



Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council
Working Group on Sanitation

Meeting of the Editorial Panel of the
Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation
Yvoire, France, 4-6 June 1997

9 July 1997
World Health Organization, Geneva

LIBRARY IRC
PO Box 93190, 2509 AD THE HAGUE
Tel.: +31 70 30 689 80
Fax: +31 70 35 899 64

BARCODE:

0:

18135

304 97 ME

304-97ME-18135

**Meeting of the Editorial Panel of the
Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation
*Yvoire, France, 4-6 June 1997***

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology of the Meeting	2
Main Decisions of the Editorial Review Panel	2
Future Steps in the Development of the Sanitation Resource Kit	4

Annexes

- Annex 1 New Table of Contents of the Sanitation Resource Kit
- Annex 2 Terms of Reference for the Editorial Panel
- Annex 3 Agenda of the Meeting in Yvoire, France, 4-6 June 1997
- Annex 4 List of Participants

**Meeting of the Editorial Panel of the
Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation
Yvoire, France, 4-6 June 1997**

Introduction

From the first meeting of the Collaborative Council Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation in Thun, Switzerland (March 1994) until now, the Working Group has had a vision of fulfilling its mandate to promote sanitation by providing the sector with key information documents that would help to promote sanitation and achieve a better rate of coverage than the achieved during past decades. Ideas for such documents have evolved over five meetings of the Working Group between 1994 and 1996.

A number of key documents were produced by the Working Group as a whole through discussions, such as *The Problem of Sanitation*, *Principles for Better Sanitation Programmes*, *Features of Better Sanitation Programmes*, and *Commonly Held Wrong Assumptions about Sanitation*. Other information documents were envisaged by the Working Group, but it was agreed that the group as a whole would be unable to write these, since they would require more time and writers with expert backgrounds. The Working Group Coordinator was advised to prepare terms of reference and search for volunteers or consultants to prepare these special documents.

At the last two meetings of the Working Group in El Salvador (March 1996) and in Viet Nam (November 1996), the concept of a "Sanitation Resource Kit" (rather than a Sanitation Promotion Kit) evolved, and its ideal contents were elaborated in the two meetings. Following those meetings, Working Group members not present were invited to comment upon the draft table of contents and add their suggestions.

In February 1997 a major effort was begun by the Coordinator to assemble the entire Kit, based upon all suggestions, to locate authors, to formulate a graphic design for the Kit and to have it prepared for the next meeting of the Collaborative Council in The Philippines (November 1997). To assist in this process, WHO hired a communications specialist, Sara Wood.

By the end of May 1997, most of the documents (short articles, lists and checklists) were assembled and ready for review. The Working Group Coordinator invited six persons who had been actively involved with the Working Group but who had not authored any of the documents (with one exception) to conduct an objective outside review of the entire contents of the draft Kit and to do a critical review of the contents of each article. The review panel consisted of John Odolon (Uganda), Ashoke Chatterjee (India), Roland Schertenleib (Switzerland), Dennis Warner (U.S.A.) and Dick de Jong (Netherlands). Ato Brown (Ghana) had also been invited but was unable to attend at the last moment.

These reviewers met for three full days in Yvoire, France, read every article as teams and critically reviewed them. They identified gaps in the Kit and reviewed items which had been suggested for inclusion but not previously endorsed by the Working Group. They also considered major issues such as the communications strategy for the Kit, the target audience, copyright issues, acknowledgments and the future development of the Kit once it had been

printed. This brief report summarizes their decisions which are to be implemented by the Coordinator.

Methodology of the Meeting

The Editorial Panel divided into two teams to review articles, with one team reviewing and editing the articles concerned with conceptual issues, case studies and gaining political will, the other the articles on doing better sanitation programmes.

Each team was provided with a set of papers in individual folders. Each folder contained the original terms of reference for the article, the article (most had undergone some further editing by the coordinator and Ms. Wood) and critical reviews of the article when they existed. (The Coordinator tried to have each article that had not been developed previously by the Working Group critically reviewed by two Working Group members or other sector expert before this meeting. However, this ideal was not achieved for every article as some reviewers did not get their reviews done on time.) Each team was also given all general comments on the Kit, as some correspondence concerned the Kit as whole rather than individual items. The teams were asked to consider all comments and correspondence, positive and negative, concerning the Sanitation Resource Kit.

The Editorial Panel provided written comments on every article, did further copy editing where necessary, and decided whether an article was to be included or excluded. They also held discussions on the concept of the Kit as whole, identified gaps in the Kit and decided how these gaps were to be filled.

Main Decisions of the Editorial Review Panel

The Panel made an overall assessment of the Kit. They felt that the Kit will meet the objective of promoting sanitation, that it reflects the varied discussions of the Working Group, that the product will be useful and effective, subject to certain changes recommended below.

Referring to the TOR 1b and 1c (Annex 2), the Panel decided to change the working of the target audience for the Kit to "sanitation professionals and includes anyone wanting to promote sanitation and improve sanitation programmes at national, district and international levels. The Resource Kit also serves as the Working Group's report to the Council."

The Panel decided to rename the first section of the Kit from "Improving the Science and Professionalism of Sanitation" to "Responding to the Challenge". This section will be further subdivided into two parts. The first part will be named "Conceptual Issues: the Need for New Approaches" and the second part "Examples of New Approaches". (See new list of contents attached in Annex 1.)

The Panel determined that this first section of the Kit was lacking examples of low-cost sewerage and new approaches to waste water treatment. Roland Schertenleib offered to write

a TOR for an article on low-cost sewerage options and he obtained agreement from Duncan Mara of Leeds University to write the article for the Kit. Dr. Schertenleib also volunteered to review a case study on waste water treatment that had been submitted for the Kit to see if it could be expanded into a more general article on innovations in waste water treatment.

The Panel endorsed the inclusion of two documents prepared by the Working Group on Water Supply and Sanitation Issues in Small Island States which are excellent summaries of alternative excreta disposal technologies, the inclusion of the HESAWA case study in its original printed form, and an article on Gaining Political Will in Uganda to be prepared by John Odolon.

Three articles were dropped from the Kit for different reasons. Two of these articles may still be included if the criticisms leveled at them can be rectified. Dick de Jong agreed to work further on the Training of Professionals for Sanitation, which seemed to lack some current information, and Ron Sawyer has agreed to work further on the case study concerned with vermicomposting. It was felt that the article on Strategic Sanitation Planning (which was not dropped) needed to be rewritten with a focus on the principles and process of SSP rather than the current emphasis placed on the UNDP-World Bank Program. The Coordinator agreed to contact the Program about doing a new version.

The Panel decided not to include advertising brochures on books and sector magazines.

The Panel suggested that an item on the new UNICEF handbook on Better Sanitation Programming be included in the Kit. It should be a two-to-four page flyer on the process and further information about where to obtain copies or help on going through the process. The Coordinator agreed to discuss this with UNICEF.

The Panel felt that the section on Gaining Political Will in the Kit was still weak and that some good case examples still needed to be found. Ashoke Chatterjee agreed to obtain an example from India and Dick de Jong would provide one from Peru. Working Group members are also encouraged to send in good examples of gaining political will for the Kit.

The Panel came up with and endorsed a poster design concept. The actual design decisions were left to Dr. Simpson-Hebert and Ms. Wood, subject to time and budget availability.

The Panel reviewed the copyright statements to be used with the Kit. WHO holds copyright on most of the material in the Kit and gives it freely for use for others for non-commercial purposes. Certain authors wanted to retain copyright on their contributions. Therefore, WHO will write to these authors requesting them to allow their work to be freely used for non-commercial purposes, while permission for use for commercial reasons will require written permission from the author. It will be clear at the end of each article which items are not under WHO copyright.

The Panel made decisions on how each contributor to the Kit shall be recognized, and also how reviewers and Working Group members will be recognized. Briefly, it was decided that all persons who attended Working Group meetings, wrote an article or reviewed an article will receive recognition.

The Panel requested that the Sanitation Resource Kit be assembled in a ring binder, rather than any other type of binding. This was to allow for ease of use and the ability to add one's own items to the binder. The Panel selected the cover design, after taking into consideration market research on the design options conducted by WHO.

Future Steps in the Development of the Sanitation Resource Kit

The next step in the development of the Sanitation Resource Kit is to send an advance information copy to the entire Working Group on Sanitation, other people on the mailing list of the Working Group, WHO Regional Offices and UNICEF (offices to be selected by them). During July and August the contents of the Kit will be designed and formatted by the WHO Graphics Department.

In September 1997 the Kit will go for duplication and be produced as a draft document for the meeting of the Collaborative Council in Manila (November 1997). It will have a colorful and attractive binder. The binder will contain evaluation forms for the Kit as a whole and for individual articles. The Collaborative Council, Working Group members and all other interested parties will be asked to review the Kit, field test it, and provide comments to the Coordinator at WHO during the six months following the November meeting. At the end of six months, in mid-1998, all evaluation forms received will be reviewed, suggestions for revision will be considered and a final Kit will be printed by early 1999. The Panel suggested that WHO continue to collect comments on the Kit for two years thereafter and that revisions be made again if necessary.

SANITATION RESOURCE KIT

List of Contents

- Leaflet on the logic of the Kit, who might use it and how to use it.
- A poster designed to promote sanitation, present a positive image and raise its profile.
(Target audience: Sector Professionals)



Responding to the Challenge

A. Conceptual Issues: the Need for New Approaches

- *Sanitation Challenges in the 21st Century*, Working Group on Sanitation, 1997.
- *The Problem of Sanitation*, Working Group on Sanitation, revised 1997.
- *Sanitation Myths: Obstacles to Progress?*, Mayling Simpson-Hébert, first presented at the Stockholm Water Symposium, August 1996.
- *Commonly Held Wrong Assumptions About Sanitation*. (Working Group, 1995)
- *Towards an Ecological Approach to Sanitation*, introductory speech by Uno Winblad, WHO Advisor, at the International Toilet Symposium, Toyama, Japan, 9-11 October 1996.
- *The Training of Professionals for Sanitation in the 21st Century* (inclusion still pending).
- *Research Needs in Sanitation*. (Working Group, 1995)

B. Examples of New Approaches

- *Dry Toilets in El Salvador*
- *Advocating Dry Toilets in Mexico*
- *National Low Cost Sanitation Latrine Programme, Mozambique*
- *YACUPAJ Project in Potosi, Bolivia*
- *The Use of Urine as a Fertilizer for Food Production in Mexico*.

• *Low-Cost Sewerage*, Duncan Mara, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, Great Britain.

• *Sanitation for Small Islands*, Derrick Depledge, SOPAC, product of the Working Group on Water Supply and Sanitation Issues in Small Island States.

• *Waterless Composting Toilets*, Derrick Depledge, SOPAC, product of the Working Group on Water Supply and Sanitation Issues in Small Island States.



Gaining Political Will

• *Suggestions on How to Gain Political Commitment*, drawn from pages 12, 13 and 14 of the Working Group report to Barbados and includes sample advocacy statements. (Working Group)

• *Why Sanitation? Common Diseases related to Sanitation.*

• *Achieving more Effective Intersectoral Cooperation in Sanitation: Pointers from Nepal*, Dinesh C. Pyakural, Director General, Department of Water Supply and Sewerage, Ministry of Housing and Physical Planning, Nepal, 1997.

• *Cost Effectiveness of Sanitation Programmes: A Tool for Generating Political Interest and Commitment* [paper under development; inclusion still pending].

• *Social Mobilization*, Sunil Mehra, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, U.K. (1997)

• *Securing Political Will and Action in Uganda*, John Odolon, Ministry of Health, Uganda. (1997)



Doing Better Programmes

• *Principles of Better Sanitation Programmes* (Working Group, 1995) and 'Principle Cards' (15 cards).

• *Important Elements for a Successful National Sanitation Programme*, drawn from pages 17 and 18 of the Working Group report to Barbados. (Working Group, 1995)

• *Checklist for Planning Better Sanitation Projects.*

• *Checklist for Planning Hygiene Behaviour Change Components of Sanitation Programmes.* (1997)

• *Features of Better Sanitation Projects.* (Working Group, 1995)

- *Principles for Sanitation in Emergency Situations*, Proceedings of an International Workshop held in Oxford, December 1995.
- *Checklist for Better Sanitation Programmes in Emergency Situations*, derived from the above.
- *Changing Hygiene Behaviour: Lessons from other Sectors*, Carol Jenkins, Ministry of Health, Papua New Guinea. (1997)
- *Gender Checklist for Planning Sanitation Programmes*, Angela Haden, Geneva, Switzerland. (1997)
- *Participatory Approaches to Hygiene Behaviour Change and Sanitation*, John Odolon, Ministry of Health, Uganda. (1997)
- *Promoting Sanitation through Children: A Child-to-Community Approach*, Angela Haden, Geneva, Switzerland. (1997)
- *Child-Centred Approaches to Sanitation: the Bal Sevak Programme in Pachod, India*, Nandita Kapadia-Kundu, Pune, India and Ashok Dyalchand, Maharashtra, India.
- *The HESAWA School Health and Sanitation Package*, Eben S. Mwashu, Zonal HESAWA Coordination Office, Mwanza, Tanzania.
- *Social Marketing: Tools for Sanitation Programmes*, Sunil Mehra, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, U.K. (1997)
- *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Sanitation Projects: Key Concepts*, Mayling Simpson-Hébert and Sara Wood. (1997)
- *Sanitation, Flies and Disease Transmission* [paper under development; inclusion still pending].
- *Household Financing Options for Sanitation*, Rob Varley, Research Triangle Institute, U.S.A. (1997) [paper under development; inclusion still pending].
- *Private Sector Involvement in the Promotion of Sanitation*. (1997)
- A flier on *Strategic Sanitation Planning*, World Bank.
- A flier on *The PHAST Initiative*, WHO.



- Sanitation Resource Kit Evaluation Form.

ANNEX 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE Editorial Review Panel for Sanitation Resource Kit

You have been invited to conduct a final review the Sanitation Resource Kit before it goes to print in September. Please read all of the sections below before you begin. Then, one by one, please try to answer the questions below based upon your experience.

1. LOOK AT THE DESIGN AND CONTENTS OF THE KIT AS A WHOLE.

- a. Is the design and list of contents consistent with the objective of promoting sanitation? If not, why not? How could the design aspects of the Kit be improved to more successfully meet the Kit's objectives?
- b. The primary target audience for the Kit is the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council who are the decision makers in the sector. Will the design of the Kit appeal to them? If not, why not?
- c. The secondary target audience is water and sanitation professionals at other levels. Will the design of the Kit appeal to them? If not, why not?
- d. Will the design have global appeal? If not, why not?
- e. Does the Kit look important and convey a prestigious image? If not, why not and what would be more effective for achieving this purpose?
- f. Can one design presentation effectively appeal to both target groups? If not, what are the alternatives?
- g. Does the organization of the Kit into the three sections, Improving the Science and Professionalism of Sanitation, Gaining Political Will, and Doing Better Programmes make sense?
- h. Is it the best way of dividing the Kit. If not, why not and what are your suggestions for improvement?
- i. In terms of the design and layout, does the Kit work effectively for the following things:
 - Are the sections clearly differentiated?
 - Is it still obvious that the individual items are part of the Sanitation Resource Kit?
 - Is it clear which section an individual article belongs to?
- j. Are there any important information gaps in the Kit? If yes, how can these gaps be filled?

2. LOOK AT THE PACKAGING OF THE KIT.

Is a loose leaf folder arrangement appropriate for the Sanitation Resource Kit given its objective and target audience. If not, why not and what would be better? Cost considerations need to be taken into account here.

3. READ EACH PIECE WITHIN THE KIT AND ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT EACH ONE.

Review of the leaflet to introduce the Kit (No. 1).

Look at the contents of the Introductory Leaflet:

- Does it clearly explain the conceptual thinking that has guided the development of the contents of the Kit and its presentation in this form?
- Does it explain the purpose of the Kit?
- Does it define the target audience i.e. who could find the Kit useful?
- Does it explain clearly how the Kit could be used?
- Does it explain clearly how the Kit is organized? If not, why not?

Review of other content items of the Sanitation Resource Kit

This list is provided to help you do the review of each article. It lists a series of questions which you can pose to yourself as you read through each Kit item. The result should be an in-depth review of the style, content, worth and usefulness of each item in terms of meeting the objective set for the Kit. Some of the questions will be more relevant than others depending on whether it is a paper, checklist or list of principles you are reading. If the answers to most of the questions are positive, then it means this item is appropriate for inclusion in the Kit. We would like you to use this list because it means that there has been a consistent criteria applied for the review across the contents of the Kit.

Overview

Will this piece promote sanitation?

Does it attract your interest?

Is it in the right section?

In-depth Content Review

Is the title consistent with the content of the article?

Is the piece consistent with the principles of equity, protection, and eco-sustainability?

Could a programme manager use the ideas and information expressed in this piece to promote sanitation and/or to improve his/her own programme?

Does the piece make sense and is the point that it makes clear?

Is it well structured, do the ideas flow logically? Would it benefit from some reorganization of the content?

Is any important information missing? Are there any gaps in the content?

Is the level of language appropriate to the target audience?

Is the use of scientific terms or jargon appropriate?

Does it hold your attention throughout?

Could the content of the article be lifted directly and used for promotional purposes?

Is the piece the right length? Could it be shortened?

Are the sources for further information easily obtainable?

Are there other sources you would recommend?

Does the piece seem to be resourceful without being dictatorial? If not, why not?

Question specific to Checklists

Is a checklist format appropriate for this subject?

4. LOOK AT THE KIT AS A PROMOTIONAL TOOL.

Will the Kit promote sanitation? If you think not, why not?

If your answers are on the negative side, what can you suggest to improve the Kit so it will do a better job of promoting sanitation?

5. GENERAL ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED BY THE EDITORIAL PANEL

New items:

a. Review the items which have been submitted for consideration but haven't been previously agreed on for inclusion by the Working Group.

- *Flier from Duncan Mara on his books
- *Private sector involvement in the promotion of sanitation
- *Guidelines for selection and development of sanitation for small islands
- *Waterless composting toilets

b. Decide if fliers should be invited for inclusion from relevant magazines such as:

- Worm Digest
- I.R.C. Notes
- Waterlines

If the panel decides this would be appropriate then a criteria needs to be established for choosing which publications are to be invited to participate. Also the panel will need to agree on a standardized terms of reference to guide the content of these fliers. This would state the following sort of things:

- length
- content
- how to order
- order form to be included etc.

c. Logos

Decisions need to be made on which logos should to be included on the Kit and the individual items, and where they should appear. A recommendation has been made on this and has been put before the WSSCC. A copy of the correspondence is attached for consideration and endorsement by the panel, if it believes this recommendation is appropriate (Attachment A).

d. Copyright

WHO will hold copyright to the Kit and all the items except those which are already subject to separate copyright ownership. This latter case relates to some of the field example material. However, the intention is to make all the items available freely for use provided it is for educational or non commercial purposes. This means that if people want to photocopy, translate or reproduce part or all of the Kit for this purpose they can do so without having to obtain approval from WHO or individual copyright holders. This is done by stating how the material can be used without prior permission in the copyright declaration. We will seek permission from independent copyright holders for their material to be used in this way too. This will be done in writing. If someone wants to use the material outside these stated parameters they must seek approval of either WHO or the separate copyright holder.

We have consulted with WHO's legal office extensively on this subject and propose the following declarations to enable the Kit to be used in this way (See Attachment B).

e. A decision needs to be made on how to recognise the differing types of contributions:

• Those from authors specially commissioned by the Working Group to prepare a paper for the Sanitation Resource Kit

Logo position - at the end of the paper

Wording - Prepared by Sunil Mehra, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, U.K., 1997.

Copyright WHO

Position - at the bottom of the first page

[SAN] Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation

[WHO logo] [WSSCC logo]

• Those named author papers included in the Kit, but not specially prepared for it

Suggestion

Position - under the title, but in very small font

Wording - Uno Winblad, WHO advisor, introductory speech, International Toilet Symposium, Toyama, Japan, 9-11 October 1996.

Copyright Uno Winblad

Logo position - at the bottom of first page of the paper

[SAN] Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation

[WHO logo] [WSSCC logo]

• Field examples

These are a little more complex because we have to recognise the copyright of the authors and that Ron Sawyer was the coordinator of these experiences.

Suggestion

Position - at the end of the paper

Wording - copyright symbol Darren Saywell 1995, edited by SARAR Transformación SC, Mexico for WHO with the permission of Darren Saywell, 1997.

Logo position - at the bottom of the first page

[SAN] Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation

[WHO logo] [WSSCC logo]

e. Contributions - General

A decision needs to be taken on how the contributions of people should be recognised. The contributions vary, some are significant like writing papers, others are less so, like sending in a letter with a suggestion of a topic that the Kit should cover (See Attachment C for our suggestion on how to recognise the contributions to the Kit). This is a very touchy subject and if we get it wrong we will come under heavy criticism, even to the extent that some people and organizations may not use the Kit if we don't get the recognition part right. This needs careful, considered thought.

f. Acknowledgement of the Working Group

A decision needs to be taken on whether the Working Group will be referred to according to its official title designated by WSSCC - which is Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation - or will it be called the name the Group gave to itself - Working Group on Sanitation?

Also a final decision needs to be made on where the Working Group should be acknowledged on each piece of the Kit.

Suggestion

Position - bottom of first page with the WHO and WSSCC logos

Wording - Working Group (which name the panel agrees on)

g. Standard terminology

The Kit will be edited by an independent editor and in order to make this job easier we need to think about establishing some terminology rules for the Kit. The reason for doing this is so that there is consistency throughout out the Kit. It would be very confusing to the reader to find, for example, a number of different definitions of sanitation in the Kit. We should think about what are the key terms, definitions etc. which will be used in the Kit and established an agreed wording for each. This can be provided to the editor as a terminology guideline. It means that we don't have to concern ourselves with finding all the inconsistencies, which there are likely to be quite a few, as papers have been prepared by different people, we can establish the guidelines which the editor then applies.



Attachment A

FACSIMILE Message No. Page 1 of 3 pages

From: Sara Wood
Rural Environmental Health
Unit, WHO

To: R. Wirasinha
c/o Carlton Beach Hotel
The Hague, The Netherlands

Your ref.:

Fax No.: (31-70) 352-0020 Date: 29 May 1997

Our ref.: REH W2-522-21

Subject: WORKING GROUP ON SANITATION - SANITATION RESOURCE KIT

As you know, a Sanitation Resource Kit is under production as the main product of the Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation. We are now at a point where decisions need to be made on which logos should appear on the Kit and where these should appear.

The purpose of this memo is to set out our recommendations on this issue for your consideration and advice. We need a response as soon as possible as we would like to present this information to the Sanitation Resource Kit Review Panel which starts its meeting on Wednesday 4 June.

We are basing our suggestions on what was done for the Gender Issues Sourcebook for Water and Sanitation Projects prepared by the Working Group on Gender Issues. (copy attached)

Front Cover of the Kit

(top of the page) Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation

(bottom of the page) WHO logo and WSSCC logo

Individual Kit Items

(bottom of first page of each item) WHO logo, Working Group, WSSCC logo

Thus, all items in the kit including the folder will carry recognition of WHO, the Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation and the WSSCC.

WHO will have copyright to the Kit and to all the items except those which are already subject to prior copyright ownership. These latter items are some of the case study examples which are already copyrighted by individual authors or organizations. We have been working extensively with WHO's legal department to ensure that we go through the proper approval process to obtain permission to reproduce these pieces. The procedures are in place and approvals will be obtained in advance of printing. Do you have any advice or comments to offer based on your experience with other printed products?

We also have to seek permission to use the WHO logo on the Sanitation Resource Kit and this process is also underway.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could respond to this memo prior to Tuesday 3 June. I apologise for having to track you down while you are on duty travel. I am sure you have a lot to do already, but it is important we have a decision to present to our meeting.

Kind regards,

Sara Wood

cc: Mayling Simpson-Hébert

Attachment B

© World Health Organization 1997

All rights reserved. This document may be freely used, copied, distributed and translated, in whole or in part, for education and other non-commercial purposes. However, any other dealing, including the adaptation into electronic form, requires the permission of WHO, and requests should be directed to REH, World Health Organization, 20 avenue Appia, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland. Please note that there are certain parts of this document of which WHO is not the copyright holder. Permission to use these parts outside the usage stated above must be sought directly from each copyright holder concerned. The address information for contacting each copyright holder appears at the bottom of the last page of each such part. It is the responsibility of the user alone to obtain permission from the copyright holders.

Any dealing, in whole or in part, for commercial or promotional purposes (including distribution for a fee to a third party) is strictly prohibited.

The views expressed in parts by named authors are solely the responsibility of those authors.

Attachment C
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Prepared by:

Contributions: [List names of authors of papers and organizations.]

Reviewers: [List names and organizations.]

Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation: [List names only of individuals who have made contributions to Kit by way of attending meetings, sending in comments, etc.]

ANNEX 3

AGENDA

Meeting of Editorial Panel of Working Group on Sanitation *Yvoire, France – 4-6 June 1997*

Tuesday evening, 3 June 1997

19:30 onwards *Opening remarks and welcome dinner*

Wednesday, 4 June 1997

9:00-10:30 **Opening Session - Orientation**
Objectives of the Meeting:
•To review and finalise the entire contents of the Kit, specifically:
 -make the edits and changes to the papers,
 -redraft papers if necessary,
 -exclude items if they are inappropriate.
•To review and finalize the design and layout of the Kit
•To review and finalize the packaging of the Kit
•To ensure the Kit meets the Working Group objective of promoting sanitation.
Agenda
Parameters of the meeting
Communication strategy
Background to the formation of the Kit
Where we are now
Report on the market research for the cover design
Open discussion

10:30-10:45 *Break*

10:45-11:15 -Working in three pairs on the design and contents of the Kit as a whole, packaging of the Kit (Items 1 and 2 or TOR)

11:15-12:30 -Plenary
Reporting back on Items 1 and 2 of TOR

12:30-13:30 *Lunch*

13:30-15:30 -Review of individual components of the Kit, working in three pairs* (Item 3 of TOR)

15:30-15:45 *Break*

15:45-17:30 -Item 3 of TOR (con't)

*Each pair will review about one-third of the total contents of the Kit.

Thursday, 5 June 1997

- 9:00-9:15 Plenary - reporting on progress, problems
- 9:15-10:30 Item 3 of TOR (con't)
- 10:30-10:45 *Break*
- 10:45-12:30 Item 3 of TOR (con't)
- 12:30-13:30 *Lunch*
- 13:30-14:15 -Reports on Item 3 to whole group in summary form:
- 13:30-13:45 Pair one
- 13:45-14:00 Pair two
- 14:00-14:15 Pair three
- 14:15-14:45 -General discussion
- 14:45-15:30 -Reviewing individually or in pairs all edits and comments
- 15:30-15:45 *Break*
- 15:45-17:30 -Review by individual pairs of all edits and comments

Friday, 6 June 1997

- 9:00-9:15 -Plenary
- 9:15-10:30 -Further comments and changes on individual articles, etc.
- 10:30-10:45 *Break*
- 10:45-12:30 -Plenary
Consensus on final contents of the Kit and further steps, if any
- 12:30-13:30 *Lunch*
- 13:30-15:30 -Plenary
The Kit as a promotional tool (Item 4 of TOR)
- 15:30-15:45 *Break*
- 15:45-17:30 -Plenary
General issues to be finalized by the Panel (Item 5 of TOR)
Last items/general

ANNEX 4

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Working Group on Promotion of Sanitation:

Ashoke Chatterjee

National Institute of Design
Paldi Ahmedabad 380 007
INDIA
Fax: (91-79) 663-8465
Phone: (91-79) 663-9692

Dick de Jong

IRC International Water Supply
and Sanitation Centre
P.O. Box 93190
2509 AD The Hague
THE NETHERLANDS
Fax: (31-70) 358-9964
Phone: (31-70) 331-4133
E-mail: jong@irc.nl

John K.O. Odolon

Environmental Health Division
Ministry of Health
Box 8 Entebbe
UGANDA
Fax: (256-42) 21164 (via WHO Uganda)
Phone: (256-42) 20059

Roland Schertenleib

Head, SANDEC
EAWAG
Ueberlandstrasse 133
CH-8600 Dübendorf
SWITZERLAND
Fax: (41-1) 823-5399
Phone: (41-1) 823-5018
E-mail: schertenleib@eawag.ch

Dennis Warner

Chief, Rural Environmental Health
World Health Organization
CH-1211 Geneva 27
SWITZERLAND
Fax: (41-22) 791-4159
Phone: (41-22) 791-3546
E-mail: warnerd@who.ch

Secretariat:

Elizabeth Garfunkel
Mayling Simpson-Hébert
Sara Wood
Rural Environmental Health
World Health Organization
Geneva

**For additional information or
further copies of this report,
contact:**

**Dr Mayling Simpson-Hébert
Rural Environmental Health Unit
World Health Organization
20, avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 - Switzerland
Tel: (41-22) 791-3531, 791-3540
Fax: (41-22) 791-4159
Email: simpsonhebertm@who.ch**