

Baseline Findings Watershed Bangladesh

1. Introduction:

This document contains the findings of the baseline exercise in Bangladesh, at the level of Watershed strategic partnership members active in the country and local implementing partners. All the consortium partners (IRC, Simavi, Wetlands International and Akvo) will be contributing to the programme in Bangladesh. There has been an adjustment in the location of the programme compared to the "Inception Report". The Work package team had initially suggested four upazila's (sub-district) to select from, based on the implementation areas of the Blue Gold programme of Royal Dutch Embassy (EKN) in Bangladesh. During theory of change preparation workshop, the representative of the embassy indicated that this might not be necessarily an advantage and Watershed programme can consider other locations so that the results can be compared between the two programme. In consultation with local implementing partners and based on their on-going programme and future plans for WASH Alliance programme, Bhola Sadar Upazila from Bhola district has been selected to implement the programme. Bhola district comprises of 7 Upzila's (sub-districts), 68 unions and 5 municipalities. It is the largest delta of Bangladesh. The population of Bhola Sadar is 430,520 people according to the population census and it is one of the priority areas of country's hard to reach strategy. Many chars (marshy land) are also under jurisdiction of this district.

None of the Watershed Strategic Partnership members have yet an office in Bangladesh. Simavi is the only partner who will be contracting local partners to work with. The other partners will provide technical advice on the requested issues to these partners. Simavi has identified three local implementing partners as follows:

- **Development organisation for Rural Poor (DORP)** is a national Non-Government Organization (NGO), established in 1987, working in the field of development in different parts of Bangladesh. DORP is the main target of capacity strengthening activities provided by consortium partners and Watershed programme. They will be then working with two platforms of CSOs at the Upazila level. These platforms will be formed following DORP's successful experience in WASH Alliance International Programme with "WASH budget clubs" which were established during WASH budget monitoring project. Information about the capacity of these platforms will be gathered when DORP starts implementing the programme. These two platforms are:
 - **Local NGO Network:** DORP will identify 5-7 local NGOs/CBOs who are active in WASH/IWRM in the area, and are interested/have experienced in Lobby and advocacy for Sustainable WASH. DORP's experience with these local NGOs/CBOs shows that often they do not have enough knowledge/capacity, staffs or budget to do evidence base lobby and advocacy but they are very committed to mobilizing the communities to demand their rights and link them to the local governments. The representatives of these NGOs will form the "Local NGO Network" and will be capacitated by DORP with the support of other partners to reach the desired results.
 - **Water Management Citizens Committee (WMCC or in Bangla Pani Bebothapona Nagorik Committee):** will be formed with 12-15 members from different sectors such as journalists, businessman, ex-government officials, local elite, political person, teacher, women, fishermen, rickshaw puller, yogurt producers, differently abled people, Coolie (who will carry the goods from water ferry, boats and steamer, etc. DORP will in particular ensure that this committee will be represented by a mix of influential people and those who are often excluded.

Three levels of CSOs in Watershed



- **Wateraid Bangladesh (WAB):** Since 1986, WaterAid Bangladesh (WAB) has been managing water and sanitation projects in Bangladesh in collaboration with local NGOs and local government initiatives. WAB is registered with NGO Affairs Bureau of Bangladesh Government and is one of the most influential actors in the WASH sector in Bangladesh. Although WAB will not be considered a target CSO for Watershed programme in Bangladesh, but rather a technical partner who will act on behalf of the consortium to strengthen the capacity of other national CSOs/Networks. It is, however, assumed that all the partners, including WAB will learn through participation in the programme. The responsibility of translating the gain knowledge to organisation capacity for Watershed Strategic partnership partners and WAB will stay with the partner. WAB will in particular work with National level CSOs to promote the WASH-IWRM nexus and connected issues within the WASH and environmental sectors, as well as amongst the media, central government bodies and other stakeholders. Regarding national level CSOs, WAB will use its strong collaboration with networks including Bangladesh WASH Alliance (BWA), Bangladesh Water Integrity Network (BAWIN), End Water Poverty (EWP) campaign, Fresh Water Action Network South Asia Bangladesh (FANSA-BD), Water Supply and Sanitation Collaboration Council Bangladesh (WSSCC-B) and NGO Forum for Public Health in order to enhance coordinated action in the sector with respect to the key advocacy issues of Watershed.
- **Gender and Water Alliance Bangladesh Programme (GWABP):** Simavi is currently discussing with GWABP their involvement in Watershed programme in Bangladesh, as technical advisor to DORP and WAB to ensure Social Inclusion and Gender are well incorporated in the programme.

Based on the consultation with the local partners, the following capacity strengthening advice is requested from the other strategic partnership members:

Akvo: The partners need capacity strengthening on Outcome Harvesting, monitoring QIS and evidence based lobby and advocacy. Since Akvo is taking the lead in these topics within the consortium, they are requested to provide the technical advice on these topics.

Wetlands International-South East Asia: The interlinkages between WASH and IWRM are still not a very known issue in Bangladesh, in particular for DORP. They need specific capacity strengthening on this topic in order to be able to assist strengthening the capacity of local CSOs. Considering that this is the expertise of Wetlands International they are requested to provide this technical assistance.

IRC: Monitoring of WASH services, and how basic/inclusive WASH standards can be defined and monitored, is also another area which was identified that partners need capacity strengthening support. Considering IRC experiences on this, they are requested to provide this technical assistance.

The major government institutes who will be targeted for the Lobby and Advocacy efforts of Watershed programme in Bangladesh include:

Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE): DPHE is the national focal agency for the water and sanitation sector. It is involved in planning and implementing water and sanitation facilities in the rural and urban areas, except areas under WASAs. The DPHE carries out implementation in collaboration with the city corporation, paurashavas and union parishads. DPHE will be targeted both at local (Upazila) and National level.

Local Government Institutions at National level and Upazila Parishad and Union Parishad levels

:Union Parishad is the lowest tier of local government institution systems while Upazila parishad is the administrative unit of a number of Unions (8 to 10). Both tier have the directly elected representatives who have separate roles and responsibilities. Upazila Chairman and Upazila Nirbahi Officer (sub-district executive Officer) has broader engagement with total Unions of upazila while Union Chairman is engaged with his/her unions only. The local budget will be prepared by the Union Parishad and will be sent to National level through Upzila partishad. There are local standing committees who are responsible for specific issues. The "Public Health, Sanitation and Safe Water Supply" standing committee at Upazila level and " Union water, sanitation and sewerage standing committee" at Union level will be the major standing committees on whom the programme will focus. Further, according to the Water Rules 2015, the "Integrated Water Resources Upazila standing Committee" has been introduced to deal with IWRM issues. From experience, we know that it might take a while before the rules are implemented but DORP will also keep demanding for this committee to become functional and will target them for the policy influencing activities.

Water Resources Planning Organisation (WARPO): is a National level organisation which has come into existence in 1992 as the secretariat of the Executive Committee of National Water Resources Council (ECNWRC), an exclusive government organization for macro-level water resources planning, coordination and implementation of the Bangladesh Water Act. It is a multi-disciplinary organization with an around 47 professionals from a wide range of discipline. As per Bangladesh Water Act all organization/authority/local government institutions undertaking/implementing Water Resources development /management project need to have "Clearance Certificate" from "Clearing House" at WARPO.

Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB) and Local Government Engineering Department (LGED)

Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB):has been engaged in the development and management of the water resources of the country through 776 projects till June 2014. They work both at National and local level.

Local Government Engineering Department (LGED): mandated for development and management of small scale water resources for the command areas under 1000 hectares. It has developed around 720 small scale water resources sub-projects that improved water management of around 450,000 hectares of land. The Integrated Water Resources Management Unit (IWRMU) of LGED provides necessary guidelines and support for their smooth operation, maintenance and sustainability.

It should be noted that the above mentioned government institutions work under two different ministries, Ministry of Local Government Division and Ministry of Water Resources. The collaboration of these two ministries, in particular at the local level, has been minimal. In 2016, after assignment of Bangladesh prime minister to High Level Panel on water, she has given direct assignments to these two ministries to increase their collaboration. This gives a good opportunity for Watershed programme which the partner will use to increase the success of their policy influencing activities.

2. Outcome monitoring table:

1.outcome	2.Indicator	3.Description of Indicator	4. Description of method and source	5. Frequency / timing	6. Responsible persons	7. Costs (staff-time and additional costs) ¹
3. CSOs have increased capacity to do L&A for Inclusive/ Sustainable WASH services for all	CSO-5	Level of Inclusion of marginalised groups in L&A of CSOs	For DORP, the progress will be monitored through annual discussion on CSA and monitoring/following up on the action plans. Further, DORP will adjust/ the CSA or develop similar indicators for monitoring the process of capacity strengthening of the two platforms that they will work with in the Bhola Upazila Sadar. Wateraid BLD will also work with two national network of NGOs platform. In that case, it will be difficult to use CSA for assessing the capacity so Wateraid will use their monitoring methods to track the progress.	Annually CSA will be reviewed but half yearly the progress on action plans will be shared. This is the same for all. Annually CSA will be reviewed but half yearly the progress on action plan CSOs related indicators will be shared. Every 6 months Every year Every 6 months	Simavi is the lead partner responsible for achievement of this outcome and will be conducting CSA for DORP supported by others. DORP and Wateraid will report annually on the progress of strengthening capacity of the targeted (networks of) local/Nationals CSO.	
3. CSOs have increased capacity to do L&A for Inclusive/ Sustainable WASH services for all 4. CSOs have capacity to advocate for enforcement of WASH/IWRM rules & Regulation	CSO-6	Level of integration of WASH-IWRM in L&A of CSOs	Simavi, DORP and Wateraid keep necessary budget for the monitoring of the progress. This is the same for all CSOs related indicators.		Wetlands is the lead partner responsible for achievement of this outcome, Simavi will be conducting CSA for DORP supported by others. DORP and Wateraid will report annually on the progress of strengthening capacity of the targeted (networks of) local/Nationals CSO.	
3. CSOs have increased capacity to do L&A for	CSO-9 (Bangladesh)	Level of integration of demand for			IRC is the lead partner responsible for	

¹ It has not been possible for us to set the costs per outcome. The partners have reserved sufficient budget for PME activities but it is not possible to separate those per outcome.

Inclusive/ Sustainable WASH services for all	see below)	Sustainable WASH Services in L&A of CSOs			achievement of the outcome, Simavi will be conducting CSA for DORP supported by others. DORP and Wateraid will report annually on the progress of strengthening capacity of targeted local/Nationals CSO.	
7. CSOs generate evidence from monitoring activities (i.e. on public budget, Sustainability and Inclusiveness of WASH services, linkages between IWRM, enforcement of rules and regulations)	CSO-1	Level of use of reliable evidence for L&A by CSOs			Akvo is the lead partner responsible for achievement of the outcome, Simavi will be conducting CSA for DORP supported by others. DORP and Wateraid will report annually on the progress of strengthening capacity of targeted local/Nationals CSO.	
10. CSOs hold Service providers/ authorities accountable at upazila level	CSO-8	Level of holding service providers to account by CSOs			Simavi is the lead partner responsible for achievement of the outcome and will be conducting CSA for DORP supported by others. DORP and Wateraid will report annually on the progress of strengthening capacity of targeted local/Nationals CSO.	
13. Mechanism is in place to link citizens who are often excluded to public and private	Gov -1,	Level of Government responsiveness to stakeholder demands on WASH/IWRM	DORP and Wateraid Bangladesh will monitor the progress in their respective areas and report every six months. This will include	Annually.	DORP and Wateraid Bangladesh	

service providers & other duty bearers			updated policies, policy notes, circulars etc. Annually interview with other stakeholders will take place. After Outcome Harvesting training, it can also be more elaborated how the outcomes will be documented.			
15. Upazilla level standing committee is strengthened/ functional & represents all the right holders including those who are often excluded	Gov-3	Level of inclusion of marginalized groups (in policies and plans)				
15. Upazilla level standing committee is strengthened/ functional & represents all the right holders including those who are often excluded	Gov-9	Level of integration of WASH/IWRM in implementation and monitoring by local government	DORP will monitor the progress in their respective areas and report every six months. Annually interview with other stakeholders will take place. After Outcome Harvesting training, it can also be more elaborated how the outcomes will be documented.	Annually	DORP	
17. More public resources are available at union and higher levels for inclusive/Sustainable WASH & IWRM	Gov 4,	Level of transparency in budget allocation by National Government	Wateraid Bangladesh will monitor the budget allocation of the relevant government authorities through desk study.	Annually	Wateraid Bangladesh	
	Gov 6	Level of transparency in expenditure by National government	Wateraid Bangladesh will monitor the budget allocation of the relevant government authorities through desk study.	Annually	Wateraid Bangladesh	
	Gov 5	Level of transparency in budget allocation by local government	DORP will monitor the budget allocation using their budget monitoring tools through local CSOs and will annually report on situation.	Annually	DORP	
	Gov 7	Level of transparency	DORP will monitor the expenditure using their budget monitoring tools through local CSOs, however, since most of the time the budget only becomes available after January and the government institutes then need to spend it, it is not expected that DORP can report on this in 2017.	Annually	DORP	

3. Baseline process:

Sara, Ayan and Ingeborg filled in the Capacity Self Assessment (CSA) for Workpackage in Dhaka. The results was shared with Ritesh and Satish and their comments was incorporated in the report. Sara and Ayan conducted the CSA with DORP, with participation of different staffs from different departments. Sara also discussed the QIS and different indicators with Wateraid but since the Watershed programme will be using Wateraid Bangladesh expertise and the purpose is that we will learn together from the process, the Capacity Self Assessment was not conducted with Wateraid. For the government indicators, DORP and Wateraid were asked to provide the baseline data for the relevant government authorities that they will be targeting based on their knowledge and experience. The report is compiled by Sara. There was a confusion in deadline for baseline and the plan was to discuss the report on 18 January in a skype call. But now Sara will share the report first with PMEL group and at the same time with the WP, for their comments.

4. & 4 . Capacity Self Assessment findings and Organisation Capacity Action Plan

Please see the attached excel sheet. It should be mentioned that the CSA was filled in for both WP and DORP before the CSA was finalized. The WP raised the need for a capacity element on "Level of Understanding of Sustainability of WASH services" which is added at a later stage. Therefore it is not included in the report. Further, Simavi previous experience entails that you capacity strengthening is a process which can't really be translated in scores. It is possible that the CSO scores itself initially higher since they do not have enough insight about the relevant element. Only when they start learning, they realize they need much more support.

5. The QIS ladder

5 QIS ladder for CSO and 7 for Government has been selected to monitor in 2017 where we gathered the baseline information

The Baseline information for CSO has been based on the CSA conducted for DORP. After starting the implementation in the selected upazila, DORP will collect relevant information for the two platforms that they will form.

CSO - 1: Level of use of reliable evidence for L&A

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs convince their target groups with reliable evidence
75%	CSOs use reliable evidence to base L&A strategies and messages on
50%	CSOs partner with relevant stakeholders to identify and fill gaps in reliable evidence for L&A
25%	CSOs are aware of the importance to use reliable evidence for L&A
0%	CSOs are not aware of the importance of using reliable evidence for L&A

Narrative

DORP has a lot of experience in producing evidence, in particular budget data to do L&A. There are also a lot of evidence that its lobby and advocacy has worked. However, as an organization still it is important that they develop broader evidences than only budget and that they will also are able to influence their target group systematically with reliable evidence.

CSO - 5: Level of inclusion of marginalised groups

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs convince their target groups to address the needs of marginalised groups
75%	CSOs have explicitly included the interests voiced by marginalised groups, in their L&A messages and strategies
50%	CSOs engage with marginalised groups to listen to their opinions and understand their needs
25%	CSOs recognise the diversity of groups and are aware of the importance to consider this in their L&A messages and strategies
0%	CSOs are unaware of the importance to consider the diversity (in gender, age, income, ethnicity, religion, sexual preference,...) of groups in their L&A messages and strategies

Narrative

DORP tries to target the poorest of poor and most marginalized in its projects. The documentation on how disaggregated data are collected to feed in this process is important. Further, how marginalized groups are taken in the decision making processes and how DORP can convince their target groups to address the needs of marginalized groups needs to be improved.

CSO - 6: Level of integration of WASH-IWRM in L&A

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs convince their targets from both WASH and IWRM sectors to collaborate on themes/issues relevant for the CSOs constituency
75%	CSOs have integrated strategies and specific L&A messages for WASH and IWRM sectors

50%	CSOs are engaged in L&A about the same theme/issue with targets (in government and/or private sector) from both the WASH and IWRM sectors
25%	CSOs are aware that sustainable WASH is dependent on proper water resource management
0%	CSOs do not understand the relation between WASH and IWRM

Narrative

This is a new concept for DORP and although there is some knowledge within the organisation, and the WASH related knowledge is high, the inter-linkages with IWRM are not yet widely known.

CSO - 8: Level of holding service providers to account

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs are holding government WASH and IWRM service providers to account successfully ²
75%	CSOs are holding service providers to account regarding sustainable and inclusive WASH / IWRM
50%	CSOs have planned concrete actions on how they will hold service providers to account regarding sustainable and inclusive WASH / IWRM (for example by tracking the inclusiveness and sustainability of WASH and IWRM services)
25%	CSOs know how to hold service providers to account regarding sustainable and inclusive WASH / IWRM
0%	CSOs are not holding service providers (government and/or private sector) to account regarding sustainable and inclusive WASH / IWRM

Narrative

DORP uses different accountability tools to hold service provider accountable but these tools are mainly focused for WASH related interventions. They also have been applying social accountability tools with WASH service providers successfully so if it was only about the WASH service providers they could have scored close to 100%. However, their practice does not take into account the IWRM related service providers or how they are linked with WASH service providers, therefore still there is room for improvement to include these linkages.

² At WP level, in the narrative, the term “successful” needs to be specified to be contextualised.

Government QIS ladder

These ladders were filled in by DORP and Wateraid for their targeted government department and the results are supported by the context analysis report.

As was mentioned in the introduction section, at the local level (Bhola Upazila Sadar) the targeted government institutes are the local offices of Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB), Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE), Local Government Institution (LGIs), unions and Upazila Public Health Sanitation and Water Supply Standing Committee, Upazila Integrated Water Resource Standing committee.

At the National level, Water Resource Planning Organisation (WAPRO), Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB), Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE) and Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) will be targeted.

The detail information from the local level will be specified when DORP start the implementation. To save the space and not repeating the QIS ladder for each of these (considering they mostly have the same situation, any differentiation will be made in the narrative scenario.

GOV - 1: Level of Government responsiveness to stakeholder demands on WASH and IWRM

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	Government reports to stakeholders on how they have incorporated/addressed their demands on WASH and IWRM service provision
75%	Government action is guided by stakeholders' demands on WASH and IWRM service provision
50%	Government actively seeks to understand stakeholders' demands on WASH and IWRM service provision
25%	Government is aware of the importance of listening to stakeholders' demands on WASH and IWRM service provision
0%	Government is unwilling to listen to stakeholders' demands on WASH and IWRM service provision

Narrative

The government institutes are yet to become more responsive to demands on WASH and IWRM. No effective coordination among the agencies are in place. Every agency works in silo. The current situation demands a lot of actions to bring our government response to the demands of different stakeholders. DPHE and BWDB have been more in contact with other stakeholders (or targeted by lobby and advocacy programmes), therefore they are more aware of the importance of listening to the stakeholders but still the practice to actively seek input from the stakeholders is missing.

The baseline scoring are as follows:

WAPRO: 0%,

BWDB: 25%

DPHE: 25%

LGED: 0%

GOV - 3: Level of inclusion of marginalised groups (in policies and plans)

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	Government reports back to marginalised groups how their needs have been included in the WASH/IWRM policies and plans
75%	Government has explicitly included in policies and plans how marginalised groups will benefit from WASH/IWRM service delivery
50%	Government actively engages in dialogue with marginalised groups on their needs regarding WASH/IWRM, in several ways
25%	Government is aware of the importance to explicitly address the needs of marginalised groups in WASH / IWRM policies and plans
0%	Government has not explicitly addressed the needs of marginalised groups (women, youth, elderly, low income groups, isolated communities, refugees, slum dwellers,...) in WASH / IWRM policies and plans

Narrative

Probably this is the most neglected issue in policy and planning process in Bangladesh. Although often mentioned as the main target groups, marginalised groups are seldom consulted to learn about their priorities. Political leaders and parliament members who represent them often forget to echo their voice in policy making forum. Rigorous efforts are needed to create space for the disadvantaged groups in policy planning process.

The scoring is as follows:

WAPRO: 0%,

BWDB: 0%

DPHE: 0%

LGED: 0%

GOV - 4: Level of transparency in budget allocation by National Government

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	National Government coordinates joint (inclusive, sustainable) sector budget allocation
75%	National Government supports dialogue on (inclusive, sustainable) sector budget allocation
50%	National Government is practising transparent (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation
25%	National Government is aware of the importance of transparency in (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation

0%	National Government does not have transparency in (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation
----	--

Narrative

The National Government is fully aware of the necessity of securing transparency in national budget allocation. The agencies involved follow prescribed policy and process in making resource allocation. But the mass people in the country is not familiar with the process except what is presented in the parliament every year. The basis is not known. The major issue missing here is accountability. The main challenge is to develop a sense of accountability in government agencies and holding them accountable to people.

The scoring for all the national government institutions (WAPRO, DPHE, BWDB, LGED) is 25%.

GOV - 5: Level of transparency in budget allocation by Local Government

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	Local Government coordinates joint (inclusive, sustainable) sector budget allocation
75%	Local Government supports dialogue on (inclusive, sustainable) sector budget allocation
50%	Local Government is practising transparent (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation
25%	Local Government is aware of the importance of transparency in (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation
0%	Local Government does not have transparency in (inclusive, sustainable) budget allocation

Narrative

Often the situation at local level with regard to transparency is worse than national level since in most cases the government departments are not aware of the importance of the transparency in budget allocation. Often they are also not aware of national policies which obliged them to be transparent in their budget allocation. The situation is slightly better for Local Government Institutions since there has been a lot of promotion of this accountability for them. The programme team need to observe the budget allocation process between May and June 2017 to get a clear idea on the level of transparency and how they follow the budgeting procedures. The expected scores are between 0-25% for different local government institutes.

GOV - 6: Level of transparency in expenditure by National Government

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	National Government is practising transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM and requesting feedback from civil society
75%	National Government is practising transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
50%	National Government is planning how to practise transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
25%	National Government is aware of the importance of transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
0%	National Government do not have transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM

Narrative

The National Government is fully aware of securing transparency in national expenditure. The targeted agencies follow prescribed policy and process in making expenditure. The major issue missing again is accountability. The main challenge is to develop a sense of accountability in government agencies and holding them accountable to people.

The scoring for all targeted Government institutes (WAPRO, BWBD, LGED and DPHE) is 25%.

GOV - 7: Level of transparency in expenditure by Local Government

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	Local Government is practising transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM and requesting feedback from civil society
75%	Local Government is practising transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
50%	Local Government is planning how to practise transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
25%	Local Government is aware of the importance of transparency in expenditure on WASH and IWRM
0%	Local Government do not practise transparency in expenditures on WASH and IWRM

Narrative

None of the targeted local government departments practices or is aware of importance of practicing transparency on their expenditures. The baseline score for all the targeted government institutes are 0%.

GOV - 9: Level of integration of WASH/IWRM in implementation and monitoring by Local Government

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	Local Government is implementing and monitoring WASH/IWRM policies and plans in an integrated way, openly communicating the findings and using these to improve services
75%	Local Government is implementing and monitoring WASH/IWRM policies and plans in an integrated way and openly communicating the findings
50%	Local Government is implementing and monitoring WASH/IWRM policies and plans in an integrated way
25%	Local Government is preparing to implement and monitor WASH/IWRM policies and plans in an integrated way
0%	Local Government is neither implementing nor monitoring WASH/IWRM policies and plans in an integrated way

Narrative

At National level, the Government agencies are aware of the need for integration, some policies in favour of integration are there; but rules are not specified and monitoring gap exists. The membership of the prime minister of Bangladesh in the High Level Panel has played an important role in creating more collaboration.

At local level however this understanding is not there and the local governments neither implement nor monitor WASH/IWRM in an integrated way.

The scoring therefore for National level targeted Government institutes are 25%

6. Baseline Findings – Work Package – specific indicators

CSO - 8: Level of integration of demand for Sustainable WASH Services in L&A

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs convince service providers to deliver basic sustainable WASH services for all
75%	CSOs develop recommendations for service providers on sustainable WASH services level standards for all
50%	CSOs engage in L&A with service providers for sustainable basic WASH services for all
25%	CSOs are aware about the requirements for sustainability of basic WASH services for all

0%	CSOs are unaware of requirements for sustainability of basic WASH services all
Narrative explanation of the scoring	
In Bangladesh, like many countries, sustainability of WASH services is an issue. Often, users, service provider and other stakeholders including CSOs do not have clear understanding on requirements for sustainability of basic WASH services. DORP and Wateraid have identified this as a learning agenda to improve their understanding of the requirement for Sustainable WASH services and IRC has been asked to provide technical assistance on this issue. Considering this was not part of CSA the discussion did not take place with DORP but based on the experience of Simavi focal point the scoring will be 25%.	

MS-2: Level of media coverage on inclusive/sustainable WASH/IWRM services

Score	Mini-scenarios
100%	CSOs and Media work together to effectively cover at regular bases issues related to link between WASH/IWRM and sustainable WASH services for all
75%	Media modify their strategy to regularly (more than four times a year) present issues related to link between WASH/IWRM and sustainable WASH services for all and local media
50%	CSOs work with media to cover at least four times a year an issue related to link between WASH/IWRM and sustainable WASH services for all and local media
25%	CSOs work with media to cover at least twice a year an issue related to link between WASH/IWRM and/or sustainable WASH services for all
0%	CSOs are not approaching media to cover any issues related to link between WASH/IWRM and/or sustainable WASH services for all

Narrative explanation of the scoring	
Media play a strong role in awareness raising among users and service providers on link between WASH/IWRM and sustainable WASH services for all. Both DORP and Wateraid Bangladesh will be working on this issue. Currently the media will report on WASH or IWRM related issues separately but they are not able to make the linkages between Sustainable WASH services and IWRM. Since the CSOs working with the media also do not have the necessary capacity to provide this insight, they also can't provide the story. Therefore we the current scoring is set at 25%.	

7. Reflection on the baseline process

The work package team has set a skype meeting on 18 Jan to discussed this which was planned based on the deadlines specified in https://www.dropbox.com/home/WASHIT%20Partnership?preview=20161110_+deadlines+Wate+rshed+2017.xlsx

An early reflection on the deadline would be that it does not help to include any deadline in a guideline if it is not incorporated in the overall deadlines for the year.

During the skype meeting on 18 Jan, the partners provide comments. There were no major comments on the report. Only DORP indicated that there is no WAPRO at local level which is now corrected in the report.