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From toilet construction to collective behavior change

Previous experiences using infrastructure oriented approaches in sanitation interventions led to poor progress on outputs and outcomes. Building on this experience, many countries have recently adopted a behavior change approach to improving sanitation. The primary focus of this approach is changing the behaviors of individuals, households and communities, rather than promoting toilets. Raising community awareness about the need for better sanitation leads to increased demand and acceptance. This approach is more likely to be sustainable.

In India, the Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) launched in 1999 signalled a paradigm shift with the adoption of a behavior change approach – one that emphasized a community led approach to total sanitation. Similar Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) initiatives have been initiated in other countries including Bangladesh, Pakistan, Indonesia, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Bolivia among others.

Increasing the demand for sanitation improvements would generate little sustainable change if the supply of sanitation products and services did not develop simultaneously. Access to a range of affordable product options at convenient locations at the right time- when demand is generated, is essential to the process of achieving a Total Sanitation community. Facilitating the development of a market to supply products, through private entrepreneurship (to ensure sustainability) is a key component of this approach.

Moving Beyond Projects: Scaling up and Sustaining Sanitation Improvement

The approach of increasing demand through a community- led behavior change focus is promising in terms of achieving Open Defecation Free (ODF) communities, which can then go on to achieve Total Sanitation (communitywide adoption of a set of key sanitation and hygiene practices). There are however two major challenges:

- Sustaining the outcomes: Behavior change, especially at the community level, is challenging to sustain over a long period of time. After the initial euphoria of improving sanitation outputs and outcomes, a slip back to the previous behavior patterns is often encountered.
- Scaling Up: Expanding the achievements of a few communities to hundreds and thousands of communities across a district, state/province or country is another major challenge. Although projects provide the initial momentum, similar initiatives have failed to scale up.

In addition to increasing demand and improving the supply of sanitation products and services, a third program component is essential to scaling up and sustaining the desired changes, viz, generating an enabling environment.
An Enabling Environment – the key to Scaling Up and Sustainability

An enabling environment is defined as the policy, institutional and financial environment that promotes self-sustaining growth of DEMAND for, and SUPPLY of, improved sanitation. An enabling environment for rural sanitation programs is envisaged to have at least eight different dimensions:

1. Policy, Strategy and Direction
2. Institutional Arrangements
3. Program Methodology
4. Implementation Capacity
5. Availability of Products and Tools
6. Financing
7. Cost-effective Implementation
8. Monitoring and Evaluation

Recognizing and addressing the issues within these eight dimensions is essential to facilitate the development of the enabling environment, which supports demand generation and supply creation, leading to Total Sanitation.

An enabling environment does not happen on its own, but has to be consciously developed. In addition, an enabling environment has to be able to be measured, so that progress towards it can be monitored, understood and facilitated.

The Total Sanitation and Sanitation Marketing (TSSM) Project

The TSSM project being implemented in India (Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh), Indonesia (East Java) and Tanzania accordingly employs a three-pronged approach: increasing consumer DEMAND, enhancing market SUPPLY, and generating an ENABLING ENVIRONMENT for rural sanitation. TSSM (2007-2010) is supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and executed by the Water and Sanitation Program in partnership with the three country governments. The goal of TSSM is to help 3.75 million additional people gain access to improved sanitation by 2010 in the three countries, while learning how best to scale up sanitation improvements sustainably, cost-effectively and with health and socio-economic impact, and to influence 5-15 more countries to apply the learning gained at scale by 2015.

The project supports innovations within existing government programs; develops new projects in partnership with the government. Through these efforts, the project hopes to facilitate access to improved sanitation for nearly 3.75 million people in the three countries and based on what is learned through the project, replicate it in other countries and reaches 250 million people by 2015.
Measuring the Enabling Environment – The Spider Diagram

An understanding of current enabling environment (EE) and where it should be helps to prioritize and address the critical gaps. To enable this, a set of scales, and a system of consolidating scale measurements into a Spider Diagram, has been developed by WSP. It is currently being tested with stakeholders in the three countries.

A baseline assessment of the EE was done at the start of the project in 2007 in each country. This will be followed by a repeat assessment at end of the TSSM project in 2010. In addition, annual reviews of progress, with local stakeholders are also undertaken.

The measurement method includes ordinal scales for each dimension of EE- 7 point scales starting at zero. Each scale has a common description for application across countries. For example, Institutional arrangement has the following indicators:

- Nodal Ministry/lead national institution identified 1
- Roles and responsibilities for sanitation clear 1
- Coordination mechanism established 1
- Dedicated budget line in place 1
- Clear links established with other sectors 1
- Clear operational structure 1

All scaled dimensions are consolidated into a Spider Diagram. Examples of Spider Diagrams from the three countries are based on the Baseline Enabling Environmental Assessments carried out in 2007. The scores for 2008, 2009 and 2010 represent results expected from Action Plans formulated in each country, in response to the assessments. An understanding of the baseline assessment of the enabling environment leads to the development of an Action Plan with short, medium and long term goals.
The tables, given in Annex 1, following the Spider diagrams summarize progress to date in each country, since the baseline measurement, and the action plan to reach the goals.

**Indonesia EE Assessment by TSSM project**

![Spider diagram showing progress in Indonesia EE Assessment by TSSM project from 2007 to 2010.](image_url)
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Assessment Updates from Indonesia, India and Tanzania

### INDONESIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline EE assessment findings - 2007</th>
<th>Progress since baseline – as of Nov.2008</th>
<th>Plans for 2008-10 under implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National policy for Community-based WSS established since 2003 but, no operational strategy in place for rural sanitation, Monitoring and evaluation of progress with respect to, national sanitation targets problematic due to mismatches between JMP definitions and SUSENAS (national survey) definitions re. safe/hygienic/improved sanitation. | National Operational strategy for Rural Sanitation & Hygiene launched by Minister for Health in Aug 08:  
- mandates “zero subsidy” approach for household sanitation, regardless of funding source.  
- endorses a combination of CLTS and sanitation marketing approaches for scaling up access to, and use of improved sanitation (aligned with JMP definitions)  
- Defines collective behavioral indicators to measure program performance (no. of ODF communities/districts etc.), instead of # of toilets constructed | Proposals formulated and national/local stakeholders’ debate facilitated re. institutional incentive schemes for using TSSM approaches and achieving ODF outcomes in communities/sub-districts/districts.  
Capacity building for institutionalizing program performance monitoring at district, province and national levels using M&E indicators based on the new national strategy  
- Support for dissemination of the Operational Strategy, to create wider acceptance and national ownership. |

Lack of consensus among donors re. Total Sanitation approach and
| “zero subsidy for household facilities” principle | No government, donor or NGO programs will henceforth provide subsidies for household sanitation facilities in rural areas. | managing rural sanitation and hygiene programs in Indonesia through: a) demand generation for improved sanitation and hygiene, b) improving market supply of products and services to meet demand, and c) generating an enabling environment for demand and supply to grow and sustain each other. |
| Little evidence of TSSM project in East Java province building partnerships at national level. | • National Planning Body (Bappenas) has allocated funds to assist replication of TSSM interventions in other provinces.  
• MOH has adopted TSSM approaches and implementation tools for its projects funded by the World Bank (WSLIC 2, PAMSIMAS) and the Asian Development Bank (CWSH), covering 29 provinces. | • Strategies and plans for replication of TSSM approaches for achieving district wide ODF status by 2010-2013 formulated in different districts of East Java.  
• Supporting collection and analysis of cost-effectiveness data in each TSSM district, as the basis for effective rural sanitation program planning and budgeting. |
| Low sanitation program funding in district budgets. | • All 29 district governments in East Java allocating increasingly larger funds for rural sanitation 2007 onwards. LG budgets now available for non-construction activities (training, social mobilization, demand creation etc.) everywhere in East Java.  
• However, per capita funding for improving rural sanitation situation still inadequate. District legislators and program administrators unaware of extent of funding needed for sustainable impact.  
• Household sanitation investment generated by TSSM interventions in East Java amount to 10 times the investment hitherto generated by programs offering subsidies. | Supporting national institutional capacity building plan formulation for rural sanitation and hygiene improvement - incorporating short, medium and long term capacity development strategies. |
| Institutional arrangements and capacity for rural sanitation implementation mostly project-based, externally funded, not sustained | • TSSM project building sustainable institutional capacity in East Java districts through on-the-job-training of local government staff from Health and Community Empowerment offices and sub-district health centers (Puskesmas).  
• Generic rural sanitation program implementation. | |
| Availability of products and services limited. Markets offer little or no choices for the poorest. Government and donor programs have to date supplied and propagated standardized solutions of a single type. | • Catalogue of sanitation options developed and information being offered to rural consumers on-demand.  
• Training and accreditation program developed for local masons in delivering those options with quality assurance.  
• Communication campaign designed for generating consumer demand for improved sanitation |
|---|---|
| Program methodology unclear as to how communities with difficult technical or social conditions will be served and how school sanitation improvements will be effected sustainably. | • Advocacy with local leadership (Bupatis and legislators) being used to obtain school sanitation improvement as rewards for communities achieving ODF status. So far problems not encountered in getting schools thus served.  
• Difficult technical conditions identified for East Java and technological options appropriate for them being incorporated in Catalogue of options.  
• School sanitation and hygiene improvement program process designed and currently being tested in 14 of 29 districts |
| | • Supporting sanitation supply chain improvement in East Java so that all segments of consumers are able to exercise adequate choice for improving their sanitation and hygiene facilities.  
• Setting up quality assurance mechanisms involving producers, vendors, consumers and accreditation authorities.  
• Documenting lessons learned in the process for replication in other provinces.  
• Clear guidelines to be established for involvement of primary schools in the Total Sanitation program process, as institutions that catalyze and monitor sustainable sanitation and hygiene behavior improvement in the whole community. |
### TANZANIA: Enabling Environment Assessment update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Baseline EE assessment findings - 2007</th>
<th>Progress since baseline</th>
<th>Plans under way for 2008-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Policy, strategy, and direction | - No national policy  
- Weak strategy  
- No shared vision                                      | - National policy development process begun  
- MoU among key ministries being developed                                                  | - Complete draft policy  
- Signed MoU  
- Develop implementation strategy                                                  |
| 2. National institutional arrangements | - No lead agency  
- No coordination  
- No dedicated resources                                           | - Lead agency identified  
- Coordination structure implemented  
- Dedicated budget line and resources                                                 | - Established roles and responsibilities  
- Operational structure implemented  
- Well defined links with other sectors                                               |
| 3. Program methodology           | - No program methodology  
- No understanding of TSSM  
- Limited behavior-change experience                                            | - Program methodology being refined to TZ  
- Increasing awareness of CLTS-based approaches  
- Growing understanding of marketing                                                   | - Implementation of program methodology  
- Adoption of methodology by national and local governments  
- Adoption of methodology by partners                                                     |
| 4. Implementation capacity       | - Insufficient capacity at all levels  
- No capacity building plan                                                      | - Nothing yet                                                                        | - Develop capacity building plan  
- Improve capacity at district and village level.  
- Increase capacity among private sector  
- Increase capacity among partners                                                       |
| 5. Availability of products      | - Limited products and tools available  
- Products and tools do not respond to consumer preferences | - Increasing products available  
- Consumer research                                                                   | - Products available catered to consumers  
- Marketing campaigns                                                                     |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and tools</th>
<th>conducted to conform products and approaches to consumer demand</th>
<th>targeting consumers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No funding</td>
<td>− MoWI providing increasing funding to local governments</td>
<td>− Proper costing of programs developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No funding plan</td>
<td>− MoHSW providing increasing funding to local governments</td>
<td>− Financing plan developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Donors allocating increasing resources.</td>
<td>− Sufficient resources acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost-effective implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No method for collecting cost data</td>
<td>− Developing methodology for assessing effectiveness of implementation</td>
<td>− Cost-effective assessment methodology/systems in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No method for assessing effectiveness of implementation</td>
<td>− Tracking costing</td>
<td>− Data being collected, analyzed and utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No M&amp;E system in place for monitoring sanitation outcomes</td>
<td>− MoWI now collecting sanitation indicators</td>
<td>− Sanitation and hygiene captured in routine data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− MoHSW tracking diarrhea indicators.</td>
<td>− Policy decisions based on proper data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Project M+E being developed.</td>
<td>− Implementation decisions informed by routine data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# An Update on Enabling Environment
## India (Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Baseline status 2007</th>
<th>Current status – 2010</th>
<th>Plans for 2008-10 under implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy, strategy, and direction** | • Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) guidelines of Govt. of India promote a demand driven approach.  
• Nirmal Gram Puraskar (NGP – incentive program of GOI – promotes competition among local governments to achieve community level sanitation outcomes  
• Strategy for Total Sanitation adopted by state of Himachal Pradesh  
• Strategy for Total Sanitation drafted for Madhya Pradesh, pending Cabinet approval | • TSC and NGP guidelines and State strategy drive implementation of community led outcome focused sanitation program.  
• In HP, State level competitive incentive program (Maharshi Valmiki reward scheme) promotes Total Sanitation and Sanitation plus outcomes.  
• In MP, state level incentive program drafted  
• Increased political will on sanitation developing. | • High political will for community led total sanitation approaches across the states developed.  
• High multi stakeholder institutional partnerships developed  
• In HP, incentive program operating at scale, and staggered to incorporate performance grades.  
• In MP, incentive program operationalized |

| Institutional Arrangements | • Institutional assignments for sanitation are clear, but lacks priority among competing sectors  
• Lack of dedicated sanitation cells at state and district cells.  
• Partnerships with other stakeholders like Gram Panchayats, NGOs in nascent stage. | • Priority for sanitation significantly higher at state and district levels.  
• Sanitation cells established at state and district levels  
• Partnerships developed with GPs, being developed with Support Organisations (NGOs)  
• In MP, strong partnerships developed at state level with | • Sanitation considered a top institutional priority in menu of development program  
• Institutional clarity with dedicated units exists at all levels of government  
• Strong partnerships with other stakeholders  
• Inter departmental coordination robust at state and district |
| **Program Methodology** | • A demand driven total sanitation approach adopted by state and most districts in principle.  
• Sanitation marketing not strongly promoted, left to existing market mechanisms | • Community led approaches adopted by state and all districts in HP, and in select districts in MP  
• Incentives programs being adopted to strengthen outcomes of sanitation and other rural development programs.  
• Sanitation marketing being increasingly adopted by facilitating and strengthening the market as required to make available affordable and appropriate models of hardware and (masonry) services, as well as awareness about options available to facilitate informed choice | • Community led approaches institutionalized in the states’ sanitation agenda.  
• Strong sanitation marketing with markets playing an appropriate role for products and services  
• Incentives seen as a major approach to drive outcomes in many rural development programs.  
• Principles of TSSM approach adopted in other states of the country. |
<p>| <strong>Implementation Capacity</strong> | • Capacity for implementation of community driven approaches to raise demand and sanitation marketing poor at state and district levels. | • Capacity on CLTS approaches developed in all districts of the state; capacity on sanitation marketing being developed and supported through continuous training (including exposure | • High level of capacities exists to raise demand through community participation and ensure supply of products and services at all levels. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Availability of products and Tools</strong></th>
<th><strong>visits) and incentive programs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Financing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Very limited activities undertaken in developing market based or alternate supply chains.  
• Availability of technology options for affordable sanitation remains poor. | • Market based approaches being promoted in the districts  
• Communications strategy for HP and Consumer Research in MP being finalized.  
• Efforts to develop a menu of communications tools and behavior change communication campaign underway.  
• Understanding of technology options and products among consumers and service providers being developed. | • Private market supplies appropriate and affordable products to consumers based on demand.  
• Consumers have informed choice regarding menu of options to adopt affordable sanitation options.  
• Services and information available for O&M of sanitation hardware. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cost-effective Implementation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Methodology for collecting data for assessing costs of reaching total sanitation being prepared.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strong credit facilities available for hardware construction and sanitation plus activities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No data is available on costs of various approaches to reach total sanitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitoring and Evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Monitoring system on process of TSC implementation in place.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strong monitoring system, which tracks inputs, outputs, outcomes, sustainability and</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring system on inputs (resources spent), outputs (toilets constructed), and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| outcomes (NGP) operational at all levels. | strengthened on usage and sustainability of outcomes. | impacts, exists. |
| • No robust monitoring system of usage of hardware and sustainability of outcomes prevalent. | • Methodology for assessing impacts of sanitation program being developed. | • Monitoring information actively feeds into program process and outcomes. |
| • Detailed with/without and longitudinal data collected and analyzed on impact of large scale sanitation on health and welfare outcomes in rural HP and MP |