



*Developing effective
relationships for
sustainability*

Partnerships
in Practice

WASH in Schools - Understanding Multi-Sector Partnership Approaches: an Exploratory Review

Research Paper

**Tiberghien J-E.¹, Dunaiski M.², Fouché M.², Geyer T²,
Kovacs R², Moraud A.²**

¹ PhD, Programme Manager at Partnerships in Practice

² Master student at PSIA Sciences-Po Paris

September 2015



Credit Photo: Binesh Roy WaterAid Nepal

Abstract

Recent decades have seen a growing mobilization of the international community to fill the gap in the provision of water, sanitation and hygiene services in schools (WinS). WinS programmes involving multi-sector partnerships (MSP) are increasingly being implemented at national or regional levels in a number of African, Asian and Latin American countries. Whilst information regarding the nature of WinS work, including best practices, is well documented and easily accessible, there is a gap of knowledge on the various institutional arrangements delivering these programmes. Correspondingly, WinS experts and practitioners lack guidance tools for the analysis and formative assessment of their partnerships. This paper presents an attempt

towards developing a typology of WinS partnerships, which shall help practitioners step back from programme implementation to assess key characteristics of their partnerships, improve their design and enhance the sustainability of their interventions. This first exploratory review provides a description and analysis of the WinS partnerships involving NGO partners and directly implementing activities on the ground. It provides insights into the institutional and programmatic trends characterizing the historical evolutions of these partnerships, assesses their common strengths and reviews the challenges they face during implementation, notably in terms of partnership dynamics.

Acknowledgments:

The authors wish to thank Annemarieke Mooijman, Elynn Walter (WASH Advocates), Sue Cavill (WaterAid), as well as Tracey Keatman and Ken Caplan (Partnerships in Practice) for their support in designing the analytical framework.

1. Introduction

1.1. WASH in School (WinS)

Throughout the developing world, water supply and sanitation facilities in schools are often non-existent or poorly maintained and students largely fail to practice basic hygiene behaviors (UNICEF and WSSC 2003). However, for the first time, more than half of schools in the poorest countries have access to water and sanitation facilities (UNICEF 2013). Recent decades have seen a growing mobilization of the international community to meet the gap in the provision of water, sanitation and hygiene services in schools (WinS). The increasingly coordinated and effective advocacy work, targeting key institutions at the national level (e.g. Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health), has resulted in greater financial resources being channeled towards WinS work (WASH Advocates 2015, UNESCO UNICEF WHO The World Bank 2005).

In many developing countries, such as Zambia, Indonesia, The Philippines Honduras or Guatemala WinS is appearing in national-level dialogues and gaining greater importance on the political agenda (WASHAdvocates 2013, UNICEF 2012). WinS programmes involving multi-sector partnerships (MSP) are increasingly being implemented at national or regional levels in a number of African, Asian and Latin American countries. Partners usually include international donor organizations and international and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working hand in hand with central- and district-level government representatives, as well as local communities (UNICEF 2012, IRC 2007).

1.2. Examining WinS partnerships

The nature of WinS partnerships has evolved significantly during the past two decades. They now take various forms (e.g. alliances, networks, and partnerships of varied scales and lifespans) and focus on different aspects of WinS interventions (e.g. advocacy, handwashing with soap, access to WASH facilities). Formal research used to focus primarily on the impact of WinS work (Freeman et al. 2013, Joshi and Amadi 2013, Greene et al. 2012, Bowen et al. 2007). Yet, the chronic difficulties faced by schools to sustain the benefits of WinS programmes in the long-run is

triggering increasing efforts to better understand the conditions for sustainability (SWASH+ 2012, Alexander and Dreibelbis 2012, Saboori et al. 2011, 2010). Such sustainability challenges clearly call for deeper formative analyses of WinS interventions leading to improved approaches and more sustainable WinS service delivery. However, they also require research examining the partnerships implementing these WinS interventions. Whilst information regarding the nature of WinS work (i.e. rationale, state-of-the-art approaches) is well documented and easily accessible, there is a corresponding gap of knowledge on the various institutional arrangements delivering these programmes.

1.3. Project Aim and Objectives

The aim of this exploratory research is to lay the foundation for the development of a typology of WinS partnerships, which shall help WinS practitioners assess key characteristics of their partnerships, improve their design and enhance the sustainability of their interventions in different contexts. The objectives of this project are threefold:

- **To draw up an inventory of WinS partnerships, characterizing partnership forms**
- **To conduct an historical review of WinS partnerships, tracking key evolutions**
- **To undertake the diagnosis of WinS partnerships: assessing their strengths and challenges**

2. Methodology

2.1. Research boundaries

In this research, partnerships are defined as: “collaborative and temporary arrangements involving two or more organizations with the purpose of (1) addressing particular issues or deliver specified tasks that a single organization cannot accomplish on its own as effectively as with another organization; (2) whereby individual organizations cannot purchase the appropriate resources or competencies solely through a market transaction; (3) with the ultimate aim of institutionalizing and mainstreaming new

mechanisms and practices that then make the partnership no longer necessary.”¹

Different kinds of partnerships (e.g. coalitions, networks, public-private partnerships (PPPs) and other multi-sector partnerships (MSPs)) are active in the WinS subsector. Also, much WinS work is led by the government independently from such partnerships. As a result, the thematic area of this research is potentially very broad. **To keep the scope of this exploratory research manageable, focus was put on the MSPs which involve NGO partners and directly implement activities on the ground.** Preliminary consultations with key informants in the subsector suggested that these partnerships are likely to be particularly interested in and responsive to the results expected from this research. The WinS partnerships analyzed under this project thus typically bring together:

1. The public sector, including the local government, the Ministry of Education (MoE) and the Ministry of Health (MoH)²
2. Civil society organisations, including NGOs (international, national, local) and CBOs such as Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA), women’s groups and faith-based groups,
3. Donor agencies (bilateral, multilateral)
4. The private sector, including private companies and foundations
5. Research institutions

2.2. Approach

The project is based on a standard qualitative research approach. Information was collected via two channels: a literature review of the academic and grey literature (see the list of sources consulted and keywords used for searching in Annex 1), as well as a series of semi-structured interviews conducted with a panel of WinS practitioners. These conversations were guided by the use of an analytical framework (see Annex 2), which was reviewed by three international WinS experts.

The panel of informants comprised 25 WinS practitioners from bilateral and multilateral donor

organizations, the private sector, NGOs, research institutions, global partnerships, as well as independent consultants (see Annex 3). Limited resources prevented a direct and thorough assessment of the perspectives held by the representatives of the MoE (at national, district and local levels) and members of the school community (e.g. teachers, parents, and pupils). It was assumed that these perspectives would be conveyed, at least to some extent, in the views of researchers, consultants and NGOs. Despite the under-representation of the public sector and a bias towards the non-profit organizations and research institutions based in Europe and in North-America, this sample allowed insights to be gathered from a wide range of organizations engaged in WinS partnerships. Triangulation of information helped to increase the validity of findings. The limitations inherent in the size and distribution of the sample call for caution before over-generalizing some of the findings, which often remain context-dependent.

3. Findings

3.1. Inventory

Undertaking the inventory of the WinS partnerships implies identifying their characteristic dimensions. The literature review and interviews led to define a set of key criteria, which can help characterize WinS partnerships. It comprises: the *specific objectives* of the partnership, the *type of partners* it brings together, its *degree of formalization*, its *timeframe*, *scale* of intervention, and the *key guiding principles* it adopts.

a. Objectives

While the overall goal of the WinS partnerships under scrutiny in this research is generally the same (i.e. improving water supply, sanitation and hygiene in schools), most partnerships aim to improve access to WinS services, which notably implies the construction or rehabilitation of WASH facilities. “Hardware objectives” are generally complemented by “software objectives” focusing on promoting behavior change and improving

¹ This definition, used by the UK-based NGO Building Partnerships for Development in Water and Sanitation (BPD), was adapted from a definition originally developed by AccountAbility.org

² including their representatives at central, district, local and school level

hygiene education. In addition partnerships frequently include in their strategy specific advocacy goals (e.g. influencing national level WinS guidelines and school curricula) and specific objectives focusing on gender equity and menstrual hygiene management (MHM). The latter may be crosscutting and involve work at infrastructural, educational and advocacy levels. Partnership also engage in learning, which can imply formal research, to improve programme design.

b. Partners

As noted above, international and local NGOs play a central role in the partnerships studied for this research. Informants also highlight the key role generally played by the community and government representatives (at local level and sometimes at regional or national levels). They also frequently cite UNICEF and the Ministry of Health and/or Education as central actors. Private sector actors, foundations, research institutions, bilateral donors, and the media also occasionally make important contributions to WinS partnerships yet their role is often perceived as less central.

c. Degree of formalization

The formal basis of the collaboration between partners takes various forms. Contracts and grants are frequently used between donor organizations and their lead implementing partner, such as an NGO or a consortium of NGOs. Relationships with private sector actors are frequently associated with formal contracts. Non-legally binding agreements like Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) are extensively used to structure other relationships, such as bilateral relationships between UNICEF and the MoE, and tripartite agreements between former partners and lead implementing NGO(s). MoUs often formalize sub-agreements with local partners, such as local CSOs, schools, communities, and local government authorities, where relationships are not likely to be based on legally enforceable agreements. School management and development plans often formalize WinS-related roles and responsibilities.

d. Timeframe and scale

The partnerships considered in this study generally have a preset timeframe, which can span from one

to six years with a typical duration of 3-4 years. Longer partnerships often see the rolling out of their programme in successive school clusters located in different regions. The timeframe generally depends to a large extent on the funder. The participation of the MoE and UNICEF appears to be correlated with longer-term partnerships, while small-scale NGO-led partnerships tend to be implemented under shorter timeframes. Negotiating detailed agreements and properly engaging the often numerous institutional partners (e.g. MoE, MoH, local government) requires significant time. Much of the relationships forged during the official timeframe may remain active years beyond programme completion, notably where implementing NGOs maintain a long-term presence.

The scale of partnerships ranges from the very local, with a few schools targeted in a given locality, to the international scale, where consortiums of NGOs engage in multi-country programmes. In this study, most MSPs were found to target clusters of schools within one or several districts of a given country. Although partnerships sometimes encourage the MoE to replicate and scale up interventions, they rarely operate on a national scale themselves.

e. Approach and driving principles

WinS partnerships may differ in their approach. Certain principles, such as combining hardware (infrastructure) and software (behaviour change) components, or fostering a bottom-up, demand-driven approach are now embraced by most partnerships and are hardly differentiating. Informants underlined the top-down approach adopted by certain partnerships, notably in relation to larger-scale programmes, such as those joined by UNICEF. In such partnerships, institutional buy-in from the MoE at central or district levels is critical and may impose more centralized and vertical patterns in programme implementation. Nevertheless, many partnerships manage to partly reconcile these principles, the MoE taking the lead in the process of prioritizing schools with demand creation and participatory planning occurring at school and community level.

Integrating WinS in district-wide approaches is a methodology emphasized by some partnerships, which implies effective stakeholder engagement.

Involving stakeholders is a driving principle for many partnerships, which may focus on the community, as a prerequisite for sustainability and/or on the government to seek greater influence through the joint demonstration of high impact interventions. Getting school governance right was found to represent a major driver for certain partnerships. Others put particular attention on the quality of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process.

f. Innovation

WinS partnerships commonly introduce novel technologies and designs for WinS facilities (e.g. water supply systems, water purification devices, tap stands, toilets, wastewater treatment and reuse systems) leading to improvements at various levels (functionality, cost-efficiency, inclusiveness, sustainability). The aim is sometimes to demonstrate appropriate solutions to relax often restrictive and cost-prohibitive standards. Innovations also target hygiene education and behavior change, which can involve learning through play, arts and craft (dancing, drawing or singing), the use of tailored didactic tools and spaces (e.g. the hygiene corner).

Likewise, partnerships often pilot novel approaches, mechanisms and sets of incentives to trigger demand and to enhance sustainability. School+CLTS (Community-Led Total Sanitation), social marketing approaches, the promotion of children as agents of change, the use of mascots and mass media to disseminate messages, the use of interschool competitions (e.g. linking WASH to football) and certification schemes illustrate such innovations recently introduced by WinS partnerships. Innovations also seek to enhance accountability: partnerships pilot ICT tools (e.g. mobile phones apps, on-line database) to better monitor WinS status and progress or to put in place user-friendly alert systems and grievance mechanisms allowing members of the education community to report shortcomings in the WASH services of each school.

Finally, innovation occasionally takes place in the partnership itself whereby new kinds of partners are brought in (e.g. private sector actors), or roles, responsibilities and leadership are distributed in a novel way (e.g. by giving local NGOs a more

prominent role, by working intensively through PTAs).

3.2. Evolutions

a. Key programmatic trends

WinS programmes have undergone several noticeable evolutions during the past decades. Related comments made by informants suggest three principal trends:

(1) *a shift in the focus of programmes*: framed and implemented around the delivery of WinS facilities, interventions now increasingly concentrate on hygiene behavior change as the core goal. Access to appropriate facilities becomes a prerequisite to achieve that end. This shift started over 15 years ago.

(2) *a move towards more holistic approaches*: either by contextualizing WinS as a component of community WASH programmes, or through greater programmatic cross-sector integration (e.g. interventions combining WASH and nutrition).

(3) *a concern for greater stakeholder engagement*: this notably plays out in efforts to boost community involvement and a more systematic coordination of interventions with the government at central and local levels.

These evolutions reflect a widely shared interest in making programmes more sustainable. The concern for ensuring the availability of funds at school to sustain improved hygiene behavior is illustrated by the recent interest of WinS partnerships for life-cycle cost approaches, as well as efforts to improve the mobilization and allocation of resources by strengthening school governance and stakeholder accountability. Likewise, recent developments on M&E frameworks reflect the current focus of WinS partnerships on boosting sustainability and better tracking the effectiveness and impact of programmes.

b. Evolutions in the environment of partnerships

Informants note the growth of the WinS subsector: still a small niche in the WASH sector during the 1990s, WinS is now being embraced as a strategic intervention by a growing number of organizations. Advocacy campaigns stressing the

potential health and socioeconomic benefits of WinS have sought to raise the awareness and involvement of many governments and triggered positive responses from donors to the extent that WinS became a fashionable theme a few years ago. Arguably, the times when large World Bank-funded school infrastructure programmes overlooked WinS belong to the past. And presumably, the expected mention of schools in the WASH objectives of the post 2015 agenda will attract further attention to WinS.

This expansion is characterized by a greater diversity of partners. The involvement of the MoE and MoH is now frequently complemented by the participation of public administrations with other mandates, such as nutrition. As noted above, the active engagement of the community and the local government authorities is increasingly sought. As for private sector actors, their engagement in WinS, which can be tracked back to the 1990s, remains limited in scale and largely ad-hoc. Nevertheless, their interest to support or engage in WinS partnerships appears to be growing (Tiberghien et al. to be published). Academia is becoming a more frequent and important partner, bridging knowledge gaps and testing assumptions underlying the rationale for WinS. Lately, external players advocating for more inclusive and gender-sensitive approaches have been increasingly active in the WinS arena.

A third major evolution in the space in which partnerships are formed and operate relates to the increasingly rich and easily available information on good practices. This improved access to practical data has freed up time for addressing WinS sustainability more comprehensively, and to tackle more complex institutional issues. In addition, several informants note a more horizontal sharing of information on the successes and failures of programmes, which contrasts with the top-down process of dissemination of information which has prevailed.

NGOs, research institutions, and individual consultants play a key role in triggering new trends: conceptualizing, piloting and refining innovations later adopted and disseminated by large donor organizations and UNICEF. The latter is regarded as one of the principal organizations driving change in the subsector. Vigorous,

sustained and vocal advocacy work can have tremendous influence on shaping WinS policies, practice and partnerships, judging by the considerable attention recently paid to menstrual hygiene management (MHM).

c. Future trends

Informants expect most of the current trends in programmes to gain momentum. Partnerships will likely further promote the cross-sector dimension of their programmes and foster school-community integration. The shift of focus from building WASH facilities towards anchoring improved hygiene behavior and influencing systems is likely to deepen. Efforts to improve solid waste management and to establish hand-washing with soap routines will likely intensify. Likewise, initiatives aimed at influencing education curricula, WinS norms and related school building standards should become more frequent. Many informants see issues of equity, including MHM, as still up-and-coming. Others suggest that this trend has already surpassed its peak.

Enhancing the financial sustainability of programmes will remain a major concern. Several informants anticipate a greater focus on engaging a wider range of actors to diversify the sources of funding away from large donor organizations. In their view, partnering with private sector actors will not only bring larger and more flexible funding, but also access to more efficient marketing and promotion strategies. Strengthening partnerships with faith-based organizations, which traditionally provide strong and sustained support to schools, is evoked too, given their capacity to create awareness, boost ownership and mobilize resources in order to sustain improved hygiene behavior.

The pressure to firmly provide evidence of the impact of WinS work is expected to result in greater impact evaluations involving randomized controlled trials to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of interventions.

3.3. Diagnosis

Key dimensions of WinS partnerships and trends characterizing their evolutions have been outlined in the two previous sub-sections. Based on insights from informants, the following

paragraphs undertake a diagnosis of their strengths and common challenges.

a. Partnership dynamics

Pooling partners' differences, for better and for worse

WinS partnerships represent great opportunities for learning. Informants invariably underline the cross-fertilization favored by regular exchanges between partners bringing complementary expertise, nuanced perspectives from their different sectors, and who are keen to share experiences of success and failure. Collaborating with strong partners bringing a team of experts and a wide range of tools, publications, and manuals to the partnership is more likely than not to engender success. Yet informants stressed the importance of putting in place in the early stages processes that foster peer-to-peer exchanges. Participatory planning involving all partners and key school and community stakeholders that allows them to discuss and validate the distribution of roles and responsibilities is invariably cited as a critical step to mitigate risks.

Yet partnerships also attempt to bridge a diverse set of incentives, timelines, and working cultures. Beyond the usual consensus on overarching objectives, partners frequently come with conflicting agendas, which may reflect organizational priorities, or marked preferences for certain technological options, tools and approaches. Preexisting competitive relationships between NGO partners may be hard to surmount and cause interferences.

Organizations occasionally feel that their identity is put at risk in partnerships embracing (or allowing the expression of) values and principles seemingly incompatible with or antagonistic to their own. A private actor focused on gaining visibility, efficiently delivering quantitative outputs, and relatively unfamiliar with development issues may find the interaction tedious with a skilled NGO significantly concerned with sustainability and the quality of stakeholder engagement, and vice versa. The latter NGO may find it challenging to work with a less experienced NGO or funding partner that approaches WinS either as a feel-good thing, promoting a heavily sloganized advocacy, or with a disproportionate focus on achieving quantitative

targets. Tensions are frequent between innately innovative organizations familiar with a learning-by-doing approach and partners whose official mandate, bureaucratic culture or sense of accountability make them comparatively very risk-averse.

In this context, collaborating is frequently arduous and the more numerous the partners, usually the more complicated the partnership. The convening power of partners and the personality of their representatives are key to the success of WinS partnerships. The technical background and expertise of partner representatives, as well as their human relationship skills and experience in working in partnership can be pivotal. Informants often cite the leadership and coordination skills of key individuals as critical success factors. Building trust is essential, and in that respect team-building events such as retreats are found helpful to foster uninhibited exchanges and the emergence of a shared leadership amongst partners. This may help introduce more horizontal relationships where power asymmetries associated with the control of funds or the relative size of organizations can inhibit productive exchanges. They may catalyze the engagement of local institutions that have historically been found to rely excessively on other partners.

Engaging public partners and the community vs. disenfranchising mandated partners

Actively engaging government officials at both central and local levels emerges as a recurrent challenge. Several departments and layers of the MoE usually have a stake in programmes and mobilizing them often proves time-consuming. Reluctance of the government to engage on non-infrastructure-related issues is cited as a common constraint. However, actively involving public partners in the monitoring strategy and ensuring their support to the O&M of facilities is critical for sustainability. Forging long-term relationships with local government officials and the mayor is commonly hindered by high turnover rates.

According to several experts, this widespread struggle to actively engage public partners reflects a profound difficulty to hold their responsibility for WinS. Some informants underline that providing schools with safe and healthy WASH facilities falls under the responsibility of the MoE, just as it is the

duty of the MoH to equip clinics with such facilities. A concern is that by intervening in schools, external agents (i.e. from the WASH sector) may reinforce the misperception in the MoE that WinS is not really in their mandate.

Such a risk of “disenfranchising mandated partners” needs to be analyzed in the context of decentralization, which redefines school-related roles and responsibilities. Several informants thus stress that where schools are considered as quasi community assets, WinS needs to be contextualized as a community-based intervention. Plugging programmes into the community power structure and working closely with PTAs appears to be pivotal in that respect. PTAs provide a good entry point, represent a force to mobilize resources, and can be capacitated to endorse new responsibilities.

b. Implementation challenges

Outputs vs. outcomes

The main challenge of WinS partnerships is to keep the brand new or freshly upgraded facilities safe and functional following project completion and to ensure that improved hygiene practices such as handwashing are sustained beyond that point. Achieving sustainability requires partnerships to put in place numerous conditions, each of which presents its own challenges. Informants underline the importance of sustained community support to allow a shift in social norms and hygiene behavior at school and domestic level. They stress that this process often exceeds the agreed partnership timeframe and suggest that the design of programme log-frames and M&E systems frequently focus on short-term deliverables that prioritize the achievement of easily quantifiable outputs over more essential processes.

Adapt standard solutions and keep a flexible design

Informants also repeatedly warned against the risks of applying overly standardized solutions, technologies or approaches, without having local experts adjusting them to local conditions. These risks are well known in multi-country programmes in relation to technology transfer. When possible, using locally available technologies and strengthening their supply chains often constitutes a clear strength. Approaches effective in one

country may not work in another. For instance, WinS advocacy and approaches have often relied on the assumption that children can be agents of change within the family and community. Whilst a pioneer study (Bresee et al. 2014) suggests that this can occur to some extent and under certain conditions in Zambia, some informants warn against generalizing the application of this principle regardless of the context.

Programmatic flexibility is a strength that can help transform an intervention likely to yield mediocre results and poor momentum into a rich learning experience leading to the development of local leadership and the institutionalization of new practice. Financial partners often have a decisive role in determining whether a partnership shall reconsider its initial work plan when the path followed appears manifestly unsustainable.

Accountability – capacity to comply

According to most informants, allocating roles and responsibilities amongst partners and stakeholders is rarely an issue. The problem rather starts with the low capacity of stakeholders to fulfill their responsibilities and the difficulty of the partnership to foster compliance.

At school level, the problem is manifest in relation to teachers, whose motivation and active engagement have long been identified as key conditions for success. The fact that teachers’ compliance with their newly appointed WinS duties erodes rather quickly often results in part from the excessive number of accountabilities they have to assume. The high turnover rates of school staff compound the problem. Analyzing the issue from a more macro perspective, some stress that hygiene promotion is chiefly under the mandate of the MoH, hence the absence of trained hygienists and hygiene promoters in the MoE. They conclude that it is not the teachers’ vocation to promote hygiene. On a related note, the effective joint engagement of MoH and MoE officials at local level is often mentioned as a key success factor.

Part of the challenges faced by WinS partnerships at implementation level are thought to originate from an excessive reliance on a strong commitment from school, community and district level stakeholders, rather than on an effective strategy to engage them. This applies to school

staff and PTAs as well as to the local government, whose support to the O&M of WinS facilities often amounts to wishful thinking. In the absence of appropriate incentives and accountability mechanisms, the allocation of roles and responsibilities amongst school, community and district stakeholder through MoUs can become a purely formal yet ineffective tick-box exercise. Regarding the community, some informants observe significant variations in their civic spirit across and within countries. This results in various degrees of appreciation by community members of the significance of their role towards WinS objectives.

Finally, with respect to stakeholder accountability, several informants stress the importance of setting up processes to ensure a proper monitoring of the WinS status and progress of schools. Some partnerships have found the use of benchmarking tools by the MoE particularly powerful in that regard. The advocacy of UNICEF to promote the tailored integration of WinS parameters in Education Management Information System (EMIS) will strengthen WinS partnerships.

4. Discussion

4.1. Throwing new light on the topic

The review of the sector literature indicates that investigating WinS work from a partnership perspective is novel. Related information is rare in the scientific and grey literature. Interviewees generally welcomed the opportunity to express their views on the opportunities and challenges related to WinS partnerships. Partners are used to analyzing and discussing programmatic content but have far less occasions for such structured exchanges on using partnerships as a delivery approach. Given the prevalence of partnerships as an approach, the hope is that such analysis provides important insights into overcoming WinS sustainability challenges.

Informants stress the need to strengthen institutional relationships, internally amongst partners and externally with key stakeholders. Beyond the varied degree of legal commitment they impose, agreements can also convey a spirit that influences the dynamic between partners. Depending on their formulation and on the nature

of the exchanges before and during their drafting, MoUs are meant to foster more or less horizontal relationships. They can encourage the genuine engagement and creativity of partners but often, as an informant noted, establish partners as mere contractors tasked to implement a defined work plan through a very vertical relationship. Such issues are rarely discussed despite their significant implications on the effectiveness of partnerships at implementation level.

Achieving genuine and sustained engagement of school, community and government stakeholders is identified as a key priority to address to ensure that sustainable WinS programmes is not a privilege confined to those schools endowed with outstanding leadership from the educational community. A deeper engagement of school, community and government stakeholders requires framing their WinS-related roles and responsibilities considering that they will apply well beyond the actual programme implementation period. Partnership building ideally involves the systematic analysis of stakeholders' incentives, constraints and possible contributions. School, community and government stakeholders should ideally undertake this analysis with partners, keeping it focused on the long-term outcomes of the programme rather than on its more immediate outputs. Likewise, these key stakeholders should actively participate in the negotiation of appropriate accountability mechanisms and means of enforcing them over the long term.

4.2. Laying the groundwork for a typology

This research project laid the foundation for the development of a typology of WinS partnerships, focusing on the MSPs involving NGO partners and directly implementing activities on the ground. It has led to identify key features of WinS partnerships and significant trends characterizing their institutional and programmatic evolutions. The scope of the research, voluntarily narrowed in this project to the examination of a certain category of WinS partnerships, will need to be expanded. The mapping of all kind of WinS partnerships would need to be completed, notably by integrating global and national WinS networks,

coalitions and PPPs, including country-level PPPs which do not include NGO partners.

5. Conclusion

This study assumes that analyzing the partnership arrangements that design and deliver WinS programmes will enrich the understanding of the challenges experienced at implementation level, therefore leading to more impactful and sustainable interventions. This research verified the lack of documented analysis of WinS work from a partnership angle and witnessed the interest of experts for such information. By highlighting the steadily growing programmatic emphasis on engaging partners and strengthening stakeholder accountability, the study demonstrated the relevance of shedding more light on the institutional relationships at the core of many WinS interventions.

This paper documents what appears to be the first exploratory review of WinS partnerships. The variety of such partnerships (e.g. coalitions, networks, PPPs and other MSPs) and the limited resources of the project have required narrowing the scope of the research to one category of WinS partnerships. Within these boundaries, the project has allowed a structured description of the different forms of these partnerships, produced insights into the institutional and programmatic trends characterizing their historical evolutions and led to an assessment of their common strengths and challenges. Whilst the methodological constraints of this project, and notably its narrow scope and a limited sample of informants prevent far-reaching conclusions, findings relevant for the subsector have emerged.

Generally speaking, WinS practitioners have no common analytical framework and tools to jointly assess and address the limitations inherent in the design and operation *of their partnerships*. They take for granted that working in partnership is complicated by nature, and gradually learn to get them running by trial and error.

The increasing emphasis put by the international community on partnerships as a means of delivering sustainable development goals and the growing concern of donors for greater partnership accountability encourage WinS stakeholders to critically review and improve their partnership practices. A number of iNGOs active in the WASH sector (e.g. Plan International, WaterAid) are engaged in the process of refining their partnership strategies and approaches, strengthening simultaneously the corresponding skills of their programme teams. The findings of this project and of further research investigating WinS partnerships can catalyze the transposition of this effort in WinS programming.

The substantial development of on-line resources and knowledge sharing mechanisms fostering the adoption of best WinS practices stands in contrast with the corresponding void of guidance tools to assist WinS experts and practitioners in the analysis and formative assessment of their partnerships. In this context, the attempt to start classifying and analyzing WinS partnerships, describing their characteristics and listing their likely challenges and opportunities, is meaningful. As more and more organizations reflect upon and improve their WinS partnership practices, tools allowing the rapid dissemination of this learning will be needed. In this respect, the WinS Network led by UNICEF might represent a very relevant platform to promote and disseminate learning and good practices on WinS partnerships.

References

- Alexander, K. and Dreibelbis, R. (2012). Results from a School WASH Service Delivery Trial - A SWASH+ project report - Research Summary. Available at: <http://www.ircwash.org/resources/research-summary-results-school-wash-service-delivery-trial-may-november-2011> [Accessed 28.08.14]
- Ballard et al. (2005). Globalization, marginalization and contemporary social movements in South Africa. *African Affairs*. 104, 615-634.
- Bowen A, Ma H, Ou J, Billhimer W, Long T, Mintz E, Hoekstra R M, & Luby S (2007) A cluster-randomized controlled trial evaluating the effect of a handwashing-promotion program in Chinese primary schools. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene*, 76, 1166-73.
- Bresee S., Lupele, J. and Freeman M. (2014). Exploring the Potential of Children as Change Agents for WinS in Rural Zambia. Emory University. Presentation during the WinS Network Webinar August 2014 session. Available at: <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/901o6l9to4hywx4/AAAGxK45VcDStLpQaS26VBTa?dl=0> [Accessed 04.09.14]
- Caplan, K. (2013). Plotting Partnerships – Reviewing objectives and spirit. BPD Classic Hits Series, May 2013. Available at: http://www.bpdws.org/web/d/DOC_80.pdf?statsHandlerDone=1 [Accessed 13.01.14]
- Esseku, H. et al. (2013). *National Assessment Report*. Wash in Schools, Ghana. School Health Education Programme. Ghana Education Service.
- Freeman, MC; Clasen, T; Dreibelbis, R; Saboori, S; Greene, LE; Brumback, B; Muga, R; Rheingans, R (2013) The impact of a schoolbased water supply and treatment, hygiene, and sanitation programme on pupil diarrhoea: a cluster-randomized trial. *Epidemiology and infection*. pp. 1-12.
- Greene, LE, Freeman MC, Akoko D, Saboori S, Moe C, Rheingans R. (2012). Impact of a School-Based Hygiene Promotion and Sanitation Intervention on Pupil Hand Contamination in Western Kenya: A Cluster Randomized Trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 87:385–393
- IRC (2007). *Towards Effective Programming for WASH in Schools: A manual on scaling up programmes for water, sanitation and hygiene in schools*. Delft, The Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. (TP series; no. 48). 93 p.
- Joshi, A. and Amadi, C. (2013). Impact of water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions on improving health outcomes among school children. *Journal of environmental and public health*, 2013 (article ID 984626), 10 pp.
- Mann, B. (2014). Navigating the WASH sector: a guide for corporate grantmakers. *WASH Advocates Report*. Available at: http://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/issuelab_17291_0.pdf [Accessed 23.05.14]
- Mooijman, M. et al. (2010). *Strengthening Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in Schools – A WASH guidance manual with a focus on South Asia*. The Hague, The Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. (TP Series 53).
- Saboori, S., Mwaki, A., Porter, S., Okech, B., Freeman, M.C., and Rheingans, R.D. (2011), Sustaining school hand washing and water treatment programmes: lessons learned and to be learned. *Waterlines* (30)4: 298-311.
- Saboori, S., Mwaki, A., and Rheingans, R.D. (2010). Is Soapy water a viable solution for hand washing in schools? *Waterlines* 29(4), 329-336.
- Schouten, T. & Moriarty, P. (2013). *The Triple-S Theory of Change*. IRC International Water and Sanitation center, January 2013.
- SWASH+ (2012). SWASH+ Top ten findings. <http://www.washinschools.info/page/4804> [Accessed 31/03/2015]
- Thomas, R. (2003). *A general inductive approach for qualitative data analyses*. University of Auckland, School of Population Health. Available at: <http://www.frankumstein.com/PDF/Psychology/Inductive%20Content%20Analysis.pdf>. [Accessed 13.01.14].
- Tiberghien J-E., Albert M., Moersberger H., and Schädler (2014). Engaging private sector actors in WASH in School work. Manuscript submitted.
- UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, The World Bank (2005). Why Hygiene, Sanitation and Water in Schools? Toolkit on Hygiene Sanitation and Water in Schools. FRESH initiative. Available at <http://www.wsp.org/Hygiene-Sanitation-Water-Toolkit/Why/index.html> [Accessed 05/05/14]
- UNICEF (2013). 'Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Annual Report'. Available at [http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/2012_WASH_Annual_Report_14August2013_eversion_\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/2012_WASH_Annual_Report_14August2013_eversion_(1).pdf) [Accessed 05/05/2014]
- UNICEF (2012). Raising Even More Clean Hands: Advancing Health, Learning and Equity through WASH in Schools. Available at [http://www.unicef.org/wash/schools/files/Raising_Even_More_Clean_Hands_Web_17_October_2012\(1\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/wash/schools/files/Raising_Even_More_Clean_Hands_Web_17_October_2012(1).pdf) [Accessed 05/05/2014]
- UNICEF and WSSCC (2003). WASH in schools: Teaching today's children, reaching tomorrow's possibilities. Information folder. New York. Available at <http://www.wsp.org/Hygiene-Sanitation-Water-Toolkit/Resources/Readings/WASH%20IN%20SCHOOLS%20BROCHURE.pdf> [Accessed 31/03/2015]
- WASH Advocates (2015). WASH in Schools – Background. Available at <http://www.washadvocates.org/learn/schools/> [Accessed 31/03/2015]
- WASHAdvocates (2013). WASH in School Timeline. Available at <http://www.washadvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/WinStimeline.pdf> [Accessed 31/03/2015]

Annexes

Literature review: sources and keywords

Category	Type of source	Example
Scientific literature	Peer-reviewed journals	Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development; Water Alternatives; Tropical Medicine & International Health; American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene
	Conference proceedings and archives	Proceedings of WEDC International Conferences; Archives of UNC Water Health & Policy conferences
Grey literature	Sector journals	Waterlines
	Sector Newsletters	WASHPlus weekly
	Institutional reports	UNICEF Raising clean hands, reports from iNGOs such as Plan, Save the Children, Care
	Programme documentation	USAID WASH Friendly schools, MWA Mi Escuela Saludable, GiZ Fit for School, CARE SWASH+, WASH in Schools Mapping
Other	Blogs	http://blogs.worldbank.org/water/ ; http://sanitationupdates.wordpress.com/other-wash-blogs/
	Webinars	UNICEF, SWASH+
	Websites	http://www.washdoc.info ; http://www.irc.nl ; http://www.washinschools.info ; http://www.washplus.org ; http://www.hip.watsan.net ; http://www.globalhandwashing.org/ ; http://www.unicef.org/wash/schools/ ; http://www.washadvocates.org/learn/schools/ ; http://www.globalwaterchallenge.org

Keywords used for searching: wash in school; school wash; wins; school; water; sanitation; hygiene; partnership; partners; institutional

Analytical Framework

Inventory
<p>Open-ended questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you know of or have you been involved in different kinds of WinS partnerships? 2. What are the key differences between these various types of WinS partnerships? <p>Specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Which objectives are/did the WinS programmes/partnerships you are/have been involved in try to pursue? 4. Who were the central actors involved in the programme(s)/partnership(s)? 5. What was the nature of the institutional arrangements (coalition, network, PPP, MSP)? 6. What elements formalized the relationship (charter, MoU, contract)? 7. Under which timeframe did the programme(s) take place? 8. Which key principles characterized the programme(s)? 9. Were there specific innovation that the programme was seeking to introduce? 10. At what scale did your project operate?
Evolution
<p>Open-ended questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What key trends have you noticed in WinS partnership work? 2. Can you think of innovations that have successively been introduced into WinS work? 3. In your opinion, what is the next important trend in the field? 4. What are the drivers from within the sector or beyond underlying these innovations? <p>Specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Have you noticed an evolution in the objectives pursued by WinS partnerships in time? Are some focus areas (e.g. inclusiveness, menstrual hygiene, management, sustainability) gaining or losing importance? 6. How have the nature of the actors (e.g. private, public, CS, community, donors), their roles and contributions evolved over time? 7. How has the timeframe and scale of WinS programmes evolved?

8. Are changes observable in the general approach to WinS programmes? Have some approaches gained importance (e.g. advocacy, partnership building, M&E), and in what respect?

Diagnostics

Questions about partnership dynamics:

Open-ended questions:

1. In your view, what are/were the key strengths of your partnership in terms of the collaboration between partners?
2. (Focusing solely on the relationship between partners and disregarding the content of the specific WinS work implemented), what are/were the main difficulties faced in your partnership?

Specific questions:

1. Why do you think your partnership faced these difficulties? Do you think these difficulties do/did relate to a lack of convergence of interests?
2. To what extent do/did they relate to a lack of clarity in the distribution of roles and responsibilities?
3. To what extent do/did they relate to a lack of resources (e.g. financial, HR, convening power)?
4. To what extent does/did your partnership face governance and accountability issues?

Questions about implementation:

Open-ended questions:

7. At implementation level, what are/were the key successes of your partnership?
(Please specify on what component or area: hardware, hygiene promotion and behaviour change, advocacy, stakeholder engagement, monitoring and evaluation?)
8. At the implementation level, what are/were the main challenges faced by your programme? (Please specify on what component or area: see above)
9. What do/did you identify as the key barriers to programme sustainability?
10. Beyond the issue of funding, what do you perceive to be the obstacles preventing the replication of your programme?

Analysis

1. Could the challenges faced by your programme (both at partnership and implementation level) have been mitigated in advance with more in-depth analysis?
2. Do you think that the challenges faced by your programme result from the specific nature of your partnership (e.g. number of partners, objectives, level of formalisation, governance structure, accountability mechanisms)? If so, to what extent and why?
3. Do you think that the strengths of your programme (both at partnership and implementation level) result from the specific nature of your partnership? If so, to what extent and why?
4. From your experience in the field, would you say that particular kinds of WinS partnerships (coalitions, PPPs, Gov-NGO partnerships and other MSPs) tend to encounter particular kinds of problems? If yes, how much do you think this is related to the partnership as such, rather than the operational context?
5. From your experience in the field, would you say that particular kinds of partnerships are more likely to successfully deliver certain components of WinS work (e.g. more likely to be innovative, accountable, deliver sustainable outputs)?

Recommendations

1. From your experience, which measures would be needed to make the outcomes of WinS partnerships more sustainable?
2. If partnerships are not meant to be permanent how can innovations be adopted and shared?
3. From your experience, what would be the relevance and feasibility of:
 - a. Undertaking more or better advocacy work? (Please specify at which level, local/national/regional/government and what level of advocacy awareness raising/lobbying/political influence/policy changes)
 - b. Undertaking more or better partnership building work? (Please specify at which level and how)
 - c. Undertaking more or better monitoring and evaluation? (Please specify how)
 - d. Addressing the lack of incentives of school, community and district level stakeholders to be more proactively engaged in WinS work? (Please specify how)

Informants

Type of organisation	Informants - Name and organisation
NGO (14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arno Coerver (Malteser International) • Oeds- Willem (Football for Water) • Mark Duey (Water for people) • Edgar Fajardo (Water for People) • Vianney Sauvage (CARE France) • Orlando Hernandez and Sarah Fry (FHI 360) • Leslie Moreland (Watercan), Melinda Foran (CAWST) • Elynn Walter (WASH Advocates) • Sharon Roose (Plan Netherlands) • Alex Campbell (BORDA network) • Reverend Alfred Bailey (Alliance for Religions and Conservations)
Research institutions and consultants (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitsuki Hirai (George Washington University) • Marielle Snel (IRC), Bethany Caruso (Emory University) • Pavani Ram (University of Buffalo) • Alexandra Orsola-Vidal (World Bank) • Maria Inez Matiz and Miguel Otero (Universidad del Bosque) • Annemarieke Mooijman (independent consultant) • Susan Davis (Improve International)
Bilateral and multilateral organisations (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marcus Howards (Australian DFAT) • Anthony Kolb (USAID) • Beau Crowder (Dubai Cares)