

CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT IN THE WATER SECTOR – A GUIDANCE NOTE

Draft: January 9, 2018

Seema Thomas and Ghazia Aslam

GPSA

1. Introduction

Despite the importance of drinking water for life, a large proportion of world's population lives without access to clean drinking water. Worldwide, 780 million people do not have access to adequate water sources. Almost 800,000 children die from diarrhea each year. Unsafe drinking water, inadequate availability of water for hygiene and lack of access to sanitation together contribute to about 88% of deaths from diarrheal diseases. More than 35% of the world's population lacks access to adequate sanitation. Millions of women and girls, in particular, spend hours a day fetching water (WHO/UNICEF, 2012; US Census Bureau). The Sustainable Development Goals agenda includes a dedicated goal (6) on water and sanitation that sets out to “ensure availability and sanitation for all.” Understandably, the water sector has been the focus of international development interventions globally.

Developing countries are facing issues related to water whether it be accessibility to clean water, depleting water resources, pollution of water sources or conflicts resulting from water resource management despite the huge financial contributions by governments and donors worldwide. In order to solve these issues, historically development practitioners and scholars have focused on technical interventions such as constructing water delivery infrastructure. However, presently there has been a realization that most of these crises are fundamentally attributable to poor governance (Plummer and Slaymaker 2007). While conventional technical knowledge and capacity will continue to be important and necessary, lack of accountability and responsiveness to citizens has been identified as one of the key obstacles to improved service delivery in the water sector (Tropp, 2005).

More recently, practitioners have looked toward citizen engagement and participatory methods and approaches that empower citizens to seek accountability from the government in order to address critical governance challenges in the sector (Velleman 2010; Plummer and Slaymaker, 2007; Ndwa, 2015). In fact, citizens' engagement in different aspects of water governance has become a mainstream discourse in the water sector and is being embraced by local and multinational development organizations across the world (Sultana, 2009). This approach has become especially relevant in the light of World Bank's commitment to increase beneficiary feedback to 100% of WBG-supported projects.

Despite widespread use of CE in the water sector, our understanding of how citizen approaches can be applied in the water sector and how practitioners can best support citizen engagement in water sector remain limited. This note aims to fill this gap by examining selected World Bank projects in the water sector (we limit our analysis to water service delivery). Specifically, we survey the range of CE approaches integrated in the World Bank projects in the water sector and what implementation challenges have been observed in integrating CE in these projects. We also analyze, what lessons can be learned from these experiences. For World Bank projects we examined Project Appraisal Documents (PADs), Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICRs), Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) reports and where available external evaluations of the projects. Wherever

possible, learning from World Bank projects has been supplemented with other donors' and civil society organizations' experience in integrating CE in water delivery operations.

We begin the note by briefly discussing the rationales of integrating CE in development projects in general and in water sector, in particular. We also present a brief history of CE in development practice, and more specifically in the World Bank. After presenting methodology of the note in the third section, fourth section presents the survey of CE approaches used in the water delivery sector. Fifth section identifies some challenges that have been observed in integrating CE approaches in water projects. Sixth section distills some lessons from these experiences. Seventh section concludes.

2. CE – rationales and relevance

Citizen engagement (CE) has existed in a variety of forms globally, ranging from bottom-up approaches to active roles in civic governance (McNeil, 2015). Similarly, many terms exist for citizen engagement; some refer to it as civic engagement or civic participations, and in other instances, it implies something more collective, such as community engagement.

2.1. Historical Perspective

Citizen engagement has followed a long history. Participatory development that sought to engage local populations in development, emerged as a central theme in the 1970s. This prompted a shift from the “top-down, technocrat and economic” approach (Cornwall, 2002) to a more participatory approach spearheaded by James Fulbright in the US Foreign Assistance Act in 1973 (USG, 1973). This act sought to involve beneficiaries in planning and implementation of development projects. Shortly thereafter other bilateral agencies followed suit. This was further underpinned by new urgings from multilaterals, such as the United Nations Economic and Social Council, encouraging governments to “...adopt popular participation as a basic policy measure in national development strategy... [and] encourage the widest possible active participation of all individuals and national non-government organizations in the development process, in setting goals, formulating policies and implementing plans.” To further narrow the field, a perspective focused on the institutions emerged, thereby utilizing inputs from stakeholders of communities in design, notably where the tool used is defined by entities outside the community involved. (Tuft and Thomas, 2009)

Specific to the World Bank Group (WBG), many operations began engaging with multiple types of stakeholders beginning in the 1970s, notably with civil society organizations (CSOs) where these processes were instituted in the 1980s. As an example, in 1982, the Bank established a formal World Bank-NGO Committee for senior management to hold consistent dialogues with leading international CSOs. This prompted a new agenda that included information disclosure, environmental protection, and social development. This dynamic discourse continued, particularly on participatory approaches, through the 1990s ushering in terms such as social inclusion, social accountability and governance and anticorruption in the early 2000s. Influenced by the 2004 World Development Report Making Services Work for Poor People, which detailed the benefits of dialogue with citizens to improve targeting of service delivery, the WBG's Governance and Anti-Corruption Strategy introduced engagement with citizens, and its 2012 Update began addressing concepts of transparency and accountability in conjunction with closer interaction among beneficiaries, the private sector and government. In 2012, spurred by the Arab Spring, the inception of the Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA Board Paper 2012) provided a mechanism for strategic funding and capacity building for civil society organizations (CSOs) to implement social accountability programs in opted-in countries.

Furthermore, as part of the Bank's safeguard policies (WB Operational Policies and Procedures) or performance standards, the WBG continues to require formal engagement with project-affected people and communities. Further harnessing this momentum, InterAction and CIVICUS, two leading international CSO networks, hosted a conference raising the visibility on engaging citizens, thereby encouraging the Bank to move towards a formal commitment of citizen engagement.

Consequently showcased at the 2013 Annual Meetings, current WB President Kim announced the Bank's corporate mandate to increase beneficiary feedback to 100% of WBG-supported projects pointing to the evidence that citizen engagement can help governments achieve improved development results under the right conditions. "The approach to mainstreaming CE in WBG-supported operations is guided by five principles: it is results-focused, it involves engaging throughout the operational cycle, it seeks to strengthen country systems, it is context-specific, and it is gradual."

To date, the primary form of engagement utilizes mandatory consultations through the preparation of Systematic Country Diagnostics, Country Partnership Frameworks, Program-for-Results operations, and investment project financing. A review of World Bank-support projects with Citizen Engagement activities have focused on service delivery, natural resource management, and social inclusion projects. Box 1 provides brief definitions of CE and its related concepts of social accountability and CDD, along with brief understanding of how they are related.

2.2. Relevant definitions

For the purposes of this note, GPSA sought to identify frequently used terms.

The World Bank Group defines "**Citizen engagement** as the two-way interaction between citizens and governments or the private sector within the scope of WBG interventions—policy dialogue, programs, projects, and advisory services and analytics—that gives citizens a stake in decision-making with the objective of improving the intermediate and final development outcomes of the intervention. The spectrum of citizen engagement includes consultation; collaboration and participation; and empowerment. Access to information is a necessary enabling condition, but it typically implies a one-way interaction only. Information-sharing and awareness-raising activities alone, therefore, do not meet the definition of citizen engagement. Closing the feedback loop (i.e., a two-way interaction providing a tangible response to citizen feedback) is required to meet citizens' expectations for change created by their engagement, use their input to facilitate improved development outcomes, and justify the cost of engaging with them (World Bank, 2014). A number of mechanisms exist for engaging with citizens. They broadly include (a) traditional consultation and feedback mechanisms, such as focus groups and satisfaction surveys; (b) participatory mechanisms, such as community scorecards, participatory planning, and budgeting; and (c) citizen-led mechanisms, such as community management or user management committees. In addition, third-party monitoring mechanisms include social audits, citizen report cards, public expenditure tracking surveys, and working with independent monitoring entities such as information commissions, ombudsmen, or supreme audit institutions" (World Bank, 2014).

Likewise, social accountability for the purposes of this note is defined as follows from the GPSA Board Paper as "beneficiary and civil society engagement in monitoring and assessing government performance, particularly in providing feedback on, and voicing demands for, improved service delivery. This kind of engagement—also referred to as **social accountability**—enables beneficiaries and civil society groups to engage with policymakers and service providers to bring about greater accountability for and responsiveness to beneficiary needs" (GPSA Board Paper)

Connecting these two terms together, for the GPSA,

Social accountability – or citizen engagement with policymakers and service providers in monitoring and assessing government performance – provides feedback on and enables citizens to voice demand for improved service delivery, thereby contributing to greater development effectiveness. (Poli, 2014)

Finally, another related term, Community Driven Development (CDD), is frequently used in the discourse of citizen engagement in the water sector. “**Community Driven Development (CDD)** is an approach to local development that gives control over planning decisions and investment resources to community groups (including local governments). CDD programs operate on the principles of transparency, participation, demand-responsiveness, greater downward accountability, and enhanced local capacity. CDD — an approach that gives control of development decisions and resources to community groups — has been a key operational strategy for World Bank programs over the past decade. CDD operations empower communities, deliver cost-effective infrastructure, enhance livelihoods, and improve community dynamics” (World Bank, 2017).

For GPSA, citizen engagement is analogous to an umbrella of a variety of participatory approaches. Social Accountability and Community Driven Development fall under this umbrella by including beneficiary feedback, but may have different purposes. While Citizen Engagement in the World Bank context has a critical role of helping to improve World Bank operations, social accountability focuses on the process with the hopes of improving accountability of government, typically to support reforms in a country. Political Economy Analysis plays a pivotal role in taking account of the *political* nature of accountability processes. (Poli, 2014)

2.3. CE Rationales

Proponents of participatory approaches believe there are many benefits. The World Bank in conjunction with CIDA, USAID, and IRDP studied participatory approaches and found that while these approaches are typically more expensive at the onset, in the long-run costs tends to diminish, while contributing to the sustainability of the project and better addressed local needs.ⁱ

Critics argue that participatory approaches take a significantly longer time and incur much higher costs, particularly if consensus is needed (Poli, 2014). Other critics argue that the participatory processes tend to reinforce societal dynamics and neglect the most marginalized (and vulnerable) groups with respect to gender, disability, class and caste as examples (Aslam, 2014).

Furthermore, if a country has weak formal institutions, “the involvement of citizens, communities and civil society groups [becomes] useful, valuable, and even necessary. Integrating CE mechanisms in development programs help ensure the process is inclusive, effective, accountable, and responds to communities’ priority needs. CE approaches improve targeting of beneficiaries. Citizen engagement can also help identify the most vulnerable and marginalized and enhance their voice. In addition, engaging citizens in the monitoring of development projects, helps improve accountability, and deters fraud and corruption. In contexts where formal accountability systems are weak and sometimes non-existent, CE approaches are key in promoting transparency and hold service providers accountable.

Similarly, citizen feedback and grievance redress mechanisms help provide feedback for course

correction and address implementation issues in a timely manner. Analyzing grievances, particularly those that are unveiling systemic issues, help practitioners in designing better and more effective programs. Recent development literature has emphasized the problem-driven iterative adaptation approach and stresses that effective development programs be flexible that allow for mid-course correction (Aslam, 2014).

CE mechanisms promote citizens' ownership of development interventions, improve accountability, provides transparency and voice in decisions regarding access and distribution of resources, and curb fraud and corruption. CE mechanisms also provide early warning signs to development practitioners and relevant stakeholders when certain risks are escalating or cannot be mitigated. This is especially crucial in development interventions where access and distribution of resources or targeting of beneficiaries is involved" (Aslam, 2014). Overall, citizen engagement is seen to address three fundamental issues: empowerment of citizens, reduction of corruption, and improvement of services (WB, 2017).

The Social Inclusion in Water Program team has a pillar focused on social accountability and citizen engagement. The World Bank's Operations Policy and Country Services guidance note on "How to use citizen engagement in operations" has also attested to the importance of CE in water sector. The note observes that citizen engagement can improve service delivery, by ensuring voice and participation in decisions about services, demanding accountability from providers, and ensuring that service quality and cost are reasonable (WB OPCS, 2017). The note also suggests that CE provides opportunity to women and other excluded groups to participate in the governance process.

In summary, participatory approaches, such as citizen engagement was, is, and continues to be valued, but learning how to embed robust mechanisms continues to remain a challenge. As part of the collaboration between the Water Partnership Program and the Global Partnerships for Social Accountability, this paper seeks to address those concerns in the water sector with an emphasis on World Bank projects.

3. Purpose and methodology of the note

The purpose of this note is to review relevant water operations in order to survey the CE and social accountability approaches that are integrated in the sector and to distil guidance on how best to integrate these approaches. The note also aims to provide guidance to practitioners on what kind of challenges they can anticipate, and provide some pointers on how these challenges can be addressed.

This note supports GPSA's mandate established by the World Bank Board for knowledge generation and dissemination, and institutional strengthening of CSOs." Based on the results of our analysis, GPSA developed a series of recommendations to strengthen the citizen engagement implementation strategy, incorporating good international practices and what has been achieved in other Global Practices. As part of a broader effort, this note seeks to expand the stocktaking of citizen engagement in the water sector, as there is an increasing effort to systematically track and report on results, and draw lessons learned from these activities.

Using the World Bank's Project Portal (database) for all projects with a water componentⁱⁱ, we identified select cases to be examined for this note. As the world's largest multilateral source of

financing for water in developing countries, the World Bank has a portfolio of water investments of US\$35 billion. The Water Global Practice is currently managing a lending portfolio that includes 177 projects totaling US\$24.5 billion, accounting for about 11% of total World Bank lending. In addition, projects with a water sector-related component managed by other Global Practices total US\$10 billion. In the Water GP, all projects incorporate a citizen-oriented design, where a majority (but not all) have a beneficiary feedback indicator, where consultations and GRMs are the most common mechanisms. GRMs and satisfaction surveys provide frequently used indicators.

In terms of the sample evaluated, closed projects above \$30 million USD spanning July 2004 to July 2012 in the subsector of water supply with the theme of participation and civic engagement numbered 44 including projects with additional financing. After further narrowing the project subset by removing the additional financing projects, the final selected projects for review numbered 21.¹ The following features describe the rationale for the identified set of projects:

- **Closed** projects provided detailed information from inception to closure, including evaluations and baseline. ICRs and IEG reports of the completed projects provided the level of detail and reflection from the team which would not have been possible for active projects.
- Projects **above \$30 million** were more substantive bank engagements often with a multi-stakeholder approach excluding additional financing projects.
- The timeframe of **July 2004 to July 2012** reflects the GAC strategy inception to the corporate mandate of citizen engagement.
- The subsector selected was **Water Supply**, which has been one of the key areas addressed in the GPSA portfolio (programmatic and knowledge)

The theme chosen was **Participation and Civic Engagement** given its relevance for the topic of citizen engagement

To examine these projects, we surveyed the Project Appraisal Documents (PADs), Implementation Completion Reports (ICRs), Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) reports and external evaluations where available.

4. Range and rationales of CE approaches in water delivery projects

Citizen engagement approaches in development projects fulfil a number of objectives, as we discussed above. Citizen engagement becomes especially relevant in water sector since, the governance of the water sector is complex, and spills across agencies and different levels of government. Water governance therefore requires increasingly complex governance arrangements that include a large number of stakeholders — users, utilities, private service providers, regulators and executive branches, civil society organizations, and community groups. These multi-tiered relationships and a large number of stakeholders make integrating CE in water delivery projects complex.

One of the most prominent objectives highlighted by the project teams was that CE helps with sustainability of projects in terms of effective implementation of water project, enforcement of regulation and ownership of decisions and outcomes. The idea is that engaging citizens in the project, citizens will feel ownership of the project and will play an active role in the management of water services after the completion of the project, thereby improving sustainability. The process of engagement also develops capacity of communities. If done well, it should empower the community

¹ Out of the 21 projects 7 projects were found to be unrelated to the topic either because they were CDD projects without earmarked funding for water sector or the CE approaches used were not substantial enough. Annex 1 provides a complete list of the projects.

to act as a homogenous self-governed group in the long run reducing their reliance upon the government for funds or services.

For example, ICR of Ghana's Community Based Rural Development (CBRD) project states that CE approaches "enhanced beneficiaries' sense of ownership and involvement in implementation and were therefore integral to achieving the project's development objectives [of increasing access to affordable and reliable piped water supply in targeted urban centers]." Similar reasoning is provided in project documents of Tana and Beles Integrated Water Resources Development Project in Ethiopia and in Peru's National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (PRONASAR), Panama's PASAP project, and India's Utterkhand project. Encouragingly, there is some evidence that such impact exists; the evaluation of PRONASAR program shows that the sustainability of water supply systems rehabilitated through the project increased by 42% compared to non-project areas (IEG).

Citizen engagement includes a range of activities and approaches that are undertaken to varying degrees by different actors, ranging from public consultation to active participation in the design and delivery of projects.

Water user committees:

One of the most common CE approaches used in water delivery sector are establishment of water user committees. These committees are formed to represent the user communities, and their role ranges from preparation of project plans to monitoring program implementation. The establishment of these committees is generally associated with training and capacity building. The capacity building focuses on several skills including bookkeeping, assessment of public services, and communication.

In Punjab, India, for example as part of the Punjab Rural Water and Sanitation Sector Improvement Project, the water and sanitation committees take the responsibility for program implementation and monitor sustainability of operations after the implementation of a project is over. In Ethiopia as part of Tana and Beles Integrated Water Resources Development Project, watershed committees were established and strengthened to prepare comprehensive watershed development plans, which were then implemented with community-based planning and participation. Also in Uttarkhand Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project, water user and sanitation committees were established for each supply scheme and for each village consisting of beneficiaries of the scheme. These committees were responsible for scheme planning, designing, procurement, construction, O&M, tariff fixation and revision, community contributions (capital and O&M), accounts management, and auditing. Similar approaches are observed in PRONASAR project in Peru, CBRDP project in Ghana and in PASAP project in Panama.

Water user committees are also one of the most used CE approach in water sector in global context. Oxfam, for example, has established water user committees in many contexts including in Pakistan, Nepal and Kenya. In some cases, these committees have also included stakeholders in addition to beneficiaries; they bring users, beneficiaries, local authorities and local service providers together. For example, Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) have supported the development of such multi-stakeholder groups in Kumasi in Ghana and Maputo in Mozambique. The establishment of such multi-stakeholder groups encourages building strong relationship among all stakeholders and has ensured that the stakeholders will be able to carry on working together once the program finishes (WSUP, 2013).

Consultations:

Several projects carried out consultations with direct beneficiaries to decide on the levels of service provided, institutional arrangements of water service provision and arrangement for water service governance and operation and maintenance. PRONASAR project in Peru is a good example of comprehensive consultations. In this project, consultations were part of the intervention methodology for each subproject beginning at the pre-implementation stage. The initial consultations also helped identify communities that were unwillingness to participate in the project, thereby helping to improve the sustainability of the project.

Morocco's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project also provides an informative example of how consultations can be structured. The project established Social Mobilization Teams (SMT) to carry out the consultations. Once the selection of where a sub-project is to be located is decided by the government and local stakeholders (local authorities and elected representatives), SMTs started their work in respective communities. In the first phase, SMTs informed the community about the requirements for accessing the project and technical options. In the second step, SMTs carried out a diagnostic to establish an accurate socio-economic baseline for the implementation of the project and to explore the best methods for the management of the water systems. They also helped communities manage the water systems and provided them with the relevant training.

Information, Education, and Communication (IEC):

IEC campaigns aimed at disseminating information about the project, rules of engagement, and benefits of improved water supply is another CE approach used in water sector projects. These information campaigns also aimed to generate demand for water and sanitation services, encourage behavior change, and to gather the appropriate support for the project. India Uttarkhand Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project and The Punjab Rural Water and Sanitation Sector Improvement Project of India are examples of projects that utilized IEC approaches to engage citizens.

Beneficiary Feedback Survey

Many projects carried out beneficiary feedback surveys. However, these surveys spanned a wide range of methodologies and rigor. The overall objective of the surveys was to evaluate the impacts of the project as stated in the PDO and assess the tangible changes as the result of the respective project. In Ethiopia, Tana and Beles Integrated Water Resource Development Project collected both qualitative and quantitative data before and after the implementation of the project. Uttarkhand Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project implemented several third-party surveys. Similar baseline, mid-line and end-line surveys were conducted as part of the project monitoring and evaluation of the project in Punjab, India. Other projects that employed these surveys included Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project in Morocco and Urban Water Project in Ghana.

Other CE approaches

Other CE approaches employed by these projects included Grievance Redress Mechanism and Complaints Handling mechanism. Only one project -- The Punjab Rural Water and Sanitation Sector Improvement Project -- established a GRM system that allows users of services to launch complaints.

Some CE approaches, observed at the global scale but not in the World Bank projects (at least in the sample of our study) in the water supply sectors include community score cards (CSC) and citizen report cards (CRC). Generally, these mechanisms solicit beneficiaries' feedback about the quality of

service provision, which is then compiled and disseminated to all stakeholders usually with the facilitation of a CSO. These methods, therefore, create a yardstick which is visible and objective, and provides an opportunity for citizens to present their case for service improvement to service providers based on evidence. Water Aid, for example, has used community score cards in Ghana, Nigeria and Bangladesh. Simavi has implemented citizen report cards in Kenya and India.

Budget tracking, monitoring and advocacy is another approach that has been used widely in the water sector outside the World Bank. The objective of these approaches is to enable citizens to have a voice in budgetary decisions and make the state accountable to its citizens in the utilization of the budget. CSOs generally undertake the process of budget literacy – training citizens to become aware of the processes involved in a complete budget cycle including formulation, enactment, execution and audit. They also engage in budget advocacy to ensure that enough budget is allocated to WASH services. Simavi has implemented this approach in Bangladesh where it also established “Budget Monitoring Clubs” where community members gather to discuss these issues. The Association of Water and Sanitation Boards in Ghana and Women’s Empowerment in Nigeria have also used budget tracking to monitor whether funds allocated by national governments to their districts and regions were actually received.

Challenges in implementation

Difficulty of tailoring CE approaches to the context

Implementing citizen engagement approaches is not straight forward even after entry points have been determined and approaches have been defined. This complexity arises, in part, from the need to tailor these interventions to context as well as from differences in contexts that require different implementation strategies. In many cases, it was observed that project teams faced significant challenges in implementing the CE approaches; CE approaches were not implemented as envisaged at the project preparation phase either because the demands of the contexts were not anticipated or the project cycle did not allow for adaptation as the project progressed.

PASAP project in Panama is an example that represents this challenge. One of the CE approaches that the project used was capacity building of water boards. The ICR of the project found that the training course developed for the capacity building of water boards was not customized on educational and socio-economic backgrounds of the participants and that many communities did not receive the training needed to integrate the lessons into their operating structures. Recognizing the weaknesses of this approach, the Project financed additional social consultants and provided additional social support to the communities. This additional support, however, was not applied systematically; some communities received more support than others, and some communities had not received adequate training. Thus, at the completion of the project, water boards were not adequately performing their function of operation and maintenance or transferring knowledge to incoming water boards, as the design of the project envisaged.

A similar situation was observed in Morocco. In the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project, Social Mobilization Teams (SMTs) were established and trained to carry out consultations with the community. In the first phase, SMTs were to inform the community about the requirements for accessing the project, and technical options. In the second step, SMTs were to carry out a diagnostic to establish an accurate socio-economic baseline for the implementation of the project and to explore the best methods for the management of the water systems. This diagnosis became the basis of the

water governance plan for the local communities. The implementation of these activities did not go as envisaged. First, works in the initial subprojects started before the SMTs were in place; in some places, consultations took place after the construction of the sub-project had already begun. Second, the time spent on each village/subproject was not adequate to ensure communities' full ownership of systems. The primary constraint was the availability of resources. SMTs were being supported by the Technical Assistance (TA) budget did not allow enough time and resources to be spent in communities as would have been desirable.

Lack of capacities

Another challenge for integrating CE approaches in water projects is related to lack of capacities of various stakeholders. Effective implementation of CE approaches often requires capable civil society or community based organizations, strong administrative structures and competent implementing agencies.

In many contexts, effective implementation of CE approaches was hampered by the lack of capable civil society. The capacities of civil society that are important for CE approaches include technical and analytical capacities but also organizational and political capacities that can mobilize citizens and build alliances across society and state-society boundaries (Grandvionnet et al., 2015). For example, in Punjab Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project, ICR pointed out the lack of civil society that could effectively implement community mobilization for the establishment of water and sanitation committees. In addition to the lack of experience, poor performance was exacerbated by their adversarial relationship with the Department of Water Supply and Sanitation (DWSS). Similar issues were highlighted by the IEG report on Peru's PRONASAR project.

In the same vein, in some projects the capacity of the government administrative structures was found to be inadequate in some projects. Local governments can be critical to the success and sustainability of participatory local development efforts. They are needed to support operation and maintenance of services, and for continuing support of community groups.

In Peru's PRONASAR project, the lack of capacity of the implementing agency National Fund for Social Compensation and Development (FONCODES) to efficiently transfer funds to local governments and executing small works in rural areas led to severe project delays and hampered the effectiveness of the project. In addition, because of the lack of capacity, FONCODES was also not able to add the social mobilization and support as had been anticipated. Similarly, in Ghana, weak local government had a debilitating impact on the maintenance of the sub-projects (Adusei-Asante and Hancock, 2016).

Disassociation of community with the process:

One of the preconditions for successful CE approaches is that citizens are motivated to engage in the process. If citizens are not willing or able to be involved in the governance development process, the CE approaches become futile. In many of the programs, this was found to be the case. In Peru, IEG report on PRONSAR project found that citizens were not highly motivated and willing to engage. There was a frequent turnover of members of water boards and abandonment of duties. Similarly, Adusei-Asante, 2015) found in their case study of Abaase town in Ghana found that communities were not very involved in the engagement process within the CBRD project, and that disassociation tended to impact negatively on local organizing initiatives. While the size of Abaase was small enough to allow for face-to-face interaction on local development issues, the residents tended to place more

emphasis on religious interactions than meeting as a community. Jenkins (2016) also found lack of citizens' willingness to engage to be a debilitating factor in citizen engagement approaches in her study of Ghana.

There are many factors that lead to this seeming disassociation. There is evidence that citizens do want to engage in planning and monitoring of water governance (for example, see Harris et al., 2017 in case of South Africa and Ghana), they are constrained by contextual factors or are discouraged by their previous negative experiences of interaction with government, donors and CSOs. In case of Ghana's CBRD project, Adusi-Asante (2015) suggests that the community's experience with a previous failed project in 2002 and the resulting mistrust in the local leaders may have contributed to the community's disassociation. Jenkins (2016) also suggests that disillusionment with government, unresponsiveness and an overall governance system which silences the voice of those most in need led to disassociation of citizens. WSUP (2013) also suggest that citizens decide not to engage as they perceive these engagement processes to be symbolic rather than real or meaningful.

Another limiting factor is the consultation fatigue and the lack of clarity on CE inputs will be used in decision making and implementation. Unless stakeholders understand why they should engage and unless the process of engagement directly addresses their interests, it will be unlikely that they will engage or know why they should engage (Lotz and Sisitka, 2006). Lack of citizens' agency that different individuals can exert within context also affects their ability to engage (Hickey, 2010). Lotz-Sisitka and Burt (2006) suggest that there has been a strong emphasis on creating participatory structures in water sector, but they have not been supported by a complementary development of human capacity. In other words, they emphasize citizens have not been able to make use of the participatory structure because of lack of agency and capacity.

Social structures of communities may also restrict engagement of communities. Intra-society relationships – field of power relationships that shape social interactions – are relevant in understanding some of the barriers that prevent people from participating effectively in CE mechanisms (Grandvoinet et al., 2015). Pre-existing inequalities hamper the ability of marginalized groups to engage. Sometimes communities are not homogenous and can be transient due to frequent migration; this affects their ability to coordinate collective action, which in turn negatively impacts their ability and willingness to engage. Other limiting factors include lack of time (Clever, 2004), lack of trust or confidence in local service providers or local authorities and resistance to behavior change (WSUP, 2013).

The barriers to citizens' willingness to engage are even more severe in urban and peri-urban communities, as Jenkins (2016) reports, community management and norms that encourage citizens to engage in collective activities in rural areas become weaker with the drive toward modernity in a typical peri-urban and urban communities.

Local power dynamics and reinforcement of existing inequalities

In many projects issues of elite capture were observed. Local communities do not necessarily function as homogeneous entities but are organized along political and socio-cultural lines, that translate into citizen engagement activities. In some cases, wealthy and well-connected residents used their positions in community associations for their own interests. As Mansuri and Roa (2013)'s review of participatory approaches highlights that on average participants in community based development activities tend to be wealthier, more educated, of higher social status and better connected politically. These elite, in

some cases, also play a role in blocking engagement of marginalized citizens. There is a large literature that explores how elite capture and its consequences can close the space for citizen engagement rather than open it. (For example, see:____). Power relations and the ensuing capture of engagement structures by powerful actors has been identified as a major barrier to greater integration of community members in water user committees (Jenkins, 2016).

In analyzed World Bank cases, CBRDP project in Ghana presents a good example of how elite capture can debilitate the process of citizen engagement, where local traditional leaders seemed to have captured the engagement process. Adusei-Asante and Hancock (2012) report that if people expressed dissent with local leaders at meetings, they were persecuted afterwards. In a mixed-gender focus group discussion with some Abaase traders, a young man explained that: “The chief and his elders chair the meetings so you must be careful the way you talk ... during meetings you might offend someone and this would bring problems. I would rather stay at home and work instead of going for meetings.” (Adusei-Asante and Hancock 2012).

Limited sustainability of projects

Limited sustainability of the projects is another challenge, and it has been associated with the inability of water user committees to fulfill their function of management of water sources. Water user committees, as discussed above, are one of the most prevalent vehicle for citizen engagement in water sector. They were observed in Peru, Ghana, India, Ethiopia and Morocco. These committees, in addition to participating in decision-making, are also mandated to manage, operate and maintain water resources. Members of these committees are empowered through training on their roles and responsibilities such as promoting good practices, the operation and maintenance of water source, gender inclusion, how to collect funds for the services, book-keeping and monitoring the facilities.

In many cases, however, where assessments were done after the end of the project, it was found that after the conclusion of the project these committees functioned poorly; communities and sometimes members of the committees did not follow through with their responsibilities and were not able to raise funds to maintain the service. This trend is not unique to World Bank projects. Other donors, practitioners and scholars have also observed the issue of sustainability with water user and management committees. For example, see Baumann 2006; Hutchings et al., 2015; Kleemeir, 2000; Schouten and Morianty, 2003; WaterAid, 2011). In Uganda, Terry et al., (2015) found that in one district water user committees were faced with abuse and physical attack from community members when attempting to collect funds and most community members refused to contribute to the funds.

Several reasons have been attributed to the lack of sustainability including limited capacities of committees in terms of skills and material resources, and lack of knowledge of rights and responsibilities within the committees and the wider communities. Another important factor that complicates the function of committee is that sometimes the task of maintenance and collection of funds becomes politicized and complex, way beyond the purview of the committees (Terry et al., 2015).²

² However, there are some encouraging examples of projects where the committees could function effectively to sustain water projects at the community level. Bakalian and Wakeman (2009) evaluated the program SANBASUR. The program provides basic water and sanitation services, stressing training for village water committees, hygiene education, and system construction, and strengthens the institutional capacity of municipal districts, village water committees, and their counterparts. The evaluation found that a surprising number of sampled communities had been delivering water on a consistent basis over moderate to even longer periods (10–15 years) without post-completion support. Many systems broke down, yet communities had often been able to mobilize their resources to get the systems running again

Gendered aspect of water service delivery

A large and growing body of literature suggests that women and men often have differentiated relationships to water access, uses, knowledges, governance, and experiences (Harris et al., 2017). Women are often primarily responsible for water provision, especially for domestic needs (e.g. cleaning, cooking), and that this results in differentiated uses of water, as well as gender differentiated effects when water quality or access is compromised.

What complicates the issue is that even though women are affected to a greater degree by lack of water resources, they tend to participate less than men in water governance. Additionally, the character of the participation is often qualitatively different where men's opinions are given more weight than women's. Therefore, it has been highlighted throughout in the literature as well as in some of the projects we analyzed that we need to explicitly integrate the gendered aspects of water access, uses and conditions.

Lessons learned for design and policy of CE approaches

This section focuses on lessons learned not just from the review of the World Bank projects but also from the experiences of CE and participatory approaches worldwide in water and other sectors (where these lessons seemed relevant to the water sector). These lessons provide guidance not only for overall policy and programmatic approach but also more specifically about the design of the CE approaches.

Understand and address local power dynamics to reduce the likelihood of elite capture

While one of the goals of integrating CE in service delivery is to reduce power asymmetries and to enable more equitable forms of governance, engagement does not always lead to a balance of power. Participation can entrench existing power relationships by encapsulating the social and political inequalities found in communities within the CE structures. As we mentioned above, elite capture can negate the positive impacts of CE. Therefore, for a successful CE initiative it is essential that these inequalities and power dynamics are addressed appropriately.

Even when elite capture of engagement is not overt, there is still a need to get beyond the "loud voices" (Saferworld 2008) which may dominate participatory fora and limit participation by more vulnerable, impoverished or less educated community members (Barron 2009, King et al 2010). King et al (2010) and Barron (2009) both cite examples of participatory fora which appeared inclusive but where a much smaller group of participants actually participated during meetings or in substantive decision-making. Often these centered around natural elites such as local politicians, civil servants and better educated members such as nurses or school principals (McNeil and Mumvuma, 2006; Saferworld 2008).

A comprehensive background and stakeholder analysis is a stepping stone to understand how the water sector is organized in terms of functions and responsibilities, how different stakeholders are related to each other, what role they play and the influence they can have over water policies and project processes. It is important to understand these issues and see beyond the traditional and at times superficial picture. The analysis should also explore relationships across different groups, their relationship with each other and with the state officials. An important aspect of such analysis should be to understand how things can go wrong and how the program design can be altered should this

happen. This is especially true in fragile and conflict-affected contexts where fractured relationships often lie at the heart of the conflict, and are in constant flux.

An assessment of CBRD project in Ghana suggests that the project design failed to identify one of the most influential stakeholder – Traditional Chieftaincy establishment while focusing on the local government sub-structures. Adusei-Asante and Hancock (2012) explain that a complex socio-cultural system in rural Ghana drew heavily on the influence of Traditional Chiefs to provide the cohesion, support and social capital required in development programs. Failing to formally involve Chiefs in the engagement process led to suspicion about the program in Chiefs' perception; they tended to view CBRD as a threat to their authority, resulting in sub-par performance of the project (Adusei-Asante and Hancock, 2012).

The process of background analysis can therefore guide practitioners in identifying vulnerable and marginalized groups of citizens. This knowledge helps them to tailor CE approaches to the needs of different sub-groups, thereby helping to neutralize the impact of elite capture (McGee and Kroeschell, 2013), recognizing that hidden power relations and reasons for exclusion may be based on many factors – age, class, cultural beliefs, ethnicity, political affiliation and health status. World Bank (2007) suggests that, to prevent elite capture, information on any social accountability project should be “plentiful, transparent and widely shared”. In addition, external facilitators can be used to monitor the program. Social mobilization, discussed in the later section, also helps ameliorate capture of CE fora by powerful interests.

Allow for adaptive learning with a constant feedback loop within the project

One lesson that was evident in almost all projects was that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to understand or establish ‘best practice’ for CE in water sector because of how it responds to multitude of contextual factors. CE approaches sometimes themselves shape the context over time in complex and unintended ways. CE approaches, therefore, need to be tailored to specific interplay of a range of different factors that influence and shape engagement process and the quality of opportunities for participation in each setting. This observation leads, therefore, to an important lesson: integration of CE approaches in water sector requires an adaptive approach through learning by doing (Poli, 2015). The process should allow for each intervention to take advantage of what was learned in the design and implementation of earlier intervention. An adaptive approach is even more important in fragile and conflict-affected contexts where the contexts is rapidly changing.

Projects and integration of CE approaches must be designed in a way that allows such adaptive learning to happen. Task teams realized that the World Bank’s customary design and implementation of projects may not allow repeated adjustments, discouraging adaptive learning. There were some instances where teams tried to adapt the program design to the changing context, but such adaptations were few and far between or not timely and systematic.

Adaptive learning can also allow projects to be tailored more closely to the local context, taking account of, and valuing local knowledge. This approach will be better able to accommodate local cultures and practices rather than establishing competing engagement and accountability mechanisms.

Focus on social mobilization activities

Development practitioners and scholars have increasingly argued that the main bottleneck to citizen engagement is not information asymmetry but the low or absent social mobilization of citizens to act

on what they see and know (Khemani 2014). Social mobilization is a process that engages and motivates citizens, government officials and other concerned groups to act to solve a problem, and to harness collective abilities of the communities to accomplish tasks. Information about or existence of a committee does not necessarily spur citizen or state action; some sort of mobilization of these stakeholders is often necessary to trigger and facilitate citizen voice, especially for vulnerable or marginalized individuals and groups. This wisdom is also true for water sector; mobilization of all related stakeholders on improving and sustaining water resources and delivery is essential for effectiveness and sustainability of CE interventions. These stakeholders include citizens, citizen groups, local leaders, service providers and local government officials.

In order to engage citizens, practitioners should be clear about the intention for convening citizens and design engagement in a way that envisions a clear path leading from engagement to the satisfaction of that intention. It is important to design participation in ways that its outcomes are meaningful to participants. Frustrations, cynicism, or apathy can be the result of a poorly designed public engagement process in which participants' hopes for learning, working or accomplishing some goal are disappointed by a process that is futile.

Many projects in their ICR or in IEG reports pointed out the need to focus on these activities. For example, PASAP in Panama generated the lesson that social mobilization to encourage citizens to engage in the water governance process needs to be done from the very beginning and at every stage of the project. Sufficient time should be allocated to the social mobilization phase prior to design to ensure that citizens understand the pros and cons of the project, and their responsibilities. Most importantly, these activities can help gauge their willingness to engage. The project also highlights the importance of tailoring such efforts to each community's needs of adapting to the evolution of their needs throughout implementation. Successful social mobilization will also help ensure sustainability after the project is over by keeping the citizens engaged in maintaining water resources over the long term.

An assessment of CBRD program in Ghana has also led to the same lesson – the program implementers need to make an effort to build and mobilize communities upon which to base the project (Adusei-Asante, 2015). When citizens in a locality do not have shared interests and goals, they are not able to coordinate action. Efforts for citizen engagement need to build these traits for CE endeavors to be successful.

Back support to community management committees

A specific lesson that arises from our analysis concerns the community management committees. As mentioned above, one of the primary reasons of establishing these management committees is to improve sustainability of water projects and infrastructure. There is reason to believe that involving communities in managing ongoing delivery of water services can lead to longer lasting access to water services, for example through fewer system breakdowns, continued maintenance and ownership and protection of services. Yet, it was found that several projects these committees had stopped working after the project was over, as we discussed above.

Many projects' ICR or assessments suggested that these communities need to be supported (by governments, NGOs or other partners) or incentivized to perform the operational and maintained function after the project has ended to ensure sustainability goals. The lack of sustainability and non-participation of these committees in these tasks has been attributed to the lack of such support and

incentives. In Peru, IEG report suggested that voluntary, rather than contractual, and unpaid nature of water board did not offer any incentives for it to function in a cohesive purposeful manner and could be the main reason of communities' incentive. The report concludes "to ensure sustainability, there needs to be provision for training, a contractual arrangement of accountability, and compensation [to water management committees]" (IEG, 2006). Conversely, in India, the World Bank project team, attributed in the ICR that post-project back-support provided to the community through state government's nodal agency Uttarkhand Jal Sansthan (UJS) that was built into the project design contributed to the sustainability of the project impact.

Other organizations are also increasingly acknowledging that sustainability of services can only be achieved through ongoing support to the communities by external bodies. Community management in the absence of continued external (post construction) support is bound to fail (Baumann 2006; Hutchings et al. 2015; Kleemeier 2000; Schouten and Morianty 2003). On the ground it has stimulated actors (see e.g. WaterAid 2011) to move towards 'community management plus' approaches (Baumann 2006; Hutchings et al. 2015) involving backstopping by governments, NGOs and the private sector in terms of technical assistance, managerial advice, and recurrent cost sharing.

Concluding remarks

Following points to be highlighted in concluding remarks:

- There are many different forms of engagement – consultations (most basic) to partnership in implementation and monitoring.
- Attention to many details e.g. conducting a stakeholder analysis may seem time-consuming and a 'waste of time' to more technically-orientated managers, but it cannot be ignored if the ultimate objective of sustainability is to be achieved.
- CE is very much used instrumentally in the projects (e.g. for the purpose of sustainability) as one reason to compensate for the lack of funding for operation and maintenance. While ownership of the water service is expected as an objective, none of the outcomes expected in any program documents linked to empowerment.
- Integrating CE requires funding, staff and other resources. Many program documents hinted that such support, specifically for CE, was hard to come by.
- In addition to more resources, other changes in how projects are designed are also warranted. Some documents suggested that a social development specialist should be part of the team to be able to integrate CE effectively and that "technical and social teams should coordinate very closely" throughout the program cycle so that citizens' needs and requests can be integrated more comprehensively in the project design (Morroco, ICR).

CE in Water – References

- Adusei-Asante, K., & Hancock, P. (2016). Addressing aid externalities: A study of the World Bank's community-based projects in Ghana.
- Adusei-Asante, K. (2015). A Community-Based Program in a Non-Existent Community. *African Studies Quarterly*, 15(2), 69.
- Adusei-Asante, K., & Hancock, P. (2012). Theories in Community-Driven Development Operations: A Case Study of Ghana Local Government System. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(5), 83-98.
- Aslam, Ghazia. "Citizen Engagement in fragile and conflict-affected contexts in the Middle East and North Africa", 2014.
- Baumann E. (2005) Common RWSN Context, Discussion Paper, St. Gallen, SKAT/RWSN
- Cleaver, F. (2004). The social embeddedness of agency and decision-making. In Hickey, S and Mohan, G. (ed.) *Participation--From Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*, Chapter 17
- Cornwall, A. (2002) 'Beneficiary, Consumer, Citizen: Perspectives on Participation for Poverty Reduction.' *Sida Studies*, pp 11.
- Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) Board Paper, World Bank Group, 2012.
- Government. Of United States of America. S. 1443 (93rd): Foreign Assistance Act of 1973.
- Hickey, S. (2010). The government of chronic poverty: from exclusion to citizenship?. *The journal of development studies*, 46(7), 1139-1155.
- Hutchings P, Chan MY, Cuadrado L, Ezbakhe F, Mesa B, Tamekawa C, Franceys F (2015) A systematic review of success factors in the community management of rural water supplies over the past 30 years. *Water Policy* 17:963–983
- Jennings, R. (2000). 'Participatory Development as New Paradigm: The Transition of Development Professionalism'. Community Based Reintegration and Rehabilitation in Post-Conflict Settings Conference. pp 3.
- Jenkins, S. (2016). Come together, right now, over what?: an analysis of the processes of democratization and participatory governance of water and sanitation services in Dodowa, Ghana. *Master Thesis Series in Environmental Studies and Sustainability Science*. [LUCSUS \(Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies\)](#)
- Khemani, S. 2014. "Transparency, Citizen Engagement, and the Politics of Development." Concept Note for a policy research report on governance, World Bank, Development Research Group,

Washington, DC.

Kleemeier E (2000) The impact of participation on sustainability: an analysis of the Malawi rural piped scheme program. *World Dev* 28(5):929–944

Lotz-Sisitka, H., & Burt, J. (2006). *A critical review of participatory practice in integrated water resource management*. Pretoria: Water Research Commission. Pretoria, South Africa

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). Can participation be induced? some evidence from developing countries 1. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 16(2), 284-304.

McGee, R., & Kroeschell, C. (2013). Local accountabilities in fragile contexts: experiences from Nepal, Bangladesh and Mozambique. *IDS Working Papers*, 2013(422), 1-41.

McNeil, Mary. Citizen Engagement: History and Definitions, Week 1: Video transcript, Governance Global Practice, World Bank Group, 2015.

McNeil and Mumvuma (2006). Demanding good governance. A stocktaking of social accountability initiatives by civil society in Anglophone Africa. Washington DC: World Bank; 2006

Poli, Maria et al. “Are We Ready for Strategic Social Accountability?” GPSA Dissemination Notes 2014.

Poli, Maria et al. “Adaptive Learning” GPSA Dissemination Note, 2014.

Poli, Maria, et al. “What next for Strategic Social Accountability?” GPSA Dissemination Notes. 2014.

Plummer, J., & Slaymaker, T. (2007). *Rethinking governance in water services*. Overseas Development Institute.

Ndaw, M. F. (2015). Unlocking the Potential of Information Communications Technology to Improve Water and Sanitation Services.

Saferworld. 2008. “Water and Conflict: Making Water Delivery Conflict-Sensitive in Uganda.” Saferworld, London, August.

Schouten T, Morianty P (2003) Community water, community management. IRC, Delft, ITDG Publishers, London, From System to Service in Rural Areas.

Sultana, F. (2009). Community and participation in water resources management: gendering and naturing development debates from Bangladesh. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34(3), 346-363.

Terry, A., McLaughlin, O., & Kazooba, F. (2015). Improving the effectiveness of Ugandan water user committees. *Development in Practice*, 25(5), 715-727.

Tropp, H. (2005). Developing water governance capacities. *Feature Article. UNDP Water Governance Facility/SIWI, Stockholm.*

Tufte, Mefalopulos, Thomas, Paolo (2009). Participatory communication a practical guide. Washington, DC: World Bank. p. 4. ISBN 978-0-8213-8010-9.

Velleman, Y. (2010) Social Accountability. Tools and Mechanisms for Improved Urban Water Services, Discussion Paper, London: WaterAid.

WaterAid (2011) Sustainability Framework.

World Bank (2006) CDD in the context of conflict-affected countries: challenges and opportunities” Social Development Department, World Bank, Washington, DC

World Bank Operational Policies and Procedures: Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies, April 5, 2017

World Bank Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations, 2014.

World Bank’s Operations Policy & Country Services. How to use citizen engagement in operations. October 4, 2017.

World Bank: ABCs of IDA—Community Approach to Development, 2017.
<https://ida.worldbank.org/results/abcs/taking-community-approach-development>

WSUP (Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor) (2013) “Getting communities engaged in water and sanitation projects: participatory design and consumer feedback” Topic Brief #007, WSUP, London

Grandvoininnet, H., Aslam, G., & Raha, S. (2015). *Opening the black box: The contextual drivers of social accountability.* World Bank Publications.

Project Template for Assessment

Country:

1.Summary	
2.Governance context	
3. Main project	
Name	
Project objective	
Project duration	
Project design	
4.CE	
Type of initiative	
Objective of integrating CE	
Brief description of CE initiatives	
Notes about implementation of CE (How well were CE instruments implemented)	
5. Results: Achievement of program objective	

6. Results: service delivery outcomes
7. Results for vulnerable groups
8. Explanations for impact/lack of impact - contextual issues
8. Main explanations for impact/lack of impact - design issues
9. Lessons learned about CE
9. Source documents
