

Scoping Study

**Dialogue between the World Bank
and Civil Society Organisations
about Urban Water and Sanitation**

Final Report

August 2007

For the Freshwater Action Network

by Public World, London

1. Introduction and Acknowledgements

Freshwater Action Network (FAN) have conducted a scoping study, with Public World support, to explore mechanisms for pursuing dialogues on Urban Water Supply and Sanitation between civil society organizations (CSOs) and the World Bank (WB) at global, regional and national levels.

Following preliminary research and a workshop held at World Bank Water Week, the scoping study organised a process to enable CSOs and World Bank representatives to propose dialogue activities. In parallel to that process, and based on interviews with participants in earlier dialogue activities between the World Bank and CSOs and on discussion at the Washington workshop, the consultants drafted process guidelines and criteria for determination of the feasibility of particular dialogue activity proposals. The draft process guidelines and feasibility criteria have been subjected to widespread consultation, and 38 dialogue activity proposals have been evaluated in accordance with them.

As consultants to the study, Brendan Martin and Sue Cavill of Public World have worked closely with the FAN Advisory Group, and particularly Danielle Morley and Ceridwen Johnson at the FAN Secretariat in London, and with the World Bank's Water Anchor, and particularly Meike van Ginneken and Eric Dickson. They would like to take this opportunity to record their grateful appreciation for the productive collaboration that has made this study pleasurable as well as productive, and to extend those sentiments to Stephen Turner of Wateraid (from which FAN receives continuing support, including accommodation) and Jamil Saghir, Director of Energy, Transport and Water at the World Bank. The organisational and individual commitment, leadership and support of all the above have provided the conditions in which this study has been possible and sustainable.

The study has also benefited greatly from the expertise and insights of many organisations and individuals, worldwide, in the form of comments on draft documents, proposals for dialogue activities, observations about the lessons of experience of earlier dialogue initiatives, and in other ways. These valuable contributions have been far too numerous to detail, but we are sure that others whom we cannot name will share our wish to record in particular our appreciation of the late Mariana Suzuki Sell, of the Instituto Ipanema in Brazil. As a member of the FAN Advisory Group and FAN's South American regional network, Mariana spoke on behalf of FAN at the Washington workshop in February 2007, which formed part of an important study. Both there and in many earlier and subsequent contributions of advice and expertise, Mariana's intelligence and professionalism were equalled by her personal warmth and supportiveness. Her tragic death in the aeroplane crash at Sao Paulo airport on July 17 deeply saddened us all.

Mariana will be badly missed by all who share her deep commitment to securing for all the human right to clean water.

After this introductory section, this report comprises:

2. Guidelines for conduct of dialogue activities	<i>page 4</i>
3. Feasibility criteria for evaluation of dialogue activities	<i>page 9</i>
4. Dialogue activities that are being pursued	<i>page 11</i>
5. Scoping Study chronology	<i>page 20</i>
6. Next steps	<i>page 22</i>
 Bibliography	 <i>page 23</i>
 Appendix 1: Proposals received that are not being pursued	 <i>page 25</i>
Appendix 2: Summary report of Washington workshop	<i>page 28</i>
Appendix 3: Joint statement from Washington workshop	<i>page 41</i>

2. Guidelines for Conduct of Dialogue Activities

Following widespread consultation throughout the course of the scoping study, these guidelines have been compiled for integration into the design, implementation and monitoring of dialogue activities.

1. Legitimacy and accountability of dialogue activities

Dialogue between the World Bank and CSOs has to take into account that the World Bank's clients are governments, which have (or should have) their own processes of popular accountability, and that CSOs vary in their scale, roles and accountability arrangements, which affect the appropriate level and nature of their involvement in policy and project design and implementation. Dialogue between the World Bank and CSOs should enrich the outcomes of those relationships but not seek to replace or circumvent them.

In order to do so, a dialogue activity must be transparent, not only internally (among participants) but also externally, so that citizens and CSOs not participating in it, but nevertheless having a legitimate interest in its impact on policy and projects, are able to see what is going on. This is essential not only because the World Bank is a public institution, and its clients are governments, but also because CSOs seeking to influence policy and project design and implementation should also be exposed to wider accountability.

However, participants in any dialogue activities are accountable in the first place to their own constituents and to each other. In this context, it is important to distinguish between ability and willingness to participate; participants in dialogue activities must be both willing and able to participate, but willingness and ability are not the same thing, and each has different implications. CSOs taking part in dialogue activities should take care not to claim representative legitimacy over other civil society actors to whom they are not accountable, while efforts should be made to include CSOs with representative legitimacy among people who might be affected by the outcome, and to strengthen their capacity to participate as necessary.

While participation in any particular dialogue activity should be open to any CSO whose representative constituency could be affected by it, those that choose to participate should not be expected to be accountable to those that choose not to. However, in accordance with the transparency principle, there should be a presumption in favour of public disclosure of information about a dialogue activity, and those choosing not to participate are, obviously, free to comment as they wish.

2. Roles and relevance of dialogue

Dialogue is necessary and desirable in order to enable a wide range of often conflicting views to be taken into account in the development of policy, and design and

implementation of projects. By its very nature, therefore, it seeks to reach agreements between competing interests and priorities, and varying perspectives. It is anticipated that dialogue on water and sanitation services for urban poor people will continue in many other ways outside the dialogue activities developed through this scoping study in order to promote the sustainability of urban water and sanitation.

Dialogue is not an end in itself, but should contribute to expanding and improving sustainable water and sanitation services for urban poor people. Dialogue activities between CSOs and the World Bank should, therefore, be focused on that end by being relevant and as far as possible linked to World Bank policies or projects. Moreover, only if an activity is relevant to the priorities of its participants will it command the time and other resources required to sustain it through the difficulties inherent in dialogue processes.

These considerations imply that the scheduling of dialogue activities should relate to the scheduling of World Bank policy formulation and project design and implementation, as appropriate, and that the process should be given sufficient time to fully explore the issues concerned and to overcome difficulties along the way.

While seeking agreement where it can be reached, and allowing sufficient time to do so, dialogue cannot overcome all differences, and should not be expected to do so. Even when agreement cannot be reached, information sharing and mutual learning and understanding can still be valuably enhanced through dialogue. Identification and understanding of continuing disagreements, and the reasons for them, can be as significant an outcome of dialogue as any agreements reached.

3. Inclusion and representativeness

It follows from the issues outlined above that a thoughtful and honest approach to the tensions associated with legitimacy, accountability and inclusion is required, and that general principles must be appropriately applied in particular contexts. There can be no hard and fast rules covering a wide range of contexts, and it must be recognised that communities have their own methods for dialogue and consultation, and often strive for consensus, which takes time. Time is also needed for consultation and information sharing among CSOs and communities.

Any dialogue activity can include only willing participants, but its participants should seek to include, as far as is reasonably feasible, any and all CSOs which represent people who could be affected by its outcomes. Therefore, a dialogue activity should include a process of stakeholder mapping, to identify additional participants and/or define the limits of the status of the activity in view of the range of actual participation.

At national and local level, and particularly when a dialogue activity is directly related to a World Bank project, the inclusion of government representatives is desirable.

In identifying the capacities of potential participants to actually participate, an important issue is language, which can be an obstacle to inclusion, especially in relations between

international institutions and communities that include the poorest people. Language barriers and their implications for inclusion and exclusion should be identified, and solutions devised and implemented. Where possible this should involve translation and interpretation, as appropriate, but where budgets cannot extend as far as that would require, other solutions should be identified. They could include written or oral reports to, and feedback from, constituencies potentially affected by the dialogue activity, but excluded from the language in which it is conducted. Obviously, such reporting and feedback processes should be conducted in the appropriate languages.

Access to technology can also be a barrier to inclusion, and this should be taken into account in the choice of mode of any activity, and in ensuring that it is suited to the theme and location of the activity. Appropriate technology varies with context. For example, an electronic forum might be an effective way to promote wide participation in global dialogue about policy (although the language or languages in which such forums are conducted also needs to be considered), but highly unsuitable for local level project-related dialogue, where face to face contacts and meetings would be more appropriate. Similar considerations apply to whether dialogue takes place in written or oral forms.

4. Leadership and commitment

Dialogue requires leadership commitment at two levels: individual and organisational. Any dialogue activity requires individual champions on both sides, but they must be supported by their organisations and their leaderships, and provided with the resources and status required. Organisational resources should be dedicated to the dialogue and may need to be costed into budgets. If there is too much reliance on individual champions, without sufficient engagement from their organisations, dialogue can become marginalized and, in the event that individual champions move on, unsustainable.

5. Building and sustaining trust

The difficulties inherent in dialogue activities point to a need for participants to begin with a commitment to find ways to overcome them, and to learn to understand each other's roles, capacities, powers and constraints. Only by doing so can mutual respect and trust develop, and without mutual respect and trust, dialogue cannot be productively sustained.

There are implications here not only for the way in which participants relate to each other in the dialogue activity, but also outside it. While a dialogue activity is a discrete activity, it is nevertheless affected by other aspects of the relationships between the participants. While participants should not be expected to either put aside or remain silent about any wider disagreements between them, the way in which these are aired is bound to have an affect on the dialogue relationships themselves.

This has important direct implications for the use to which information shared through the dialogue activity is put by participants, and indirectly for the way in which participants express their views about each other's roles and activities in other respects.

While these considerations should not undermine robust public discourse, which remains completely legitimate, they should be taken into account in decisions about the manner in which participants and their organisations engage in public debate.

The process of trust building also has implications for the timescales for dialogue activities, which need to take into account the time required for joint definition of objectives, terms of reference, operational procedures, and monitoring and evaluation. Not only are those important elements of dialogue activities in themselves, but the way in which they are dealt with, and their effects on relationships and process, contribute to the overall trust building process, which cannot be rushed.

6. Operational procedures

A dialogue activity requires clear terms of reference and protocols, defining objectives, scope, timescales and accountability arrangements, and these should be themselves arrived at through a dialogue process between the participants in the activity.

Similarly, the parties should set agendas, record agreements and decisions, and define mutual expectations, benchmarks, signposts, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and a dispute resolution procedure jointly, at the outset.

In short, on the basis of these overall guidelines for the conduct of dialogue activities, the parties in any particular activity should draw up procedural guidelines and protocols for their particular activity that are reviewed at regular intervals.

7. Resources for participation

Dialogue requires that participants possess or have access to the skills and aptitudes required, and can devote sufficient time and other resources to enable adequate levels of productive participation. Participants should be able to command the support of their organisations to sustain access to the necessary time and other resources, and to be able to organise their schedules accordingly.

In cases in which the participating organisations cannot sustain the required resources, the dialogue activity should address the problem and seek mutually agreed solutions, such as training, employment of advisors, and financial supports for costs associated with travel, attendance at meetings, translation and interpretation, and other necessary supports.

Securing the required resources to enable participation will often involve securing funding, which is an issue in itself and also throws up another issue that can affect the way in which dialogue is conducted arising from inequality of access to resources. If the World Bank is the source of financial support for the activity, this can lead to a contractual relationship between the participants. To avoid the difficulties associated with combining a contractual relationship with a dialogue relationship, a preferred solution might be for the parties to jointly identify resource gaps and seek external funding to fill them.

While third party funding is preferable, however, it is not always possible. In cases in which CSO participation in an activity is funded by the World Bank in whole or in part, care needs to be taken to distinguish the contractual relationship involved from the dialogue relationship itself. This is important because the nature of the accountability arrangements of each is significantly different, and the dependent nature of the contractual relationship could undermine the required independence of participants in the dialogue relationship unless conscious efforts are made to ensure it does not do so.

3. Feasibility Criteria for evaluation of proposed dialogue activities

In evaluating the feasibility of proposals for dialogue activities, we have to consider not only the feasibility of each proposal but also the feasibility of the overall package. The latter is necessary for two related reasons:

- The aim of this exercise is not only to set in motion particular dialogue activities, but also to do so in a way that enables each to learn from each other, and lessons to be developed from them all, and shared beyond their participants.
- Among the constraints on the scope of dialogue is limited capacity not only among CSOs but also in the World Bank, and those constraints -- particularly management focus and time -- are relevant not only to each activity but also to the overall package.

At the outset of the scoping study, the terms of reference agreed between the World Bank and Freshwater Action Network anticipated the identification of 10 activities, and this was one of the tasks assigned to the consultants. That number, while not written in stone, probably represents (and quite possibly exceeds) the capacity limit at this time.

Although an ambitious attitude is clearly important to any endeavour, a realistic attitude is no less important. If the process is overloaded at an early stage, its potential to grow and to produce knowledge that can be shared more widely than those immediately engaged in it will be undermined.

With the above considerations in mind, we are using two sets of criteria in evaluating the feasibility of dialogue activities. Both sets are the product of the consultative process that has been at the heart of this scoping study. (See Section 5 of this report). One set of criteria applies to each dialogue activity, and the other to the overall package.

In assessing the feasibility of *each* activity, we are applying the following criteria:

- *Criterion 1: Focus on urban water and sanitation for the poor:* the activity must have a clear link with the development of urban water and sanitation services, at policy or project levels, and be aimed at enabling their expansion and improvement, especially for poor people.
- *Criterion 2: Dialogue is the core focus of the activity:* while having a link with a policy or project, it must be primarily a dialogue activity rather than a new development project in its own right.
- *Criterion 3: Commitment and organisational support on both sides:* it must command sufficient committed support from both the World Bank and civil society, at both individual and organisational levels, to overcome problems in a spirit of mutual respect and trust building.

- *Criterion 4: Sufficient capacity on both sides to get started:* while Criterion 3 requires that it must be taken forward in a way that is capable of building its capacity to overcome problems, it must start with sufficient capacity on both sides to enable that process to establish momentum.
- *Criterion 5: The proposed dialogue activity must be fundable:* As well as being relevant in accordance with Criterion 1, the activity must complement rather than duplicate existing initiatives, and its timetable, work plan, participating organisations and budget must be capable of securing the confidence of funders.
- *Criterion 6: Modes of dialogue suited to location and theme:* While some modes of dialogue are suited to some themes and locations (from global to local), others are suited to other themes and locations.

In assessing the feasibility of the overall package, we are taking into account the desirability of:

- *Criterion 7: Thematic diversity:* the activities should complement each other and between them cover as wide a range of relevant themes as possible.
- *Criterion 8: Location diversity:* we are aiming to establish a balance in the package between global, regional, national and local level dialogue activities, and a balance between regions.
- *Criterion 9: Mode diversity:* while applying Criterion 6 to each activity, we are trying to ensure that a wide range of modes of dialogue are involved in the package as a whole.
- *Criterion 10: CSO diversity:* closely related to Criterion 8, we are trying to ensure that CSOs of different types -- from advocacy to service delivery, and from large global to small local -- are involved.

We have set out the criteria we are using to evaluate and develop proposals clearly not only because of the obvious need for transparency but also to demonstrate that, in arriving at those criteria, we have taken account of the general consensus that has emerged through consultation during the scoping study.

4. Dialogue activities that are being pursued

In total thirty-eight dialogue activity proposals were submitted. The long list of the activity proposals together with reasons to show why they did not meet the feasibility criteria are provided in the Annex.

The following table presents the shortlist of the 11 feasible activities. A feasible activity meets the feasibility criteria outlined above and consists of :

1. *mode(s) of dialogue* (workshops, project team support, joint research, etc);
2. *geographical level* (global, regional, country, local); and
3. *thematic focus* (utility reform, community-managed development, development of sanitation services, etc.)

Table of dialogue activity proposals in development. (Please note that not all the proposed activities will necessarily go ahead in the form set out below, and that some may merge with each other.)

Country	Activity	Contacts	Key Objectives	Description	Next Steps	Proposed budgets
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 1</i></p> <p>Scope: Global</p>	Global co-ordination and learning from dialogue activities	<p><u>Freshwater Action Network</u> Danielle Morley</p> <p><u>World Bank</u> Meike van Ginneken Senior Water and Sanitation Specialist, Energy, Transport & Water Department</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange good practice on dialogue and facilitation • Learn from and share findings from the dialogue activities • Provide a communication platform for the dialogue activities • Learn about the WB and how it works/thinks on urban WSS • Learn about CSOs and how they work/think on urban WSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process guidance with a mentor/facilitator via video conferencing (VC) and/or a face-face periodic meetings, to identify and discuss challenges, breakthroughs (process) and findings (policy) of dialogue activities, and to help measure their impact on both the WB and CSOs • Regional VC in countries where urban reform is current • Website for communication between participants, and between them and non-participants. • Document case studies of best practice • 2 x 6 month secondments from CS to WB 	<p>Danielle and Meike are in contact regarding their proposal and are awaiting progress with development of other dialogue activities before fleshing out their proposal.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ keep participants to time as necessary ➢ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➢ broker on request ➢ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Danielle and Meike to develop their proposal.</p>	No budget yet
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 2</i></p>	Effectiveness of World Bank Investment in water supply and	<p><u>WaterAid</u> Timeyin Uwejamomere</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase understanding of the design of World Bank WSS investments • To discuss mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global workshop to discuss terms of reference for the joint review, including clarification of key concepts such as 	Timeyin /Laura at WaterAid to submit a revised concept note to Meike. Once Meike has received this a trilateral discussion will be held between	£ 94,600

<p>Scope: Global</p>	<p>sanitation</p>	<p><i>World Bank Meike van Ginneken, Senior Water and Sanitation Specialist, Energy, Transport & Water Department</i></p>	<p>for ensuring that such investments benefit the poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint action plan to take forward recommendations 	<p>'effectiveness' and 'the urban poor'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research in selected countries Workshops (global and national levels) to review research findings 	<p>Wateraid, the World Bank and Public World. Following that, WaterAid and World Bank will be jointly responsible for finalizing the activity, with timetable, budget, etc.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> keep participants to time as necessary arrange and chair trilateral telecon broker on request draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Timeyin /Laura at WaterAid to revise the draft and send to Meike.</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 3</i></p> <p>Scope: National</p> <p>Benin</p>	<p>Accès à l'eau des populations des zones hydro-écologiquement difficiles du Centre Bénin : villes de DASSA et GLAZOUE</p>	<p><i>Ligue pour la Défense du Consommateur au Bénin (LDCB) Romain Abilé HOUEHOU</i></p> <p><i>World Bank Christophe Prevost Senior Water and Sanitation Specialist, Washington</i></p>	<p>Accroître l'accès à l'eau aux populations des zones hydro-écologiquement difficiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conférences Visites d'études et démonstrations Partenariats dans la conception et la mise en œuvre de projets d'approvisionnement en eau dans les villes des zones hydro-écologiquement difficiles du Bénin. 	<p>Discussion to be held on the proposal between the CSO and World Bank in September – the date of Christophe Prevost's next mission to Benin. The proposal may be revised in light of this discussion.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> keep participants to time as necessary arrange and chair trilateral telecon broker on request draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Public World to prompt Christophe Prevost.</p>	<p>No budget yet</p>
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue</i></p>	<p>Promotion des toilettes publiques</p>	<p><i>Lambassa Institute of Cultural Affairs</i></p>	<p>Amélioration des conditions d'hygiène dans la ville de</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contacts informels occasionnels e-mails 	<p>Discussion to be held on the proposal between the CSO and World Bank in</p>	<p>\$ 13.400</p>

<p><i>Activity No. 4</i></p> <p>Scope: National</p> <p>Benin</p>	<p>dans la ville de Djougou</p>	<p><i>Kassimou Issotina</i></p> <p><i>World Bank</i> <i>Christophe Prevost</i> <i>Senior Water and Sanitation Specialist,</i> <i>Washington</i></p>	<p>Djougou</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • visites d'enquêtes sur le terrain • recherches communes • ateliers de travail • réunions régulières pour échanges d'informations • rapports réguliers • mise au point d'un document de procedure 	<p>September - the date of Christophe Prevost's next mission to Benin. The proposal may be revised in light of this discussion.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Public World to prompt Christophe Prevost.</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 5.</i></p> <p>Scope: National</p> <p>Ghana</p>	<p>Sanitation management in urban informal settlements</p>	<p><i>Peoples Dialogue on Human Settlements</i> <i>Braimah Rabiu Farouk</i></p> <p><i>World Bank</i> <i>Ventura Bengoechea, Senior Water Specialist</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access by the poor to basic sanitation practices in urban informal settlements • Increase investment/lending by the bank • Identify best practices in on-site sanitation models • Institutional strengthening 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of best practice • Exchange programmes to share, learn and build new knowledge and develop innovative strategies to improve water and sanitation delivery systems • 'Self-surveying exercises' • Joint research • Developing partnerships in the design and implementation of urban water and sanitation projects 	<p>Discussion to be held on the proposal between Public World, CSO and World Bank at the August on the return of Ventura Bengoechea from leave/mission (07/31/2007). The proposal may be revised in light of this discussion.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Public World to prompt Ventura Bengoechea.</p>	<p>US\$ 10,000</p>
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue</i></p>	<p>Dialogue on how to ensure access to</p>	<p><i>Water Aid Nepal</i> <i>James Wicken</i></p>	<p>To deepen knowledge on how to ensure access to sanitation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dialogue meeting between CSOs and World Bank task 	<p>James and Soma have been in touch to discuss the proposal and James has</p>	<p>UK£18, 500</p>

<p><i>Activity No. 6</i></p> <p>Scope: Regional</p> <p>South Asia</p>	<p>sanitation for urban poor in South Asia</p>	<p><u>WSP</u> Soma Ghosh Moulik</p>	<p>for the urban poor through sharing of successful NGO and World Bank models and experiences</p>	<p>team leaders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In preparation for the dialogue, CSOs will document case studies of successful approaches to urban sanitation for the poor and task team leaders would make available documentation on their past, on-going and planned projects for the same. • These will be published as a joint publication showcasing approaches taken by different organisations in the region. • Field visits will be organised to some of the projects documented to allow participants to get first hand experience of the work. • The regional dialogue could be followed up by a global dialogue, possible using VC. 	<p>produced a draft of a concept note for the dialogue based on their discussion and the earlier proposal to FAN.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Soma to respond to the drafted Joint Concept Note. Public World to arrange a teleconference.</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 7</i></p> <p>Scope: Regional</p> <p>Central America</p>	<p>Latin American dialogue on best practice in community-based water management</p>	<p><u>FAN-CA</u> Jorge Mora Portuguez <u>World Bank</u> Manuel Schiffler, Senior Economist, Sustainable Development Group, Latin America and Caribbean Region</p>	<p>Develop a dialogue process to enable sharing information, experience, standings, proposals and visions on different community-based water management alternatives in Latin America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email-based discussion list • National-level workshops • Regional-level workshops • Continental-level workshops • Newsletters • Networking 	<p>Initial feedback from the WB is suggestions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the FAN-CA proposal should be revised to reduce its scope. ○ this proposal be merged with APRONAD's proposal (see Proposed Activity No. 8) <p>Manuel Schiffler recently met with</p>	<p>US\$143,500</p>

					<p>Francisco Rivas (see proposed activity No. 8, below) in Panama. Francisco to meet Jorge when he visits Costa Rica shortly. Manuel to call Jorge after he meets with Francisco.</p> <p>Teleconference to be held at the beginning of September on the return of Manuel to Washington.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Jorge to contact Manuel after he has had a discussion with Francisco. Public World to prompt Jorge</p>	
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 8</i></p> <p>Scope: National</p> <p>Panama</p>	<p>Water and Sanitation Project in Poor Areas (in Spanish, PASAP)</p>	<p><u>APRONAD</u> <i>Francisco Rivas Rios</i></p> <p><u>World Bank</u> <i>Manuel Schiffler, Senior Economist, Sustainable Development Group, Latin America and Caribbean Region</i></p>	<p>Increase access to drinking water and sanitation in formal / informal urban settlements inhabited by indigenous communities in Panama</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematising (technical / organisational) good practice used by indigenous urban communities to secure a drinking water supply so that they can be useful to the World Bank and the Ministry of Health (MoH) in implementing the PASAP project • Joint research on critical (cultural and organisational) issues that could jeopardise the sustainability of water and sanitation systems planned by 	<p>Although the World Bank is not interested in pursuing the APRONAD proposal as it stands (it fails to meet the feasibility criteria), discussions are underway to see if the APRONAD proposal can be incorporated into the FANCA activity (No.7, above).</p>	<p>US\$ 6,300</p>

				<p>PASAP in indigenous urban communities in Panama</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of tools or practical use guidelines for the prevention-oriented maintenance of water and sanitation systems in indigenous urban communities. 		
<p><i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 9</i></p> <p>Scope: National</p> <p>Nigeria</p>	<p>Pro-Poor Sanitation Demand Creation in Urban Slums</p>	<p><u>GEO-MOB</u> Moses O. Bereiweriso</p> <p><u>World Bank</u> Hassan Madu Kida, TTL World Bank Abuja Country Office.</p> <p>Joseph Gadek, Sr. Sanitary Engineer - Water and Urban Unit - Africa Region World Bank Abuja Country Office.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a sanitation model that best meets the people's needs in cultural and hygienic-acceptable ways • Increase access to sanitary facilities to the ever-growing urban poor population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership in planning and implementation • Consultative forums about project design through town hall meetings • Develop effective tools for guidance and use • Formation of project implementation committee (PIC) comprising community representatives including two each of youths, women and elders 	<p>Geo-Mob have been asked to review elements of their proposal that are not related to dialogue</p> <p>Trilateral discussion to be held mid-August on the return of the WB counterparts.</p> <p>Geo-Mob consulted on the possibility of including NEWSAN (Nigerian Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation) as a partner in their activity.</p> <p>Public World role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ follow up Geo-Mob re. contact with NEWSAN and review of proposal ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document <p>Next step: Public World to prompt Geo-Mob to revise their proposal and link with NEWSAN. Public World to prompt Hassan Madu Kida and Joseph</p>	<p>US\$ 40,000</p>

					Gadek regarding that and teleconference	
<i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 10</i>	Urban Water Supply Sector Reform Projects	<i>The Bread of Life Babatope Babalobi</i> <i>World Bank Hassan Madu Kida, TTL World Bank Abuja Country Office.</i> <i>Joseph Gadek, Sr. Sanitary Engineer - Water and Urban Unit - Africa Region World Bank Abuja Country Office.</i>	To organize workshops, for civil society groups in the five states presently implementing water sector reform policies, and institute a Stakeholders Consultative Forum for engaging with the World Bank, the client states and the Federal Government of Nigeria.	• Face to Face general and issue-based joint training workshops and community consultative forums/meetings	Bread of Life has included NEWSAN as a partner in their activity proposal Bread of Life asked to review their budget for the dialogue or else suggest potential funding sources. Trilateral discussion between the Public World, CSO and World Bank to be held mid-August on the return of the WB counterparts. Public World role: ➤ follow up Bread of Life re. budget or proposal revision. ➤ keep participants to time as necessary ➤ arrange and chair trilateral telecon ➤ broker on request ➤ draft final activity summary document Next step: Public World to prompt Hassan Madu Kida and Joseph Gadek regarding the proposed teleconference.	US\$ 45,319.23
<i>Proposed Dialogue Activity No. 11</i>		<i>World Bank Ato Brown, TTL World Bank Dar es Salaam office</i> <i>WSP Dominick de Waal WSP Nairobi office</i>			Ato Brown of the World Bank has responded positively in principle, but says this would require active involvement of Dominick, probably as organizer of the activity. Public World role: ➤ Contact Dominick (now at	

East Africa		<p><u>Civil society</u></p> <p><i>To be determined</i></p>			<p>WSP) re. his prospective role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Following Ato Brown's in principle positive response, follow up in early September re. further arrangements. <p>Next step: Public World to contact Dominick de Waal.</p>	
-------------	--	--	--	--	---	--

5. Scoping Study Chronology

The Scoping Study took place in three distinct phases: the activities undertaken in each phase are outlined below¹.

First phase

The first phase of the study took the form of consultation and research, which involved:

- Preliminary *desk-based* research was conducted on the World Bank's overall policies, practices and terms of engagement with civil society and the previous dialogues on urban water supply and sanitation.
- *Survey*: A questionnaire was sent to World Bank staff working on water (more than 150 people) together with all FAN members, and other NGOs, with an interest in urban water and sanitation issues (289 CSOs in total). It was sent on 1st February 2007 (and followed up with a reminder to complete questionnaire on 6th February). The survey was designed to collect information on themes, mechanisms and geographical levels for dialogue together with barriers to meaningful exchange or partnership, and ideas for overcoming the barriers. Sixteen responses were received from World Bank and 44 from CSOs.
- *Interviews were conducted* with the FAN Advisory Group, civil society organisations and World Bank actors at national, regional, and international levels.

Second phase

A workshop was held in Washington on February 26th, 2007 attended by World Bank personnel, the FAN Advisory group and some other invited participants (please see annex for the Summary Report).

A preparatory workshop was held the day before with the FAN Advisory Group (Sunday 25th February).

Third phase

An official statement and interim report were produced after the Washington workshop (in English, French and Spanish).

Activity proposal forms were developed together with a list of answers to some frequently asked questions (FAQs).

¹ Teleconferences were also held between FAN, the World Bank, and the consultants on 2nd February; 20th February; 7th June, 20th June, 11th July.

The draft process guidelines and feasibility criteria were produced, and consultation about them was conducted, as follows:

- Production by the Scoping Study consultants of a paper on process issues;
- Circulation of that paper to all FAN affiliates and hundreds of other CSOs and World Bank staff (all now linked through a listserve);
- Discussion of that draft at the World Bank - FAN workshop held in Washington, D.C., on February 26, 2007;
- Production of a revised paper in March 2007, which was circulated as before for consultation²;
- Production of draft process guidelines and dialogue activity feasibility criteria in May 2007.

Following receipt of proposed dialogue activities, through a further consultation process involving both FAN and the World Bank, and on the basis of the draft evaluation criteria, a short list of activities was selected for further development.

In addition to the consultation processes, there were regular mail-outs to the mailing list (later developed into a listserve) of the organisations identified and informed about the scoping study in the first phase, in addition to World Bank recipients and FAN members and associate members. The mailings took place as follows:

12th March: Statement that came out of the Washington workshop.

3rd April: The interim study and workshop report was sent together with a request for dialogue activity proposals.

13th April: In response to some queries on how to complete the dialogue activity proposal forms, a list of answers to some frequently asked questions (FAQs) was sent out.

15th May: Progress report was sent out.

8th June: Progress update.

² Comments were received from Mariana Sell, IPANEMA (Institute of Advanced Research on Economics and Environment); Md.Moniruzzaman Aid Organization Bangladesh; Patrick Apoya Coalition of NGOs in Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS); Patricia Kabatabazi, CIANEA; Kassimou Issotina, Lambassa ICA BENIN; James Wicken, WaterAid Nepal; Aaron Kalala Karumba, APAA Congo; Jeanette de Noack, Centro de Accion Legal Ambiental y Social de Guatemala, CALAS; Rev. George Chaima, New Restoration Ministries Int. Malawi

6. Next steps

A number of next steps have been identified that will be undertaken by the consultants in August and September in order to further develop the dialogue activities and complete the scoping study. The next steps include:

- To hold a series of trilateral discussions on the short list of feasible activities (with the CSO and World Bank counterparts) in order to further develop the proposals.
- To revise the dialogue activity proposals in light of the trilateral discussions.
- Investigate funding possibilities.
- To interview some of the active participants in the Scoping Study at the World Bank and among members of the FAN Advisory Group.
- Produce a commentary on the Scoping Study process and its lessons.
- Sign off by consultants

FAN and the World Bank will appoint a focal point to continue the facilitation and coordination role provided by Public World so far. They will work with individual organisations to take forward the proposals and secure funds and commence dialogue.

FAN and World Bank will move forward the planning for a global dialogue activity including appointment of a mentor / facilitator for each dialogue activity as it kicks off.

FAN will discuss progress so far at their Annual Advisory Group Meeting, to be held in October 2007.

- o - O - o -

Bibliography

World Bank Civil Society Team External Affairs “*Issues and Options for Improving Engagement Between the World Bank and CSOs*” Draft for Discussion, October 24, 2003

Bretton Woods Project. 2nd February 2005. *Cautious dialogue as conflict over water continues.*

Bretton Woods Project. 1st December 2004. *Draft Notes of WB-CSO dialogue on urban water and sanitation services*, 18-19 Nov 2004 Minutes.

Terms of Reference for Discussion Paper on World Bank Civil Society Engagement – A Project of the Civil Society Members of the World Bank – Civil Society (no date) Joint Facilitation Committee (JFC)

EIR, September 17th 2004, *Striking a Better Balance – The World Bank Group and Extractive Industries: The Final Report of the Extractive Industries Review, World Bank Group Management Response.*

World Bank. March 2005. *Issues and Options for Improving Engagement Between the World Bank and Civil Society Organizations.* External Affairs, Communications and United Nations Affairs Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network Operations Policy and Country Services Network

World Bank *Civil Society Engagement e-Newsletter*, World Bank, 2004-7
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/CSO/0,,contentMDK:20110693~pagePK:220503~piPK:220476~theSitePK:228717,00.html>

The Structural Adjustment Participatory Review International Network (SAPRIN) *First Edition, April 2002. The Policy Roots of Economic Crisis and Poverty: A Multi-Country Participatory Assessment of Structural Adjustment Based on Results of the Joint World Bank/Civil Society/Government Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative (SAPRI) and the Citizens’ Assessment of Structural Adjustment (CASA).*

Aviva Imhof, Susanne Wong and Peter Bosshard, 2002, *Citizens’ guide to the World Commission on Dams.* International Rivers Network.

Belinda Calaguas *Why have Bank-CSO dialogues on water faltered?* Comment. 8th April 2006.

Civil Society Members of World Bank-Civil Society Joint Facilitation Committee (JFC) *A Call for Participatory Decision-Making: Discussion Paper on World Bank-Civil Society Engagement*, June 15, 2005.

World Bank and InterAction. (no date). *Seeing Eye to Eye? InterAction Member Agencies and World Bank Staff Assess their Operational Collaboration and Policy Engagement for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development.*

Tennyson, Ros. 2003. *The Partnering tool book* International Business Leaders Forum.

Start, Daniel and Hovland, Ingje. 2004. *Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers.* ODI.

Covey Jane G. and Brown L. (2001). David. *Critical Cooperation: An Alternative Form of Civil Society-Business Engagement.* IDR Reports Vol. 17 No. 1

Collaboration Roundtable Spring 2001 The Partnership Toolkit: Tools for Building and Sustaining Partnerships http://www.bpdws.org/bpd/web/d/doc_55.pdf

Stott Leda (2003) Listening to the critics: Can we learn from arguments against partnerships with business? http://www.bpdws.org/bpd/web/d/doc_46.pdf

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (No date) Chapter 6 Maintaining Momentum in Collaboration <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/css/ppt/chap6.htm>

International Business Leaders Forum (No date) Measures for success Assessing the impact of partnerships http://www.bpdws.org/bpd/web/d/doc_56.pdf

Tennyson, Ros (2005) The Brokering guidebook: Navigating effective sustainable development partnerships. International Business Leaders Forum

Bettye Pruitt and Philip Thomas 2007. Democratic Dialogue – A Handbook for Practitioners International IDEA, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA),

Appendix 1

Dialogue proposals received that are not being pursued

The following dialogue activity proposals were received but did not meet the feasibility criteria for reasons described below.

Criterion 1: Focus on urban water and sanitation for the poor

Proposer organization	Activity title	Comments
Wetland Friends of Nepal (WFN) (Nepal)	<i>Implementing Integrated Wetland Education Model through Information Technology for Wise-Use of Water Resources, Nepal</i>	Not focused on urban water
SALAMA (santé par la langue maternelle) (Cameroon)	<i>Evaluation a l'accès à l'eau potable et a l'assainissement dans les quartiers populaires et pauvres de Yaoundé</i>	Not a dialogue activity
Pani Ghar, A private limited company (Pakistan)	<i>Coordination between "Pani Ghar" and NGOs</i>	Pani Ghar is not a CSO
Kenya Muslim Welfare Group (Kenya)	<i>Strengthening water accessibility to urban and improving hygiene</i>	Proposal revealed that activity was in fact waste management project
ASARE (Rural and Environmental Development Trust) (India)	<i>Study the strategic plans, implementing mechanism, lacunas and effectiveness of urban water supply and sanitation.</i>	Project proposal rather than a dialogue (which was considered beyond scope of proposer)
APAA CONGO (DRC)	<i>Seminars on implementation of safe water in Uvira/East of DRC</i>	Not a dialogue on urban water

Criterion 2: Dialogue is the core focus of the activity

Proposer organization	Activity title	Comments
SWAPHEP (Nigeria)	<i>Community participation in World Bank's investment decision in water supply infrastructure – focus on large dams</i>	The work plan and budget are not clearly linked to dialogue activities
Water and Sanitation Organization, America and Africa Water Association Inc. (AWA) (Tanzania)	<i>Public domestic water supply and sanitation in urban informal settlements</i>	Dialogue element of proposal appears to be with communities rather than World

		Bank
The Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural revampment and human Rights (FEEDAR & HR) (Cameroon)	<i>Hygiene quality in rivers meandering the cities of the South West province of Cameroon</i>	The work plan and budget are not clearly linked to dialogue activities
Mouvement National des Consommateurs (MNC) (Cameroon)	<i>Recherche des indicateurs de satisfaction des Consommateurs d'eau dans les quartiers défavorisés de Yaoundé</i>	Proposal did not clearly specify the dialogue activity.
Water Energy and Sanitation for Development (WESDE): Centre de Gestion de l'Environnement. (Cameroon)	<i>Gestion participative des déchets et compostage dans la ville de Maroua, Cameroun</i>	Proposal did not clearly specify the dialogue activity.
CODESEN (Senegal)	<i>Renforcement des mécanismes de dialogue, d'échange d'informations et de collaboration entre la CODESEN et la Banque Mondiale pour favoriser l'accès des pauvres à l'eau potable, à l'assainissement et à l'hygiène dans les villes du Bassin du fleuve Sénégal.</i>	Proposal did not clearly specify the dialogue activity or provide a budget.
Entebbe District Wildlife Association (Uganda)	<i>Integrated governance in water and sanitation management services in Entebbe</i>	The dialogue element is not clear
New Restoration Ministries International (Malawi)	<i>Water Filtration System and Sanitation Practices</i>	The dialogue activity is not clear – the proposal seems to be for a development project
Community based Impact Assessment Network for Eastern Africa (CIANEA) (Uganda)	<i>Community participation in impact of water and sanitation</i>	The link to urban WSS or dialogue is not clear

Criterion 3: Commitment and organisational support on both sides

Proposer organization	Activity title	Comments
People and Water NGO, (Slovakia)	<i>Water for Sustainable Cities</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified Also did not meet Criterion 2
The Nigeria Network of NGOs (NNNGO) (Nigeria)	<i>Institutionalizing Public Private Partnerships in Water Supply & Sanitation in Nigeria</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified
World Toilet Organization (Singapore)	<i>Sustainable Sanitation systems in an Urban slum in Chennai, India</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified
Association Pour la Défense des Consommateurs (APDC) (Cameroon)	<i>Approvisionnement en eau potable et assainissement des quartiers pauvres de quelques villes du Cameroun</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified Also did not meet Criterion 2

Drinking Water (Pakistan)	<i>Domestic and industrial waste water, treatment in Pakistan</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified
Women's Land and Water Rights in Southern Africa (Zimbabwe)	<i>Partnerships in the design and implementation of urban rural water and sanitation projects</i>	World Bank has little/no presence in the water sector in Zimbabwe and so no counterpart could be identified
Reach to Unreached (RUN) (Bangladesh)	<i>On-site SODIS method freshwater & sanitation in urban informal settlements</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified with an interest in focusing on this particular technology
NGO Forum for Drinking Water Supply & Sanitation (Bangladesh)	<i>Sustainable health improvement in the poor urban communities</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified
Bangladesh Water Partnership Secretariat (Bangladesh)	<i>Dialogue on Access of the Slum people to Water Supply and Sanitation Services</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified
NGO Forum for Urban Water and Sanitation (Nepal)	<i>Public utility reforms and services to the urban poor</i>	No viable World Bank counterpart in Nepal
ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability (Canada)	<i>Local Water Dialogues for Global Water Governance</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified Budget not clearly linked to dialogue activities
Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (UK)	<i>Developing new funding mechanisms for urban poor water and sanitation projects</i>	No World Bank counterpart could be identified

Appendix 2

Summary Report of Washington workshop (February 2007)

1. Background

Since 2003, there have been two attempts at starting a World Bank-Civil Society dialogue on water and sanitation issues³. The first was led by Washington-based CSOs and resulted in meetings in Washington.

The second attempt was launched with a London workshop in November 2004, and focused on urban water supply and sanitation. It involved over 30 participants from civil society organisations (CSOs) worldwide and around a dozen World Bank staff, led by Jamal Saghier, then Director of Water and Energy, and including task managers, water specialists, and a civil society engagement specialist. Initiated by the Bank's Water and Sanitation Sector Board and the water anchor, it was co-organized with WaterAid, which assembled a steering committee involving several other CSOs. The London workshop was followed by a CSO-organised seminar at World Bank Water Week, 2005 and further discussions between the Bank and CSOs in Nigeria on the Bank's Lagos and Cross River State projects.

The second attempt at dialogue led to a number of areas for follow-up, including:

- *Information access and capacity building:* A group of CSOs was to work with the Bank to become familiar with all project documentation prepared at different stages of the Bank project cycle, understand the significance of these documents, and inform the Bank what documents are important to make public and how to do so.
- *Tariff structures, subsidies and cost recovery policies:* Existing materials were to be shared, and a glossary of terms created to establish a common vocabulary to enable further discussions.
- *Scaling up community interventions:* A report was planned of cases of scaled-up community-based projects.
- *Lobbying, advocacy capacity building, and sector coordination:* An advocacy pack was planned to assist efforts to prioritise water and sanitation issues in development plans.

Although some of those activities went ahead in various forms, the process stalled for reasons that were differently perceived by different stakeholders. Without going into detail that would be unlikely to prove productive in the current context, it can be said that participants found either that they lacked the capacity to continue or that, in their perception, the costs and risks of doing so were exceeding the benefits. In the

³ *Draft Notes of WB-CSO dialogue on urban water and sanitation services*, 18-19 Nov 2004 Minutes. Bretton Woods Project 1st December 2004; *Cautious dialogue as conflict over water continues*. Bretton Woods Project. 2nd February 2005; *Why have Bank-CSO dialogues on water faltered?* Comment Belinda Calaguas 8th April 2006.

questionnaire responses and interviews, and particularly during the discussions held at the scoping study workshop held in Washington on February 26 (for details of that, see later sections of this report), several participants in the 2004-5 dialogue shared their views of why that process ran out of the steam. We have attempted to capture the lessons in the consultation paper on dialogue process which accompanies this report.

In any event, it was later proposed that the Freshwater Action Network (FAN), a network currently linking some 4,000 CSOs in all parts of the globe and housed by WaterAid in London, could be an effective organizational means to pick up the process on the CSO side and further develop engagement with the Bank. The aim is to enable those CSOs that wish to engage in dialogue of various kinds, on various themes and at various geographical levels, to do so, despite the increased scepticism of others as to the value of the efforts. That scepticism has various causes, but include perceptions of limited 'buy-in' by the Bank, despite the Bank's continued declared commitment to CSO dialogue, as well as perceptions of negative attitudes on the part of those CSOs which believe dialogue serves no useful purpose or is even harmful.

An agreement was reached to explore the potential for renewed dialogue efforts through a scoping study to identify 'feasible activities' and 'rules of the game' for WB-CSO dialogue on urban water supply and sanitation. FAN agreed to conduct the scoping study, with World Bank support, and has commissioned Public World to assist with it.

The study's *terms of reference* stipulate that dialogue processes should 'as a minimum' lead to sharing of information and knowledge, development of mutual understanding and trust, and opportunities for CSOs to provide input to World Bank policy making and operations. It is intended that this should strengthen common understanding of the complexities in the sector and enable participants to learn from each other. The dialogue processes should not expect to forge a consensus, but rather allow for recognition of the areas of difference, while still seeking out ways to build understanding and knowledge among all participants and pursue dialogue actively where possible and mutually beneficial.

2. Activities of the Scoping Study to date

The main activities undertaken prior to the workshop included:

1. ***Desk based research*** on the World Bank's overall policies, practices and terms of engagement with civil society and previous dialogue attempts on urban water supply and sanitation.
2. ***Survey*** A brief survey of CSO and Bank staff views and experiences. The questionnaire was sent to 289 CSOs working on urban water supply and sanitation issues (108 FAN members and 181 other CSOs). 60 CSOs returned their completed questionnaire. A questionnaire was also sent to all watsan staff at the World Bank (about 150 people) and the 7 regional managers responsible for watsan. 16 WB staff returned their completed questionnaire.

3. **Interviews** were conducted with a range of CSO (14) and Bank representatives (7) at national, regional, and international levels through face to face meetings, telephone interviews and written submissions.
4. **Regional and other consultation meetings** Existing relevant regional and international meetings that involved large numbers of civil society actors were targeted for information dissemination regarding the Scoping Study.
5. **Conference Calls** with the FAN advisory group and Meike van Ginneken and Eric Dickson at the World Bank.
6. Meetings with Ceridwen Johnson of FAN Secretariat.

That work was followed by:

1. A preparatory workshop attended by all CSO participants and some other invited participants on Sunday 25th February.
2. The workshop held in Washington, D.C., on February 26, 2007 at World Bank Water Week.

Phase 3 of the scoping study is underway and at this stage involves further consultation about how dialogue should be conducted, how a 'feasible' dialogue activity should be defined, and invitations to CSOs and World Bank staff to propose dialogue activities. Following that process, process guidelines will be drafted and circulated for further consultation and eventual agreement; a list of feasible dialogue activities will be drawn up, on the basis of responses to invitations to propose activities; and the feasibility, including timetables and budgetary requirements, of proposed activities will be further researched. The intended outcome is an agreed set of process guidelines and feasible activities, which it will be the responsibility of the participants to pursue, along with an agreement about a plan for co-ordinated information sharing and lesson learning from the activities.

2a. Research Findings: Themes for dialogue

The scoping study so far has led to a wide range of themes being suggested for dialogue, at a variety of geographical levels and through a variety of modes. In the following table, we have grouped them into six categories.

Theme	Examples of Specific Ideas
Holistic Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural WSS development and sustainability • Equitable sharing of water resources • Integrated Water Resource Management issues • Financing for growing and processing macadamia nuts • Hand washing
Capacity Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building capacities of CBOs / NGOs in urban poor areas to understand, organize, inform and serve the poor • Capacity building and action research to strengthen CSO voice • Improving CSO understanding of World Bank

	<p>processes and procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving World Bank capacity and resources to engage in dialogue • Recruitment of and training in the required skills to develop and sustain dialogue.
Public Private Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the private sector/models of private sector participation • Public private partnership -- how to make it work • Partnerships -- building more effective partnerships • Role of small scale providers in areas which lack network, and facilitate selling of bulk water to them • Small enterprise development, involvement of small scale operators, micro-credit
Better Public Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public utility reform/ public utility management • Redress/dispute resolution • Governance/ Accountability/Citizens Voice, including for anti-corruption • Regulation and role of CSOs in influencing WSS providers • General Agreement on Public Services (GAPS)
Better WSS projects and service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social auditing role of CSOs • Resource allocation, e.g. rural/urban, budget tracking, etc. • Improved dialogue between CSOs and service providers • WSS appropriate technology • Sanitation, and building demand for it • Consumer/Community participation in water and sanitation governance. • Pro-poor access to WSS and priorities of the poor • Children (access to WSS and participation) • Supporting each other's efforts, cooperation between WB and CSOs • Achieving project objectives (avoidance of unfinished, damaged and costly infrastructure)
Policy Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy reforms • Water as a public good/an economic good • Funding of the sector • Water tariffs: structures, levels and subsidy mechanisms • Decentralisation and governance arrangements • Implementation of laws, particularly on information disclosure • Shared connections for illegal squatters in the name of

	<p>an intermediary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenure Issues: de-linking rights to service from tenure status
--	---

2b Research Findings: Modes of dialogue

The following table lists and categorises the modes of dialogue suggested by respondents:

Mode of Dialogue	Examples
<u>Technology-mediated Dialogue</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone conferences • Videoconferencing sessions/video dialogue • E-conferences (structured discussion via Internet) • Email/Listserve • Blogs (informal swapping of information and views via Internet)
<u>Face to Face Dialogue</u> <i>General face to face</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutual fact-finding or study visits, and demonstrations • Meetings • Conferences • Joint training • Participating in each other's events, such as seminars, round tables, etc.
<u>Face to Face Dialogue</u> <i>Issue-based face to face</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships in the design and implementation of urban water and sanitation projects • Peer evaluation of programmes and projects • CSO representatives seconded to the WB, especially to work on strategy • Consultative forums for formal consultation about policy and/or project design
<u>Indirect contact for information exchange</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Websites • Newsletters • Surveys • 'Best practice' case studies

The questionnaire also invited respondents to match modes and geographical levels with particular themes, for a summary of these results please see the annex.

Respondents saw the main benefits of dialogue in terms of:

- Gaining technical support from the WB
- Understanding what others in the region and internationally are doing
- Getting a better understanding of WB policy/practices for the urban water and sanitation
- Seeing how CSO can work with WB to help the urban poor
- More effective WB projects

- Enabling good ideas from the ground to be replicated with formal support from the World Bank, or by attracting partners from the private and the public sector

The main constraints that were identified as affecting the sustainability of participation in the dialogue activities include:

- Lack of funding
- Size, time frame and type of project
- Language
- Pace of dialogue
- Equipment and human resources
- Training/technical knowledge especially on financing matters
- Individual Task Team Leader interest and competence in pursuing CSO dialogue
- General level of interest by the client country in CSO dialogue
- Lack of knowledge among CSO of WB's mission and policies
- Receptiveness of World Bank to a locally-driven approach
- Political will on the part of local and national Government to support the process

3. Workshop

Following the preliminary research, the World Bank and Freshwater Action Network (FAN) held a joint workshop on February 26, 2007, at the Bank's Water Week in Washington, D.C.

The Bank's 15-strong delegation at the workshop was led by Jamal Saghir, the Bank's Director of Energy, Transport and Water in the recently established Sustainable Development vice-presidency. World Bank participants also included several water task managers from around the globe, as well as specialists in civil society engagement and communications. Most of the CSO participants were from the FAN advisory group, who developed the project with the World Bank. The advisory group is made up of CSO representatives from Africa, Asia and Latin America including FAN's regional networks in Africa (ANEW), Central America (FAN-CA), Mexico (FAN-Mex) and South America and International NGOs WaterAid and BothEnds. Other CSOs taking part in the workshop included Public Services International, the global union federation representing water utility workers; and the Washington-based Food and Water Watch. Please see the Annex for the workshop programme and list of participants.

The workshop participants were organized around five tables. During the workshop two breakout group sessions were held; in the first session the participants discussed the issues associated with the process of dialogue or the 'rules of the game'. Each table was allocated a specific issue to discuss (selected on the basis of the questionnaire and interviews). In the second breakout group session the participants were given a specific theme and set the task of developing a proposal for a dialogue activity, addressing systematically the following points:

- what is the appropriate mode of dialogue suited to this theme?
- what is the appropriate geographical level?

- how could the activity feed back into more effective projects for UWSS development?
- how would the 'rules of the game' apply?

Table	1 st breakout sessions	2 nd breakout sessions
1	Transparency in dialogue processes	Diagnosis of the problems of delivering urban water and sanitation services to the urban poor
2	Trust building	Developing guidelines for CSO involvement in dialogue
3	Representation and inclusion	Learning from best practice about 'Community – Public Sector Partnerships'
4	Bank's project cycle and dialogue timing	The relationship between urban water supply and sanitation and Integrated Water Resource Management
5	Benefits and risks of dialogue	Financing urban water supply and sanitation

Report of the workshop discussion

Reports from first breakout sessions

Table 1: The group were given the topic of transparency in the dialogue process. Transparency was discussed in terms of the representativeness of the particular CSOs and networks involved in the dialogue process, a factor which is complicated by the diversity of CSOs around the world and their different missions and focus. It was suggested that the parameters for inclusion of CSOs in the dialogue activities should be decided transparently, and that organisations sceptical about the dialogue process should be included if possible. Transparency was also discussed in terms of accountability between FAN and WB and within their constituencies.

Table 2: Trust-building was perceived as a long, time-intensive process. The main pre-requisites of trust were found to be:

- Knowledge (of the counterpart), understanding of each other's position
- Familiarity, ability to communicate, mutually agreed and transparent communication protocol
- Commitment to a dialogue process and willingness to consider unanticipated or unwelcome outcomes
- Openness about the process, readiness to accept criticism
- Clarity about the expectations

The main obstacles to trust were found to be:

- Complexity of the processes (at national level, many different institutions involved, including national governments not always willing to dialogue).
- Reputation risk: many NGOs fear they may be perceived as being too close to the Bank (co-opted). Similarly, for Bank managers -- working with NGOs may be

- risky vis-à-vis the client government, senior management, depending on the outcome of the discussion.
- Heterogeneity of the stakeholders at any level, making it difficult to decide with whom to conduct dialogue.
 - Lack of commitment from national governments: in many countries national governments only reluctantly engage with local civil society (under the Bank's pressure).
 - Diverging expectations about what is at stake in the dialogue and what can and cannot be discussed (in the sense of what is the Bank / the national government putting on the table and what is beyond the dialogue's scope).
 - Inadequate or non-existent communication channels: culture, language, technology may act as obstacles.
 - Unclear lines of accountability for dialogues at national level, where none really own the "projects" and can claim to be representing entirely the most important stakeholders (governments, utilities, civil society etc.). Prior and parallel relationships may complicate the dialogue.

These obstacles can be overcome by strengthening the need for an open and transparent communication protocol, as well as a clear and joint vision about the goal of the dialogue.

Table 3: This table discussed the theme of representation and inclusion. It was acknowledged that the 'rules of the game' for the dialogue process will be 'horses for courses' depending on the subject, the purpose of dialogue and the different participants in the process. The participants in the dialogue activity might include networks of organizations of urban water supply and sanitation service providers and CSOs monitoring the Bank, groups negatively/positively affected by Bank projects, and other local organizations. In World Bank there are also civil society liaison officers that can be tapped for information. It was acknowledged that dialogue won't work if local perspectives are not included or capacity issues at the local level are not recognized. Similarly, under the heading of inclusion, information from the dialogue should be disseminated in local languages and in terms that can be easily understood. The criteria for choosing participants in the dialogue process should reflect the principals of legitimacy, transparency and inclusion rather than representativeness as it was thought that no one can represent CSOs as a whole. The group suggested that dialogue should preferably start with Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) or the Project Information Document (PID) – i.e. at an early stage in the project cycle.

Table 4: This group discussed the Bank's project cycle and dialogue timing. There was disagreement within the group as to whether dialogue exists over the CAS; for example, some said that many/most CAS have dialogue, others say that there is next to none in practice. The extent of dialogue depends on the institutional context, and the governmental context. Whereas CAS is a general document, the group thought that there is a need for more pointed engagement; for example, dialogue would be more specific if focused on project identification and preparation. The monitoring aspect of dialogue, especially at local level, needs to be strengthened. The obstacles to starting dialogue were perceived in terms of:

- CSO maturity/capacity to engage, capacity to monitor (at community level);
- Politicisation: within CAS, can be a problem, but can include opportunity for engagement;
- Bank staff technical expertise;
- Time to implement (pressure on staff to deliver);
- Budget not allocated for non-financial, non-technical elements.

Attempts to overcome these obstacles include:

- Linking the CAS with sector and projects.
- Looking at the Joint Assistance Strategy (multi-donor), from which the CAS is drawn.
- Stakeholder mapping and social assessment process as a prerequisite for projects.
- Using WB country offices as a CSO focal point.
- Using community-based performance monitoring as a mechanism.
- Integration of CSOs in the formal monitoring of WB activities.

Dialogue might require institutional strengthening and capacity building; however, the group were clear that this should not compromise CSO independence. For example, in Uganda, a fund has been created by the WB for CSO capacity building, independent of government. Whilst, there is a need to resource the participants in dialogue activities the group stated that they should be aware of distortions whether it be from WB money or global NGOs. There is also a need to understand that there will be competing interests within the dialogue activity, so the key is to build mechanisms for integrating such different imperatives.

Table 5: This table talked about the benefits of a CSO – WB dialogue on water for the urban poor, the risks and costs related to such a dialogue process and risk mitigation mechanisms. The main benefits of dialogue were perceived to be:

- The creation of a democratic space for all actors to participate in.
- Increased CSO, as well as World Bank, leverage on governments.
- A successful dialogue could potentially shorten World Bank project cycles.
- Dialogue will ensure that the Bank gets feedback from actors at local, national, regional and international levels.

The risks and costs associated with dialogue include:

- The dialogue might become a time consuming process that will not lead to results for poor people in urban areas of developing countries.
- The dialogue might be dominated by those organisations with the strongest voice, or with the largest funds.
- The representativeness of the actors involved.
- Reputational risk for actors involved.
- The dialogue could undermine the position of local and national government and thereby weaken their role in decision making processes, which in turn undermines the democratic system.

Risk mitigation and the ‘management of expectations’ was deemed particularly important by participants, given that there are no guarantees in the dialogue process. Participants stressed that stakeholders should articulate and discuss expectations at the beginning of the dialogue process. Other risk mitigation strategies suggested were to act on concrete dialogue activities and to generate inclusiveness and ownership of the dialogue.

In conclusion, the group acknowledged that the potential benefits, costs/risks and risk mitigation strategies will differ depending on the geographical and political context of the dialogue. They suggested that conducting dialogue at the national level might present greater opportunities to design a dialogue process that is fully inclusive of all relevant actors, and that focuses on the real challenges at hand. Moreover, they cautioned against excluding governments (national and local) from the dialogue process; dialogue should not replace democratic decision-making processes, nor should it weaken the position of governments vis a vis civil society or the World Bank.

Report back from 2nd breakout group

Table 1: This group discussed how to diagnose problems with urban water supply and sanitation. It was established that the World Bank responds to specific problems, usually defined by government. Thus, by the time that the WB engages the problem has already been defined and so the WB doesn’t engage with CSOs on project identification issues. Moreover, the WB typically negotiates with government. In addition, in some countries the government doesn’t want WB to deal with CSOs, which puts the WB in a difficult position as the government is the WB client. The group discussed the feasibility of some solutions to these problems, such as changing the World Bank protocol so that it won’t negotiate with government unless CSOs are involved.

Table 2: This group discussed how to develop guidelines for CSO involvement in dialogue. It was suggested that a possible dialogue activity might be the development of guidelines and a tool kit which shows how the Bank can involve CSOs in the design and implementation of projects. This could be used for training Bank staff at the global or regional levels. (The WB has recently updated a “Civil Society Consultation Sourcebook” which might serve as a good example of what kind of sourcebook might be developed.) However, it was also pointed out that these guidelines should not be ‘one size fits all’, but take into account the country context. Researching and drafting joint guidelines will help to build trust and develop common understanding around definitions, data and analysis.

An important question is whether these guidelines should be developed at the global level or only at the country level. The consensus in the group was that, yes, they should be developed for the global level and be shared across countries, but that the guidelines should be developed first from the country level, so they are relevant to the country context. A good example are the guidelines for civil participation in monitoring water reform policies developed by WaterAid which began with 10 country case studies which were discussed in a workshop in Uganda.

Questions discussed about who should participate include:

- Should both operational (which are willing to be more collaborative) and policy advocacy CSOs (which tend to be more critical) be included in this process?
- Should academics and government officials also be involved in the process of developing guidelines? Government inclusion was thought important but not necessarily at the beginning of the dialogue process/activity between CSOs and the WB.

Table 3: The group discussed the theme of CSO-public sector partnerships in urban water supply and sanitation. The group thought that there may be examples of successful CSO-public sector partnerships but they are not widely known, perhaps because they are not documented in an easily accessible way. For example, the WB has a long and complicated procedure for identifying a ‘successful’ project. Therefore, documentation of these experiences might be a useful first step to dialogue, and these documents could then be circulated for comment. Cases of successful Community-Public partnership in urban water and sanitation can be used to influence policy but also to inform communities – for example a community in Guatemala can learn from another in Nigeria. Dissemination of these cases might be through face to face meetings or through the media.

Table 4: The group were given the relationships between Urban Water Supply and Sanitation and Integrated Water Resource Management as the theme for dialogue. The group acknowledged that different uses of water tend to be treated separately and recognised the need to bring a broader perspective to urban water supply and sanitation. As such, dialogue should be focused at the basin level or international trans-boundary levels. Stakeholders at the basin level should be targeted through a bottom-up approach; it was suggested that institutional committees/councils could be used in this context to facilitate dialogue. It was perceived that the WB tends to turn to the larger CSOs for dialogue but smaller CSOs should also be invited to play a role. Potential dialogue activities for combining IWRM and UWSS were identified as:

- Environmental Impact Assessments of water projects.
- Applications by water supply utility for the right to use water at the basin level.
- Capacity building to ensure proper participation.

Table 5: The group were given the theme of dialogue about financing urban water supply and sanitation. At the global level, the group identified important activities as the exchange of knowledge and lessons and advocacy for the sector at the global level. At the national level the group thought themes for dialogue might focus on the effective, efficient and transparent use of funds at national level; an activity in this context might include WB Public Expenditure Review as a mechanism for dialogue. The group saw the potential for dialogue at the regional level, as it would enable cross-country and cross-sectoral levels and would be less threatening to national governments. The group identified a number of modes for working together at country level including:

- Working together at the project level.
- Public presentation of Public Expenditure Reviews (PER).
- Joint compilation of high quality reliable data.
- Meetings between CSOs, WB and Governments or quarterly review meetings.
- Global advocacy to increase allocation of resources.
- A watchdog role for CSOs

Closing statements

In his closing remarks, Eustache Ouayoro for the WB, confirmed the need for CSOs and WB to work both to improve their work on water supply and sanitation and to achieve the MDGs, particularly in Africa. Eustache pointed out a number of ways that CSOs can already influence the WB decision making, such as:

- The preparations of CAS and PRSPs.
- The Water Strategy at country level – where government decisions are made.
- The national MDG Action Plans.
- Staff in WB country offices –particularly in Africa where there are numerous local offices.

Eustache also highlighted the role CSOs have in making the WB accountable, for example by monitoring and measuring the performance of WB projects.

In response, Edward Kairu on behalf of FAN, thanked the Bank for their candid acknowledgement that they have no choice but to work with CSOs. Edward talked about the importance of CSOs and WB learning from each other, since each has a comparative advantage in terms of working with the urban poor. In particular, Edward mentioned the need for CSOs to be involved at all levels of the project cycle – particularly in terms of project selection. He recognised that dialogue can be complex and will be a challenge: even if this workshop doesn't lead to dialogue, the doors should be kept open. Edward also acknowledged that governments also have a key role in the dialogue process.

4. List of workshop participants

World Bank and related bodies:

Luiz Gabriel Azevedo, ECA - lead water resource specialist
Oscar Alvarado, SAR - sr WSS specialist
Ato Brown, AFR - lead sanitary engineer
David Michaud, LAC - young professional
Genevieve Connors, EAP - young professional
Claudio Purificato, EAP - WSS specialist
Eustache Ouayoro, AFTU2 - sector manager
Andrew Makhoka, MNA - sr WSS specialist
Jamal Saghir, ETW - Director
Matar Fall, ETW - lead WSS specialist
Meike van Ginneken, ETW - sr WSS specialist

Eric Dickson, ETW - jr WSS specialist
Jyoti Shukla, PPIAF - program manager
Karla Chaman, EXT Dev Communications - communications officer
John Garrison, EXT - sr NGO liaison
Tracey Osborne, PPIAF - communications officer

CSOs:

Jorge Mora Portuguese FANCA coordinator Costa Rica
Edward Kairu ANEW Chair and Executive Director, Maji na Ufanisi (Water and Development NGO) Nairobi, Kenya
Jamillah Mwanjisi Maji na Ufanisi (ANEW coordinator) Kenya
Danielle Hirsch Operational Manager, BothEnds Netherlands
Ramisetty Murali Modern Architects for Rural India (MARI) India
Mariana Sell IPANEMA (Institute of Advanced Research on Economics and Environment) Brazil
Joseph Halder NGO Forum Bangladesh
Jeanette de Noack Centro de Accion Legal Ambiental y Social de Guatemala, CALAS
Patrick Apoya Coalition of NGOs in Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS) Ghana
Nathalie Seguin FAN Mexico coordinator
Rolando Castro FANCA member Costa Rica
Ceridwen Johnson FAN Info and comms officer London
David Boys Utilities for Public Services International
Robin Simpson Senior Policy Advisor at Consumers International and freelance consultant London
Ken Caplan Building Partnerships in Development for Water and Sanitation London
Laura Hucks WaterAid London
Timeyin Uwejamomere WaterAid London
Belinda Calaguas WaterAid London
Yemisi Ransome-Kuti Nigeria Network of NGOs, Nigeria
Maj Fiil Food & Water Watch, Washington
Molly McCoy ITUC/Global Unions, Washington Office

Scoping study consultants:

Brendan Martin Public World, London
Sue Cavill Public World, London

Appendix 3

Joint statement from Washington workshop, February 26, 2007

March 9, 2007

Water and sanitation for the urban poor: World Bank dialogue with civil society organizations

The World Bank and Freshwater Action Network (FAN) last week took a step forward in their joint efforts to develop systematic dialogue between the Bank and civil society organisations (CSOs) about water and sanitation services for the urban poor. They held a joint workshop at the Bank's Water Week in Washington, D.C., as part of a scoping study to assess the potential for dialogue and identify particular themes and modes for dialogue at global, regional and national levels.

The Bank's 15-strong delegation at the workshop was led by Jamal Saghir, the Bank's Director of Energy, Transport and Water in the recently established Sustainable Development vice-presidency. Welcoming the participants, Mr Saghir stressed the institution's commitment to working with CSOs and other actors to strengthen efforts to bring water and sanitation services to all. World Bank participants also included several water task managers from around the globe, as well as specialists in civil society engagement and communications.

Most of the CSO participants were from the FAN advisory group, who developed the project with the World Bank. The advisory group is made up of CSO representatives from Africa, Asia and Latin America including FAN's regional networks in Africa (ANew), Central America (FAN-CA), Mexico (FAN-Mex) and South America and International NGOs WaterAid and BothEnds. Through its 499 members and associate members, FAN links around 4,000 non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs), both directly and through affiliated regional and national networks. Other CSOs taking part in the workshop included Public Services International, the global union federation representing water utility workers; and the Washington-based Food and Water Watch.

The workshop reviewed the lessons of experience of earlier attempts to sustain information sharing and knowledge development between CSOs and the World Bank in the sector, and explored how dialogue could be carried forward in future. Themes discussed included how to enable the participation of poor people in diagnosing and overcoming the obstacles to provision of services to them; how those services can be financed; and the roles of the public and private sectors and community-based groups in providing them.

Between now and June, when the scoping study will be completed, CSOs and World Bank staff will be invited to propose dialogue activities they believe could enhance their efforts to develop and improve urban water and sanitation services. They will also be consulted about the "rules of the game" and other dialogue process issues, with a view to promoting accountability, inclusiveness, transparency and trust. In addition, the scoping study will attempt to link interested CSO and World Bank parties and assist them by

assessing the feasibility of their proposed activities, and by identifying possible funding sources.

For more information, and to add your voice in the scoping study, please contact Public World, the consultancy appointed by FAN, with World Bank support, to carry it out. You can contact the scoping study team in four ways:

By email: dialogue@publicworld.org

By mail: Dialogue, Public World, 29 Moresby Road, London, E5 9LE, UK

By phone: +44 20 8806 7107

By fax: +44 20 8806 5814