

# Lessons learnt from the first national workshops

*Leonie Postma and Madeleen Wegelin, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, 2000*

1. Introduction
2. Agreed objectives and the expected outputs
3. Lessons learnt

## 1. Introduction

This document reviews the experiences of the international workshop on School Sanitation and Hygiene held in Delft in February 2000 and the national workshops held in Vietnam, Nepal and Zambia, with the aim to apply its lessons in the planning of the workshops still to be held in the programme. The objective of the global SSHE workshop was to discuss the overall programme approach, to establish what activities were already on-going in this field in each of the countries and to assess how in the countries both the education section and the WES section could be optimally involved in the project. During this workshop plans were made for the country level workshops that were to be held to make programme planning country specific and to ensure involvement and ownership of all local stakeholders.

A main objective of the global SSHE project is to test the approaches as described in the SSHE manual and to promote a conducive environment to SSHE ensuring the involvement of all stakeholders. However, the project activities in the different countries are likely to be different due to differences in the starting situation. Thus to enable comparisons between approaches in countries, a minimum of 'non-negotiable' objectives and outputs were agreed upon in the global SSHE workshop. These objectives and outputs therefore need to be taken into account in the planning of the National SSHE workshops. Because they are the basis for the lessons learnt in this little document, they are given again below in section 2. The objectives of the national workshop as stated in the cooperation outline are:

- To develop a national plan of action and a workplan for the SSHE-project
- To create a institutional network on SSHE (and develop ideas on how this can become an active one)
- To systematise and document existing experiences

As a reminder, the agreed objectives and outputs are...

## 2. Agreed objectives and the expected outputs of the SSHE programme

### The overall objective of the SSHE project is:

To ensure that the present and future health and education of school-aged children improve through better hygiene behaviour and a healthy school environment.

### The project objectives and the non-negotiable outputs are:

1. Country-specific, child-centred teaching programmes utilising the life skills approach developed/improved  
*Output:*
  - Child centred teaching programme in the pilot schools exists
2. Capacity to utilise technical guidelines for school facilities developed  
*Output:*
  - Appropriate & accepted guidelines developed
  - Training programme for teachers developed & accepted (Teachers college)
  - Proper operation and maintenance of the facilities
3. Initiatives supported and sustained by the different stakeholders at community level  
*Output:*
  - Description of methodologies to involve communities
  - Organisational set-up at community/municipal/district level exist
4. A methodology for improved SSHE field tested in at least six countries on three continents  
*Output:*
  - Description of steps that are taken with regard to different sections in the manual
  - Analysis of results and experiences
  - Tested & revised manual
5. The experiences of the pilot projects documented and disseminated  
*Output:*
  - Description of processes and outcomes in 10 schools
  - Dissemination in Country

- Regular contributions to Notes and News on SSHE, the SSHE website and email conference
  - Training modules for TOT (long-term objective)
6. Global, Regional and National awareness and commitment towards SSHE increased
- Output:*
- Advocacy package developed
  - Funding obtained

### 3. Lessons learned during the national workshops in Nepal, Vietnam and Zambia

#### 3.1 Links between global and national objectives

Looking at the objectives and expected outputs of the global project, it is felt in Zambia, Nepal, as well as in Vietnam that the existing national SSHE-programmes and the global programme will be mutually beneficial. The existing programmes will offer the scale and the global programme the framework for consolidated testing of approaches, technical designs etc. Therefore this small SSHE project is seen as a vehicle for innovation and improving the larger national programmes.

##### **Nepal**

The SSHE national workshop was the second national workshop on SSHE in Nepal and tried to link the ongoing and the global SSHE programmes. Many water supply and sanitation programmes do have a SSHE component. About one year ago UNICEF, in collaboration with the Environmental Sanitation Section of the Department of Water Supply and Sewerage and its partner Nepal Red Cross Society, started the SSHE-programme in 7 (out of 75) districts in various (geographical) regions of the country, 4 highly intensive and 3 less intensive. For this purpose a programme guideline and a primary school teachers workshop guideline have been developed. The global SSHE-programme is seen as an opportunity to systematically test, share and document approaches to address certain key elements of SSHE.

##### **Vietnam**

Vietnam already has a mature and large-scale SSHE programme. More than 6,400 schools have been provided with water and sanitation facilities through some financial input from UNICEF, and even more financial support from the government and community members. Given this, participants would have had difficulty understanding the purpose and use of a small experimental project. To avoid this, the workshop was organized so that, the participants began by identifying needs for qualitative improvement of their current program. These needs were built on in subsequent sessions.

##### **Zambia**

The SSHE programme in Zambia fits in with the Basic education Sub-sector Investment Programme (BESSIP) that was started in 1999, and especially with its subprogramme on School Health and Nutrition (SHN). Any activity in the SSHE programme therefore is also linked to activities in the larger education sector, including life skills approach. In addition, the SSHE programme links in with the ongoing D-WASHE programme in which district authorities concerned (including water, education, health and social services departments) decide on water, sanitation and hygiene development plans on a yearly basis, based on demand from the sub-districts.

During the SSHE workshop in Vietnam, it became clear that the SSHE programme in Vietnam also may have an interesting spin-off in view of the nation's continuing

difficulties in the promotion of household sanitation. SSHE can be a crucial entry point for successful sanitation among the young and future generations.

#### **Vietnam**

Despite more than three decades of household sanitation programming, with millions of latrines constructed, raw excreta continues to be used by farmers in the north as fertilizer while in the south it tends to be thrown into fish ponds. The situation in the north of the nation is of particular concern as children suffer two to three times the parasite infestation of those in the South. It has proved very difficult for rural adults to replace a commercial value on human excreta with a social value on improved health. SSHE can be seen as an alternative strategy which may demonstrate more success because it focuses on the young and future generations. Thus, the experimental SSHE project would, without adding significant additional financial resources to each school, aim for:

1. *Sustainability*: Improving operation and maintenance of sanitation and water facilities in schools
2. *Consistent use* of facilities by all children, including handwashing
3. *Educational methods*: simple, more inter-active and child-based learning drawing on life skills approaches.

### **3.2 The agenda and time allocation of the national workshop**

Where the agenda of the global workshop held in Delft was copied for the national workshops, this turned out to be only partly relevant. It is important that the agenda is adapted to the specific issues that play a role in the national SSHE ongoing or planned activities. The workshop needs to address specifically those items that need to be clarified and that need a consensus of all stakeholders involved.

Care has to be taken that not too many activities are planned, as was the case in Vietnam and Zambia. As a result insufficient time was available for learning, for in depth analysis and for planning activities. The time needed for a workshop depends on the local circumstances. For instance, in Nepal, it was already a second workshop and therefore a three day workshop was carried out. However, in Zambia, the workshop was a first get together and the 3.5-4 days allocated were clearly not sufficient.

The development of the national workplan has to start early in the workshop (third day), as these workplans show most clearly where the gaps exist in knowledge and capacity in the country. If the development of the workplan is started in time this can lead to clear agreements on the roles and responsibilities of the various participants and organisations and thus to the successful implementation of the programme.

The lessons show the importance of having an agenda established well in advance of the workshop, in which also the inputs expected from the Support Organisation, IRC or UNICEF New York are agreed upon.

### **3.3 Sharing of national experiences in the national workshop**

In all three workshops it was felt that the national workshop was absolutely essential for the participants of the various districts and organisations to understand the SSHE issues, to hear from each others experiences and to think about it in an integrated way. It was clear in all countries that dissemination of existing experiences is weak, especially when these take place outside the realm of international organisations, who tend to be more

active in dissemination. This applies to district interventions carried out by the local administration, but also to activities carried out by for instance churches or local NGOs. It is therefore advisable to ensure that in the planning of the workshop, a search for the lesser known activities is carried out and resource persons who can present their experiences, are invited. This also ensures that positive lessons are transferred into the SSHE programme.

#### **Zambia Case**

The presentation on SSHE activities by three districts showed that the approach used by one NGO (DAPP) is quite successful as it is person-person and involved teacher and head of school training and later also a PTA training that mobilized the communities to become more involved in WASHE activities. A presentation from Western Province on participatory methods that they used for the past ten years was also quite revealing. Yet, these experiences are not normally transferred from one D-WASHE to another.

### **3.4 Life skills**

During the life skills session in the various national workshops became clear that it is difficult for the staff from MoE to convey how the life skills approach, as for instance used in school HIV/Aids programmes, can be also used for hygiene education. It is obvious that more attention is needed on how the life skills approach can be adapted for SSHE. To bridge most of this gap, a special life skills for hygiene education workshop will be organised in New York from 12 -15 September.

#### **Zambia Case**

In Zambia, the UNICEF Representative in his opening speech, indicated the importance of WES intervention to reduce the risk for HIV/Aids infected persons from falling sick of water and sanitation related diseases and to ensure access to water and sanitation at an acceptable distance. HIV/Aids prevention and treatment is of the biggest development issue in Zambia at the moment. The life skills approach is being used by MoE for Aids/HIV education in schools and can be adapted for SSHE. Despite the very good practical examples of lifeskills exercises it was clear that global introduction of the lifeskills context and approach needs more attention.

### **3.5 Monitoring and evaluation**

In all three countries monitoring issues were felt very important, and an issue that needs much more attention. The new modules produced by Kathy Shordt provided very useful working materials and raised an interest as well as a request for more training. It is important to allow sufficient time for monitoring during the national workshops.

### **3.6 Advocacy**

Due to time constraints, not enough attention was paid during the workshop to advocacy issues in Vietnam and Zambia. To increase the national and regional commitment towards SSHE, sufficient attention needs to be paid to this important issue.

### 3.7 Identification of outside support needed in the programme

The National workshop is a good setting to identify the technical support needed during the project, such as support for the development of teaching aids based on the life skills approach or the support for monitoring and evaluation or for the improvement of the technical designs.

#### **Zambia**

In the workshop, half a day was set aside for a session on monitoring and for some exercises. During the exercises became clear that true understanding of 'monitoring for effectiveness' needed much more elaboration and much more practice than was possible. It was discussed if there is a possibility to have a kind of course on monitoring in the country with a that specific focus on SSHE monitoring. There was certainly demand for such an activity. But to get the most out of it, the programme should possibly be a bit more advanced and all participants have to be fully involved in SSHE activities.

### 3.8 Other important issues that need to be discussed

- It is worthwhile to make sure you have a clear presentation on the data and trends related to SSHE at the start of the workshop. If possible, include a gender dimension in this analysis. E.g. simple calculation in Zambia showed that the ratio of pupils/latrine for boys is much lower than for girls. So while girls need more privacy, they have to share a latrine with many more girls.
- The context and aim of SSHE, and the elements UNICEF considers to be crucial with regards to SSHE (life skills and child centered approach).
- The existing government policies supporting SSHE.
- The base line information which has been collected at the start of the project.
- The establishment of a national network for SSHE and its role in terms of exchange and advocacy.
- Action planning; what, who, when, where and how

Below is a list of questions relevant to prepare the national workshop

### List of questions of help in preparing the national workshop

1. What are the objectives of the workshop?
2. Do your objectives of the workshop coincide with the objectives as mentioned in the cooperation outline for the project (see below)? Do you have any additional objectives?
3. Whom will/did you invite for the workshop? Are you sure you have listed all key stakeholders for both project implementation as well as advocacy issues?
4. Do you have a balance between WES and Education staff, Are Health and Communication people invited?
5. Who will take part from the side of UNICEF? What role do you want them to play? What role do you want UNICEF NY to play, if able to participate).
6. What do you want participants to do? Listen to and react on the UNICEF-project; present their work; learn from previous experiences within the country/region; look for synergies; or..... Be specific! Just "to participate" is not clear enough.
7. Have you been considering a role for a Support Organisation? What role should this be? How will you negotiate with the SO?
8. What role do you want IRC to play?
9. What do you consider to be important issues for discussion during the workshop, looking at the objectives you have (see below for a possible list of issues)? Do you have all the resource persons available to address all these issues, e.g. to address life skill issues?
10. How does the national workshop relate to the global workshop and what do you want to get out of it (also see objectives)?
11. How can you ensure that the workshop goes beyond a mere "exchange of experiences", but that it will result in a concrete action plan?
12. What will be the role of the other organisations in the development of the action plan and in the implementation of the action plan?
13. How do you arrange for the reporting during the workshop? Have you decided on the type of workshop report: summary of key issues, description of the workshop process, etc.
14. What data is available in the country: have the data been processed (e.g. data on facilities in schools, differences geographically, urban/rural, gender) and does it form part of the SSHE database. Is a clear presentation on these data prepared, so that it can be used effectively?