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## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B1H</td>
<td>Three Behaviors in One Hour (BCC toolkit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Behavior Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFPs</td>
<td>Commune Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLTS</td>
<td>Community-Led Total Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>Country Programme Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSHIP</td>
<td>Cambodia Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoRD</td>
<td>Department of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Executing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>Global Sanitation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementation Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMP</td>
<td>Joint Monitoring Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-NGO</td>
<td>Local Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;D</td>
<td>Learning and Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Microfinance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid Term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTOS</td>
<td>Mid-Term Outcome Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>National Coordinating Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODF</td>
<td>Open Defecation Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRDs</td>
<td>Provincial Departments of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAST</td>
<td>Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAM</td>
<td>Participatory and Social Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVA</td>
<td>Participatory Village Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGC</td>
<td>Royal Government of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SanMark</td>
<td>Sanitation Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-WASH</td>
<td>School Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>[United Nations] Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sub-Grantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan USA</td>
<td>United States National Office [of Plan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFPs</td>
<td>Village Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSCC</td>
<td>Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first phase of the Cambodia Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (CRSHIP1 or “the Programme”) began in 2011 as a five-year US$ 5.09 million grant awarded by the Global Sanitation Fund (GSF) of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC).

The goal of CRSHIP1 was to increase access to improved sanitation and promote sustainable sanitation and hygiene practices in rural Cambodia by utilizing “tested and proven approaches such as CLTS (Community-Led Total Sanitation), SC-WASH (School Water Sanitation and Hygiene), Sanitation Marketing, monitoring systems at commune and village levels, and widespread awareness-raising activities.”

CRSHIP1 targeted 200,000 households in 2,000 villages from 53 districts across 6 provinces: Kampong Cham, Tbong Khmum, Kampong Speu, Takeo, Svay Rieng and Kandal. The CRSHIP program aimed to achieve Open Defecation Free (ODF) status in 60 percent of the targeted villages (1,200 ODF villages). As the first phase of CRSHIP ended in early 2016, it had promoted sanitation and hygiene practices in over 2,027 rural villages, 630 of which achieved ODF. Despite having one of the highest success rates in Southeast Asia, the Programme fell short of its ODF target by 29 percent.

The presence of CRSHIP in Cambodia has helped to foster many opportunities beyond the Programme itself. Through CRSHIP, the WSSCC National Coordinator (NC) leveraged the Programme to enhance cooperation between government and civil society actors. CRSHIP also served as a catalyst for several sector wide collaborative efforts including the start of a national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and further development of the country’s Behavior Change Communication (BCC) portfolio. Moreover, CRSHIP contributed significantly to building the capacity of local non-governmental organizations (L-NGOs) to implement WASH programs.

Today, in 2016, the second phase of CRSHIP (CRSHIP2) is beginning its early stages of implementation. The purpose of this review is to explore and document some of the critical design components, events, challenges, and lessons learned during CRSHIP1 that have significantly influenced Programme performance, informed the initial design of CRSHIP2, and may still be pertinent to the further enhancement of the Programme.

After reviewing over 35 CRSHIP1 related documents and conducting 11 key informant interviews, the following report summarizes the critical challenges, lessons learned, and output/implications for CRSHIP2. Each element is grouped under one of the five major Programme components:

**COMPONENT 1**

**Sanitation and hygiene promotion in rural communities**

- Challenge – Selection of target villages and managing the challenges posed by the diversity of contexts and environments encountered
  - Lesson – Improve ability to identify community characteristics suitable for CLTS application
  - Output – Use of the Participatory Village Assessment (PVA) tool

- Challenge – Effective community engagement
  - Lesson – Leverage the influence of community civic leaders
  - Output – Consultation with civic leaders in the design and implementation of the Programme in target areas
• Challenge – Lack of capacity and skills to provide quality field facilitation
  ▪ Lesson – Conduct frequent and targeted follow-up with communities post triggering
  ▪ Output – Improved ratio of implementation partners (IPs) to target villages
• Challenge – Development of Behavior Change Communication (BCC)
  ▪ Lesson – Design BCC tools to be adaptable to fit facilitators’ capacity and the local context
  ▪ Output – Development of the Three Behaviors in One Hour (3B1H) BCC toolkit
• Challenge – Equitable and inclusive approaches
  ▪ Lesson – Go beyond a one-size-fits-all approach and use context-driven, adaptive planning to reach the poor and marginalized
  ▪ Output – Development and use of the Participatory and Social Mapping (PSAM) Toolkit to help map and assess poverty, vulnerability, seasonality, and gender issues at the community level in order to develop appropriate and targeted approaches
• Challenge – Supply-side coordination and strengthening
  ▪ Lesson – Identify and include Sanitation Marketing (SanMark) partners early to maximize San-Mark effectiveness and coordination
  ▪ Output – Establishment of a SanMark sub-grant to expand the role and impact of supply side approaches in CRSHIP2

COMPONENT 3

Advocacy

• Challenge – Effective national level advocacy
  ▪ Lesson – Provide national level support from MRD to ensure sub-national government cooperation and ownership of the Programme
  ▪ Output – CRSHIP2 advocacy to sub-national levels tied closely to the roll-out of the 2014-2018 National Action Plan (NAP) for Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene
• Challenge – Effective grass-roots advocacy
  ▪ Lesson – Communicate clear pathways for grass-roots advocacy to help inform Programme, provincial and national level advocacy and policy
  ▪ Output – L&D sub-grant to facilitate more opportunities for implementation partners to document and communicate lessons learned, observations, challenges, and concerns

COMPONENT 4

Documentation and Dissemination

• Challenge – Responsive monitoring & evaluation system
  ▪ Lesson – Monitor indicators beyond sanitation coverage and ODF in real-time to enhance understanding of factors that lead to achieving ODF
Many changes and new elements were introduced in CRSHIP2 to respond to the challenges encountered during CRSHIP1. However, the greater purpose of these new elements are to help CRSHIP2 become more proactive and adaptive to specific contexts and unknown future challenges. Arguably one of the biggest changes that sets CRSHIP2 apart from CRSHIP1 is the dramatic shift from a large-scale WASH implementation programme to a large-scale action learning programme. A programme which aligns with the targets set by both the Cambodian National Action Plan for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation and Sustainable Development Goal 6.2 by working to help all rural Cambodians gain access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene; while paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

**COMPONENT 5**

Coordination Mechanism and Directly Executed Activities

- Challenge – Clear roles and responsibilities between the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM) and EA
  - Lesson – Establish the roles, responsibility and authority of all actors, especially at the management levels
  - Output – Division of the administration roles among the EA, the TA and L&D sub-grants to strengthen capacity. Focus the NCM’s role on advocacy, policy and stakeholder coordination.
- Challenge – Stakeholder coordination and camaraderie
  - Lesson – Have strong, facilitated coordination and collaboration among sub-grantees (SGs) and sector partners for better performance
  - Output – EA support of stakeholder coordination at the national level; responsibility among SGs to facilitate coordination of sub-national level actors; supplemental support to both EA and SGs from the TA sub-grant

---

5 In CRSHIP2 Sub-Grantees (SGs) are referred to as Implementation Partners (IPs), however this document will maintain the use of the term SGs.
The first phase of the Cambodia Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (referred to as ‘CRSHIP’ or ‘Programme’) began in 2011 as a five-year US$ 5.09 million grant awarded by the Global Sanitation Fund (GSF) of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) to the Royal Government of Cambodia’s Ministry of Rural Development through Plan International Cambodia as the Executing Agency (EA).

Today, in 2017, the first phase of CRSHIP (CRSHIP1) has ended, and a second phase, CRSHIP2, is now in the early stages of implementation. The purpose of this review is to retrospectively examine CRSHIP1 in the context of this current transition period between CRSHIP1 and CRSHIP2. This review explores and documents some of CRSHIP1’s critical elements (i.e. design components, events, challenges, and lessons learned) that have significantly influenced Programme performance, informed the initial design of CRSHIP2, and may still be pertinent to the further enhancement of the Programme. More specifically, this review seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What has been the overall history of CRSHIP to date?
2. What have been the critical challenges, actions and lessons learned throughout the implementation of CRSHIP1?
3. What critical programme elements in CRSHIP1 have led to some of the new elements and the broader partnerships found in CRSHIP2, including but not limited to: (i) Learning and Documentation (L&D) sub-grant, (ii) Technical Assistance (TA) sub-grant, (iii) development and broader use of the Participatory Village Assessment (PVA) and Participatory Social Assessment and Monitoring (PSAM) tools, and (iv) the addition of an Equity and Non-Discrimination specialist to the team?
4. Last but not least, what are the knowledge gaps from CRSHIP1 that remain unaddressed but may still be relevant for the implementation of CRSHIP2?

Section 2 describes the methodology used to develop this report. Section 3 examines the original design and intent of CRSHIP. Section 4 identifies the Programme’s key milestones and events, followed by an in-depth review of the critical challenges and lessons learned throughout CRSHIP1’s implementation. Section 4 also discusses how these key learnings have influenced CRSHIP2 and identifies learning questions that remain unanswered. Finally, Section 5 concludes with an examination of CRSHIP2’s potential for greater learning and positive impact.
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 DESKTOP REVIEW

The L&D team conducted a desk review of over 35 documents related to CRSHIP1 to chronologically and categorically outline critical programme elements that significantly influenced the performance of CRSHIP1 and informed the design of CRSHIP2. A full list of documents reviewed is included in Appendix A.

2.2 KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW

After outlining the critical programme elements, the L&D team sought to gather richer and more in-depth information about the elements found in the desk review. Eleven individuals, who were directly involved in CRSHIP1, were selected to provide their first-hand accounts. These interviews provided an opportunity to extract some of the tacit knowledge and individual perspectives that may not have been captured in previous reports. The list of individuals interviewed for this review is included in Appendix A.
In rural Cambodia, poor hygiene behavior at the household and community level and the absence of sanitation facilities is the primary cause of diarrhoeal diseases. In 2010 and 2011 when CRSHIP was being designed, rural Cambodians were less likely to have access to improved sanitation than any other population in the Southeast Asia region. Around that time, less than 41 percent of rural Cambodians had access to improved sanitation.6

In 2008, the WSSCC created the GSF as a mechanism to inject funds into countries with a high need for improved sanitation. Cambodia’s WSSCC National Coordinator, Dr. Chea Samnang, lobbied for Cambodia to be one of the grantees for the second round of GSF supported programs. This led to the initiation of a Country Sanitation Sector Analysis to inform the preparation of the GSF Country Programme Proposal (CPP). The analysis found a number of issues in Cambodia that limited progress in the sector, namely:7

- Socio-cultural factors (poverty, lack of participation, lack of ownership and lack of behavior change)
- Limited capacity for management at all levels, particularly weak coordination between different government departments, and organizations
- Decentralization related to roles and responsibilities of government agencies
- Limited participation of the private sector in rural sanitation due to factors such as lack of access to credit, investment risk, lack of business skills development, unfair competition, and a weak regulatory system

• Absence of a single standardized monitoring system to which all organizations could contribute
• Very few low-cost latrine designs and a lack of solutions for sustainable toilets for floating villages and areas prone to regular flooding

The subsections below highlight some of the key Programme components that were included in the design of CRSHIP1 to help address these sector issues and reduce the number of rural Cambodians without access to improved sanitation.

3.1 PROGRAMME GOALS AND COMPONENTS

The goal of CRSHIP1 was, and continues to be in CRSHIP2, to increase access to improved sanitation and promote the sustainable practice of key sanitation and hygiene practices in rural Cambodia. To reach these goals, CRSHIP uses “tested and proven approaches, such as CLTS (Community-Led Total Sanitation), SC-WASH (School Water Sanitation and Hygiene), Sanitation Marketing, monitoring systems at commune and village levels, and widespread awareness-raising activities.”8

The use of subsidized approaches were explicitly absent from these activities, with the exception of “specific cases where the poorest segments of rural communities cannot be effectively reached by Programme activities.” Even in such cases, the Programme would not directly subsidize sanitation and hygiene facilities but would work with, and leverage funds from, development partners and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for subsidizing sanitation and hygiene needs of the poorest and most vulnerable.”9

6 (Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey [CSES], 2013)
7 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
8 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
9 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
The two primary objectives of CRSHIP were to:

1. Promote the sustainable practices of consistent use of latrines, hand-washing with soap, and drinking only safe water in rural villages
2. Develop and strengthen capacity in government, local authorities, and local NGOs in promoting improved sanitation and hygiene

To achieve these objectives, five Programme components were developed. Each component is listed in Table 1 below along with their proposed budget allocation. Section 4 describes each of these five components in greater detail and uses them to frame the critical challenges and lessons learned from CRSHIP1.

Table 1: CRSHIP1 Components and Budget Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Component</th>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sanitation and hygiene promotion in rural communities</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Capacity development in government, local authorities, local NGOs, community sanitation and hygiene promoters and in the private sector who promote sanitation and hygiene in rural communities</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Advocacy work for increased rural sanitation and hygiene promotion support at national and sub-national levels</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of experiences / lessons learned under the National Programme</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Coordinating mechanism and directly executed activities</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 PROGRAMME TARGETS

CRSHIP1 targeted 200,000 households within 2,000 villages from 53 districts across 5 provinces: Kampong Cham, Kampong Speu, Takeo, Svay Rieng and Kandal. Among the 2,000 targeted villages, CRSHIP1 set a target of achieving an Open Defecation Free (ODF) village rate of 60 percent. Target areas were pre-selected based on the following criteria:

1. Sanitation coverage is less than 50 percent according to the Cambodia Census 2008
2. High population density (to address greater health risks from poor sanitation conditions in high-density areas)
3. Favorable geographical conditions (flat/even terrain, areas with appropriate latrine designs, non-flooding/ floating areas, non-hard soils, etc.)
4. Experience in CLTS and Sanitation Marketing
5. Good implementation capacity of Provincial Departments of Rural Development (PDRDs)
6. Road accessibility

Source: Plan International. Presentation CRSHIP Progress Update 2015

10 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
3.3 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

At the national level, the Programme was administered by an Executing Agency (EA, Plan International Cambodia) and monitored by a Country Programme Monitor (CPM, PricewaterhouseCoopers), which were selected by the GSF/WSSCC. The GSF, in coordination with the government through the MRD, established the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM) in July of 2010. The NCM, established to support Programme implementation, consisted of thirteen members representing key stakeholders from the RGC, multilateral organizations and NGOs working in the sanitation and hygiene sector.\(^\text{11}\)

The main Programme component, Sanitation and hygiene promotion in rural villages, was originally envisioned in the Country Programme Proposal (CPP) to be largely undertaken by government personnel at the provincial and district levels (PDRD and DoRD) in the initial phases, followed by the transferring of monitoring actions to commune and village level mechanisms. However, in practice local non-government organizations (L-NGOs) became the primary implementers as sub-grantees (SGs) to enhance PDRD and DoRD capacity on the ground.\(^\text{12}\)

Monitoring activities at the commune and village levels were carried out by Commune Focal Points (CFPs) and Village Focal Points (VFPs). CFPs were typically commune council members whose role covered women and maternal health. VFPs were community members who were perceived to be influential in the community, often the village chief.

Other Programme activities were either directly implemented by the EA or through SGs selected from government agencies, local authorities, local and international NGOs, and individuals or private firms with experience and competence in the sector.

Figure 2: Institutional arrangements of CRSHIP1

Source: Modified from Plan Int. Presentation -CRSHIP Progress Update 2015

Note: in CRSHIP1, implementing organizations were referred to as “sub-grantees” or “SGs”. In CRSHIP2 they are referred to as “implementation partners” or “IPs”. This report maintains that distinction.

\(^{11}\) (NCM Cambodia, 2011)  
\(^{12}\) (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
“I believe experience from the implementation of CRSHIP for the last few years are helpful lessons and practical experience that can be good contributions and inputs.”

-- Mr. Ky Sophal, MRD Deputy Director

The key milestones and events of CRSHIP1 can be grouped into three stages: (1) Preparation, (2) Implementation, and (3) Handover. Within the second stage there were three rounds of implementation. Table 2 below provides an overview of the timeline of CRSHIP1’s key milestones and events. The sub-sections below discuss in more detail how each of the milestones and events listed in Table 2 influenced CRSHIP1 performance and/or the design of CRSHIP2 according to each of the five Programme components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Programme Phase</th>
<th>Key Milestones and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2011 | Preparation     | Plan International awarded Executing Agency grant  
Established the enabling environment for the Programme (created and operationalized the support mechanisms, mobilized sub-grantees, built capacity among key partners, strengthening links with other sector mechanisms and networks) |
| 2012 | Round 1 of Implementation | First Quarter - CLTS Training of SGs by National Center for Health Promotion  
Fourth Quarter – CLTS Training of SGs by Dr. Kamal Kar |
| 2013 | Round 2 of Implementation | Sanitation Marketing Sub-Grants began  
Cambodia Elections – Uncertainty in government leadership slowed progress  
Severe Flooding in many regions slowed implementation  
Second, Third, and Fourth Quarter – EA paused implementation of Programme for restructuring  
Behavior Change Communication tool Three Behaviors in One Hour developed and SGs trained |
| 2014 | Round 3 of Implementation | Report: Output Data Analysis of ODF and non-ODF villages  
First Sub-Grantee Quarterly Meeting  
Report: Study on MFI Models in Cambodia  
Report: Mid-Term Outcome Survey (MTOS)  
CRSHIP2 Inception Workshop  
First Annual Learning Event Held  
Report: CLTS In-Depth Review  
Report: Mid Term Evaluation (MTE)  
National CLTS Guidelines endorsed by MRD  
National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM) becomes inactive  
Sanitation Marketing Sub-Grants Ended |
| 2015 | Restructuring of CRSHIP to respond to the WSSCC/GSF Implementation Note, the MTE and align with the Draft National Action Plan  
Development of the PSAM toolkit |
| 2016 | Handover | First Quarter - First CRSHIP1 Transition Strategy Workshop  
Second Quarter - CRSHIP1 National Transition Strategy Workshop |
4.1 SANITATION AND HYGIENE PROMOTION IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

As indicated in Table 1, the sanitation and hygiene promotion in rural communities component made up the majority of the Programme’s budget and activities. The activities under this component generally focused on enabling local government agencies, with major support from SGs, to implement non-subsidized approaches to improving access to sanitation through CLTS, SC-WASH, and Sanitation Marketing.

As CRSHIP1 came to a close in early 2016 it had promoted sanitation and hygiene practices in over 2,027 rural villages, 630 of which achieved ODF. This translates to a 31 percent ODF rate13 one of the highest success rates in Southeast Asia14. As the Programme worked to achieve ODF villages, CRSHIP helped to foster many opportunities beyond the Programme itself. Through CRSHIP, the WSSCC NC was able to leverage the Programme to enhance cooperation between government and civil society actors. CRSHIP also served as a catalyst for several sector wide collaborative efforts including the start of a national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and an expansion to the sector’s BCC tool portfolio. Moreover, CRSHIP contributed significantly to building the capacity of the many L-NGOs in which it worked with to implement WASH programs. Despite the positive influence CRSHIP1 had on Cambodia’s WASH sector, the Programme fell short of achieving its intended goal of 60 percent ODF within the timeframe of phase one.

Figure 3 below illustrates the rate of CLTS triggered villages versus the number of ODF villages and the number of latrines built in the target areas (shown on a secondary axis). Some of the milestones presented in Table 2 have been overlaid for reference. Although the number of improved latrines in the target areas did increase significantly over the time period of the programme, it is believed that take-up was predominately among non-poor households. Hence many villages did not achieve ODF despite increases in sanitation access. Furthermore, multiple challenges experienced by the SGs and partners at the field implementation level contributed to low ODF achievement rates, particularly at the beginning of the program. Many challenges went beyond field level implementation.

This section focuses of some of the key challenges experienced by SGs during field implementation and lessons learned from those challenges, while later sections will discuss programmatic challenges.

Ouk Sam ouern is a 50-year-old blind farmer in Rum Lich village, Cambodia. Spurred by a GSF-supported triggering session he attended, he decided to build a latrine quickly. However, he did not have enough money to build a modern latrine like some of his neighbours, but this did not stop him – his mind was made up. “I had only $80 to build a normal pour flush latrine – I dug the ground to put in the concrete rings, made the walls with some bricks and palm leaves and covered the roof with palm leaves. Some people laughed at me because I built this kind of latrine but I don’t care – I care about my family’s health.”

Implementation partners practice video recording techniques
Photo credit: WaterAid/Mohory Sarom

13 (Plan International, 2016)
14 (UNICEF, 2013)
4.1.1 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion
Challenge #1: Selection of Target Villages

As the SGs and their government partners began implementing the Programme in Round 1, the village selection criteria was based on latrine coverage rates from secondary data sources – primarily 2008 census data. Villages with difficult topography, partial flooding, and past or current experiences with sanitation subsidies were selected as target villages. This presented numerous challenges to implementing sanitation and hygiene promotion and achieving ODF. As CLTS triggering rates continued to climb, ODF rates remained stagnant. By the end of Round 1, it became apparent that the SGs lacked the adequate guidance and experience for selecting villages favorable for implementing sanitation intervention tools, namely CLTS.

The 2014 report on Output Data Analysis of ODF and non-ODF Communities recommended that “careful consideration and research needs to be done during village selection including but not limited to: baseline latrine coverage, financial status/access to resources, location, and previous exposure to sanitation projects. SGs need training and guidance on village assessments and how they should strategically build the results into their implementation plans.” This and other similar recommendations helped to inform the development of the National CLTS Guidelines in 2014, which included the PVA tool. The purpose of the PVA tool is to “obtain information on the socio-economic, physical, health, sanitation and hygiene, and environmental conditions in the village... The PVA results are used to decide whether the target village possesses the favorable conditions for the CLTS approach.”

The 2014 National CLTS Guidelines include the following selection criteria:
1. The village is accessible
2. More than 50 percent of all households do not have latrine
3. No NGOs or other projects are implementing CLTS in the village

---

15 (Plan USA, 2016)
16 (Plan International, 2014b)
17 (MRD, 2014)
4. Local authorities have given their commitment and support
5. Sanitation status, including environment and knowledge among the community’s people, is low
6. Villagers show willingness to participate
7. Rural and town areas should be eligible as long as they have low CLTS but specific implementation method should consider town versus rural context

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

Since 2014, CRSHIP SGs and their local government partners have been trained on the use of PVA. According to some SGs, simply knowing what community characteristics to look for early in the implementation process has helped to save time and money, and has contributed to improved performance.18

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- How will CRSHIP address villages that do not meet the CLTS criteria?
- How can identifying the poor and marginalized be taken into account when selecting villages?

4.1.2 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion

**Challenge #2: Effective community engagement**

During CRSHIP1 triggering sessions and follow-up events, most of the participants involved were reported to be older women and young children. While only a few men - who are often considered the household decision makers - participated in the events.19 Not reaching the decision makers with triggering or BCC messages was cited by several SGs and reports as one of the most significant limiting factors to achieving ODF. As an example, a recent case study of one CRSHIP1 commune found that “some of the key barriers included the lack of participation or interest of the key decision makers (particularly due to their absence in the meetings due to work, etc.).20”

Strategies imparted by some SGs to overcome these challenges included:

- Spending the night in villages to meet with the heads of households when they returned from work or before they left the next morning
- Going to the farms to engage with heads of households where they worked
- Conducting Programme activities in the villages on weekends and holidays21

Due to intensive time requirements and limited reach of the approaches listed above, many SGs found them better suited for ‘last mile’ strategies after trying everything else. Alternatively, SGs found greater success with community engagement and participation through “working with existing relationships and social capital within villages, and harnessing the energy and respect of local champions and peer educators to overcome some of the initial barriers.”22 Examples of this included, but are not limited to:

- Setting targets with individual leaders within the commune councils to commit to make his/her own village reach ODF23
- Engaging religious leaders (monks) to disseminate sanitation and hygiene messages during religious ceremonies, and lead local fundraising and support activities for families that are poor and cannot afford to build a toilet by themselves24
- Working with school authorities such as principals, teachers and parent groups

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

Learning from these examples, CRSHIP2 has been designed to have more “thoughtful engagement of civic leaders to champion change in their villages – beyond supporting government staff to do their job.”25 SGs are strongly encouraged to sign memorandums of understanding (MoUs) with PDRDs, as well as conduct orientation and consultation meetings with local civic leaders to engage and encourage their involvement in the design and implementation of the Programme in the target area.

In addition to PVA, CRSHIP2 SGs are also using a new set of assessment tools called PSAM. Several of the PSAM tools are designed to facilitate community
engagement through participatory approaches to data collection, monitoring and self-assessment.

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- What role, if any, should social capital play in the selection of target villages?
- Are religious leaders effective change agents for motivating villages to improve hygiene and sanitation?
- How can Sc-WASH be used to influence Community WASH and vice-versa?

### 4.1.3 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion Challenge #3: Quality of field facilitation

As shown in Figure 3, by the end of the first round of implementation (Q4, 2012) only 14 villages had reached ODF status despite more than 800 villages triggered. At this time, many of the SGs lacked the technical capacity to effectively implement hygiene promotion activities, including CLTS. Furthermore, the IPs were assigned large coverage areas and were expected to achieve high targets beyond their physical and technical capacities. Both of these factors contributed to the lower than expected ODF rates. However, this section focuses on challenges in coverage areas and high targets, whereas capacity challenges are discussed further on in Section 4.2.

As stated in Plan International’s meta-analysis of CRSHIP1, “effective CLTS implementation requires intensive follow-up and facilitation skills to encourage community-wide behavior change. Some SGs were noted to have a high ratio of villages per staff member, which limits their ability to conduct frequent and consistent follow-up.” As an example, in the first round, the number of target villages per SG ranged from 60 to 514. During the Programme’s restructuring period of 2014-2015, the EA and CRSHIP leadership attempted to address these issues by providing SGs with additional funds to increase the frequency of follow-up activities and incentivize CFPs and VFPs to do the work. As described in Box 1, this strategy had reportedly mixed results, though its impacts have been largely undocumented.

**BOX 1: INCENTIVIZING CFPs AND VFPs**

The first plenary meeting of CRSHIP SGs, called the Annual Learning Event, was held in 2014. During that meeting many SGs voiced their challenges with motivating CFPs and VFPs to conduct follow up activities due to their many competing priorities. Several SGs were already experimenting with incentivizing CFPs and VFPs to conduct follow-up activities with performance based incentives. After the Learning Event, the EA formalized the practice with the following cost-structure:
- CFP – US$ 28/month
- VFP – US$ 10/month for ODF villages, and US$ 20/month for non-ODF villages

The rationale for providing VFPs conducting follow-up activities in non-ODF villages a higher amount than ODF villages was because those VFPs would need to work harder. However, this caused a reverse-incentive for many of the VFPs who began to stop reporting ODF villages so they could continue receiving the higher payment. The incentive structure was thus later revised and continues to be the following in CRSHIP2:
- CFP – US$ 28/month
- VFP – US$ 20/month for ODF villages, and US$ 10/month for non-ODF villages

Opinions on the effectiveness of this strategy vary among CRSHIP partners. Some feel it has had a positive influence on Programme outcomes by increasing the frequency and quality of follow-up activities. On the other hand, others see it as introducing a ‘employer / employee business’ relationship between the SGs and their CFPs and VFPs. Partners also question whether this practice sets a negative precedent for other community development programs that utilize CFPs and VFPs.

Sources: (Sok Ek, 2016; Toan, 2016; Lempho, 2016; Catalla, 2016; Hang, 2016)

---

26 (CRSHIP, 2015)
27 (Hadjel, Developing a Learning Grant, 2015)
28 (Plan USA, 2016)
29 SNV had the highest number of target communities at 514. Excluding SNV, the average number of target communities per SG in the first round was 135.
30 This additional budget line item, along with several other Programme modifications, brought the total budget of the program up from US$ 5.09 million to approximately US$ 6.17 million.
QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

- What is the optimal ratio of households per SG when implementing hygiene and sanitation promotion follow-up activities?
- Is a 60 percent ODF target realistic within the timeframe of the Programme?
- Are financial incentives an effective means of motivating CFPs and VFPs to conduct follow-up activities, and does it actually improve results?
- Will follow-up activities be sustained after the program has ended under the current CFP and VFP incentive scheme?

4.1.4 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion Challenge #4: Developing and measuring adaptive BCC

One of the outputs from CRSHIP1 was the development of the Three Behaviors in One Hour (3B1H) BCC toolkit. 3B1H integrated several tools from previous BCC campaigns – namely the “Stop the Diarrhea” WASH campaign – with additional design input from sector stakeholders. Several reports, including the MTOS, found the 3B1H tool to be, “quite effective as people now have understood the negative impact of not practicing proper hygiene behavior.”

There were however a number of drawbacks that limited the impact of 3B1H on CRSHIP outcomes. First, the 3B1H tool was not completed and rolled out until the third and final round of implementation. Thus all of the hygiene and sanitation promotion activities that occurred in the two rounds prior were conducted without consistent and effective BCC tools. The delay was attributed to (i) a late start in the development of the strategy, (ii) vague initial objectives, and (iii) a lack of clarity on who would make the final decisions at the Programme management level.

Figure 4: CRSHIP1 and 2 Targets and Budgets

Source: Plan International. Presentation CRSHIP Progress Update 2015

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

One of the most significant changes made to the Programme when designing CRSHIP2 has been reducing of the number of target villages while maintaining approximately the same budget and goal of 60 percent ODF achievement (see Figure 4).

Reducing the number of target villages to roughly 100 target villages per SG is designed to help provide SGs with more time and other resources to conduct follow-up activities and to pause and reflect on how to improve performance.

Figure 4: CRSHIP1 and 2 Targets and Budgets

Source: Plan International. Presentation CRSHIP Progress Update 2015

31 Beginning in July 2010, under the guidance of the Cambodian Ministry of Rural Development, WaterSHED and Lien Aid supported the creation of an open-source “Stop the Diarrhea” WASH campaign in partnership with various sector stakeholders, including but not limited to UNICEF, WSP, SNV, and the creative firm, 17 Triggers (WaterSHED, 2010).
32 (Plan International 2014a)
33 (Plan International, 2015)
34 (17 Triggers, 2014)
As a second issue, training on 3B1H focused on tool facilitation, but did not provide guidance to SGs on where, when and how to modify the tool in order to optimize its effectiveness. Furthermore, it was unclear how to measure the performance of 3B1H. This last issue has since made it difficult to provide evidence to support the toolkit’s effectiveness. Finally, there were also a number of challenges with the 3B1H tools themselves. Many SGs found the tools too difficult to deliver on their own and not adaptable to the variety of local contexts and audiences that SGs encountered.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

CRSHIP2’s BCC strategy was to build on CRSHIP1’s 3B1H and address the issues described above. However, a number of additional challenges have arisen recently that, at the time of the writing of this report, were delaying the roll out of a BCC strategy. The primary challenge being that the 3B1H toolkit is not consistent with MRD’s 2015 National Guidelines for BCC which states; “Concerns regarding the effectiveness of using the threat of illness and scare tactics… In addition, the “3B1H” campaign, as the name suggests, aims to address all the three WASH behaviors in a one hour-long session. Although ambitious and creative, this runs the risk of addressing too many communication objectives at once, creating message overload with the target audience.” Therefore the toolkit has not been endorsed by the government. As an alternative, CRSHIP2 SGs have been trained in the use of PHAST for hygiene promotion as a temporary substitute for BCC materials. Although PHSAT is recommended by MRD, the National Guidelines for BCC points out that “the behavioral determinants addressed in PHAST are knowledge and perceived threat of diarrhea. Beyond these two determinants, PHAST materials do not address any motivations (attitudes, drivers, intentions, etc.) for latrine adoption.” The guidelines recommend that “PHAST or versions of PHAST should be replaced with updated BCC materials that tap into the drivers of behavior change as knowledge of the health impact of diarrhea and the threat of illness from poor sanitation have not been identified as motivators to latrine adoption.”

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- Can the 3B1H tool be adapted to fit within the National Guidelines for BCC? What is an appropriate and effective substitute?
- How can the effectiveness of BCC strategies/tools be monitored going forward?

**4.1.5 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion Challenge #5: Implementing and monitoring adaptive, equitable and inclusive approaches**

In rural Cambodia today, there are an unknown number of complex social, economic, political and environmental factors influencing every household. One SG in their annual report gave the example of how issues around migrant workers affects the Programme: “Migration from the districts to cities for work poses both opportunities and challenges in terms of promoting the access to sanitation. Many households have been able to afford to build a new sanitary toilet with the support from a family member who has migrated out of the home village and has sent money back to the family. On the other hand, when the head of the household has migrated and not been able to attend the sanitation demand creation activities in the village, it’s more difficult to convince these households to invest on building a toilet.” These new and varied circumstances require adaptive, context specific strategies that were difficult to develop and implement under the design structure of CRSHIP1.

In addition to a lack of adaptability, the CRSHIP1 design also had a limited scope for targeting and monitoring the asset- or income-poor, women, children and vulnerable or marginalized populations such as the elderly, people with disabilities and those with chronic illnesses. CRSHIP1 included vulnerable households in its M&E framework. However, specific targeted actions were neither developed nor implemented.
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This shortcoming was also identified in the WSSCC/GSF Implementation Note and later the MTE, which concluded that CRSHIP lacked sufficient focus on equity.  

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

The influencing factors for CRSHIP2 to become more adaptive and inclusive stem from the lessons described above, as well as from other factors including the WSSCC/GSF’s experience from other countries, and their strategic decision to promote equality and non-discrimination within their programs in alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 6.2.

As stated in the Baseline Study for CRSHIP2, “Overall, the data shows that key target groups for CLTS programs who do not have access to sanitation are, understandably, poor and uneducated. Since CRSHIP2 intends to target more poor and vulnerable beneficiaries, behavior change tactics specifically tailored to the most vulnerable groups seem warranted to reach these beneficiaries.”  

In response to these drivers, CRSHIP2 will apply several new tools and methods to assist the Programme to become a more complexity and diversity sensitive programme. One such example is the PSAM toolkit developed by the EA and the GSF. PSAM is intended to assist villages and SGs to foster self-analysis and understanding of the local social, cultural, and environmental context; bring to light community problems and root causes that affect CRSHIP interventions; and serve as the first step to mapping and understanding inequality and identifying those who are vulnerable.

Along with PSAM, CRSHIP2 has added a part-time consultant role of ‘Equity and Non-Discrimination Specialist’ to the EA’s team. The role of this specialist is to help ensure that equity is “woven into the fabric of every investment, every supervision mission, every reward, and every audit.”

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- How effective will the PSAM tool be for developing context specific and inclusive sanitation and hygiene strategies?
- Is implementation of the PSAM tool cost-effective?

**4.1.6 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion Challenge #6: Supply-side coordination and strengthening**

The 2014 CLTS In-Depth Review reported that “SGs indicated that while CLTS guidelines promote the ‘sanitation ladder’ model for sanitation uptake, community preferences strongly favor improved latrines for usability and durability and are content to wait to adopt changes until sufficient funds are available. A lack of low-cost improved latrine options, few options for financing, a history of past hardware subsidy programs, and little targeting regarding the timing of interventions, with little analysis and inclusion of decision makers and ID-Poor (RGC’s poor identification system) populations further complicate progress on sanitation uptake.” The report goes on to recommend, “increasing access through financing options and selection of lower cost improved latrine options… as possible strategies to address this challenge.”

CRSHIP1 utilized two SanMark SGs (iDE and WaterSHED) beginning in Round 2 in 2013. The Programme’s design was to generate demand for sanitation by conducting CLTS first, followed by SanMark to meet that demand. To help support financing for the sanitation products, both SanMark SGs brought with them their existing partnerships with micro-finance institutions (MFIs). However, some of the common challenges experienced by Programme partners included a lack of latrine supplies in some target areas, late or no response by latrine suppliers, and inconsistency in the quality and cost of materials.

---

39 IOD PARC, 2014
40 EMC, 2015
41 NCM Cambodia, 2014
42 Plan International, 2014c
43 CRSHIP, 2014b

**SDG 6.2: By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.” (UN, 2015)**
Two critical issues are believed to have limited the CLTS followed by SanMark approach. First, the decision to delay the start of the SanMark grants was not conducive to the way SanMark organizations and projects operated. As explained in one of the SanMark SG’s annual report: “(SanMark projects) go beyond the typical supply chain development and support for entrepreneurs, focusing on the consumer through demand creation and financing, and strengthening the enabling environment through their relationship with local leadership.”44 Thus SanMark programs require a significant amount of lead time to become established and operational in a target area.

Second, as mentioned in the CLTS In-Depth Review, there was little coordination between the CLTS SGs and the SanMark SGs. This severely limited the effective timing of interventions and opportunities to exploit synergies between the two types of sub-grants, such as the coordination on mutually self-serving activities of strengthening the enabling environment and forging relationships with local leaders.45 As the Programme progressed, many of the SGs took it upon themselves to coordinate with each other. As one CLTS SG found; “Establishing cooperation agreements with other IPs, particularly those that implement Sanitation Marketing (SanMark) approaches, allows for coordination and improved effectiveness of project interventions.”46

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

For the implementation of CRSHIP2, there still remains a “lack of clear contextual understanding of when each approach should be used and their timing. CLTS advocates think SanMark raises the aspirational bar too high, lowering achievement of ODF, and SanMark experts can see CLTS as not being relevant to the Cambodian situation where there is wider past experience of the (SanMark) approach.”47

Regardless, several supply side barriers remain that need to be overcome, namely: (i) lower cost technology or payment options for toilets that still meet consumer preferences, (ii) low cost technology options for households living in challenging environments (i.e. flood prone, rocky areas), and (iii) mechanisms for safe collection and disposal of fecal sludge when pits become full. To try and address these challenges, CRSHIP2 has included a grant to “expand the role and impact of SanMark approaches in delivering CRSHIP’s broader targets and goals... The grant will seek to do so by developing the approach in a way that considers issues of financing, sustainability, environmental barriers, and supply-side capacity within the targeted geographies for the grant.”48 At the time this report was written, the grant was still in the process of being awarded.

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- What is the best way to harmonize, sequence, and integrate CLTS, SanMark, MFIs and any other financial assistance approaches together to increase and sustain coverage?

**4.2 Capacity Development**

The second component of CRSHIP1 was aimed at the “development and improvement of relevant capacity building tools and approaches and the training of government, commune councils, local NGOs, private sector, and community sanitation and hygiene promoters.”49 This component aimed to address some of the human and technical resource gaps that were needed to achieve the goals of the Programme and the Cambodia WASH sector as a whole.

Limited capacity among all CRSHIP partners proved to be a major challenge, even before implementation began. For the EA, it was difficult to find qualified SGs, particularly among L-NGOs, as very few of them had experience with sanitation and hygiene promotion activities such as CLTS.50 This contributed to significant delays throughout the start-up of the Programme. Also, as previously mentioned, SGs were assigned large coverage areas and expected to achieve high targets beyond their physical and technical capacities.51 Furthermore, there was a general lack of capacity and focus among all CRSHIP partners to effectively identify, engage and support the poor and marginalized. All of these factors contributed to the lower than expected ODF rates.
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Despite these challenges, CRSHIP1 made significant progress in achievement of its capacity development aims. More than 6,800 people - ranging from MRD and PDRD staff, SGs, commune council members, primary school teachers, village leaders, health center staff and village development councils - were trained on CLTS, Sc-WASH, BCC and hygiene promotion. Moreover, a significant amount of CRSHIP1’s capacity development activities and outputs have directly contributed to Cambodia’s first CLTS and BCC guidelines, as well as the National Action Plan (NAP) for Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene, thus contributing significantly to Cambodia’s human and technical resources for WASH.

4.2.1 Capacity Development Challenge #1: Timely and sustained technical assistance

To compensate for the lack of capacity at the SG level, the EA and the NCM began to take on a larger role in coordinating technical assistance. However, both entities had limited capacity to provide TA themselves. Therefore, international experts and consultants – such as Dr. Kamal Kar, Knowledge Lab, and Agile Development – were contracted to conduct additional trainings and consult on TA. Although these efforts enhanced the quality of Programme implementation, they often came too late to effectively change Programme outcomes. In some instances, mitigation measures could not be enacted until nearly a year after the challenges were first identified.

The use of short-term consultants for TA also lacked the necessary follow-up activities and monitoring to effectively sustain improved performance. These post-training activities were viewed by CRSHIP leadership as necessary, but the burden fell mostly onto the shoulders of the EA, which at the time (2012-2013) was suffering from its own capacity challenges, including a leadership gap within management, as well as a high staff turnover.

4.2.2 Capacity Development Challenge #2: Opportunities and capacities to learn and reflect

According to the In-depth Review of CLTS, many CRSHIP SGs were operating without regard to performance outcomes, and “the lack of understanding and analysis of the project progress [were] the key causes for high triggering rates and for low ODF achievement amongst the SGs.” Contributing to this issue were two factors. First, implementation was initiated in 2012 without an M&E framework in place, and SGs began conducting CLTS triggering in villages without understanding initial conditions or a mechanism by which to monitor the impact of CLTS. It wasn’t until February 2014 that an assessment of progress was made to give SGs and their government partners the first opportunity to see their performance at increasing sanitation access. Monitoring by SGs, with evaluation and data dissemination conducted by the EA, continued from then on to the end of the first phase of the Programme.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

From the lessons of CRSHIP1, leadership recognized the need to bolster the training and capacity development strategy institutionalized within CRSHIP2. This led to the conceptualization of the TA sub-grant for CRSHIP2. The goal of the TA sub-grant is to improve the capacity of government, local authorities, local NGO implementing partners (SGs), community sanitation and hygiene promoters, and the private sector to more effectively and efficiently promote good sanitation and hygiene practices in rural villages. Part of the TA’s main objectives are to: (i) provide on-going technical support and carry out a variety of capacity building interventions among all partners and (ii) monitor the implementation of program activities of partners to ensure that technical learning is applied appropriately.

QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

• How can TA effectiveness be improved to respond to the capacity and monitoring challenges identified in CRSHIP1, and how will this be measured?
The second contributing factor was a lack of capacity and opportunities for SGs to self-assess performance, think critically about their approaches, and identify and troubleshoot problems, particularly those related to targeting the poor and vulnerable. Throughout the first round of implementation in 2012, SGs worked autonomously without much interaction with fellow SGs. Around the beginning of Round 2 in 2013, some of CRSHIP SGs began self-initiating coordination meetings with other SGs in their respective target provinces. The EA later adopted this practice in 2014 and began organizing Programme-wide quarterly meetings/workshops with SGs and government partners to review and reflect on implementation experiences and identify lessons learned. Such lessons were then fed back to project implementation, making necessary changes to project design. As a preparatory step, the EA also requested that SGs include case studies in their quarterly reports about emerging changes in their target villages.57

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

Many elements of CRSHIP2 have been designed specifically to enhance learning and reflection throughout the Programme. First, there is a concerted effort in CRSHIP2 to improve information gathering to inform Programme design at both the national and sub-national levels. A baseline study was commissioned by the EA to “give the CRSHIP2 program an in-depth understanding of the sanitation context in these additional target provinces with a particular focus on the context analysis of key program target beneficiaries, including households with ID Poor 1 and 2 status, female-headed households, people with disabilities, landless households, etc.”58 Furthermore, the PVA and PSAM assessment tools are being implemented by SGs to gather more in-depth information about the target villages. Monitoring mechanisms established in CRSHIP1 are intended to carry on with some enhancements in CRSHIP2.

For key stakeholders, including SGs in CRSHIP1, the coordination meetings proved very useful for learning and reflection. Learning and reflection will remain a key part of CRSHIP2 quarterly and annual meetings. Furthermore, as stated in the proposal for CRSHIP2, “learning and reflection practice will be strengthened by allocating sufficient resources to implement key lessons....To further strengthen this practice, capacities of the SGs and government partners on monitoring and evaluation, and on research and documentation, will be developed as part of overall capacity building within CRSHIP2.”59 To help build collective learning capabilities, the L&D sub-grant was created to facilitate real-time learning and sharing, document best practices and challenges, and conduct action research. The outputs of the L&D sub-grant will be used to nurture knowledge-based project interventions in target areas, and ensure that best practices are shared broadly and incorporated into Programme implementation.60

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- How will SGs incorporate baseline, PVA, and PSAM information into their implementation strategies?
- How can CRSHIP monitor whether learnings are being translated into actions?

4.3 Advocacy

The purpose of CRSHIP’s advocacy component was to “work with government and development partners and civil society to mainstream rural sanitation and hygiene issues and impacts, moving towards prioritization of rural sanitation and hygiene in government development agenda and greater resources from government and development partners.”61 Through advocacy, CRSHIP has made significant inroads towards “mainstreamed rural sanitation and hygiene issues, earning wider support base for government and development partner shift to non-traditional approaches and greater resource support for rural sanitation and hygiene work.”62 Through the advocacy component, CRSHIP1 also made significant contributions to many national policy and guidance outputs from that period (i.e. the National CLTS guidelines, BCC guidelines, and draft of the NAP).

57 (NCM Cambodia, 2014)
58 (EAC, 2015)
59 (NCM Cambodia, 2014)
60 (Plan International, 2014a)
61 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
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Nevertheless, several policy and governance challenges still remain for the Cambodian WASH sector in order to reach the RGC’s goal of universal access to sanitation by 2025. These challenges include, but are not limited to, local government ownership of the Programme, uniform policies toward the use of subsidies, and the need for increased budget allocation toward rural sanitation and hygiene, particularly among leaders in government, development partners and from the private sector.

4.3.1 Advocacy Challenge #1: Effective national level advocacy

A significant part of MRD’s advocacy role was to promote CRSHIP and motivate sub-national governments by participating in CRSHIP events and visiting target areas by the Secretary of State. However, due to coordination and contractual challenges, MRD participation in CRSHIP1 was inconsistent. For example, the Secretary’s visits occurred less than a handful of times. As a result, local governments did not see national government support for the Programme, thereby diminishing local government ownership.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

Under CRSHIP2, the EA has developed its own advocacy and communications plan. However, national advocacy will continue be the role of MRD, which plans to link its CRSHIP advocacy work onto the launching of the NAP. “The NAP calls for local Government, including District Administrations and Commune Councils, to play increasingly active roles in identifying Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene priorities, and allocating investment funds towards those priorities.” In CRSHIP2 target areas, local government authorities will be encouraged to capitalize on the additional capacity provided by SGs to help them achieve the goals of the NAP. Furthermore, many of the contractual issues between the EA and MRD experienced in CRSHIP1 have been addressed, and the Secretary of State has once again agreed to carry out field visits to CRSHIP target areas.

QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

- How can MRD’s advocacy role be enhanced to increase local government ownership of the Programme?

4.3.2 Advocacy Challenge #2: Effective grass-roots advocacy

The Programme’s sub-national advocacy efforts relied significantly on SGs to motivate grass-roots advocacy from the local level. However, advocacy was not included in SG’s ToRs, therefore it never became a part of the SG’s work plans. This contributed to the persistent challenge that “PDRDs did not have strong ownership towards CRSHIP1…leading to limited awareness of the program outcomes and limited accountabilities.” Furthermore, until the third round of implementation – when formal quarterly meetings were held – there were no clear ways to gather information from SGs on what was happening on the ground to inform national advocacy efforts, such as for the development of the CLTS guidelines.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

Several of the individuals interviewed for this report believed that there was a missed opportunity in CRSHIP1 to conduct more grass-roots advocacy such as institutional triggering, which involves implementing the methods used in CLTS triggering to ignite change at the institutional level. CRSHIP2, will introduce the idea of institutional triggering at the sub-national levels. Conducted in series with national advocacy strategy, described above in Section 4.3.1, institutional triggering may help to increase local government engagement and ownership. Furthermore, CRSHIP2 SGs are strongly encouraged to form closer relationships with local government authorities by establishing an MoU with PDRDs and holding orientation and consultation meetings with government stakeholders to engage them in Programme decisions and activities.

---
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CRSHIP2 has also made a greater effort to create more opportunities to capture learning from SGs. This is being facilitated by the L&D grant in the form of learning and sharing events, research, learning notes, short narratives, and social media. Documented SG learnings can be used to inform policy and to monitor policy implementation and enforcement on the ground.

QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

- Can institutional triggering be an effective means of enhancing government participation and ownership of CRSHIP2?
- What other approaches to building local government support for sanitation are being tried in Cambodia and internationally?

4.4 Documentation and Dissemination

CRSHIP1’s fourth component included documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of experiences and lessons learned. This was included for recording and regular formal reporting of Programme activities. Furthermore, this component included evaluations to identify and validate lessons, measure cost-effectiveness, and share experiences.

To date, CRSHIP has produced a significant amount of valuable data and learning (see Appendix A). However, much of this information did not become available until it was too late to make programmatic course adjustments. Most reports and studies were not completed until after the final round of implementation had begun. Moreover, even fewer of those documents were disseminated among CRSHIP partners and the national and global WASH sector. Part of the NCM’s responsibility was to “ensure that the results of the programme monitoring outcomes are well communicated to the government and all other stakeholders.” However, due to unclear review procedures and roles between the NCM and EA, much of the learnings from CRSHIP1 remained tacit knowledge within SGs and a few individuals involved in the Programme since its start. The lack of communicated reporting has contributed to perceptions among sector actors not closely involved with CRSHIP management that the Programme was purposely being secretive and non-transparent.

Last but not least, CRSHIP1 missed out on collecting valuable data, particularly in documenting the implementation process. For example, the MTE pointed out that, “ODF is a binary indicator that signifies the outcome of CLTS triggering and implementation. Following triggering, but prior to ODF achievement, little is understood of progress toward sanitation unless other indicators are measured focusing on household level latrine coverage. Other indicators should be monitored to determine key factors that impact the rate of ODF achievement in different circumstances.”

4.4.1 Documentation and Dissemination

Challenge #1: Responsive M&E system

At the heart of the National Advocacy component was to be a robust and responsive M&E system, for the purposes of monitoring, accountability and learning. Outputs were then to be shared among the SGs, government partners, and the broader sector through the EA and NCM. However, by 2014 the MTOS, and later the MTE, found that such a system had not been put into place.

The lack of a strong programme level M&E system was in most part due to CRSHIP’s support to parallel efforts, in partnership with MRD and other sector stakeholders, to develop a national M&E system. CRSHIP was intended to pilot and adopt the national system. However, the design and roll out of the M&E system were severely delayed due to several compounding factors, which are outside of the scope of this review. As reported in the MTOS, the lack of an M&E system, “hampered the overall documentation of learnings and collection of M&E information.”

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

Currently, CRSHIP2 has an M&E reporting structure in place, which was organized and developed in lieu of a national government M&E system. Plans are under way to establish a more robust, programme-specific M&E system.
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QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

• Are there sufficient reporting and feedback mechanisms in place in CRSHIP2 to inform Programme performance until a more robust M&E system can be operationalized?
• How will the delay in establishing an M&E system for CRSHIP2 affect Programme learning and documentation?
• How is CRSHIP2’s performance toward equity and inclusion to be measured and monitored?
• What process or systems could be used to generate and organize disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data collected from the various program components?

4.4.2 Documentation and Dissemination

Challenge #2: Learning and sharing lessons learned

As previously noted above, information did not flow regularly across Programme partners in CRSHIP1. It wasn’t until SGs began self-organizing coordination meetings in Round 2 of implementation that learning and sharing begin to occur. Starting in 2014, the EA hosted six Programme-wide quarterly meetings and one ‘Annual Learning Event.’ According to some SGs, these quarterly meetings provided only limited opportunities for input and reflection by stakeholders.76 The majority of the time during these meetings was spent reporting triggering and access statistics, along with receiving program messages from the EA. Challenges and lessons were sometimes captured during these meetings, but many challenges and lessons went undocumented within the Programme. Even less information was shared outside of the Programme with the broader WASH sector.77 This challenge has been attributed a lack of capacity across the entire Programme – from the NCM and EA to the SGs – to document learning and disseminate knowledge.78

IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2

CRSHIP leadership recognized the need for fully dedicated and neutral facilitators for learning and documentation in CRSHIP2. Therefore, the L&D sub-

grant was established to mainstream learning. The key functions of the L&D sub-grant are to identify emerging issues and opportunities throughout implementation, document both processes and outcomes through action- and formal research, and synthesize and disseminate learnings to internal, national and global forums. In testament to CRSHIP2’s commitment to learning, the L&D sub-grant became the first sub-grant to be awarded and activated in the Programme.79

QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING

• How can government partners be engaged more closely in learning and documentation?
• How can lessons learned be shared more broadly outside of CRSHIP?

4.5 Coordination Mechanism and Directly Executed Activities

The final component of CRSHIP1 had two parts. The first was to support the NCM activities. This included coordination, consultation, and facilitation at the government and sector level. The second part supported directly contracted activities by the EA, such as baseline studies, national-level advertisements and campaigns, and Programme audits.

CRSHIP became, and remains today, one of the largest multi-stakeholder collaborative programs in Cambodia. The NCM and EA’s efforts to foster partnerships and networks with MRD, PDRD and other NGOs in the provinces contributed to “improved capacity related to project management, CLTS, hygiene promotion, Sanitation Marketing (including MFI), SC-WASH and BCC.”80 However, by 2014, stakeholder participation in the NCM had dropped, in part due to the departure of several key members and organizations. Since then the NCM has for the most part been inactive.

77 (McLennan, 2016)
78 (Catalla, 2016)
79 (Hadjel, 2016)
80 (NCM Cambodia, 2014, p. 20)
4.5.1 Coordination Mechanism and Directly Executed Activities Challenge #1: Clear roles and responsibilities between NCM and EA

From the inception of CRSHIP1, the distinction between the roles and responsibilities of the NCM and the EA were not clearly understood by both parties, creating many challenges particularly in the early stages of the Programme. Many NCM members did not feel that the EA had the technical capacity to administer the Programme. NCM members therefore became heavily involved in advising and reviewing programming. This created significant bottlenecks impeding implementation of many of the EA’s directly contracted activities, including conducting baseline studies, selecting SGs and commissioning research among other activities.81

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CRSHIP2**

Since the NCM became inactive, the EA has been predominantly responsible for Programme administration. One positive outcome from this has been that the EA has been able to make quicker more responsive decisions. Contributing to this has been the fact that the EA’s own capacity has been bolstered with a larger dedicated staff, and the delegation of the TA and L&D roles to sub-grants. On the other hand, without an active NCM, coordination between the national government and external sector partners has not been strong. However, at the time this report was being finalized, efforts to revitalize the NCM were in progress.

The NCM in CRSHIP2 has been rebranded and recalibrated as the Programme Coordinating Mechanism (PCM). The roles and responsibilities of the PCM will focus predominately on helping to facilitate a stronger relationship between the government and the Programme. A key member of the PCM is the WSSCC National Coordinator (NC) whose main roles includes establishing “a strong working relationship with the EA and the PCM by regular communications with the EA and PCM chair and standard participation in PCM meetings, to ensure strategic planning, elevate GSF profile, and aid advocacy and knowledge networking.”82

- Will the current institutional arrangement of the EA, TA, and L&D roles be conducive for a more responsive and nimble Programme?

4.5.2 Coordination Mechanism and Directly Executed Activities Challenge 2: Stakeholder Coordination and Camaraderie

According to many of the individuals interviewed for this report, one of the biggest missed opportunities in CRSHIP1 was the opportunity to foster unity and camaraderie within Cambodia’s WASH sector. The design of CRSHIP1 was participatory, with input from sector stakeholders. However, once the Programme moved from proposal to preparation, communication and coordination between CRSHIP management and sector partners became less frequent and less engaging. Those who witnessed the progression of the Programme attribute the limited coordination and communication to the roles, capacities and management approaches of the EA and the NCM.83

One of the NCM’s key functions was to “provide facilitation work to link the EA, the CPM, and SGs to relevant government agencies, development partners, and NGOs.”84 Despite this mandate, the lack of internal coordination between SGs and external coordination with the local authorities85 suggests that the NCM was weak in this coordination role, particularly at the sub-national levels. Poor coordination contributed to low Programme ownership by local government and missed opportunities to build and strengthen partnerships and align SG work plans.

Initial stages of CRSHIP preparation through to latter rounds of implementation were significantly impacted by capacity challenges across the program. Stakeholder

81 (Catalla, 2016)
82 (WSSCC, 2013)
84 (NCM Cambodia, 2011)
85 (CRSHIP, 2015)
engagement and coordination roles were affected by levels of resourcing available at the EA, which made hiring and retention of staff a challenge; and led to consequent impacts on work flow processes in terms of delays (contracting for instance was especially hard hit). One SG reported that the contracting process took over a year to complete.

In 2013, new management led to several positive changes in the EA. There was an increased number of dedicated staff and a more concerted effort by the EA to facilitate stakeholder coordination. However, relations between the EA and several of the SGs continued to be challenged by several factors and events. First, impromptu meetings, new deliverables, and key program decisions were often communicated to SGs without a fully thought through strategy of consultation and engagement. This caused undue stress on SG resources and took away from field activities, thereby contributing to further program delays.

Second, there were several occurrences where the communication, marking and branding strategy of CRSHIP was not well observed. On these occasions, CRSHIP public documents and outputs excluded credit to the SGs who had helped contribute to them. For example, a summary booklet for donors, “Plan International in Cambodia – Milestones and Achievements in 2013”, or the 3B1H toolkit did not adequately represent the work of the SGs who helped to contribute to those products or outcomes.

Finally, Plan International Cambodia became involved in an Asia Development Bank project which provided sanitation hardware subsidies to over 20,000 households, some of them near CRSHIP target villages. This activity was not well aligned with CRSHIP’s non-subsidy approach and therefore could have potentially, from some SG’s perspectives, undermined the effectiveness of CRSHIP activities—though evidence for this was not provided.

In CRSHIP2, the role of facilitation and coordination at the national level predominately rests with the EA. At the provincial level, SGs now have a greater responsibility to ensure coordination with the local authorities and stakeholders. The TA sub-grant has been designed to supplement capacity at both the national and sub-national level to identify and address coordination gaps. Through greater capacity to document and disseminate information and lessons learned, the CRSHIP2 program aims to enhance transparency by reporting activities, learning, and performance in national and global forums.

As a symbolic gesture of reform to build camaraderie with CRSHIP2, SGs are referred to as ‘Implementation Partners’ (IPs). More substantive changes are being made through the L&D sub-grant to build a community of practice among IPs and create more opportunities for IPs to be more involved, provide feedback, and contribute to the Programme’s strategy. Along with this comes the commitment from the CRSHIP management to appropriately recognize and represent contributions and organizations involved in all programming work.

**QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEARNING**

- Without the NCM how can sector stakeholders outside of CRSHIP be informed and participate in the Programme?
- What activities or actions can CRSHIP further take to foster unity and camaraderie with the Programme and the Cambodia WASH sector?

---

86 (Rautavuoma, 2016) (Ravell, 2016)
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5 CONCLUSION

“CRSHIP2 is shifting from working at scale with an approach suitable for optimal conditions in conducive environments, to a context driven adaptive scale up strategy supported and informed by what emerges from the field.”

– Hakim Hadjel, GSF Sr. Program Officer, 2015

CRSHIP has the uncommon privilege of being able to build and evolve based on the direct experience from the Programme’s own history. This has been made possible because of Programme’s ever-evolving and growing collaborative approach supported by a sufficient multi-year budget. As demonstrated in the contents of this review (and summarized in Appendix B), many of the Programme elements found in CRSHIP2 are a direct response to the challenges of CRSHIP1. Today, the Programme’s management structure is more clearly defined to help streamline operations. The EA now has a larger dedicated team to carry out its administrative and directly executed activities. The TA and L&D sub-grants have been established to support capacity building, research, and documentation. An Equity and Non-Discrimination Specialist has been added to the CRSHIP team to assist the Programme to better align with the SDGs and reach the poorest and most vulnerable. Furthermore, the PVA and PSAM tools have been added to improve the Programme’s ability to implement appropriate and context-specific strategies for improving hygiene and sanitation in target villages. Due to these enhancements, and along with clear direction from the National CLTS Guidelines and the soon to be rolled out NAP, CRSHIP2’s SGs are far better trained, equipped and supported than their predecessors.

Although many of the new Programme elements were developed in response to the challenges of the past, their greater purpose is to help CRSHIP2 be more responsive and adaptive to the unknown challenges of the future. SGs are now more empowered to communicate their activities and identify challenges in the field more rapidly. Through several mechanisms, such as social media, telephone, email, quarterly meetings, SGs can seek guidance from their peers or from the EA and TA sub-grants. SGs are given the space to adapt their strategies based on the context of the situations they encounter. Further support is provided by the L&D sub-grant to share and document their experiences to inform the Programme and the broader WASH sector.

The changes made to both the structure and approach of CRSHIP show promise for improved performance and sector learning. However, there remain several challenges unaddressed that pose a risk to the Programme’s success, namely the lack of a responsive and robust M&E system and the availability of adaptive and effective BCC tools.

Finally, reflecting on CRSHIP1 creates more questions than answers. These learning questions are very relevant to CRSHIP2, and some are likely relevant to other WASH programs in Cambodia and around the world. The identification of these learning questions points to arguably one of the biggest changes that sets CRSHIP2 apart from CRSHIP1: the dramatic shift from a large-scale WASH implementation programme, to a large-scale action learning programme. CRSHIP2 has been designed to be more adaptive by identifying questions and challenges early and pursuing appropriate context specific strategies focused on achieving access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all rural Cambodians; paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.


Dr. Samnang, C. (2016, July). (J. Dumpert, Interviewer)


Keo, V. (2016, April ). Rainwater Cambodia Program Officer. (M. Sarom, Interviewer)


Toan. (2016, April). COCD Programme Officer. (M. Sarom, Interviewer)


**APPENDIX A – SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source #</th>
<th>Source Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRSHIP Country Programme Proposal</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>Feb-11</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ToR for Cambodia National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM)</td>
<td>WSSCC/GSF</td>
<td>Apr-11</td>
<td>ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Output Data Analysis of ODF and non-ODF Villages</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Output Data Analysis of ODF and non-ODF Villages - Synthesis</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Synthesis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CRSHIP2 Country Programme Proposal</td>
<td>NCM</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implementation Note Concerning the Tim</td>
<td>WSSCC-GSF</td>
<td>Apr-2015</td>
<td>Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Study on MFI Models in Cambodia</td>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Study on MFI Models in Cambodia - Synthesis</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Synthesis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CRSHIP2 Inception Workshop</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mid Term Outcome Survey (MTOS) Report</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mid Term Outcome Survey (MTOS) Report - Synthesis</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Synthesis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CLTS In-Depth Review</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CLTS In-Depth Review - Synthesis</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Synthesis Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) Cambodia Country Report</td>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Draft Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WaterSHED Reaching Equity and Change (REACH) Final Annual Report</td>
<td>WaterSHED</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ToR for Learning and Documentation Sub Grant</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>GSF Progress Report 2014</td>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>Jan-15</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SNV Annual Progress Report</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Jan-15</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ToR for CRSHIP Implementation Partners</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lyn McLennan</td>
<td>Lien Aid, WaterSHED</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geoff Revell</td>
<td>WaterSHED</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Petra Rautavuoma</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hybunna Hang</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ms. Vichka</td>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr. Toan</td>
<td>CESVI and COCD</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Puthy</td>
<td>RedCross and COCD</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sok Ek Udom</td>
<td>Sovann Phoum</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suthavaridh Lempo</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rafael Catalla</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Samnang Chea</td>
<td>WSSCC</td>
<td>July-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Critical Challenge Lesson Learned Output / Implication for CRSHIP2

### Component 1: Sanitation and hygiene promotion in rural communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Challenge</th>
<th>Lesson Learned</th>
<th>Output / Implication for CRSHIP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Target Communities</td>
<td>Identify community characteristics suitable for CLTS application</td>
<td>Development of the National CLTS Guidelines and the Participatory Village Assessment (PVA) tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Community Engagement</td>
<td>Leverage social capital of community civic leaders: eg. Commune Councils, Village Chiefs, Religious Leaders, School Principals</td>
<td>Development of the Participatory Social Assessment and Mapping (PSAM) toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Field Facilitation</td>
<td>Focus on frequent and targeted follow-up after triggering</td>
<td>Improved ratio of implementation partners (SGs, VFPs, CFPs) to target households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Measurement of BCC</td>
<td>BCC tools should be adaptable to fit SG capacity and community context</td>
<td>Development of the Three Behaviors in One Hour (3B1H) BCC toolkit. Refinements, or alternatives, to the 3B1H tool are needed in order to align with RGC BCC guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA is needed post BCC training to maintain quality and refinement of tools as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicators are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of BCC tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable and inclusive approaches</td>
<td>Reaching the poor and marginalized requires context driven, adaptive planning to go beyond a one-size-fits-all approach</td>
<td>Use of the PSAM tools to help map and assess poverty, vulnerability, seasonality, and gender issues at the community level in order to develop appropriate and targeted approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity and Non-Discrimination specialist added to the EA team to help promote and enhance equity and inclusive practices in the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline study to identify and track the Programme’s performance toward reaching poor and vulnerable groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply-Side Coordination and Strengthening</td>
<td>Identify and include SanMark partners early in the Programme to maximize San-Mark effectiveness and coordination.</td>
<td>Identification of local material suppliers as part of SG pre-triggering activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of a SanMark sub-grant to expand the role and impact of supply side approaches in CRSHIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component 2: Capacity development

| Timely and sustained technical assistance | Technical Assistance should be institutionalized within the Programme to provide initial and on-demand training and coaching to implementation partners. | Establishment of the TA sub-grant to: (i) provide on-going technical support and carry out a variety of capacity building interventions among all partners; and (ii) monitor the implementation of program activities of partners to ensure that technical learning is applied appropriately |
| Opportunities and capacities to learn and reflect | An M&E framework and baseline should be established and communicated frequently to implementation partners to enhance understanding of performance | Baseline for CRSHIP2 conducted and shared with SGs. A basic M&E system is in place and being populated with input from SGs as part of their pre-triggering activities |
| | More opportunities and mechanisms are needed for implementation partners to learn from each other and reflect on their own performance. | Quarterly meetings and annual learning events with all SGs will continue in CRSHIP2, with enhanced focus on learning and sharing |
| | | The L&D sub-grant was introduced in CRSHIP2 to facilitate real-time learning and sharing, action research and build Programme capacity to document challenges, lessons learned and experiences |

### Critical Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Learned</th>
<th>Output / Implication for CRSHIP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National level support from MRD is critical for ensuring sub-national government cooperation and ownership of the Programme.</td>
<td>CRSHIP2 was designed to align with the 2014-2018 NAP for Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene, in order ensure its status as a Government Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-National governments (PDRD, DoRD, Commune Councils) must be more engaged in CRSHIP to ensure ownership and sustainability of the Programme.</td>
<td>CRSHIP2 SGs encouraged to form closer relationships with local government authorities by establishing an MoU with PDRDs and holding orientation and consultation meetings with government stakeholders to engage them in Programme decisions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearer pathways for grass-roots advocacy are needed to help inform Programme, provincial and national level advocacy and policy.</td>
<td>The CRSHIP2 L&amp;D sub-grant to facilitate more opportunities for SGs and government partners to document and communicate lessons learned, observations, challenges and concerns, which in turn will be used to inform the development of future actions and policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component 3: Advocacy

| Effective national level advocacy | National level support from MRD is critical for ensuring sub-national government cooperation and ownership of the Programme. | As a government Programme, CRSHIP2 advocacy to sub-national levels are tied closely to the roll-out of the NAP. This includes, but not is not limited to, supervisory missions by the Secretary of State to CRSHIP2 target areas to promote the Programme and the NAP |
| Effective grass-roots advocacy | Sub-National governments (PDRD, DoRD, Commune Councils) must be more engaged in CRSHIP to ensure ownership and sustainability of the Programme. | CRSHIP2 SGs encouraged to form closer relationships with local government authorities by establishing an MoU with PDRDs and holding orientation and consultation meetings with government stakeholders to engage them in Programme decisions and activities |
| | Clearer pathways for grass-roots advocacy are needed to help inform Programme, provincial and national level advocacy and policy. | When necessary, SGs will be encouraged to apply ‘institutional triggering’ tactics to motivate action by local government authorities |
| | | The CRSHIP2 L&D sub-grant to facilitate more opportunities for SGs and government partners to document and communicate lessons learned, observations, challenges and concerns, which in turn will be used to inform the development of future actions and policy |
### Component 4: Documentation and Dissemination

| Responsive M&E system | The CRSHIP M&E system must be responsive and robust; real-time monitoring of indicators beyond sanitation coverage and ODF to enhance the Programme’s understanding of factors that lead to the achievement of ODF. | Programme performance monitoring is occurring through a basic M&E reporting structure and learning and documentation mechanisms facilitated by the EA and L&D sub-grant respectively. Plans are in place to develop a programme-specific M&E system. |
| Learning and communicating lessons learned | CRSHIP’s contribution and impact on the local, national and global WASH sector can strengthened by enhancing the Programme’s capacity to capture and communicate learnings. | L&D sub-grant was established to mainstream learning throughout the Programme. Relevant functions of the L&D sub-grant include: identifying emerging issues and opportunities throughout implementation; document both processes and outcomes through action- and formal research; synthesize and disseminate learnings to internal, national and global forums. |

### Component 5: Coordination Mechanism and Directly Executed Activities

| Clear roles and responsibilities between NCM and EA | It is critical to the function of the Programme to establish the roles, responsibility and authority of all actors, especially at the management levels. | To streamline the operation of the Programme, the roles of the NCM has been divided among the EA, the TA- and L&D sub-grants |
| Stakeholder Coordination and Camaraderie | Strong, facilitated coordination and collaboration among SGs and sector partners leads to greater programme performance. | EA supports stakeholder coordination at the national level. SGs are responsible to facilitate coordination of sub-national level actors. Both the EA and SGs receive supplemental support from the TA sub-grant. |
| CRSHIP has the opportunity to be a sector leading and unifying Programme by promoting: (i) transparency, (ii) mutual respect of partners and stakeholders, (iii) and accountability. | Transparency: L&D sub-grant’s role includes facilitating (in cooperation with the EA and TA sub-grant) the communication of Programme plans, activities, performance and learning through national and global forums. | Mutual respect of partners and stakeholders: (i) L&D sub-grant to facilitate the development of a CRSHIP community of practice to enhance partner engagement under a common goal; (ii) Programme leadership dedicated to providing credit where credit is due. |
| Accountability: Dedication by all actors to, (i) the goals and objectives of CRSHIP, and (ii) Programme and Government policies. | | |