs in Watsan Policy and Service Delivery	20
	e) Gaps in Watsan Policy Formulation and Implementation	21
	f) Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape at Regional/Sub-regional and International levels... ..	22
	g) Existing Advocacy Activity	27
7	Findings - Institutional Capacity	33
	a) National Focal Points	33
	b) Regional Coordinators	33
	c) Secretariat	34
	d) Key Challenges.....	37
	e) Key Partners.....	38

8 Analysis	39
a) Organisational Background	39
b) National Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape	40
c) Sub-Regional, Regional and International Watsan Policy landscape.....	41
d) Existing Advocacy Activity	41
e) Institutional context.....	41
9 Recommendations	42
a) Strategic direction	42
b) Advocacy strategy.....	42
c) Advocacy capacity-building.....	43
d) Knowledge management and policy analysis.....	44
e) Implementing the AMCOW - ANEW MoU	45
f) Strengthening the Secretariat and Network Structures.....	47

Appendices:

I – Indicative CSO Advocacy Capacity Development Strategy

II - Water and sanitation policy map

III- Terms of reference for the assignment

IV- Analysis of key information sources

1 Introduction

With support from the EU, the Africa Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation (ANEW) is launching a region-wide initiative on “Promoting and improving the capacities of African Civil Society Organisations for advocacy and participation in governance to enhance provision of Water Supply and Sanitation and Integrated Water Resource Management”. The programme aims to support and strengthen the capacities of African civil society as well as institutional development of ANEW over a three year period. It will facilitate dialogue between African civil society and decision makers on access to water supply, adequate sanitation and integrated water resources management (IWRM).

The objectives of the initiative are:

- To increase the number of African countries with explicit policy and strategies that progress the IWRM and Water Supply and Sanitation targets;
- To build political commitment to action by mobilising and coordinating the experience and energy of African Civil Society Organisations and supporting their network, ANEW;
- To monitor progress and to engage in dialogue that reflects the priorities of poor and marginalised communities, with national governments, regional bodies and high level initiatives.

The initiative has an ambitious and broad scope, but it has the potential, if implemented successfully, to significantly strengthen efforts to address the water crisis in Africa. It can do this through fostering an intensified role for civil society, working in partnership with governments, inter-governmental bodies, the private sector and civil society networks. Successful implementation of the project itself will require working in partnership with other stakeholders, such as AMCOW and UN bodies.

For advocacy to be effective it has to respond to and address existing policy. It is therefore imperative that policy and situation analyses are undertaken. The main objective of this aspect of the project is to contribute to sustainable development by monitoring progress made in achieving MDG targets on Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS). To achieve this, the civil society needs well researched information and analysis tools.

In order to lay the groundwork for a broader advocacy strategy, ANEW commissioned the Nottawasaga Institute, Nairobi, to undertake preliminary research into the Watsan policy environment and the civil society capacity to respond to it. The general objective of this initiative was to review and analyse water and sanitation policies and the status of IWRM in Africa in order to promote informed and inclusive public debates and dialogues on key policy issues and IWRM.

Within these broader objectives, the survey aimed to:

- i. Review and analyse water and sanitation policies and the status of IWRM in Africa, with a view to identifying policy gaps that should be addressed by civil society advocacy;
- ii. Assess advocacy capacity of CSOs working on water supply, water resource management and sanitation in the target countries.

The assessment was designed to provide information on:

- The gaps and opportunities within the water policy arena in Africa
- Creating simplified tools for CSOs to use in their advocacy efforts
- Existing CSO capacities and skills in advocacy and networking
- Gaps in capacities and skills
- Opportunities for advocacy
- Indicators for monitoring progress

The following report has been prepared by the Nottawasaga Institute (NI), a Nairobi-based consulting firm specializing in institutional capacity development, with extensive experience in water issues in general and supporting AMCOW in particular. NI also has extensive experience in institutional development with civil society organizations.

2 Overview of the context and the study process

There is a need for African governments to increase investment in water and sanitation infrastructure and implement policies that will meet the increasing demand for water, resulting from increased population growth and industrialization. As water is an exhaustible resource, effective strategies need to be developed to address the need for equitable and sustainable management of water resources at the national and regional levels, especially in light of the fact that critical water resources within the continent are shared by multiple countries, which calls for joint management strategies across regions.

Civil society in many parts of the world has been instrumental in water development, through its direct involvement in water supply and sanitation, water resources management, campaigns for national legislation, public awareness and empowerment of individuals and communities. In Africa, a number of international and local initiatives from civil society organizations (CSOs) have gone a long way in provision of potable water and adequate sanitation facilities, especially in rural and slum areas and to the improvement of catchment's management at the local and river basin level. The involvement of civil society organisations in water policymaking will provide the opportunity for the lessons learnt from the implementation of these programmes to significantly benefit the African population.

In recognition of the above, the Ministerial Commitments made by the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) at the Pan African Implementation and Partnership Conference on Water (Addis Ababa, December 2003), include "Coherent engagement of governments, international organisations and institutions, UN specialised agencies, private sector, NGOs and others in reversing and halting the water crisis in Africa". Subsequent to the above conference, AMCOW commenced consultations with the African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation (ANEW), which ultimately resulted in the signing of an MoU in late 2007.

At the regional level, therefore, the stage has been set for civil society to substantially contribute to water policy formulation. CSOs have a vast amount of experience in working with poor and marginalised communities. This experiential knowledge, shared with AMCOW, as well as with their own governments, would ensure that the policy formulation reflects the realities on the ground, thereby increasing successful implementation of strategies and initiatives. This support needs to be provided at the national, sub-regional and continental levels.

Due to a multitude of factors, the capacity of CSOs in Africa varies from one sub-region and country to another. The impact of a strong civil society in development has been demonstrated in many countries. It is important that Africa learns from these experiences, and fosters African Civil Society in a manner that meets the needs of Africa at the national, sub-regional, continental and international levels. There is no development sector where the role of civil society is more critical than in water and sanitation, and thus AMCOW has a unique opportunity to enhance its effectiveness through joining hands with the non-governmental sector. On the other hand, the capacity of civil society to engage with governments at the policy level, as well as mobilizing the public on water issues, has a mixed record in Africa, and thus there is a great need to strengthen the effectiveness of advocacy in this area.

To address these issues, it is imperative that the existing capacities, capacity gaps, challenges and opportunities for CSO interaction in the policy environment are understood. As one of the initial steps in building CSO capacity for advocacy in Africa, ANEW has undertaken to conduct an Advocacy Capacity Assessment of African Civil Society on Water Supply and Sanitation. This study was conducted in the 17 countries covered by an EU grant, by the Nottawasaga Institute, a Nairobi based firm of consultants.

Through consultations and interviews with the variety of stakeholders involved in the water and sanitation sector, including especially extensive consultations and surveys of CSOs involved in the sector (focusing on ANEW members in 17 countries), the assessment intends to provide: a solid understanding of the policy environment of the sector, where it can benefit from better engagement with civil society; identification of successful CSO approaches to advocacy on these issues; identification of capacity gaps that will need to be addressed in order for civil society to play a more effective advocacy role; strategies to address those gaps; and proposed targets and indicators for measuring the increased effectiveness of civil society in these areas.

3 Methodology

a) Analysis of Water Sanitation Policies and Status of IWRM in Africa

In order to survey the Watsan policy environment, the consultants carried out desk-research, internet searches and selective interviews to ascertain the existence and implementation status of Watsan policies and IWRM plans in the 17 countries covered by the ANEW/EU project.

The countries are:

- **Southern Africa:** Zambia, Mozambique, Lesotho and Botswana
- **Central Africa:** Tchad, Cameroon, and Democratic Republic of Congo
- **Western Africa:** Senegal, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Mali and Nigeria

- **Eastern Africa:** Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia and Rwanda

The information gathering effort for each of the 17 countries has focused on ascertaining:

- Whether an explicit national water and sanitation (Watsan) policy exists, including identification of lead agency/authority?
- What kind of resources - human, financial and technical - have been dedicated to the development and implementation of the Watsan policy?
- What is the current status of the implementation of the national water and sanitation policy?
- Whether a national IWRM roadmap and/or plan exists, including identification of lead agency/authority?
- What kind of resources - human, financial and technical - are dedicated to the development and implementation of the IWRM roadmap/plan?
- What is the status of the implementation of the IWRM roadmap/plan?
- Is there a national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and /or Country Strategy Paper in existence and does it incorporate Watsan and IWRM related concerns and strategies?
- Is the national Watsan policy and IWRM roadmap/plan aligned with the strategy for achieving the MDG targets on water and sanitation?
- Is the country a participant in sub-regional and river and lake basin-level initiatives related to Watsan and IWRM policy and plans?
- What, if any, has been the role of civil society representatives/organizations in the formulation and implementation of the water and sanitation related policies and plans?

Information gathered from different identified sources and presented in the attachment (Appendix I) provides a first overview of the national Watsan and IWRM policies and their implementation in the countries covered by the ANEW/EU project.

The sources for desk-research have comprised national government web sites; the web sites of AU, AfDB, NEPAD, AMCOW, EUWF, GWP, GTZ, WSP, WB, the members of UN Water/ Africa (including UNEP, UNDP, WHO, UNICEF, FAO, UNESCO); and available publications. In addition, selective interviews have been carried out with some representatives of regional and international entities engaged in the water and sanitation sector in Africa as well as academics working on water and sanitation issues in Africa.

b) **Capacity Assessment Tool and Plan**

A capacity assessment tool was developed, consisting of three key components. The first component was targeted at CSOs active in the Watsan sector, and applied through one-on-one interviews by the National focal points, in each of the 17 countries. The National focal points were meant to identify and engage 5 organisations perceived to be active in the Water and Sanitation policy arena, and not necessarily members of ANEW. This exercise was not

intended as a consensus building exercise; rather it was intended to provide an analysis of the situation regarding the advocacy activity at the national level. For this reason and taking into consideration the time constraints, it was felt that consultations with a minimum of 5 organisations would appropriately provide the information required. The national focal points processed the information gathered, and submitted summary reports to the consultants via the ANEW secretariat.

The second component of the tool was addressed to the National focal points and sought to establish their understanding of their roles and responsibilities as National focal points, while also attempting to gauge the key challenges faced by the organisations at the national level in engaging in the Watsan sector.

The third component of the tool addressed similar issues to the above to the Regional coordinators.

National focal points were given a short deadline to collect, compile and submit the information to the Regional coordinators who in turn submitted the reports to the consultants via the secretariat. The consultants would like to take this opportunity to thank the National focal points for the great effort made in ensuring that responses were received promptly. The following report is compiled on the basis of reports received from:

- **East Africa:** Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and Rwanda. There was no response from Ethiopia.
- **Southern Africa:** Botswana, and Zambia. Responses were not received from Lesotho and Mozambique.
- **Central Africa:** Cameroon, Chad, and the Democratic Republic of Congo,
- **Western Africa:** Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, and Senegal. There was no response from Burkina Faso.

Regional responses were received from Central, Western and Eastern Africa.

c) Limitations and Challenges

- i. In some cases such as Senegal, the organisation interviewed was a network organisation of CSOs, and therefore the national focal point chose not to interview other CSO organisations. While the organisation interviewed provided very valuable insights and information on the national and regional Watsan sector dynamics, the consultants were unable to gauge the perceptions, level of understanding and involvement of the member organisations or other CSOs active in the Watsan sector.
- ii. The National focal points chose to process the data collected into one report, which was submitted to the Secretariat. While this synthesis was extremely useful and enabled a more efficient production of this report, the report may have benefited from the raw data collected.
- iii. Working with language barriers within a tight time frame, has made it difficult for some countries to respond.
- iv. The regional coordinator positions for eastern and southern Africa have recently fallen

vacant. However, ANEW board members from these regions have responded on behalf of the regional coordinators.

4 Background Policy Context

a) International and African commitments to action on water and sanitation¹

An historic political commitment to action on crucial development targets was made by 189 Heads of State and Government at the United Nations Millennium Summit in New York in September 2000. At that Summit the leaders adopted the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to be achieved by 2015 on eight priority issues, including poverty, hunger, universal primary education, gender equality, child mortality, maternal mortality and major diseases.

For the eighth priority issue of environmental sustainability, the world's political leaders committed "to halve by 2015 the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water" and to reach the rest by 2025.² Two years later at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in June 2002 in Johannesburg they also committed to halve by 2015 the proportion of people who do not have access to basic sanitation.³

Since 2002 there has been a series of additional international declarations and initiatives on water and sanitation, including:

- 2003 UN recognition of water not only as a limited natural resource and a public good but also as a human right;
- UN designation of 2003 as the International Year of Freshwater;
- UN declaration of 2005-15 as the International Decade for Action on Water for Life;
- 2005 UN World Summit commitment to help developing countries prepare integrated water resources management plans (IWRM) to achieve the MDG water and sanitation targets⁴;
- UN designation of 2008 as the Year of Action on the MDGs as well as the International Year of Sanitation.

In Africa, since 2002 there has also been an escalating series of important declarations and initiatives on water and sanitation, including:

- 2002 establishment of the African Ministerial Council (now African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) with all 53 ministers of water in Africa;
- 2003 Declaration of African Water Ministers and programme of action adopted by the Pan-African Implementation and Partnership Conference on Water (PANAFCON);
- 2004 Sirte Declaration of the Assembly of the African Union on the Challenges of Implementing Integrated and Sustainable Development in Agriculture and Water in Africa;

¹African Union: Achieving the Millennium development goals on Water and Sanitation in Africa BY 2015: Priorities, Partnerships and Plans.

²United Nations, 2000, United Nations Millennium Declaration, A/RES/55/2, New York: United Nations.

³United Nations, 2002, World Summit on Sustainable Development: Key Outcomes, New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA).

⁴United Nations, 2005, World Summit Outcome, A/60/L.1, para. 56 (h), page 14.

- 2004 Statement on “No water, no development, no future” by the African Ministers’ Council on Water (AMCOW) to the 13th Session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development;
- 2004 acknowledgement by the African Union of the Africa Water Vision 2025;
- 2005 International Conference on Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative held in Paris where a framework for meeting the MDG targets in rural Africa was adopted;
- 2006 Conference of African River and Lake Basin Organizations (RLBOs) in Kampala, Uganda which adopted measures for strengthening existing RLBOs and creating new RLBOs as well as strengthening the relationship of the African Network of Basin Organizations (ANBO) with the African Ministers’ Council on Water (AMCOW);
- 2006 Joint Statement on Water and Sanitation between African stakeholders led by AMCOW and the UN Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation (UNSGAB) in Tunis;
- 2007 Brazzaville Declaration of AMCOW on water governance, financing, strategic approaches and implementation;
- 2008 eThekewini Declaration of AMCOW on sanitation.
- 2008 AMCOW report on “Our Common Interest: Toward Mobilizing Concerted Action on Africa’s Water Agenda” for the Dialogue on Africa’s Water Agenda in Berlin;
- 2008 Ministerial Declaration and outcome of the first African Water Week in Tunis on Accelerating Water Security for Africa’s Socio-Economic Development;
- July 2008 African Heads of State and Government at the AU Summit outcomes and declaration; and
- 2008 AMCOW TAC and EXCO meeting outcomes and declaration.

In particular, the 2008 AU Summit culminated in the adoption of the Sharm El-Sheikh Commitments for Accelerating the Achievement of the Water and Sanitation Goals in Africa. In the preamble to their new commitments, the Heads of State and Government recognized “that water is and must remain a key to sustainable development in Africa and that water supply and sanitation are prerequisites for Africa’s human capital development”. Moreover, they also frankly confirmed “that there is an underutilization and uneven sharing of water resources in Africa” and that “not much progress has been made in Africa compared to the rest of the world to achieve the MDGs target, and that based on current trends Africa needs to accelerate its efforts”.⁵

In addition to the above, efforts continue by several UN agencies (UN-Water/Africa); regional economic communities (RECs); development cooperation partners—such as GWP, GTZ, WSP, among others; civil society organizations such as ANEW, river and lake basin organizations such as ANBO; non-governmental organizations such as WaterAid; and donor countries and agencies to keep a constant watch on the developing water and sanitation situation and to develop concerted actions to address the existing and emergent water and sanitation challenges in Africa.

⁵ African Union, 2008, Decisions, Declarations, Tribute and Resolution of the 11th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the African Union, June 30-July 1, 2008, Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, Assembly/AU/Dec. (XI).

b) Policy Challenges

To what extent can African governments, aided by various actors at the national, sub-regional and regional levels, fulfil their commitments in the Watsan sector as per the many declarations and decisions which they are parties to remains an open question. The main challenges for each African country in this regard are to:

- Develop and implement comprehensive national water and sanitation policies;
- Develop and implement Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) strategies and plans;
- Develop and implement strategies and implementation plans to achieve the Millennium Development Goals related to water and sanitation;
- Tackle the issues related to trans-boundary water and sanitation in a cooperative and equitable manner;
- Mainstream water and sanitation into all development plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Country Strategy Papers;
- Secure and dedicate adequate human, technical and financial resources to address the above challenges; and
- Develop monitoring and evaluation systems corresponding to the above.

An emerging and critical challenge for all African countries is to informatively orient all of the above to mitigating and adapting to the threats posed by climate change.

c) Civil Society role in addressing the policy challenges

The overall challenge for African countries is to address the above challenges in an integrated, sustainable and efficient manner. The lessons learned from various on-going efforts in Africa (and around the world) in this regard have clearly shown that the engagement of informed civil society representatives at each stage of developing and implementing water and sanitation related initiatives is a pre-requisite for any semblance of success. The need for establishing effective civil society entities and networks on water and sanitation at the sub-national, national, sub-regional and regional levels is paramount. While several such entities and networks currently exist in Africa and more are being developed, a concerted effort is needed to ensure that they have the knowledge-base and capacities to act as watchdogs as well as to carry out effective Watsan-related advocacy at all levels. To be able to do so, the knowledge-base of civil society actors about national, sub-regional and regional efforts in the area of water and sanitation needs to be expanded and deepened. The aim would be to identify opportunities for effective knowledge-based advocacy by civil society entities as well as build their capacity to be able to do so.

In Africa, ANEW has come to be recognized as the leading regional entity representing the civil society in the Watsan sector, as affirmed by the MoU signed between the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) and ANEW. Several major declarations and decisions relating to water and sanitation have also, directly and indirectly, affirmed the need to engage civil society representatives and bodies in all stages of Watsan policy conceptualization, formulation and implementation at the national, sub-regional and regional levels in Africa. The international

community and several development cooperation partners of Africa have further affirmed the critical role of civil society organizations as symbolized, among other initiatives, by the substantial support extended to ANEW by the European Union.

For ANEW to play its role effectively, however, the knowledge-base of its Secretariat, constituent bodies and sub-regional and national focal points needs to be developed, strengthened and supported on an ongoing basis. This is because sound knowledge of national, sub-regional and regional strategies, policies, plans and projects relating to water and sanitation is a prerequisite for informed advocacy and action by civil society. The ANEW knowledge-base must, of necessity, also include lessons learned from Watsan-related efforts not only in Africa but around the globe, especially in the developing world-regions.

It is in this context that, supported by EU, ANEW has sought to review and analyze water and sanitation policies and the status of IWRM in Africa in order to promote informed and inclusive public debates, dialogues and advocacy on key policy issues.

5 Findings – Watsan Policy Analysis

a) General Findings – policy analysis

Significant efforts are being made in most of the ANEW/EU project countries to develop and implement national strategies and plans with regard to water and sanitation, IWRM roadmap/plans and achievement of the MDG targets on water and sanitation. However, the nature and extent of information available from different sources on the above is uneven among the 17 countries covered by the ANEW/EU project.

Information currently available on the specific mechanisms (e.g. lead agencies, legal provisions and mechanisms, demarcation of responsibilities, etc.) established for developing and implementing national Watsan policies and IWRM roadmaps/plans is difficult to fully ascertain in some countries. In a few cases only, a specific lead agency has been identified and/or a legal authority established on Watsan.

It is difficult to discern, from the information **currently** available, what exactly are the kinds of resources - human, financial and technical - that have been dedicated to developing and implementing Watsan policies and IWRM plans, or what portions of national budgets have been clearly earmarked for the purpose.

Even in those cases where the existence of a Watsan-related policy or IWRM plan could be discerned, the status of their implementation and the progress made could not be clearly assessed. Only in a few cases have proper monitoring and evaluation systems been established.

There are significant differences in the quantitative assessments of country-wise achievement of the MDG targets on access to safe water and improved sanitation carried out by governments, international organizations (WHO/UNICEF) and civil society organizations.

Except in a few cases, information on the role of civil society representatives/organizations in developing and implementing Watsan policies and IWRM plans is hard to obtain. While several CSOs are cognizant of the existence and work of AMCOW for instance, overall the knowledge - base on available opportunities for interactions with AMCOW and seeking their support remains weak.

But, there are several examples of a concerted effort to develop and implement the required strategies and plans. With the increasing recognition that a large portion of Africa's water resources are in shared water basins - rivers, lakes and aquifers - several initiatives are underway to develop basin-wide IWRM roadmaps and plans. Efforts are also in place to ensure that the national IWRM plans are compatible with the larger basin-wide plans. In several cases, sectoral plans for water and sanitation are being modified and incorporated under the integrated approach required by IWRM. For example, under SADC, an IWRM compliant Protocol for shared water resources and a regional water policy and strategy have been developed. Several River Basin Commissions have been and are being established often after difficult negotiations. While integrated water management plans are desirable, the implications of ownership and access on the socio-economic and therefore political climate within each sovereign state have to be taken into consideration. An institutional framework is in place and functional under ECOWAS, coordinated by the WRCU. Several activities in the WARAP-IWRM programme of activities have support of partners such as AfDB, AWF, GEF, French GEF, EU, WSP, GWP, etc. Similar efforts are underway in the Zambezi river basin.

A country-level illustration of a national IWRM action plan, including lessons learned, is provided for Burkina Faso in the box below. It is important to note that the lessons learned in the case-study include the formation and active participation of stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of the IWRM Action Plan, among other positive aspects.

Several IWRM-related efforts are also underway at more local (sub-catchment) levels, e.g. in the Dens River Basin in Ghana and in the Lower Manyame sub-catchment in Zimbabwe. Projects for improved livelihoods in Lower Limpopo and the Namwala food security project in Zambia are further examples of IWRM-guided local projects.

At the national level, CSO engagement in Watsan policy formulation and implementation varies from participation at multi-stakeholder dialogue forums to engaging in building Watsan infrastructure or improving access to existing water points in poor/underserved areas. However, CSOs felt that the consultations are more nominal in nature. One of the key challenges impeding CSO participation on the IWRM arena is a lack of clarity and understanding on what IWRM entails. The situation is made more difficult by a similar lack of understanding on the part of government, which results in them not knowing where and how to engage the other stakeholders on the landscape.

b) Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape at National Level

The Principle policy instruments identified at the national level in the 17 countries surveyed are presented in the following table.

c) Government Interventions to Meet Watsan MDGs

To ensure sustainable delivery of water and sanitation services at the national level, it is imperative that government holds the primary responsibility for the provision of these services. Government interventions to meet MDGs on Water and Sanitation were cited as the following.

- i. **Water sector policy reforms:** To improve service delivery, various policy instruments are being brought into force. In Nigeria and DRC for example, a new water bill is before parliament. Mali and Senegal await parliamentary action on a proposed sanitation

Burkina Faso: Action Plan for IWRM⁶

Confronted with serious water resources problems constraining development, Burkina Faso decided to prepare an action plan setting out the future framework for integrated water resources management (IWRM) and identifying the specific actions and means for their implementation.

The Action Plan has as its overall objective to contribute to the implementation of IWRM adapted to the national context and the national policies, at the same time reflecting the principles of sustainable and ecologically viable rational water resources management. The underlying broad strategies of the planning process was to: implement an integrated approach rather than a sectoral approach; support for the Government to move to a more facilitation role regarding water production and services and management of irrigation schemes; propose an institutional and human resource plan for the public administration of water resources; develop an efficient and stable management framework at appropriate ministerial levels and propose a staged restructuring process. A permanent secretariat has been created to implement the decisions of the management committee of the Action Plan. It has the mission to define operational strategies for implementation, elaborate annual activity programmes and to mobilise and manage financial resources necessary to implement the IWRM.

The process has been conducted as a structured process with several key steps: a) Assessing the status, b) Adaptation of the legal framework to IWRM principles, c) Identification of key water resources management issues and development of an action plan.

Further characteristics of the process were:

- The involvement of a highly multidisciplinary team; information of stakeholders throughout the process; ensuring consultative, multi-stakeholder process;
- The inclusion of the Action Plan framework in the law and its elaboration and implementation in decrees;
- Actions that clearly address the key water resources management issues;

Lessons learned

- Political will at highest levels should be established at an early stage and the whole process should be firmly anchored in the responsible ministry and ministry staff should be involved in all activities.
- The planning process should be supported by a communication strategy for involvement of stakeholders, technical and financial partners.
- Institutional reform possibilities should be considered during the process.
- IWRM principles need to be studied and adapted to the national context.
- Stakeholder groups should be formed to discuss the plan and allowed enough time for comments and endorsement.
- Decision makers at many levels should participate in the consultative processes.
- Prioritisation of issues need to be based on rational methodologies.
- To be sure of the value of the proposals and approaches, they need to be pilot tested in a basin where economic, social and environmental stakes are high.

⁶Source: GWP

policy. In Kenya, the reforms have included reforms in the institutional structures charged with the mandate of water and sanitation management. This has resulted in the creation of a dedicated Ministry for Public Health and Sanitation, which, it is anticipated will result in more resources and specific action plans to address sanitation in the country. In some countries, national water management plans have been developed to guide the implementation of water policy. In Botswana, the Botswana

Country	National Policy Document
Kenya	The Water Act, The Sanitation and Hygiene Policy
Botswana	Waste water management strategy, Water Conservation Policy, Water Supply and Sanitation Policy (WASP), National Development Plan, Botswana National Water Master Plan, The National Waste and Waste Water Master Plan
Chad	The Water and Sanitation Master Plan 2003 – 2020, Code of Water, National Fund for Water, Decree 249 defining modes of temporary transfer by the State to the territorial authorities decentralized from its powers in regards to the delegation of drinking water public services (Chad)
Rwanda	National Water Policy, Organic Law, Land Law, Mining Law
Tanzania	National Water Policy, Water Strategy, MDGs and Mkukuta
Uganda	<i>No information provided</i>
Zambia	Water Policy Framework
Senegal	IWRM National Program (PEPAM)
Mali	Code of Water, National Sanitation Policy being adopted CSCRIP: Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty reduction (SFGPR) PAGIRE: Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Management (APIWRM) PNAE: National Plan for Access to Water (PNAW) PROSEA: Program for the Water and Sanitation Sector (PWSS)
Ghana	Water policy, Water Directorate. Sanitation policy awaiting parliamentary approval.
Nigeria	National Water and Sanitation Policy
DRC	The Water Code, National Water Strategy, National Water Policy, Water Standards and Guidelines, The Environment Code, The Health Code (<i>all these instruments are at various stages of development</i>)
Cameroon	The Water Code (under the Ministry of Environment)

Table 1 - national policy instruments

Water partnership has created platform for information sharing and the Water Utilities Corporation has annual stakeholder workshops to share information and strategise for the management of the resources. There is also an IWRM/ water efficiency plans project being implemented covering the entire country. These measures have translated to increased water access points, reduced water tariffs in rural areas and villages, and provision of private stand pipes to poverty stricken households.

- ii. **Increased Resources for Water and Sanitation Provision:** Governments have increased budgetary allocations to the Watsan sector. Some governments are also working towards mobilising resources from the private sector and bilateral donors to address the infrastructure requirements of the country.

- iii. **Awareness creation at the national level:** Various public campaigns have been organised to ensure public education on issues especially related to the importance of sanitation and hygiene. This has led to more resources mobilised at the local level to improve water and sanitation infrastructure in some areas.

6 Findings - Advocacy Capacity Assessment

a) Overview

Generally speaking, in Africa, policy formulation has been considered the domain of government. CSO involvement in policy formulation has been limited and in many cases, donor drive and thus nominal. CSO engagement in the watsan sector has been more evident in service delivery. CSOs have achieved a distinct advantage over governments in being able to access even the household level (where government is able to access the village level at best), in the areas where they work. They therefore have intimate knowledge of the issues at the local level, what is likely to work and what does not, the cultural and socio-economic context of the area and the physical layout of the landscape. They are also ideal laboratories to pilot interventions and have often times been used by donors in this manner. CSOs have also played a key role in interpreting policy and raising awareness on development issues at all, and especially at the grassroots level.

If Watsan delivery is to expand to ensure equitable access to all, it is imperative that the rich resource provided by the CSO experiences and knowledge are incorporated in the policy formulation and implementation process in a more conscious and concerted manner. To enable effective CSO engagement, it is imperative that the current policy landscape at the national, regional, sub-regional and pan-African level are well understood. It is crucial to understand the opportunities, and impediments to CSO engagement in policy formulation and implementation.

This section is a synopsis of the findings of the survey conducted via internet, of the 17 countries under the EU-funded project. This section is a first attempt by ANEW to understand and document the watsan arena from a CSO perspective, and therefore some of the information gathered is actually more a confirmation of beliefs held by practitioners in the sector. The information presented is intended to facilitate independent thought on the ground realities. The analysis of the findings are therefore presented in the section following.

b) Organisation Background

In each country, up to five organisations active in the Watsan area were interviewed. These included:

- National NGOs (on average they have been in existence for between 8 – 12 years)
- International NGOs such as Water Aid, RADDHO (working on Human Rights issues) and SNV
- Networks – Both CSO and multi-sectoral, mostly operating at the national level. Some had linkages to the Regional and Sub-regional processes.
- UNICEF

The organisations work on a diversity of issues including:

- Improved infrastructure for access to water and sanitation
- Emergency Watsan service provision
- Rural water supply
- Policy popularisation; lobby and advocacy
- Environmental protection, conservation and Community Based Natural Resource Management
- Poverty; improved livelihoods and income generating activities; micro-credit
- Capacity building of members
- Social and political governance
- Gender; women's and child rights and child protection
- Access to justice; conflict management
- Community empowerment
- Community health care, including HIV & AIDS interventions; fight against tobacco addiction; hygiene
- Youth work
- Research
- Consumer protection

Key Partners identified by the organisations interviewed included

- Government Departments
- Municipality (Chad, Uganda)
- Private Sector (Botswana, Tanzania)
- International NGOs such as Water Aid, SNV, Christian Aid and WWF
- Donor agencies
- UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF)

In Kenya, and Nigeria the organisations interviewed, saw donors and international agencies as key partners, while in Botswana they identified the private sector and government departments as key partners. In Rwanda, government departments, government projects, private sector and other CSOs were identified as key partners. In Uganda, in addition to the above, all agencies interviewed identified the local governments as a key partner. In Tanzania and Zambia international NGOs were regarded as key partners.

In Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Chad, DRC, Nigeria, Senegal, Ghana, and Rwanda all agencies interviewed relied on donor (bilateral donors and international NGOs) funding for their operation. In Botswana, Mali, Nigeria and Zambia, some of the agencies get support from the private sector, and some were member organisations that sustained their activities from membership fees and consultancy services.

All respondents reported working with the government in the following ways:

- Engaging local administration for community mobilisation
- Involvement in policy review sessions
- Working through institutions formed due to the water sector reforms e.g. WASREB, WARMA, WSTF, WAGS
- Partnership in activities such as awareness campaigns
- Dialogue and negotiation based on research and evidence-based information
- Project agreements
- Implementing and supporting decentralisation policies.

In Mali, NGOs are regulated by a state managed framework agreement. However, in the implementation of programs/projects conventions of partnership are signed with the territorial authorities.

The organisations interviewed knew of CSO networks, but the coordination and effectiveness of the networks varied from country to country. Botswana, Tanzania, Zambia, Senegal and Uganda demonstrate good examples of CSO engagement in common advocacy, research and information sharing activities. However, in Tanzania, it was observed that despite the existence of an active CSO network, organisations did not know what activities their partners were engaged in, and the focus of the network seems to emphasise training and capacity building rather than information sharing. Rwanda placed emphasis on the need for a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism, and could learn more from the practices in Uganda, where the cross-sectoral collaboration includes media. In Kenya, several networks exist, but poor coordination was cited as a challenge to their effectiveness. Where INGOs are network members, their role seems to be to facilitate and foster the participation of the local NGOs.

c) Challenges to Equitable Access to Water and Sanitation Services

Equitable distribution and access to water and sanitation services remains a key challenge for most populations across the continent. At the national level, common impediments to equitable access to water and sanitation were identified as follows.

i. Constraints in policy development and implementation

- Weak or inadequate national policy on access to water and sanitation; lack of water law (Nigeria); lack of a sanitation policy (Tanzania)
- Non-implementation of policy (Nigeria); lack of political will to implement policy
- Lack of capacity in policy implementers (District Assemblies in Ghana)
- Disconnect between water and sanitation, causing sanitation to lag behind
- In some cases, sanitation is viewed as the responsibility of households and therefore not addressed in government development strategies.

ii. Management Constraints

- Non collaboration of service providers and ineffective management of water supply projects

- Inefficient distribution of powers among institutions e.g. local government and the central government
- No mechanisms in place for water resource conflict management
- Lack of effective water pricing in rural areas
- Lack of information management leading to duplication of efforts in information gathering
- Lack of demand management
- Lack of data to guide regulatory instruments to control water allocation and use limits.

iii. Capacity Constraints

a. Government Level:

- Inappropriate/weak training of key stakeholders in IWRM (including public service personnel and CSOs)
- Weak planning capacity within government which translates to:
 - Lack of government prioritization of needs for proper budget allocation
 - Priority given to high income and urban areas
 - Lack of formalized access to service delivery e.g. slum communities
 - Inadequate stakeholder involvement in developing, implementing and monitoring public policy on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene
- Mapping and needs assessments not done objectively by sector players; gaps in statistical data access and analysis
- Lack of technical capacity to ensure clean water supply
- Lack of appropriate technology in rural areas
- No technology in place to reuse or recycle water
- Ground water protection and abstraction not adequately covered
- Protection of water catchment and recharge areas lacking, resulting in rivers and streams drying up
- Sanitation aspect not given attention.

b. CSO level

- Watchdog role of CSOs is compromised as some receive funding from government or government agencies e.g. Water Trust Fund
- Weak CSO networks
- Lack of prioritization by the CSO in the sector
- Low awareness of water policies.

c. **Community level**

- Culture and attitudes of the communities
- Lack of community empowerment to demand improved services
- Absence of appropriate technology in rural areas
- Low awareness of water policies.

iv. **Resource Constraints**

- e) Insufficient infrastructure
- f) Lack of adequate financing to develop required infrastructure
- g) Corruption and lack of transparency
- i. Externalities
- h) Poverty - inability to pay for services
- i) Land tenure issues in informal settlements
- j) Unavailability of water – poor water harvesting and conservation techniques
- k) Climate conditions and seasonality of water supply.

d) **The Role of CSOs in Watsan Policy and Service Delivery**

CSOs reported being engaged in water policy formulation at the national level. To enable effective and efficient engagement at the policy formulation level, CSOs in some countries such as Uganda and Botswana have created platforms for cross-sectoral dialogue on Watsan issues. For example the Kalahari Conservation Society is the secretariat to Botswana Water Partnership, an initiative that involves government, private sector, and CSOs. In Uganda, a similar initiative has also engaged media in the discussions. In Mali, CSOs reported being active members of different commissions during the development of policies. While most CSOs reported being invited to policy review and formulation processes, in some cases the consultations come at the end and were perceived to be more of a formality than a real intent to engage CSOs in the processes.

Some CSOs felt that donors have a greater impact on the policy formulation, as they funded policy implementation. INGOs were seen to have a better understanding, recognition and participation at the policy formulation level than local NGOs. Policy issues are higher on the agenda of the INGOs, while national NGOs tend to focus on policy implementation and service delivery.

A key impediment identified to the participation of CSOs in policy formulation was the lack of an in-depth understanding of the policy instruments, and an inability to fully understand the implication of proposed policies. Policy interpretation is a key skill lacking especially amongst national NGOs. CSOs seem to have a stronger role in policy implementation.

CSOs have mobilised resources to develop the required infrastructure in some targeted areas. They have also worked towards creating a demand for better service delivery by local and central government, and have especially mobilised marginalized groups such as women,

youth, pastoralists, and refugees to improve their access to the required services. An important component of this strategy is policy interpretation and dissemination at community level, coupled with awareness creation through campaigns and trainings.

CSOs are also engaged in demonstration and dissemination of effective technologies, especially in low-income areas, to overcome the challenge presented by poverty.

e) Gaps in Watsan Policy Formulation and Implementation

Lack of capacity among key state and non-state stakeholders was identified as a key challenge in water and sanitation policy formulation and implementation.

Oftentimes, governments do not conduct substantive research or surveys to determine ground realities prior to formulating policies. This leads to inappropriate distribution and management of available resources, and there is no prioritisation to ensure equitable access to services across the citizenry. A needs based budgetary allocation would be one strategy to ensure equity in distribution of services, but planning has not gone to that level of detail. In some cases, the lack of required political will enhances this challenge.

Non-inclusive decision making processes compound the problem. Data that has not been gathered by the state is often times available within other sectors. CSOs have a particular advantage in their access to the household level, and as a result they have access to information and experiences that would enrich policy formulation and implementation processes if adequately included.

As beneficiaries, the community members are a key stakeholder. However, their participation in policy formulation and implementation is low, minimal or non-existent. Policy formulation and implementation therefore becomes supply driven, rather than demand driven, and does not necessarily provide services where they are most needed, or fails to consider the needs and requirements of the community intended to be served.

Access to water and sanitation is perceived as a basic right by state and non-state development agencies, and therefore a number of non-state agencies are engaged in service delivery. In most countries, more than one state agency is charged with Watsan related responsibilities. The various service providers and agencies working in the sector do not collaborate and consult each other in the development and implementation of their individual plans. This leads to duplication in the roles of service providers, and there is a discontinuity between mandated service providers, independent providers and the communities.

Resource constraints and low funding are a challenge that all the stakeholders engaged in the sector face. Better planning and collaboration would increase the efficiency of resource allocation and use in the sector.

However, lack of skills in CSOs to engage in policy formulation, coupled with slow policy formulation processes, prove a challenge to effective CSO participation. Limited opportunities for NGOs due to lack of direct funding and weak understanding of policy also impedes participation. A crucial function of CSOs in policy implementation is in monitoring and evaluation. However, key aspects such as equity monitoring and public expenditure tracking are overlooked, owing to lack of skills and limited understanding of the processes. To overcome some of these challenges, CSOs establish networks to enable information sharing, monitoring, and engaging in lobbying and advocacy activities. Then again, under-funding of such networks limits the range and depth of activities undertaken.

To improve their participation in the policy formulation and implementation arena, CSOs believe they could engage in the following:

- Fundraising for more interventions and wider coverage
- Capacity building for CSOs on advocacy issues - including policy interpretation, issue identification and management.
- Awareness-raising of communities/consumers on their entitlements
- Creating a bridge between the service providers and the communities/consumers
- Improving collaboration and coordination among CSOs
- Improving the public image of CSOs to the government and the communities
- Lobbying for active participation in policy development and implementation
- Promoting active participation of communities in policy formulation and implementation.

f) Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape at Regional/Sub-regional and International levels

The level of awareness of regional policy processes, and knowledge of engagement of the national governments within these processes varies from country to country. Where the respondents were regional or national coordinating organisations, there was some awareness and understanding of the regional processes and the role of national governments therein. However, in a number of responses, the CSOs were unaware of the existence of regional and sub-regional processes, though more aware of international treaties and agreements that their governments are parties to. International agreements that national governments were seen to be party to were identified as;

- MDGs
- WSSG
- Sharm el Sheikh Declaration on Water and Sanitation
- eThekweni Declaration
- Global Water Partnership
- Cotonou agreement (signed in 2000 between ACP countries and EU)
- The AU declaration (Ghana)
- UNCCD - Desertification Convention
- UNFCCC - Climate Convention
- UNCBD - Biodiversity Convention
- Africa Water Vision 2020
- International convention on economic, social, and cultural rights
- RAMSAR

Some regional processes identified included:

- SADC and ECOWAS statutes and processes
- Shared water resource agreements: Zambezi, Okavango
- Bilateral and multilateral partnership agreements signed in the framework of the IWRM National Program and the access to Drinking Water and Sanitation national Program (PEPAM – Senegal)
- Nile Basin Initiative (Tanzania)
- Lake Chad Basin Commission (CBLT)
- Niger Basin Authority (ABN)
- IWRM
- NEEDS (Nigeria)

The impact of the international agreements on national-level action for water and sanitation service delivery was seen to be:

- The introduction of water sector reforms to improve service delivery, including review of national plans for water resource management, and creation of institutions and infrastructure to improve service delivery.
- An increase in budget allocation for water and sanitation, and an increase in donor support to the Watsan sector.
- Participating at international forums forces national governments to measure their progress against others, and become more accountable at the international level, thus making them keener to take action at national level.
- Increased willingness to engage in effective public consultation.
- Development of climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies.
- Establishment of benchmarks to guide implementation of projects (better monitoring and evaluation).
- Implementation of Vision 2020 policy (Nigeria)
- Significant improvement of access to drinking water and sanitation (in Senegal from: 49% in 2004 to 67% in 2008 in urban and peripheral urban areas; 27% to 37% in 2008 in rural areas).

CSOs play a minimal role in the formulation of international agreements but do play a role in the dissemination and awareness raising about the agreements. CSOs have a limited mandate to monitor the implementation of policy, however, they felt that their recommendations are not given due consideration. Botswana and Senegal seemed to be the exception to this – consultative mechanisms exist and are reportedly effective.

A list of policy documents was presented to gauge level of awareness of the instruments, and their use in the work that CSOs are engaged in. These were Africa Water Vision 2020, MDGs (best known, most used), AU Sirte Declaration, AU Sharm el-Sheik Declaration on Water and Sanitation, eThekweni Declaration, and the AMCOW Brazzaville Declaration. Respondents were

aware of the UNCCD, UNCBD, MDGs, the Sharm el Sheik Declaration, and the eThekweni Declaration, and used these as references in their own work. Other agreements referenced were the African Commission for Humans and Peoples Rights. Knowledge on other agreements was limited.

Awareness of organisations working with Regional entities on Watsan policies was low, with the exception of the KCS (Botswana), WASAZA (Zambia), RADDHO (Senegal), CONWAS (Ghana) and RWASEF (Rwanda) that is engaged in several regional and sub-region level activities. However, it is important to note that these are national networks, that are long-term ANEW members. The smaller CSOs, or national networks such as NEWSAN in Nigeria that work on water and sanitation issues at national and international level, but have not worked with ANEW, do not have a similar level of understanding of some of the regional and international processes, thus demonstrating a gap that needs to be addressed in future interventions. AMCOW was known by a few including the national focal points for Botswana, Rwanda, Tanzania, Zambia, Ghana, Senegal, and by UNICEF.

There was a general observation that opportunities for CSO engagement are varied. The following factors are some that were cited as those that work in favour of CSO participation in regional and sub-regional processes:

- The CSOs have capacities and expertise to implement interventions up to the household level.
- Sharing common languages at the regional level
- Challenges facing the region are the same, so CSOs can come together in their interventions to ensure their contribution is felt
- Climatic conditions in the region are the same
- Decision making processes at the regional level are similar
- The need to lobby governments is a common need
- Some regional bodies recognise CSO networks. For example, SADC recognises NAWISA.
- There are several RBOs needing facilitation of stakeholder participation and NGOs are better placed to do this.

Organisations such as RADDHO in Senegal, have substantive experience and knowledge of regional and Pan African initiatives, having participated in all stages of the Regional Consultation Process started by the African Union organization (AUO) since 1998. This includes engagement with the New Partnership for the Economic Development in Africa (NEPAD), the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), the Declaration on Stability, Security, Peace, Development and Cooperation in Africa (DSSPDCA), the Economic and Social, Cultural Council (ECOSOCC) of the African Union (AU), the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC).

In May 1997 a network called “Coordination of the Civil Society Organizations for the Defense of the Environment and the Development of Senegal River Basin (CODESEN) was established in Senegal. CODESEN has dedicated itself to establish national and sub regional organizational and institutional frameworks to facilitate dialogue, exchange of information and experiences, networking and widening alliances to increase the involvement of the civil society organizations

and the local stakeholders (authorities and populations) in the development, implementation and monitoring of the ODSR projects and programs of ODSR (PASIE, WEM/SRB, IWRMP, PAS, etc.). This experience is a potential model for other regions and countries in Africa to emulate.

Impediments to CSO participation at the regional level were identified as:

- Weak understanding and grasp of issues at the regional level; lack of awareness of regional processes
- Insufficient information on regional processes
- Lack of communication – Information dissemination is limited and not timely
- Insufficient funding
- Bureaucracy
- Lack of common work focus - Networking problems
- Limited capacity for effective participation
- Laws and regulations on agreements
- Regional bodies perceived to be a preserve of the public service and politicians
- Regional bodies do not have mechanisms for receiving information on issues from CSOs.

Country level CSOs were asked to identify the challenges they feel are common to their region. These were articulated as follows:

i. **East Africa**

- Low prioritization of Watsan by governments
- Lack of harmonised policies and laws
- Policies are formulated in a non-consultative manner
- Continuous modification of policy instruments (Rwanda)
- Weak understanding of policy documents due to complexity of language used in the documents
- Cost of technology
- Corruption
- Insufficient funding for water and sanitation
- Inadequate infrastructure
- Weak law enforcement
- Lack of advocacy skills among CSOs
- Increasing population trends
- Climatic conditions

- Unavailability of water
- Poverty
- Terrain and topography
- Culture and attitudes

ii. Southern Africa

- Non-responsiveness of the public service to the needs and priorities of the masses
- Skewed distribution of services with the urban population enjoying higher access. Also even within urban setups access is skewed depending on income. Integrated Water Resources management
- Water Demand Management
- Poor infrastructure on sanitation
- Access to services in low income areas
- The financial cost of bringing the services to people is high
- Water pollution/contamination
- Scarcity of water in remote areas
- Preservation of water bodies
- Droughts and insufficient water sources
- Poverty leading to inability to access proper sanitation and water facilities

iii. Central Africa

- Poor infrastructure for water and sanitation
- Desertification and low rainfall
- Drying of rivers and lakes
- To have a healthy environment

iv. Western Africa

- Lack of concerted action at the regional level
- Commitment within higher levels of national government to work at regional and national level is lacking
- Lack of engagement of key stakeholders such as local authorities, CSO actors, media, and private sector
- Strong dependence on external assistance
- IFIs influence for water privatization

- Weak institutions to drive public utilities; weakness in local planning
- Weak advocacy capacities of most CSOs
- Climate Change

g) Existing Advocacy Activity

A few organisations have developed an advocacy strategy and the percentage of resources allocated to advocacy varied from country to country as demonstrated in the chart below.

Country	% Resources allocated to Advocacy	% Time allocated to Advocacy
Botswana	0 - 20 - 70%	5 - 90%
Cameroon	*	*
Chad	*	*
DRC	*	*
Ghana	40%	40%
Kenya	0 - 3%	Up to 10%
Mali	Rarely over 3.5%	No percentage specified. Reported as Low
Nigeria	One organisation responded (a national network)70%	3 staff – 2 devote 50% and one devotes 100% of time to advocacy
Rwanda	*	*
Senegal	* (the responding organisation is a network dedicated to lobby and advocacy work in western Africa.)	*
Tanzania	20 – 90%	30 – 50%
Uganda	3-6 % (Local NGOs) up to 30% INGOs	Up to 75%
Zambia	70%	60%

Table 2 - resource allocation for advocacy

* No figures were provided in these countries

All respondents in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Zambia, Ghana, Nigeria, Mali, Senegal and Botswana were members of a Watsan network. Current advocacy activities undertaken included:

- Policy dissemination e.g. the water act & IWRM (in some cases this includes popularising the policy to make it easier to understand and apply)
- Policy review
- Debt relief gain monitoring (Nigeria)
- Community mobilization towards Watsan including HIV & Gender mainstreaming
- Lobbying parliamentarians
- Meeting with leaders
- Multi-stakeholder workshops and trainings
- Joint forums in the sector
- Publications e.g. newsletters
- Media campaigns
- Resource mobilisation for advocacy (Senegal)

While organisations in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana, Mali and Chad focus on national level advocacy activities, in Botswana, Zambia, Nigeria, Senegal and Rwanda, the organisations are working at national, regional and sub-regional levels. Organisations that devoted resources to advocacy had an advocacy strategy in place, and identified issues through:

- Development of a strategic plan, engagement with stakeholders
- Public consultation
- Reports from the public
- Watch dogs
- Members raise issues
- Some research

Limited research is carried out to inform the advocacy work, and in some cases baseline surveys and periodic evaluations have been used to provide information. In Uganda, while research is conducted, the results are used to inform the activities of the organisations conducting the research, and are not used to influence policy in any way. A general observation is that research is weak and not targeted, with the exception of Zambia, where respondents felt that the research they conducted informed not only their efforts but also other stakeholders in the arena. However, Senegal and Nigeria are an exception where the responding organisations engage in collecting statistical data for advocacy purposes. Other data accessed to support advocacy includes:

- National Statistics from customs, CSOs, oil companies, Country reports,
- IUCN

- Rwanda Vision 2020
- EDPRS (Rwanda)
- INGO research and publications
- Data from government databases, networks, partners and beneficiaries
- Life stories, experiences, best practices and action research
- Newspaper reports and articles
- Evaluation reports.

The respondents mainly used the following activities for advocacy:

- Publishing research and policy proposals
- Media campaign
- Meeting public officials
- Lobbying parliamentarians and technical ministries involved in WASH
- Public demonstrations/events
- Learning forums
- Sector working groups
- Carrying out pilot projects as demonstrations of ideal situations
- Dissemination of policies.

Key results achieved through the advocacy activities were identified as;

i. Government level

- Improved service provision
- Engendered policies – Pro-poor, gender considerations
- Improved customer service in Commercial Water Utility companies.
- CBNRM policy, management plans for game reserves and national parks (Botswana)
- Increased stakeholder participation
- Government has seen CSOs as partners in the sector
- Better knowledge among key stakeholders such as public authorities, local authorities, CSOs and private sector of the stakes and opportunities related to integrated water resources management and access to drinking water and sanitation
- Increased funding for the water sector
- Involvement of the Mali Head of State in International Campaign activities.

- A Water and Sanitation Bill currently before parliament in Nigeria
- The creation of Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation (Kenya)
- Creation of an independent Water Ministry, de-linked from the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural resources (Nigeria).

ii. Community Level:

- Some chiefs and village headmen have adopted acceptable Water Resources Management practices
- Many communities have been made aware of dangers of poor sanitation
- People have appreciated research results.

iii. CSO level:

- Existence of functioning networks
- Emergence of new networks of stakeholders addressing environmental education and advocacy for access of marginalized populations to water and sanitation services in urban, peri-urban and rural areas.
- Society involvement in the development of SFGPR (Mali)
- Information dissemination of policies and the status quo
- Increased media attention.

Where there was no advocacy strategy in place, there were also no indicators in place to monitor the advocacy initiatives. Some indicators identified by those organisations that do have an advocacy strategy were:

- increase in number of members participating in networks activities
- increase in number of donors
- increase in access to water and sanitation services
- Government acceptance of CSO positions
- Portion of national population with access to water and sanitation
- Budgetary allocation to water and sanitation sector
- Assessing rate of involvement of different stakeholders in WASH activities (policy formulation and implementation)
- level of rejection or acceptance and the interpretation of advocacy messages used in campaigns
- Identifying best practice
- Press reports.

In Rwanda the following indicators are proposed for future use:

- % of water samples that comply with national standards (taken at water discharge point)
- No. and nature of activities undertaken with respect to Watershed, river and lake management
- % of water bodies with changing water levels (total and by type, water balance)
- No. and nature of water supply schemes/activities put in place to promote economic production (total and by type e.g. water for crop production, livestock rearing, aquaculture, fishing, energy, transport, industry, etc.)
- Institutions and capacity built at various water governance levels
- National Water resources (IWRM) Master Plan established and approved
- Water resources management sector policy developed and approved
- Number of water resources development projects regulated
- Water resources monitoring system established
- No. of permits issued to water for productive uses
- No. of LWA established and Operational
- Publication of annual hydrological report
- Hydrological map available to the stakeholders.

Lack of funding, recognition and mis-matched perceptions were key challenges to advocacy identified by the CSOs. Other challenges identified include:

- The institutional framework for coordination of water resources management as well as the mechanisms for the monitoring and assessment is weak.
- Continuous modification of the policy structure hampers CSO ability to monitor, implement and manage water resources conditions.
- Communication between the relevant ministries and even sectors is inefficient or some cases non-existent. As a result involvement of the CSOs and private sector in WRM is limited.
- Lack of awareness on IWRM requirement within different stakeholders: Organisations working in Watsan seem to have very little knowledge on importance of IWRM. At best they understand the EIA requirements for proposed development projects.
- In some cases especially in mining projects where small scale investors are involved, implementation of mitigation measures may seem to be expensive and hence these projects are implemented at the cost of environmental protection.
- CSO advocacy efforts are ad hoc and not consistent. This is also attributable to lack of skills among persons charged with advocacy.
- Weak/surface understanding of policy documents and policy processes.
- National policies remain the appendage of the technical services of the State

- Weak CSO management structures that translate to compromised participation in networks and advocacy efforts.

Increased funding and employing dedicated resources to advocacy are some strategies that have been initiated to improve advocacy performance.

Only 3 of the 13 respondents specified the length of their relationship with ANEW and this varied from 3 to 5 years, and described the support received as follows; Support received from ANEW national focal points included:

- Information,
- Involvement to meaningful events (workshops)
- Capacity building

Support from the ANEW regional focal point included:

- Information,
- Involvement to meaningful events (workshops)

Support from the ANEW Secretariat included:

- Information,
- Involvement to meaningful events (workshops)

The perceived and anticipated added value that ANEW membership will bring to existing efforts included:

- Improvement of the working conditions
- Staff capacity building
- Strengthening operational and management capacities of the beneficiaries of the support (BO)
- Knowledge of policy documents

ANEW's potential contribution to CSO water program at the national and regional level were seen to be:

- ANEW can contribute through partnership agreements
- Capacity building
- Support in seeking financing
- Realization of studies and research
- Sharing of experience
- Funding of activities

Other desired roles for ANEW, besides contributing to the national and regional CSO were:

- To organize regional stakeholders meetings
- To finance some CSOs activities
- To Increase national stakeholders meetings
- To facilitate access to policy and other relevant documents to CSOs

The general expectation is that ANEW will provide capacity building and quality information including schedules of events, and tools to enable organisations participate better in policy formulation at national, regional and international levels.

7 Findings – Institutional Capacity

a) National Focal Points

Most of the Regional Coordinators and some of the National Focal Points have been recruited recently, and therefore have not had the opportunity to engage with each other or the Secretariat for long enough to assess the efficacy of the communication and management structure in place.

National Focal Points do receive information in the form of the newsletters and notification of events, and appreciate the communication from the Secretariat. Future expectations from both the Regional Coordinators and the Secretariat are for more information and assistance in capacity building.

b) Regional Coordinators

One key challenge for this section of the study was that the positions for regional Coordinators for Southern and Eastern Africa have fallen vacant. However, ANEW board members from these regions have responded helpfully.

The roles and responsibilities of the regional focal point include:

- Coordinate ANEW activities at the sub regional level, in close collaboration with the Executive Secretary
- Establish and maintain relationships with the Civil Society, partners, government officials and sub regional and international agencies working in the region on water supply, sanitation and water resources management
- Organize workshops and other ANEW meetings in collaboration with National Focal Points
- Keep the Secretariat informed by regular reports on all activities and events taking place at the regional level in relation to water and sanitation
- Facilitate networking and information sharing among ANEW members at the sub-regional level and by extension to all pan African members.

- Influence the government and all decision makers at regional as well as at sub-regional and international levels, so as to improve and facilitate access conditions to water and sanitation for the population.

The regional coordinators provide the link between the international and national levels of operation. To enable them perform their function effectively, national focal points provide information on national member activities and other events of importance, while also facilitating linkages with national level institutional structures engaged in Watsan. The Secretariat provides technical and financial assistance, while facilitating linkages with international processes and institutions.

Weak capacities within national CSOs hinder effective lobby and advocacy efforts at the national, and regional levels. Another challenge is that national focal points may not always provide the required information, and it may not be timely. To overcome these challenges, building the advocacy capacity of national CSOs is crucial. Once the organizations have a better understanding of the importance and mode of advocacy, they are more likely to participate as desired.

The financial support provided through the Secretariat provides the regional focal point with the required resources to undertake their responsibilities.

c) Secretariat

The Secretariat is composed of the Executive Secretary, the Information Officer, a Finance Officer and the 5 Regional coordinators (RCs), including North Africa. The RCs function is provided by the organisations that have contributed to the founding of ANEW in each of the regions. While all the other RCs receive some funding to facilitate coordination of activities, as North Africa is not covered under the EU funding their participation is limited to information sharing. For the EU, the northern African region falls under their Mediterranean portfolio. However, ANEW is a pan African network, and if a way is not found to include North Africa in the core activities, it will become a sub-Saharan network, and lose out on all the resources offered by northern Africa.

The responsibilities of the Executive Secretary include:

- Coordination of ANEW at the pan Africa level
- Support to the regional level in terms of:
 - Action planning
 - Reporting
 - Transfer of knowledge
- Provide a linkage between ANEW and its partners such as AMCOW, FAN, Water Aid, and the donors
- Commence new initiatives (currently the focus of all ANEW activities is limited to the EU funding, yet the demands on ANEW are increasing. There is need to mobilise further resources to enable ANEW perform to the level expected).
- Coordination of the Board and follow-up on decisions made

- Provide financial budgets at the Pan Africa, regional and national scales.

The Information Officer is bilingual and is responsible for:

- Collecting, collating, translating and dissemination of information in the form of a monthly bulletin.
- Managing the list serve
- Monitor research on Watsan and synthesise information to a format that will be easily understood by the ANEW membership.
- Function as an information clearing house on Watsan issues.

Currently there are gaps in the information provision:

- a. **Language** – the need for translation slows the process considerably. Nonetheless, it is a non-negotiable requirement and has to be addressed.
- b. **Increasing and high scope and scale of demand:** Africa is thirsty for information and as more and more countries come on board the diversity, depth and volume of information demand increases. To ensure consistency in the information collected and disseminated, it is essential that this function is centralised, and therefore the option of having regional level information officers is not viable.
- c. **The usefulness of the information disseminated:** A lot of information is collected, but processing of this information to make it relevant to the users is limited due to time and other resource constraints at the secretariat. Thus a lot of information may go out to the members, but whether they are able to use it is of concern. If ANEW is to fulfil the role assigned to it, it is imperative that this function is developed as it is the crux of the organisation's mandate.

The roles and responsibilities of the Regional coordinators are limited to what was developed for the EU project, and includes:

- Coordination of activities at the regional level in those countries covered under the EU funding.
- Collecting information from the regional level and bringing it up to the sub-regional level, and then collecting and disseminating information from the sub-regional level to the regional and national level.
- Promoting the relations between CSOs and government at the sub-regional and national levels.
- Promote linkages between CSOs and the RECs – this function is a little weak at present.

RCs are served by full time staff contracted by the hosting organisation. ANEW has a say in the recruitment of the person. While they are supposed to be dedicated full time to ANEW activities

and they are paid for by ANEW, they are answerable to the organisation hosting them. This is posing a challenge. Host organisations receive a portion of administration costs for hosting the RC, and therefore making the persons answerable to the Secretariat should not pose a problem. This needs to be discussed when drawing contracts for incoming RCs.

The responsibilities of the National focal points include:

- coordination of members at the national level
- information sharing
- mobilisation to action at the national level
- provide a linkage between the national level to the regional, subregional, pan African and international level.

Most of the national focal points are national networks. Independent funds are not raised for ANEW activities at the national level or the regional level.

Members of ANEW have to be NGOs working in the Watsan or related sector. The current membership stands at approximately 200. The vision is to reduce this number to 53 – such that the members of ANEW are national networks, and ANEW then becomes an umbrella network of networks. The option for broadening the ANEW financial resource base through membership fees and consultancy fees has not been explored.

The current ANEW constitution was developed on the basis of consultations with its members, and it was not difficult to do, as there were approximately 40 persons to be consulted at that time. A Committee of 5 was put in place, and they formed the RC host organisations. The first general assembly was held in 2005, and the draft constitution was passed as the policy document to guide ANEW. The constitution needs to be reviewed in light of the expansion of the mandate and scope of the organisation. An anomaly that indicates the need for the review is the fact that at present, ANEW staff are governed by different institutional policies, and there is no real conflict management strategy articulated in the constitution. There are no performance appraisal mechanisms in place. Appraisals are conducted on the discretion of the host organisations.

The organisation is learning a lot as it expands, and situations and challenges have arisen that were not anticipated at its inception. These learnings need to be incorporated in the growth of the organisation.

Board members and other ANEW members are called upon to attend meetings on behalf of ANEW when the meeting calls for representation alone. However, if the meeting has any element of implementation of activities and more substantive follow-up, then the Executive Secretary attends.

ANEW was established in 2003. When ANEW was not an independently registered entity, its founding members provided immense support. Housing ANEW within Maji na Ufanisi is an example of this support. The advantages that came with this arrangement included:

- Maji na Ufanisi is a reputable organisation that has made a mark on the Watsan sector both nationally and at the international level. Being linked with such a reputation was advantageous as it lent ANEW credibility. Maji provided a brand name.
- Maji had a financial management system in place, that has served ANEW well, and it made it easier to get the organisation off the ground.

- The political will that Maji commanded served ANEW well.
- Maji had in place other systems that supported the ANEW network.

However, ANEW has now grown bigger than Maji, and it faces an identity crisis as there is confusion about whether ANEW is an independent entity or a project of Maji. Also, the scale of the ANEW budget and the complexity of the network's structure is posing a challenge to the Maji financial management systems. The HR policy applied by ANEW is that developed by Maji, and it does not address the challenges faced by ANEW.

The manner in which the contract was developed with the EU placed the Secretariat, Chair person, and Regional Focal point for Eastern Africa under the same roof. This has caused some problems, as a result of which the option of moving the EA RC to Uganda was explored. However, the contractual agreement with the EU does not allow for that, and the decision has been to await a change in chairpersonship, and explore establishing an independent office for the Secretariat.

Initially, ANEW's website was hosted by FAN. FAN also provided the newsletter to the membership. However, now, ANEW has grown and has its own newsletter and website. It is ready to become independent.

The Board of ANEW is elected every 2 years, and more by the series of events than actual intent, it is a staggered election whereby only half the Board is changed every two years. It consists of 11 members. The five who have been serving since 2003, have served their term and their posts will therefore be up for election, while the others on the Board continue to serve until their term expires.

d) Key Challenges

- i. The current funding base is limiting. At present only 17 countries (selected by the EU) are covered, yet there are 40 active members seeking similar support. The discussions with the donor are conducted by Water Aid and FAN. ANEW does not get to meet the persons in charge, and is party to the discussions by remote.
- ii. The mandate and demands on the organisation are growing at a very rapid rate. While its partners seek to expand the organisation's responsibilities, it is also working to strengthen the network right through to the national level. This leaves little time and room for much needed additional resource mobilisation.
- iii. ANEW internal capacity to deliver on member and partner expectations is over stretched. The services committed to members are two fold. The first is a platform for dialogue. The second is capacity building, which includes provision of tools for effective advocacy work at all levels. The second component at this point is very weak.
- iv. The organisation is growing very rapidly and has no plan or strategy in place to guide that expansion. The organisation, as a result, is reactive rather than proactive.
- v. The identity crisis resulting from ANEW not being a registered entity is becoming more critical. The mandate of ANEW, the roles and responsibilities of FAN, and the role of Maji therein, all need to be discussed and clarified for the sake of all concerned. At the beginning FAN provided substantial support to keep the network visible even at the

national level (through the bulletins, newsletters etc.). However, as ANEW is assuming more and more of these functions, the role of FAN is evolving to a more global one. FAN should not be seen to be competing with and duplicate the efforts of ANEW. If FAN was seen to focus more on the global issues, and the continental networks on continental issues, engagement with other partners at all levels would become more effective and efficient. Training in the continents should be region specific, and respond to the national and regional needs and requirements for it to be relevant. For quality control and consistency, it would be strategic therefore to locate the training coordinator at the Secretariat. Capacity building is a core function of ANEW.

- vi. ANEW should not be exclusive as appears currently to be the case. The national focal points have not been able to mobilise more players, just more people, as ANEW is viewed as a “club” of sorts. For it to fulfil its mandate it is imperative that the organisation finds a way to become more inclusive of other players in the Watsan sector. There is need to develop a membership recruitment strategy that allows for an efficient and manageable structure, while being effective, and inclusive.
- vii. Given the nature of its evolution, no M&E mechanisms have been put in place. Members have M&E systems that measure service delivery in place, which have some role, but a more robust M&E system needs to be established to facilitate responsible and responsive development of the organisation.
- viii. Communication feedback mechanisms to and from members is very weak. There are no mechanisms in place to collect, analyse and disseminate information. as a complete process. ANEW currently provides information on what it is doing in terms of activities and planned activities. There is no analysis to guide the reader on the implications and uses of the information provided.
- ix. ANEW strategies and pre-consultations at some key events is weak. They are currently conducted via email or phone, and this limits the depth of discussion. At major events the consultations are more in line of what is required, but around other smaller, yet equally important events, the consultation process is weak. For example at the AMCOW ministerial session, there was an opportunity to meet the day before the event, and it was very useful. But at sub-regional events, such discussions have not been possible.

ANEW needs to build its own capacity and eventually aim to create the required linkage between policy formulation and service delivery, to ensure equitable access to Watsan services across the continent.

e) Key Partners

- African governments through AMCOW
- Water Aid and Fan – capacity support
- WSP – provides policy analysis from a government perspective. ANEW has been working with them to see how the CSO component can also be addressed. WSP is interested in partnering with ANEW, and ANEW worked with them to produce CSO Country Status overviews - assessments which are based on inclusion of some consultations with CS

- GWP (IWRM expertise)
- GWA (Gender Water Alliance) in Eastern Africa. ANEW has very good contacts and relations with GWP and GWA. However, these are based on personalities and the relations need to be institutionalised and expanded to the Pan African level for consistency and effectiveness.

8 Analysis

a) Organisational Background

The organisations interviewed include INGOs, local NGOs, national and regional networks, and UNICEF and provide a good cross-section of the CSO actors in Watsan at the national levels across the four regions of Sub-Saharan Africa. While UN agencies do not fall in the category of CSOs, the interview with UNICEF provided a good insight into the perception of a key stakeholder on the performance, role and responsibilities of national organisations engaged in Watsan in Kenya.

Most of the national organisations have been in existence for at least 5 years, with the exception of an emerging cross-sectoral network in Kenya, and have had time to foster their practices and strategic interventions based on the individual understanding of the issues at hand. The organisations working in watsan actually work on a diversity of issues. Watsan issues are emerging as an issue of basic rights that impact all components of development.

Key trends and issues emerged from the survey that need to be taken into consideration when developing national or regional level capacity building interventions. There is a substantial disparity in the advocacy and service delivery capacity of CSOs between countries. This is obviously influenced by the existing policy environment, and access to resources. As an umbrella organisation, ANEW will have to address country specific capacity gaps and provide capacity building interventions that are suited to the needs of each country.

Organisations were asked to identify key partners. It was interesting to note that while all respondents had to engage with government both at the central and local levels, in countries like Kenya and Tanzania, key partners were identified as INGOs, donors and UN agencies. In Kenya, the sentiment was that the donors had a stronger influence on policy as they paid for the policy formulation and implementation processes. Despite this, all lobbying efforts were directed at the government, yet all respondents had good working relations with the donors.

Most of the respondents received funding from donor agencies and in a few cases from government to engage in the Watsan sector. A few organisations benefited from membership and consultancy fees, and this allowed them access to non-dedicated funding, thus enabling them to be more innovative and independent in their approach. A breakdown of the source of funding is illustrated in the table below.

Source of Funds	Donor	Members	Government	Consultancies	Private sector
% of Respondents	71%	40%	14%	12%	2%

Table 3 - funding sources

83% of the respondents reported being a part of a network, though satisfaction with the networks varied from country to country. There are key lessons that need to be collected and absorbed regarding networking initiatives that should inform and guide the working of ANEW as an umbrella of African networks.

b) National Water and Sanitation Policy Landscape

All the respondents had a good knowledge of the existing policy instruments guiding Watsan delivery at the national level. Some had a good understanding of the linkages between the different documents and government agencies charged with the different responsibilities, and had also participated in national reform processes. While a majority saw CSO consultation during policy formulation exercises as more of a formality on the part of governments, they reported having been involved in such consultation processes.

A key challenge identified in the participation of CSOs in policy formulation was a weak understanding of the policy documents, and their implication on service delivery. There seems to be a significant gap in being able to engage in policy formulation as a result of this. It was also observed that INGOs such as Water Aid and SNV are better able to engage in policy formulation and review, and while these agencies work with local organisations, both to enable their participation and also to include their experiences, local organisations feel that service delivery is more their niche. The lack of policy analysis and advocacy skills within local organisations was common across all four regions.

Local CSOs were said to have a stronger role in policy implementation, and service delivery. While there are a number of local CSOs dedicated to providing Watsan services to targeted groups in a country, the nature of their intervention are characterised by short to medium term projects focused at expanding local level Watsan infrastructure. However, these organisations and the government alike are not clear on how these interventions contribute to national policy, and it is not common for CSOs to take national policy into consideration when designing these interventions. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the strategic advantage that CSOs have over any other agency providing Watsan services, in that they are able to access the different levels of national operations, and have access even to the household level if so required.

The role of CSOs should evolve with the changing reality on the ground. Where governments are weak, CSOs have supported service delivery, but to ensure sustainability, service delivery needs to be institutionalised. Therefore, as governments strengthen their capacity and take on responsibility for service delivery, the role of CSOs needs to evolve to more of a monitoring function to ensure that service delivery is maintained to the level and quality required.

While CSO and cross-sectoral Watsan networks exist in most countries, the information passed through them is not always useful. Information sharing is a key component of any networking strategy. The quality of information is crucial in ensuring that the impact of the sharing exercise is optimised. This calls for resource allocation not only to information gathering and dissemination but more importantly to information processing and interpretation, and ensuring that information is received in a timely manner.

c) Sub-Regional, Regional and International Watsan Policy landscape

While most organisations interviewed appreciate the value of regional, sub-regional and international policy processes, only 26% had knowledge of these. Less than 10% of national level organisations knew about AMCOW, and where mention was made of the Council, it was generally from national focal points and regional coordinators who have been active in the AMCOW processes. Documents like the MDGs, the Sharm-al-Sheikh Declaration and the eThikwini Declaration are known and used in the day-to-day operations of the organisations interviewed, but only to a limited extent.

If AMCOW is to achieve its mandate, the awareness of its existence and activities is imperative at all levels. AMCOW views ANEW as its key partner in raising its profile at national, regional and international levels, especially amongst CSOs. ANEW therefore needs to develop a comprehensive strategic plan, which addresses the continent as a whole, to ensure that it can deliver on the responsibility it has accepted from AMCOW.

d) Existing Advocacy Activity

The challenges and gaps thus far identified demonstrate a “generic” response to the issues at hand. To ensure that Watsan issues are addressed in a holistic manner, it is imperative that they are first unpacked to identify key entry points and players, much in the manner adopted to address the issue of HIV/AIDS and gender across Africa

Advocacy, especially in the minds of government, is equated with activism and therefore considered a threatening, unwelcome activity. While activism and lobbying are components of advocacy, activities such as information gathering and dissemination, and facilitation of cross-sectoral dialogue, are advocacy activities that facilitate informed decision-making and not necessarily confrontational. There is need to establish a clearer understanding of what advocacy entails across the sectors, including the CSOs. This will go a long way in ensuring that resources are allocated in an effective manner for advocacy, allowing for lobbying while also facilitating knowledge building, and informed decision-making across the Watsan sector.

Advocacy and policy issues are not integrated. Issue identification mechanisms appear weak, and the understanding of the issues at hand evidently lacks depth. More resources need to be applied to targeted research that will not only establish baselines and inform current policy, but also guide monitoring and evaluation.

Budgets availed to advocacy are sometimes diverted, due to a lack of absorption capacity within organisations. There is need to strengthen advocacy capacity within individual organisations and networks, to ensure their effectiveness.

e) Institutional context

ANEW is a powerful CSO platform that is recognised by government and other major stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector at regional, sub-regional, pan African and international levels. AMCOW has charged ANEW with a substantial and significant mandate, from the grassroots and national level to the sub-regional and pan African level. Such recognition for CSOs in Africa is not common and is a demonstration of the impact that ANEW has made in the Watsan sector on the continent. It is a hard won opportunity that must not be lost. However, these “external” demands have expanded at a rate that is not matched

by its internal structural growth. ANEW's current operation (National focal points, Regional coordinators, and Headquarters) provides a framework that needs to be evaluated and strengthened to ensure that ANEW is able to maintain and expand its position.

The core of ANEW's position in the Watsan policy sector is the potential and current role that it plays in linking and building capacities for policy formulation and implementation at the national and pan-African levels. This also includes facilitating an information exchange mechanism. All its member organisations rightfully expect improved advocacy ability and enhanced project implementation as a result of their membership with ANEW. While it is delivering some information the quality and context is of concern. This is a challenge that has been identified by the Secretariat.

The advocacy capacity of ANEW's membership varies even at the country level, where one organisation has the ability to engage in policy discussions at the national and international level, while other CSOs grapple to position themselves in such processes.

In the short time since its founding, a confusion of identities has evolved in that, at the international level, ANEW is perceived as a dynamic pan African CSO platform on Watsan, yet when dealing with it at the institution level, there is some difficulty in separating its identity from that of its host organisation. This has had a constraining effect on its resource mobilisation and project management capacity.

For ANEW to effectively address its "external" and "internal" mandate, it is crucial that its structure is evaluated, and measures put in place to ensure that its mandatory expansion is matched with internal structural growth. It has to be perceived and function as an independent organisation in its own right, with a technical and financial resource base that enables it to serve its constituency while building on the distinct edge it has created in the Pan African water and sanitation sector.

2 Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the findings from the two studies, the following recommendations are proposed by NI, focusing on six thematic areas, namely, strategic direction, advocacy strategy, advocacy capacity building, knowledge management and policy analysis, implementing the AMCOW-ANEW MoU, and strengthening the Secretariat and network structures.

a) Strategic direction

The current EU project funding is providing the main focus for ANEW's activities currently, even though it only concerns members in 17 countries. The advocacy capacity building programme envisioned in the EU project will need to somehow address the entire membership of the organization, and it needs to be embedded in a broader strategic plan for ANEW, i.e., what is the overall vision and mission of ANEW, and what is the role of advocacy in addressing that?

ANEW serves Africa. For ANEW to effectively serve its mandate, it needs to expand its activities to the countries not covered in the current project, and the strategic plan developed should address Africa as a continent. This document also needs to be circulated to non-participating countries, for them to add information and comment on the findings, as it is intended to inform a comprehensive pan African training and capacity building strategy.

Recommendation: ANEW to prepare a strategic plan to guide its development over the next 3-5 years. The recommendations from this current study should be used to inform the strategic planning process. This should include a comprehensive organisational assessment and organisational capacity development plan to ensure that the internal development of the organisation meets the demands of its growing mandate in Africa.

b) Advocacy strategy

ANEW's comparative advantage lies in its ability to garner the collective strength of relevant African CSOs to advocate and take action for bridging the micro-macro gap in the conceptualization, formulation, development and implementation of Watsan policies and action in Africa. Most of ANEW's member CSOs are engaged in implementing local and community-based projects and initiatives in the Watsan sector. In most cases, they also have valuable knowledge of the policies and projects of national governments and partners relating to the sector. ANEW must harness this comparative advantage to fulfil its overall mission.

Recommendation: as part of its overall strategic plan, ANEW should develop an advocacy strategy that prioritizes strategic and critical entry points for advocacy while at the same time building on the unique position and mandate of the organization. Features of the strategy should include the following:

- Training on the basic concepts, forms and modes of advocacy. This training should involve AMCOW members and other key players at the national and regional level to ensure a common understanding, thereby facilitating relations across sectors;
- Advocacy as partnering with government and other stakeholders in the effective formulation and implementation of policy that reflects the needs, rights and resource capacities of local communities;
- Building on the unique position of civil society to provide a linkage between the micro and macro levels;
- Strengthening skills of CSOs in inclusive and participatory planning processes, in order that they can play a lead role in facilitating broad stakeholder engagement in needs assessment, policy formulation and monitoring;
- Strengthening trans-boundary, river basin and sub-regional networking as a platform for working with AMCOW and other inter-governmental initiatives at this level;
- Strengthening the role and capacity of civil society in monitoring and evaluation, and research to inform stronger Watsan policy and decision-making.

ANEW has certainly come to be recognized – regionally and globally – as the prime representative of the CSOs for advocacy and action relating to water and sanitation in Africa, as highlighted by its MoU with AMCOW and the support provide to it by EU and other development cooperation partners. An outcome of this recognition is that very high expectations have been built among the CSOs regarding what ANEW could/should be able to do to help them—individually and collectively – to acquire the knowledge and capacities needed to carry out their monitoring and advocacy work effectively. Clearly, given its limited

human, technical and financial resources, ANEW is currently not in a position to fulfil all these expectations. It must, therefore, prioritize the focus of its advocacy work over the next 2-3 years within the resource constraints it faces over the duration.

Recommendation: as part of its advocacy strategy, ANEW should identify key entry points where its efforts can have the most effect and impact; based on the study team's analysis of the available information, several such entry points could be the following:

A. Regional Level entry points

- Mobilize a major popular campaign for water and sanitation as a rights-based issue.
- Sanitation is still a marginalized issue in nearly all countries. At best it is mentioned only in passing in the policies, strategies and papers. This is where ANEW could have a main focus and make substantial contributions through their membership. Especially in light of the Sharm el Sheikh outcome and declaration, ANEW could immediately focus a major part of its work on awareness-raising, capacity-building and advocacy to bring sanitation from the margins to the centre in all Watsan and development planning and action at the national, sub-regional and regional levels.
- Advocate for stronger inter-governmental collaboration at sub-regional and river/lake basin levels (in forging sub-regional water resource management plans, trans-boundary resource sharing agreements, etc.), and foster CSO networks or platforms at these levels to interface with sub-regional institutions (RECs and R/LBOs).
- Build on the current momentum towards the negotiation of a post-Kyoto protocol to the climate change convention, focusing on the water related impacts of climate change as a unique component of the African negotiating position at the UNFCCC; this could be linked to the movement for "climate justice".

B. Country Level entry points

- Promote the strategic niche and comparative advantage of CSOs in Watsan with respect to bridging the micro-macro divide, facilitating multi-stakeholder engagement and participatory planning methodologies.
- Advocate for more prominent inclusion of water and sanitation in development planning, particularly in the context of PRSPs and national budget allocations.
- Promote and support the adoption of mechanisms for transparency and accountability in implementation of Watsan policies and strategies, including local level monitoring bodies (such as the Water Watch Committees in Zambia).

c) Advocacy capacity-building

There is need to develop and implement a comprehensive advocacy training plan that responds to the national and regional needs, and draws on local expertise as far as possible, to enable members to internalise learning. The training programme should raise awareness of the ANEW

national and sub-regional coordinators, other representatives of CSOs and their membership on the ongoing and planned national, sub-regional, regional and international efforts to deal with Watsan challenges in Africa. The training should help identify the entry points and best ways for CSOs to carry out advocacy activities. Lessons learned from within Africa and other world-regions in this regard should form integral parts of the training.

Recommendation: Design and implement an advocacy training programme for ANEW members, ensuring that all countries can benefit from the training. An indicative elaboration of such a plan is provided in Annex I. Key elements of the training should include the following.

- awareness-raising and capacity-building about national, sub-regional, regional and global policies and initiatives in the Watsan sector, identifying the most critical points for intervention and the modalities to do so, monitoring the Watsan situation and seeking support for their activities;
- developing an advocacy strategy;
- understanding decision-making: identifying decision makers and influential advisors, mapping policy processes, developing relationships and building credibility;
- using documented evidence, case studies, and targeted research as a key tool in advocacy;
- strengthening networking for advocacy at national, regional and international levels;
- media strategies for highlighting the advocacy efforts of civil society organizations and the results achieved with regard to national Watsan policies and strategies, IWRM roadmaps and plans, and strategies for achieving the water and sanitation related MDGs;
- advocacy toolkit: media releases, web-sites and internet campaigning, organizing media conferences, working with parliamentarians;
- advocacy impact assessment, M&E.

d) Knowledge management and policy analysis

The effort by ANEW to develop a comprehensive knowledge-base on national Watsan policies and strategies, IWRM roadmaps and plans, and strategies for achieving the water and sanitation related MDGs is critical in the context of region-wide challenges and must continue and be expanded and supported. The ANEW directory of Watsan related CSOs, whether members of ANEW or not, needs to be updated on a regular basis with the assistance of the national and sub-regional coordinators.

A comprehensive and integrated information-gathering and user-friendly information-dissemination mechanism (an information clearing-house mechanism) needs to be developed in concert with similar efforts being made by AMCOW and AfDB, supported by development cooperation partners. Annex I to this report is a water and sanitation policy map for the 17

countries in this study. It can provide the basis for further development of and information clearing house mechanism.

Recommendation: ANEW should institutionalize mechanisms for gathering, managing and disseminating information and knowledge on policy developments and initiatives/actors in water and sanitation for easy access by its members and the general public; the proto-type database prepared through this study (see Annex II) can form the basis for such a mechanism.

The capacities – human, financial and technical – of the ANEW Secretariat to guide and support information-gathering, awareness-raising and advocacy efforts at the national, sub-regional and regional levels must be embellished on an on-going basis. At the same time, the capacities of the sub-regional and national ANEW focal points need to be supplemented and supported to gather and transmit the needed information to the Secretariat on an on-going basis.

Recommendation: A “help-desk” should be established at national level, whereby local CSOs can access assistance in policy interpretation and improve their ability to engage in Watsan issues. The information office is the heart of the organisation and should be strengthened to ensure that the organisation is prompt and responsive to its members and partners.

The national experiences are varied and rich. It is imperative that ANEW provides appropriate opportunities and mechanisms for topical information and experience exchange to enable cross fertilisation and growth of strategies employed to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation across nations and the continent.

Recommendation: Networks at the national and regional level should be strengthened to ensure functioning and vibrant information sharing and resource mobilisation.

Given the limitations faced by ANEW and its focal points for gathering data, carrying out research, etc., ANEW should consider engaging the services of an Africa-based consultancy group or a think-tank to provide it with needed research, concept notes, background papers, briefing papers, assessments, ideas for further work, etc. on a regular or as needed basis. The service provider could also be charged with preparing position papers for regional and international meetings to which ANEW is invited. Engagement of African and international water and sanitation experts and practitioners towards this aim should be given a high priority.

Recommendation: In conjunction with AMCOW-TAC, ANEW should establish a policy analysis think tank at the continental level, with sub-regional presence. This will provide the required platform to engage African intellectuals and other key stakeholders in policy interpretation and also formulation and it will facilitate more effective input of CSO experiences and learning into the policy formulation processes.

e) Implementing the AMCOW-ANEW MoU

The Memorandum of Understanding between AMCOW and ANEW, finally signed in November 2007 after long negotiations, firmly establishes ANEW as the recognized representative of

civil society in all of AMCOW's deliberations and initiatives. It hands ANEW a very important mandate as well as significant responsibilities. More than one year after its signing, however, there is no clear articulation of how this MoU will be implemented. Addressing this gap should be a priority, and needs to be a key focus in the process of developing ANEW's strategic plan and advocacy strategy.

Recommendation: ANEW to prepare a plan on a priority basis for implementing the AMCOW-ANEW MoU, within the framework of its broader strategic planning process, and arrangements made with the Chair of AMCOW TAC for a presentation and discussion of this plan, with an aim to finalizing agreement prior to the 7th Ordinary Session of AMCOW. Recommended components of the plan are the following:

- Mechanisms for coordinating and consolidating CSO contributions to AMCOW policy and planning deliberations;
- ANEW's role in knowledge building in Watsan issues in Africa;
- Fostering and strengthening partnerships between civil society and AMCOW bodies at regional and sub-regional levels, and with national governments and other partners such as ANBO, African Groundwater Commission, AWEPA, etc.;
- Capacity development of CSOs for an effective role in achieving the Watsan MDGs across Africa;
- Documentation and dissemination of case studies and research on civil society initiatives and approaches;
- Organizing a major annual CSO event as part of the African Water Week.

f) Strengthening the Secretariat and Network Structures

This study has shown that there are very high expectations of ANEW to deliver on a very broad mandate, while the current capacity of the Secretariat and the network's governance structure has so far neither the capacity nor the resources (financial, human, technical) to satisfy this demand. Development of a comprehensive strategic plan will be the first step in addressing this gap. More specific steps must be included in this planning process.

Recommendation: To ensure that the organization's development is paced with the expansion in its mandate both towards its members and partners, the staffing structure and skill base at the headquarters, regional coordinators and national focal point level should be evaluated and addressed accordingly. This process needs to be guided by a comprehensive strategic plan developed to guide ANEW's operations through out Africa, to include those countries currently not covered under the EU grant.

Recommendation: ANEW needs to expand its financial resource base beyond the current limited number of donors; it should develop a resource mobilization strategy that will enable it to facilitate its internal and external expansion as required.

Recommendation: For ANEW to consolidate its recognition as an independent entity, and also to ensure that ensure it can accommodate the required management support systems, the Board should consider options for establishing and housing the secretariat independently from any member institution.

ANNEX I - Indicative Strategy for CSO Advocacy Capacity Development

INDICATIVE STRATEGY FOR CSO ADVOCACY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE WATER AND SANITATION SECTOR

Background and Introduction

The Nottawasaga Institute conducted an advocacy capacity assessment of CSOs in the WATSAN sector, for ANEW. This study was conducted in the 17 countries in Eastern, Southern, Western and Central Africa currently supported by ANEW's EU funded project.

The study identified key challenges faced by CSOs in participating in the Water and Sanitation sector. This document attempts to propose a framework for capacity development. What follows is a tabulated synopsis of the key capacity gaps identified at the CSO level, the government level and at the ANEW secretariat level, with possible interventions to overcome these.

The level and nature of CSO engagement in Watsan, and government's willingness to engage with CSOs varies from country to country, and therefore some countries may require more intense training in a particular area than another. It is therefore recommended that the following interventions are applied in a manner that is cognizant of the realities and situation of each country. This study does provide some insight into the current status in each country and should be used as a reference. More detailed information is also available in the raw data in each of the country responses received.

This study was limited to the 17 countries supported by the EU project. There is need to validate the findings of this report in the non-participating countries, with the view to implement a capacity-building plan that is Africa-wide and not limited to the 17 countries.

Key Capacity Gap	Proposed Intervention	Responsibility
A. CSO sector		
<p>Limited understanding of policy processes, documents, and policy impact on implementation</p> <p>Lack of information on existing national and regional watsan processes initiated by CSOs, and/or Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide training to NC and RFPs on key Policy processes at national, sub-regional, regional and global policies and initiatives in the Watsan sector, identifying the most critical points for intervention and the modalities to do so, monitoring the Watsan situation. Enable CSOs to gather information on ongoing projects/programmes, including lessons learned. Make the information available on an ongoing basis through ANEW web site/portal Preparation of a guide book on the WATSAN policy sector in general, (something like the desertification convention handbook prepared by ELCI) including sections on policy implication on project implementation (role of tariffs in water regulation, resource access and ownership, responsibilities, how a water and sanitation project contributes to policy implementation, up-scaling projects) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ANEW Secretariat – Information officer/consultant. The proposed help desks can initially be established at the NC offices with the aim of getting government to eventually take over this function. If this route is chosen then it will call for training personnel at the NC to operate a help desk, basic information hand outs prepared, coordinated by the ANEW information office. The proto-type database prepared through this study can form the basis for an institutionalised mechanism for gathering, managing and disseminating information and knowledge on policy developments and initiatives in watsan for easy access especially by ANEW members. In conjunction with AMCOW-TAC,

Key Capacity Gap	Proposed Intervention	Responsibility
<p>Limited understanding of policy processes, documents, and policy impact on implementation</p> <p>Lack of information on existing national and regional watsan processes initiated by CSOs, and/ or Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing help desks at national level to enable CSOs access assistance on policy related issues. Establish think tank that provides a platform to engage African intellectuals and other key stakeholders in policy interpretation and formulation. A key product of this activity should be documents and publications that make it easy for CSOs to understand the policy arena and engage more effectively. 	<p>ANEW should establish a policy analysis think tank at the continental level, with sub-regional presence.</p>
<p>Limited access to policy formulation arenas due to lack of opportunity, information, and resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lobby for CSO participation, especially in regional WATSAN processes Lobby for increase in resources to facilitate CSO participation, especially in regional WATSAN processes. 	<p>ANEW RFPs and Secretariat.</p>
<p>Weak advocacy capacity within CSOs at national and regional levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide training on the need, role and characteristics of advocacy to all NCs, RFP, AMCOW members, and key government officials. Provide training on lobby and advocacy techniques to all NCs and RFPs leading to the development of an advocacy strategy at both regional and national levels <p>This training will include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding decision-making: identifying decision makers and influential advisors, mapping policy processes, developing relationships and building credibility; using documented evidence, case studies, and targeted research as a key tool in advocacy; the relevance of strengthened networks for advocacy at national, regional and international levels; Key stakeholder identification and engagement strategies (media, parliamentarians, other CSOs, government agencies, beneficiaries etc) advocacy impact assessment, M&E. This should highlight use of strategies such as equity monitoring, public expenditure tracking and other information easily accessible to citizens for M&E purposes. Provide training on networking to all NCs and RFPs to strengthen networking 	<p>The trainings provided should lead to the development of regional and national level advocacy strategies. ANEW will therefore have the responsibility of tracking the implementation of these strategies, and provide mentoring and other support as required by its members.</p> <p>ANEW should also develop key guides in the following areas to enable some standardization while assisting members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The advocacy tool kit M&E indicators for advocacy. Stakeholder analysis media strategies for highlighting the advocacy efforts of civil society organizations and the results achieved with regard to national Watsan policies and strategies, IWRM roadmaps and plans, and strategies for achieving the water and sanitation related MDGs; advocacy toolkit: media releases, web-sites and internet campaigning, organizing media conferences, working with parliamentarians

Key Capacity Gap	Proposed Intervention	Responsibility
	<p>capacity at both national and regional level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training on resource mobilization to NCs and RFPs. • 4 of the 17 countries reported strong CSO and in some cases even multi-stakeholder networks involving private sector and media. Exchange visits between the countries to enable experience exchange and establish a basis for regional mentoring should be organised. • Where INGOs are involved, they tend to be stronger and more conversant with issues and processes. The INGOs must also be engaged in the training, to create a mentorship relation with local organizations such that the strength that is provided by the INGOs is better utilized. • Provide training on information management to Secretariat, NC and RFP 	
Weak CSO participation in the formulation of national water and sanitation policies and actions	AMCOW and ANEW to advocate with ministers to facilitate CSO participation	AMCOW, ANEW and national CSOs through national coordinators
Weak CSO participation in regional and international deliberations on water and sanitation	Facilitate development of common CSO positions and participation in appropriate deliberations	AMCOW, ANEW with support from development cooperation partners
Limited or no CSO participation in national budget allocations for water and sanitation	Enable CSOs to advocate for adequate budget allocations for water and sanitation	ANEW with national coordinators
Weak or no CSO capacity in monitoring and evaluation of national watsan policy implementation	Assist CSOs prepare a standard template for information gathering and analysis that will enable development and dissemination of country and regional status reports	ANEW with national coordinators and Regional Focal Points.
<p>Limited resources allocated to advocacy activity</p> <p>Limited Research capacity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased understanding of the importance and relevance of advocacy as proposed above. • Exchange visits with partners in other developing countries where CSO advocacy is better developed e.g. India, Philippines, Botswana • Training on the importance of research and research methods for CSOs for advocacy for all NCs and RFPs • Promote case study collection amongst ANEW members – the information thus generated should provide a strong foundation for advocacy at national, regional and pan African levels. 	ANEW with national coordinators and Regional Focal Points.

Key Capacity Gap	Proposed Intervention	Responsibility
The Government Level		
<p>Weak Planning capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inequitable resource distribution due to lack of appropriate preliminary reconnaissance and research, lack of prioritization and skewed budgetary allocations • Inadequate baseline information on existing watsan infrastructure • Weak groundwater and catchment protection and abstraction regulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANEW through AMCOW assists governments in preliminary policy audits and situation analysis that leads to comprehensive planning at the national level. AMCOW will have to assist national governments access resources for appropriate planning • ANEW NCs and RFPs strengthen multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms (CSOs, beneficiary representatives, donors, government, private sector) to enable brokering of linkages between sectors for watsan service provision. 	ANEW, AMCOW with partners
Lack of engagement of CSOs in formulation of IWRM plans and their implementation	<p>Periodic training for CSOs on IWRM and consultations with state and non-state actors on IWRM at regional and national levels</p> <p>Dissemination of information on the status of IWRM plans - national and basin-wide - and implementation to CSOs</p>	<p>ANEW can use the IWRM training toolkits developed by GWP, UNEP etc., for training and capacity-building of CSOs on IWRM.</p> <p>ANEW with AMCOW should facilitate information exchange and consultation forums on IWRM across countries</p>
Disconnect between water and sanitation at the national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANEW through AMCOW needs to promote the link between water and sanitation • NCs capacitated to lead awareness raising campaigns on importance of sanitation 	Common campaign material developed at ANEW.
ANEW Secretariat Level		
Implementing ANEW-AMCOW MoU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended components of the plan are the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mechanisms for coordinating and consolidating CSO contributions to AMCOW policy and planning deliberations; - ANEW's role in knowledge building in Watsan issues in Africa; - Fostering and strengthening partnerships between civil society and AMCOW bodies at regional and sub-regional levels, and with national governments and other partners such as ANBO, Africa Groundwater Commission, AWEPA, etc.; - Capacity development of CSOs for an effective role in achieving the Watsan MDGs across Africa; 	ANEW Secretariat with partners

Key Capacity Gap	Proposed Intervention	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation and dissemination of case studies and research on civil society initiatives and approaches. 	
<p>Weak ANEW Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks independent identity • Mandate has expanded while institution structure has remained the same • Has no strategic plan in place to guide its development • Limited resources currently available • Lacking a media strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish independent Secretariat in a location separate from current host. • Develop a Strategic Plan to guide its work for the next 5 years • Conduct a thorough organisation capacity assessment including organisation structure audit to guide institution development to enable implementation of the strategic plan and deliver on its expanded mandate • As part of the 5-year strategic plan, develop a resource-mobilization strategy to cover ANEW's work over the period. In addition to governments, donors and development cooperation partners, identification, scoping and canvassing of private sector engaged in watsan in Africa must form an essential component of the resource-mobilization strategy • As part of the strategic plan, develop a comprehensive and targeted media strategy to publicize the work of the Secretariat and members, and raise awareness of decision-makers and public 	<p>AMCOW, ANEW and national CSOs through national coordinators</p>
<p>ANEW's support is currently limited to the 17 countries under the EU project. ANEW is not covering all African countries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently ANEW's relationship with the EU is through FAN. There is need to strengthen the relationship with its key donor, and therefore ANEW must develop some direct contact with its key donor and explore possibilities for project expansion 	<p>ANEW with national coordinators and Regional Focal Points.</p>

ANNEX II – Water and sanitation policy map

[see separate attachment]

ANNEX III - Terms of reference for the assignment

Annex IV - Analysis of key information sources

GWP

Notes: IWRM seems to be the main focus. With slight spill over into WATSAN but with almost no linkage to the attainment of MDGs. No information available on the following countries: Rwanda, Uganda, Ghana, DRC, Botswana and Lesotho.

Website: http://www.gwptoolbox.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=7

The 17 African countries are listed by region and the Toolbox allows for a search within each region, project wise, each project being numbered.

GWP must have come up with the acronym IWRM as their case studies are geared towards lessons learnt wrt IWRM.

Their region placing as not geographical as Tanzania, strangely, is not within East and Central Africa but is considered as Southern Africa.

WSP-AF

Notes: Not much on IWRM but lots of information on WATSAN wrt MDGs and their achievement. Many countries covered, information wise. Countries with not information regarding water and sanitation were Botswana, Lesotho and Chad.

Website: http://www.wsp.org/index.cfm?page=page_disp&pid=11132

Broken into regions, eg. Africa, Asia ... but within Africa, not further broken down into east, central etc like other websites so search is a bit harder.

IWRM is not a catch phrase used here but there is a strong bias to achieving MDG's within the water and sanitation framework.

GTZ

Notes: Most comprehensive website with information relating to WATSAN, home agency, MDGs and IWRM. A veritable mine of information with clear search engine. Lots of regional information and transboundary information. Information relating to Chad is not specific to the country but the Lake Chad basin. No clear policy in DRC and Senegal.

Website: <http://www.gtz.de/en/praxis/9654.htm>

The 17 African countries are listed by country within sub saharan Africa and have more than adequate information about each projects within each country

There is a strong bias to linking projects to the attainment of the MDGs.

IWRM as a phrase is used as a norm.

Of all the websites visited, this had the greatest amount of information pertaining to ongoing projects, inter related to achieving MDG's, not just dealing with water and sanitation.

African Development Bank

Notes: Information geared towards WATSAN, IWRM and MDGs. Wonderful information on SADAQ, Volta Basin Authority and other transboundary bits of information.

Website: http://www.afdb.org/portal/page?_pageid=473,968997&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

Africa is divided into regional and non regional member countries but the search engine makes no distinction.

European Union

Notes: Website overall has information addressing MDGs, PRSP wrt country strategies and does not cater so much to getting information relating to WATSAN or IWRM. No information available for DRC and Nigeria.

Website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/index_en.htm

The 17 African countries are listed by country and have more than adequate information about each country with regard to PRSP and thereby, indirectly, to water and sanitation issues.

Each country has country specific problems that are more prominent, be it HIV Aids, transports and infrastructure, anti-corruption themes, than WatSan issues.

Documents relating to french speaking countries, especially country strategies, are naturally, in french.

Reports and information relating to mozambique, is surprisingly, in English.

MDG 1 is a top priority for most countries.



African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation - ANEW
P.O. Box 58684 - 00200 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 - 20 - 2727107/8
Email: info@anewafrica.net



European Union



Nottawasaga Institute

P.O. Box 6511, 00100 Nairobi GPO, Kenya
Tel (254-20) 570-070 Email: nottawasaga@connect.co.ke