

SNV Vietnam sanitation demand creation - a strengths-based review



October 2010



Acknowledgements

This review would not have been successful without the contributions from many organizations and individuals who participated in the review process and final workshop. The review team would like to extend their sincere appreciation to the lead government partners in the Provinces of Dien Bien and Lao Cai: Dien Bien Centre for Preventative Medicine, Lao Cai IEC, Lao Cai pCERWASS and the District and Commune staff of the two provinces for both their preparations and participation throughout. We would also like to acknowledge the support of our local partners and particularly the Xuan Mai College. Many thanks to the community leaders, health staff, CLTS facilitators, the women's union and the many women and men who contributed their time, reflections and support in participating. Finally we would like to acknowledge the support of our partner, IPADE who along with AusAID financially supported this review process.

SNV

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Acronyms | iv |
| Executive summary | v |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Review purpose and objectives | 1 |
| 1.2 Program background..... | 2 |
| 2 Methodology..... | 4 |
| 2.1 Use of a strengths-based approach | 4 |
| 2.2 Clarifying objectives | 5 |
| 2.3 Strengths-focused consultations | 6 |
| 2.4 Approach to analysis..... | 8 |
| 3 Results..... | 9 |
| 3.1 Stories of success | 9 |
| 3.2 Factors of success | 13 |
| 3.3 Institutional strengths and resources | 15 |
| 4 Reflecting on success | 16 |
| 4.1 Commitment | 16 |
| 4.2 Knowledge—behaviour change | 17 |
| 4.3 Knowledge—construction..... | 18 |
| 4.4 Leadership..... | 19 |
| 4.5 Other factors | 20 |
| 5 Recommendations | 21 |
| 5.1 Scaling up CLTS in Vietnam generally | 21 |
| 5.2 Scaling up CLTS within SSH4A | 22 |
| 5.3 Follow up for the SNV WASH team..... | 22 |
| Annexes | |
| Annex A | Review participants |
| Annex B | Case studies—CLTS success stories |
| Annex C | Consolidated recommendations |
| Annex D | Workshop outlines |
| | Methodology planning workshop |
| | Provincial planning workshops |
| | Provincial data consolidation workshops |
| | Hanoi sharing and analysis workshop |
| Annex E | Provincial review schedules |
| Annex F | Terms of Reference, Review Facilitator |

Acronyms

| | |
|----------|---|
| AusAID | Australian Agency for International Development |
| CLTS | Community-led total sanitation |
| CPM | Centre for Preventative Medicine (of the Department of Health) |
| IEC | Information Education Communication |
| LCB | Local Capacity Builder |
| MoH | Ministry of Health |
| NTP | National Target Program for WASH |
| NVCARD | North Vietnam College of Agricultural and Rural Development (referred to as Xuan Mai) |
| OD | Open defecation |
| ODF | Open-defecation free |
| pCERWASS | Provincial Centre for Rural Water Supply Services |
| SBA | Strengths-based approach |
| SSH4A | Sustainable Sanitation and Hygiene for All |
| TOT | Training of trainers |
| VHW | Village Health Worker |
| WU | Women's Union |

Executive summary

This report describes a participatory review of SNV's Sanitation Demand and Behaviour Change activities in North-West Vietnam. SNV has been piloting Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS) in Vietnam as part of the National Target Program for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation II since the last quarter of 2008 as a tool for sanitation demand creation. The CLTS technique, widespread and successful in other parts of Asia and Africa, is relatively new to Vietnam. The SNV pilot operated in 43 villages in three North West provinces of Lao Cai, Lai Chau and Dien Bien. To build on lesson learned and best practices, SNV has secured funding for a broad WASH program entitled Sustainable Sanitation and Hygiene for All (SS&H4A). This program will scale-up the SNV CLTS pilot in Vietnam to a further 149 villages in 2010/11.

Ahead of the CLTS scale-up, SNV conducted a participatory review of the pilot activities, as described in this report. The purpose of this review was both to understand factors that generated success within the pilot, so that these could be replicated in the expanded program, and also to build shared understanding and enthusiasm with clients for the scale-up activities. The review adopted a Strengths-Based Approach (SBA) and explicitly focused on successes within the pilot activities. This was a useful and appropriate tool for learning ahead of the scale up. There was no intention by SNV, however, that the review been seen as a comprehensive 'evaluation' of their work and it should be acknowledged that the findings presented here are based on an analysis of the program's strengths, not its weaknesses.

Methodology

The review was undertaken by two multi-stakeholder teams who consulted with implementers and beneficiaries in four communes. Review team participants in each province included representatives as follows:

Dien Bien Province

MoH Centre for Preventative Medicine (x 3)
Commune People's Committee (x 4)
Vietnam Women's Union (x 2)
SNV staff (x 5)
Xuan Mai College (x1)

Lao Cai Province

MoH Information, Education, Communication (IECx 2)
Provincial Centre for Rural water Supply Services (pCERWASS x 2)
District Department of Health (x 1)
Commune People's Committee (x 2)
SNV staff (x 7)
IPADE (x 1)
Xuan Mai College (x 2)

The provincial teams divided into two sub-teams, each of which visited one commune and two or three villages. In keeping with the strengths-based approach, highly successful villages and communes were purposefully selected for the consultations. These consultations were conducted in small groups. Participants were invited to describe their success with CLTS and then asked two questions, namely: **what were the factors that led to this success**; and **which of these factors were most important**. Discussions were supplemented with observation in the community of newly constructed and renovated toilets arising from CLTS triggering and post-triggering.

Findings from the village and commune consultations were consolidated in a brief workshop in each province. Participants from the provincial review teams were then invited to Hanoi to take part in a sharing and analysis workshop. At this workshop, participants were asked to review both the factors of success reported during consultations and also identify strengths and assets of their institution. Findings from the consultations and the Hanoi sharing and analysis workshop form the basis of this report.

Results

It was not difficult to gather stories of success from SNV's CLTS pilot. It was abundantly clear that CLTS had generated strong change, both in reducing or eliminating open defecation and in mobilising households to build toilets. Commune leaders reported a quantum change in sanitation coverage as a result of CLTS. It was typical prior to CLTS in each of the communes for open defecation to be the dominant sanitation practice, with coverage rates for toilets in the order of 10-30%¹. After CLTS had been triggered, large-scale toilet construction ensued and coverage rates increased to 60 to 80%. Commune leaders, including representative of mass organisations, were thoroughly involved in delivering the program. They were trained by experienced trainers from the local capacity builder, Xuan Mai College, and Master Trainers from provincial health department staff (CPM in Dien Bien and IEC in Lao Cai) and felt they were well equipped to carry out the triggering at village level. Village leaders, generally the Village Head and Village Health Worker, were also trained alongside the commune leaders, in advance of triggering taking place in their village.

Community members in the villages where CLTS had been triggered reported that changed awareness resulted in many households immediately ending open defecation and commencing to build toilets from locally available resources using their own labour. Some villages raised sanitation coverage from as little as 10% to 100% in the space of a few months. Post-triggering (during which communities were shown demonstration models of four types of improved toilets²) was successful in encouraging households to both make their own improvements to simple ('temporary') pit latrines and also to register to build one of the four MoH approved 'permanent' toilets.

Review participants identified a large number of factors which underpinned the success observed in these communes and villages. Amongst the most commonly cited factors of success were:

Commitment

- Mutual support between households to build toilets
- Community spirit and participation
- Participation and commitment of government from provincial to village level; enthusiastic and pro-active

Knowledge—sanitation benefits

- New awareness of links between sanitation, disease links and good health
- CLTS communication approach is effective in explaining effects of open defecation
- People well-trained in the CLTS approach

Knowledge—construction

- Low cost, easy to build latrine models are promoted with the option of using local materials
- Neighbours sharing construction knowledge amongst themselves
- Demonstration models provided to show people how to build hygienic toilets

Leadership

- Mobilisation of the community by village resource people (Village head, WU and VHW)

¹ Data provided by CPM monitoring reports.

² These are VIP toilets, double-vault composting toilets, pour-flush pit toilets and septic tank toilets

- Monitoring by commune, district, province
- Regular communication, follow-up and monitoring within the village
- Good example set by members of village authority/mass organizations
- Close collaboration between commune and village heads

Other factors

- Village regulation established on building and using latrines

The influence that these factors hold over the implementation of CLTS is discussed in Section 4 of this report, along with suggestions arising from the review about how these factors could be supported or encouraged during scaling up of SNV's pilot.

Recommendations

The report draws short of making final recommendation. Instead, it is suggested that the senior SNV WASH staff consider the range of recommendations developed at the review's Sharing and Analysis Workshop, as summarised below, and decide on which should be taken up.

Scaling up CLTS in Vietnam generally

1. Share and disseminate experience and lessons learned
2. Provide a support fund for village-level facilitators
3. Integrate CLTS into the NTP for rural water supply and sanitation
4. Build CLTS capacity at national, provincial, district and commune levels
5. Document the CLTS methodology
6. Adapt CLTS to different contexts

Scaling up CLTS within SSH4A

1. Document the CLTS methodology
2. Develop the approach to monitoring
3. Build capacity
4. Provide financial support for follow-up activities
5. Implement CLTS within a broader environmental health program

Follow up for the SNV WASH team

1. Reflect on the SBA experience
2. Prepare for evaluation
3. Take decisions on actions arising from the review
4. Identify areas for further investigation

1 Introduction

1.1 Review purpose and objectives

This report describes a participatory review of SNV's Sanitation Demand and Behaviour Change activities in North-West Vietnam. The review adopted a Strengths-Based Approach (described below) and was undertaken by two multi-stakeholder teams engaging with implementers and beneficiaries in four communes over a two week period. The purpose of the review was to facilitate learning amongst clients, partners, local capacity builders, communities and SNV WASH staff about the sanitation demand creation process to date. The review focused on understanding key successes, positive change and critical success factors that could underpin a follow-up phase and to create a supportive environment for positive change. Stated formally within the Terms of Reference, the aim and objectives were:

Aim

Facilitate a participatory learning and review of the CLTS demand creation approach with key partners and stakeholders using appreciative inquiry to understand successes, enablers and positive change as the basis of scaling up sanitation demand strategies as part of a broader program.

Objectives

To review the effectiveness of the sanitation demand creation strategy in terms of supporting the government to increase demand for sanitation, enhance access to affordable sanitation options and enable the poorest household to move up on the sanitation ladder.

To understand the strengths of the evolving strategy for triggering and post-triggering including the cascade training methods, integration of hygiene messaging, demonstration approaches, gender sensitivity, role of key stakeholders at each level and the use of motivators at the village level.

To ensure key factors and enablers for a long-term success in generating sanitation demand inform the scaling up process and are well linked to the broader program components and health system.

To contribute towards strong partnerships and enabling environments for the next phase through facilitating strength based learning, knowledge building and experience sharing process with key partners and stakeholders.

Use of the strength-based approach (SBA) proved well-suited to generating learning and mobilising shared commitment and enthusiasm amongst clients, SNV staff and other stakeholders. It should be noted, however, that the review was in no way intended as a formal evaluation of SNV's two year sanitation demand creation program. The review purposefully selected for investigation successful communes and villages and made no conscious effort to identify and explore areas of weakness. Whilst the review clearly provides a basis for comment on factors traditionally associated with evaluation—such as relevance, impact, sustainability and effectiveness—assessing these in a comprehensive, program-wide manner was beyond the review scope.

This report describes the methodology adopted and the results of the participatory activities and analysis that was undertaken. A set of recommendations for scale-up of CLTS is provided for both SNV and in Vietnam generally. It should be noted that SNV is conducting several other pieces of research into its sanitation program, particularly in-depth anthropological research into the socio-cultural differences between provinces and ethnic groups in North-West Vietnam and the impact these have on sanitation demand. It is recommended that this report be read in conjunction with that other research to gain a fuller picture of SNV Vietnam's contribution and progress within the sanitation sub-sector.

1.2 Program background

SNV Vietnam's WASH Programme commenced in 2007 with development of capacity building approaches for the promotion of sanitation and hygiene at household level, water supply system functionality and low-cost appropriate technologies for water supply and sanitation in the three North West Provinces. This was undertaken with the Provincial Standing Offices for the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation National Target Program (NTP II) in the provinces of Lai Chau, Lao Cai and Dien Bien and led by their Provincial Steering Committees as well as the private sector. From late 2008, with support from the IPADE Foundation, SNV commenced piloting the Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach for generating sanitation demand primarily through capacity building, technical assistance and support—provided both by SNV and local capacity builders (LCB's)—to the Provincial Department of Health who in turn implemented and monitored the CLTS processes at commune and village level.

CLTS uses very simple, clearly defined participatory tools at the community level to generate an immediate sense of 'shame and disgust' concerning open defecation. In a single day, these tools motivate ('trigger') whole communities to take action to eliminate open defecation. Whilst new to Vietnam when introduced by SNV, the approach has been highly successful in other parts of Asia and Africa, even when working on a large scale.

SNV recently secured funding from Australia's Agency for International Development (AusAID) to develop further a broad WASH programs in five Asian countries—Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Nepal and Bhutan. This programme, entitled 'Sustainable Sanitation and Hygiene for All' (SS&H4A) has five components:

1. Creating demand for sanitation and hygiene improvements
2. Strengthening market-based supply chains for a variety of sanitation options and hygiene consumer needs
3. Developing, testing and scaling up of innovative localised behavioural change communication strategies that will lead to sustainable hygiene behavioural changes
4. Improving district-level WASH governance for local business development and pro- poor support systems
5. Learning, documenting and sharing of best practices of the programme within existing national and regional platforms.

Within Vietnam, implementation of the first of these components will build upon SNV's piloting of CLTS. The SNV pilot was conducted within the framework of NTP II and aimed to demonstrate an innovative approach to accelerating increased sanitation access that was not dependant on subsidies. In late 2008, SNV trialled the CLTS triggering approach with the Research Centre for Family Health and Community Development in two villages in Lai Chau and Lao Cai provinces. In 2009, SNV further adapted the CLTS approach to the Vietnamese and specifically for the ethnic minority and mountainous context in collaboration with selected staff from North Vietnam College of Agricultural and Rural Development (NVCARD), referred to as Xuan Mai College. In 2009-10 a larger pilot program was implemented with 43 villages in four communes in Dien Bien, Lao Cai and Lai Chau provinces. SNV also provided technical support for additional communes in Dien Bien and Kontum provinces where activities were funded by UNICEF.³ The communes selected by the Government and SNV are largely populated by disadvantaged, ethnic minorities. Whilst, these communes are part of the NTP II, villages that are part of the governments National Program 135 which focuses on poverty reduction for poor and mountainous communes are also included in the pilot. The sanitation coverage in these areas was very low and households lacked access to information about

³ This additional commune, Na Tau, is one of the four communes visited for this review.

appropriate sanitation facilities and service providers to assist them to build affordable sanitary toilets. The areas in which the CLTS pilot operated and the main actions completed are summarised in the following table. Detailed information on the CLTS approach has been documented by SNV's local capacity builder, Xuan Mai College⁴, and internally by SNV WASH staff.⁵ Whilst the review was not designed to deliver a comprehensive evaluation of the outcomes or impact of the pilot, the results presented in Section 3.1 provide an indication of how sanitation coverage has been improved in the four of the pilot communes.

| <i>Location</i> | <i>TOT</i> | <i>CLTS Facilitator/ Motivator Training</i> | <i>Triggering</i> | <i>Post- triggering</i> |
|-----------------------------|------------|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Dien Bien Provinces | 2 | 3 | 15 | 9 |
| Na Tau Commune ⁶ | | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| Villages (30) | | | | |
| Quai Cang Commune | | 2 | 9 | 9 |
| Villages (22) | | | | |
| Lao Cai Province | 1 | 2 | 32 | 17 |
| Hop Thanh Commune | | | 17 | 17 |
| Villages (17) | | | | |
| Na Hoi Commune | | | 15 | |
| Villages (15) | | | | |
| Lai Chau Province | 1 | 1 | 11 | |
| Muong So Commune | | 1 | 11 | |
| Villages (11) | | | | |

Under the SS&H4A program, SNV Vietnam is currently preparing to scale-up the CLTS approach to 149 additional villages in the three NW Provinces, including a district wide approach in Dien Bien. SNV's client in this work will be the Provincial Department of Health delegated by the Centre for Preventative Medicine (CPM) and Information Education Communication (IEC) units. Leadership will be provided by the People's Committees at District and Commune levels. Capacity building will be provided through SNVs technical advisors and local capacity builders, Xuan Mai College and the newly engaged Provincial Women's Union.

The sanitation demand creation component of the program will involve preparing a detailed district implementation plan; conducting simple baselines at the district and village levels; training 350 CLTS motivators to support the program at the village and commune level; CLTS triggering and follow up in the 149 villages; and building demonstration toilets at the commune level. These activities will improve sanitation access in 11,000 households, directly benefiting an estimated 55,000 people. The results of this review will inform this expanded activity.

⁴ Xuan Mai College (2009), Report on CLTS pilot program in the three provinces of Dien Bien, Lai Chau and Lao Cai

⁵ Doan Trieu Thanh, SNV WASH Advisor (2009), Community Led Total Sanitation—the answer for Sanitation and Hygiene in Northwest of Vietnam.

⁶ It should be noted that CLTS in Na Tau Commune was supported financially by UNICEF. The triggering approach, facilitator training and follow-up were all based upon the SNV model and hence this commune was included in the SNV CLTS Review.

2 Methodology

2.1 Use of a strengths-based approach

The approach taken in the review was dictated by two factors, the Review TOR (Annex G) and the pre-selection of participants, timing and locations. The TOR specified that a strengths-based approach (SBA) be used and suggested Appreciative Inquiry techniques in particular. The TOR describes SBA in the following terms:

Strengths-based approaches concentrate on the inherent strengths of individuals, organisations, communities, groups, sectors or networks as the basis for identifying, connecting and mobilising them, for planning to achieve development or change and for working in partnerships.⁷ SBAs encompass both a philosophy about how to engage constructively with people, as well as a set of tools for practical application. For the review the methodology should enable the team as key stakeholders to become clearer about the desired future, building on previous or existing success and mobilizing what resources are available in the particular context. The methodology should provide a set of methods and a framework for a review to move forward which does not ignore the realities, complexities and/or challenges inherent in each context. Strengths-based thinking acknowledges that a detailed analysis of the complexity of a situation (all the causes of all the problems and all the risks) is not a necessary pre-condition for positive change to be achieved. Rather approaches should be based on the belief that there is always something that has worked or is working well in every context and that people move in the direction in which they focus, e.g. “focus on the positive and you will move in a positive direction”.

With the exception of the two international staff, the use of SBA was new to the SNV WASH Team. Discussions during the planning workshop revealed that it was also controversial, with several participants concerned that by choosing to avoid weaknesses SBA would result in an unsuccessful review. These staff are to be commended for their willingness to trial the SBA methodology. It is recommended in Section 5.3 that an opportunity be provided in the near future for the WASH staff to analyse their SBA experience and identify contexts for which it may or may not be appropriate in future.

In response to the limited preparation time (both at national level and with each provincial team) and the concerns of most review team members about SBA, a very simple approach was agreed upon and consisted of posing two questions:

- What has been successful? Answering this question generated ‘stories of success’.
- What caused that that success? Answering this question generated ‘factors of success’.

These questions were presented at each level in the review—province, commune and village—and were answered and analysed in participatory forums by the many stakeholders involved. The findings responded to the first and second objectives of the review.

At the provincial and national levels, additional questions were posed regarding the resources available within Vietnamese institutions to scale-up CLTS and the actions required to create an enabling environment in which those resources could be applied. This aspect of the approach responded to the third review objective.

As noted in the TOR, focusing on success and the positive outcomes of SNV’s CLTS pilot was designed to enable ‘stakeholders to discuss and deepen an understanding of their current situation in positive terms and therefore draw out both specific information about the existing context and a positive attitude and sense of [existing] capacity and optimism’. As a precursor to expanding the CLTS pilot,

⁷ The methodology recommended by SNV was based on a draft paper by Rhodes, D. (2009), Discussion Paper for AusAID: Strengths Based Approaches: Advantages and Possible Uses.

this was an important element of the review methodology and responded to the final review objective.

The activities undertaken for the review are described in the following sections and comprised:

- Development of the SBA methodology for the review including consultation with the team to clarify goals, approach and purpose
- Participatory review of the pilot CLTS program at three levels—community, commune and province.
- A sharing and analysis workshop at national level to consolidate the review findings and develop recommendations

The findings and analysis presented here have also been informed by secondary review of existing project documentation and CLTS research.

2.2 Clarifying objectives

The objectives set out for the review, as described above, were broad in scope. In essence, they required the review to investigate and understand ‘success’. Given the breadth of this aspiration, it was important that the participants had a shared sense of the intended outcomes. Consequently, in developing the methodology the first task was to refine the review scope by agreeing on a set of review questions. In keeping with the participatory nature of the review, a one-day Methodology Planning Workshop (Annex D1) was held on the first day of the review and attended by the SNV WASH staff and Xuan Mai as the LCB.

Participants were invited to reflect upon their experience of SNV’s CLTS pilot and identify research questions in which they were interested. These questions were then re-phrased in terms of ‘success’, resulting in ten research questions to serve as points of reference during the review:

- i. Why is CLTS successful in eliminating open defecation?
- ii. What assets do poor households have to take advantage of CLTS?
- iii. What aspects of local culture and custom enable CLTS?
- iv. What strengths in the SNV approach will enable CLTS to work at scale?
- v. What are the strengths of the current capacity building approach?
- vi. What assets or strengths are there in government at sub-national level that can support CLTS at scale?
- vii. What assets or strengths are there in social organisations at sub-national level that support CLTS at scale?
- viii. What opportunities are there to integrate CLTS monitoring and planning into the structures and systems used by provincial clients?
- ix. What are the strengths in the different relationships that make CLTS work effectively?
- x. How can we make the CLTS process even better?

There was considerable discussion within the SNV WASH team about whether it was appropriate to avoid looking at weaknesses. Several questions that were of interest to the SNV team related to perceived areas of weakness within the pilot program and were difficult to phrase in terms of success. These included: whether an incentive scheme is required for village-level motivators; whether the impact is justified by the costs of delivering the program; and how SNV learns about the quality of triggering and improves it. Whilst these issues, and areas of weakness or poor performance, were not explicitly dealt with in the methodology adopted, the shared understanding generated by the review provides a platform for SNV to address such issues in the coming months. One of the recommendations set out in Section 5.3 is that SNV build on the strength of this review by engaging the SNV WASH team to detail the indicators against which the CLTS component of SSH4A program will be evaluated.

It had been intended that the Review Planning Workshop cover the entire review process from refining the research questions, exploring SBA, preparing participants for their role as facilitators, matching research questions to informants and data collection approaches, and agreeing on processes for documentation and dissemination of results. In practice, a considerable part of the day was required to arrange logistics with the first province, Dien Bien. Consequently, the Review Planning Workshop covered only clarification of the objectives, and exploration of SBA and how it could be used to respond to the research questions.

2.3 Strengths-focused consultations

2.3.1 Provincial review teams and preparation

Data collection centred upon consultations carried out in Dien Bien and Lao Cai provinces. In each province a multi-stakeholder team engaged with CLTS implementers and beneficiaries at commune and village level. Preparatory workshops for each review team were also used as opportunities to learn from the provincial review team members and hence consultations took place at three levels—province, commune and district. Where District Health staff had played a strong role in CLTS implementation, the review teams also met with relevant officials. Several of these officials joined in village consultations and one, Mr Thao from Bac Ha district, engaged in the full Lao Cai review process and also the Hanoi sharing and analysis workshop.

A full list of participants for the review, including the names and institutions for participants in each province is provided at Annex A and summarised below.

Dien Bien Province

MoH Centre for Preventative Medicine (x 3)
Commune People's Committee (x 4)
Vietnam Women's Union (x 2)
Xuan Mai College (x1)
SNV staff (x 5)

Lao Cai Province

MoH Information, Education, Communication (IEC x 2)
Provincial Centre for Rural water Supply Services (pCERWASS) (x 2)
District Department of Health (x 1)
Commune People's Committee (x 2)
Xuan Mai College (x 2)
SNV staff (x 7)
IPADE (x 1)

The composition of the provincial teams and the schedule of meetings had been set in advance of the methodology being finalised and was a significant factor in determining the approach taken. Allowance was required for teams that involved both those experienced with CLTS and those who will be part of the scale up activities and to whom CLTS was new. The schedule for each province provided one day for a preparation workshop, one and half days for commune and village consultations, and half a day for a sharing and analysis workshop.

The preparation workshop in each province had two functions. It provided an opportunity to brief the team on the review purpose, methodology and schedule, and also an opportunity to explore stories and factors of success directly with the provincial representatives. As detailed in Annex D2, these workshops comprised:

- i. Overview and purpose of the review
- ii. Introduction to SNV's WASH and CLTS programs
- iii. Introduction to SBA

- iv. Identifying CLTS success stories and factors
- v. Planning for commune and village visits
- vi. Other strengths—capacity building and relationships

The dominant element of the workshop was Section (iv). Participants worked in groups to identify the villages where they had found CLTS implementation to be most successful. They were then facilitated to identify what any factors that had contributed to that success. A final step, which involved the participants in each group ranking the four most important factors of success, provided a further opportunity to analyse why success had occurred. When working at the commune and village level, review team members were to use an identical process. Hence, in addition to capturing information from participants about success in their province, this activity also provided training for the review team in the SBA technique they would subsequently apply in villages and communes.

After participants had had a practice at using the SBA questions, Section (v) provided them an opportunity to plan in detail the activities and responsibilities for their commune and villages visits. The review team in each province was divided into two sub-teams—each assigned a different commune—and these sub-teams prepared detailed consultation plans. A single day proved too brief to adequately cover the full preparation workshop program. Consequently, Section (vi) was not undertaken in Dien Bien and covered only very briefly in Lao Cai.

2.3.2 Commune and village consultations

As noted above, in each province the review team divided into two sub-teams allowing the review to cover two communes in each province. This enabled the review to cover each of the four communes in Dien Bien and Lao Cai. During the provincial preparation workshops, each sub-team identified the villages where CLTS implementation had been most successful. These villages were selected for consultations. Schedules for the consultations in each province are set out in Annex E and summarised below:

Dien Bien Province

Na Tau Commune

- Na Tau No. 4 Village
- Hong Liu No. 2 Village
- Na Tau No. 5 Village

Quai Cang Commune

- Phung Village
- Cuong Village

Lao Cai Province

Hop Thanh Commune

- Tuong Village
- Peng Village

Na Hoi Commune

- Na Hoi Nung Village
- Ly Chui Phin Village

Whilst all the villages shared in common their success in CLTS implementation, they provided a good cross section for the review. Three different ethnic minorities—Thai, Dao, and Nung—were represented. The sample included some villages where post-triggering had occurred and some where triggering only had been carried out. The villages in Quai Cang and Na Hoi were quite distant from the provincial capital. In contrast, villages in Hop Thanh commune, whilst still rural in many respects, were part of an urban district and relatively close to the provincial capital, Lao Cai. They also received significant financial subsidies from Lao Cai City district to build their sanitation infrastructure, providing an opportunity to observe how CLTS operated in a highly subsidised environment. Inclusion of Na Tau also enabled observation of a UNICEF's sponsored commune.

A common approach was adopted for both commune meetings and village meetings. The review team made an introduction and explained the purpose and form of the review. Review Team members stressed that they were there to learn, not assess, and that communes/villages had been selected because of their successes. Commune or village heads typically responded with a brief report on CLTS in their commune/village. Participants at the meetings were then divided into two or three groups with attention to gender and power dynamics. At the commune level, division was generally between commune authorities (and district officers when present) and representatives of mass organisations. At the village level, division was into three groups wherever possible—village authorities, village women and village men—with group size ranging from three to ten participants.

Once groups had been established, members of the review sub-teams facilitated discussion in three stages: stories of success; factors behind the success; and ranking of the factors. Review team members who were not facilitating acted as note takers and observers. For village visits, once group discussions had concluded villagers were invited to show the review team members a range of the sanitation facilities that had been built in their village. This included examination of the SNV-IPADE funded demonstration toilets where these had been constructed.

The review teams were highly successful at keeping the commune and village consultations focused on strengths. Often the reports shared by commune/village leaders included a summary of problems, difficulties and constraints, as is customary. The review teams, however, proved adept at continuing to focus the meetings on success and were not drawn into discussing perceived weaknesses. Commencing the group work with stories of success provided a useful way of quickly establishing rapport between the review team and commune/village participants. Nonetheless, the ability of participants to engage with the review process was mixed and, in particular, uncovering the factors of success required careful facilitation. Due to it being harvest season, it was difficult to get strong participation from a broad cross-section of the community in some villages. A small sample of toilets was visited in each village (three to ten toilets). Additional time for observation during the review would have been an advantage and allowed a structured process for observation, for example, a transect walk.

2.4 Approach to analysis

The final element in the methodology was creating opportunities for review team members to analyse the findings in participatory forums. The aim of these sessions (at provincial and national level) was for participants to consider the most important factors of success, identify institutional strengths, and then consider how the factors of success and institutional strengths could best be combined to replicate CLTS success in new locations.

At the provincial level, informal analysis occurred within sub-teams during the intervals between commune and village visits. A formal opportunity was to be created through a half day workshop held at the conclusion of the consultations, to consolidate and analyse findings. (An outline of this workshop is provided in Annex D3.) In practice, the sub-teams returned to the provincial capital late on the third day of the provincial visits and the workshops were used mainly for sharing findings. In Dien Bien, some analysis was carried out on institutional strengths in relation to scaling up of CLTS and in Lao Cai, a brief session was held to identify and prioritise those factors of success over which institutions had most influence.

The full day workshop at national level at the conclusion of the review (Annex D4), which involved most members from each of the provincial review teams, provided a more structured opportunity to consider how best to use institutional strengths to achieve factors of success. The first half of the national workshop was given over to sharing and exploring the findings from the commune and village consultations in each province. Participants then worked in teams representing different institutions: provincial clients, commune and district authorities, mass organisations (Women's Union) and local capacity builders. In the afternoon, these groups identified and prioritised their

existing institutional strengths that had potential to support CLTS scale-up. The final session enabled participants to draw recommendations from the review findings and the workshop analysis and discussions. Reporting from this session forms the basis of the recommendations presented in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

It had been intended that prior to the national workshop, the SNV WASH team would hold a pre-analysis event to assess the review findings and match them to the research questions agreed upon at the outset of the review. Time constraints and road and office closures, and the need to prepare for the national workshop, prevented this from occurring. In lieu of this event it is anticipated that senior members of the SNV WASH team will engage in finalising this review report and will use that opportunity to contribute their thinking to the final findings. Time constraints also prevented the review team holding their own reflection on the review process. Given that this was the first time participants had used SBA, a facilitated discussion to share their experiences within the next few months is recommended.

3 Results

3.1 Stories of success

It was not difficult to gather stories of success from those who involved in SNV's CLTS pilot. In the two provinces visited it was abundantly clear that CLTS had generated strong change, both in reducing or eliminating open defecation and in mobilising households to build toilets. The highlights from the strengths-focused consultations for each commune are described in the sections below.

A range of statistics relating to the increases in sanitation coverage was collected during the consultations and are summarised in Annex F. The amount of data available regarding the type and construction of toilets at the village level was impressive. These figures demonstrated a quantum increase in sanitation coverage. Care is needed in interpreting the statistics, however, since the definition of 'latrine' or 'toilet' varies according to perceptions of what is 'hygienic' and this affects what is counted. Distinctions were also drawn between 'permanent' and 'temporary' latrines and this also had an impact on how data was recorded and interpreted. The application of these definitions was particularly significant in relation to the before- and after-triggering figures but is also relevant to how changes were recorded in the period after post-triggering. Finally, given the rapidly changing sanitation situation, there is always a lag in the official statistic available at commune or district level and the current situation in any particular village. This made it difficult during the review to cross-match commune statistics with the coverage reported during some of the village consultations. It is recommended that SNV develop a system to regularly consolidate the coverage figures provided by those communes in which it has been working. This information should be combined with the baseline data to present an overview of progress at any point in time.

3.1.1 Quai Cang Commune, Dien Bien

CLTS was triggered in nine of twenty-two villages in August 2009. Prior to the triggering, open defecation was widespread and sanitation coverage across the commune averaged approximately 11.1% (68 latrines/612 households). In the nine target villages both triggering and post-triggering has been carried out and amongst the 651 households 607 now have a toilet, either newly constructed or upgraded. Open defecation has almost entirely ceased in these villages. The commune leaders were trained for CLTS triggering and post-triggering—at the same time as the village leaders—and played a strong role in the pilot program. The Commune Chairman noted that before there could be any attempt to change behaviours in the village, the attitude of village leaders needed to change and that the CLTS training had been very successful in doing that. Two additional successes noted were incorporating a ban on open defecation into the commune regulations and inclusion of CLTS promotion through the Commune Health Station staff. Five villages were identified

in the discussions as having been particularly successful in their response to CLTS. These included the two villages selected for consultation—Phung and Cuong villages.

Phung village has 75 households and is in a relatively remote rural location and people are from the Thai ethnic group. Prior to CLTS, open defecation had been widespread and few households had toilets (5 latrines/75 households). In response to the CLTS triggering, 100% of households constructed a basic toilet, using local materials wherever possible. A shared understanding was achieved within that village that open defecation is a bad practice and the community has now eliminated open defecation. Post-triggering occurred recently and all but one of the 75 households in the village made an effort to improve their toilets by adding vent pipes (again made from local materials) and many incorporating urine diversion.⁸ A demonstration pour-flush latrine was built in Phung village and each household has now registered to upgrade their basic toilet to one of the four MoH-endorsed options presented in the post-triggering. Most households plan to undertake this work in December when the harvest season is finished and they have access to income from their crops and more time for non-agricultural work.

In Phung, a WASH Action Group (WAG) had been established under NTP-II.⁹ This group, which included members of mass organisations and the village authorities, were instrumental in promoting change within the village. WAG members were assigned responsibility for clusters within the village and then acted as role models in building and using toilets and motivated and encouraged their neighbours in the village to act. Not all members of the village attended the triggering sessions. Participants in the review consultations affirmed, however, that participants at the CLTS triggering had driven behaviour change within their households and that the demand for improved sanitation was widespread.

Similar success was reported in Cuong village, although the consultations there took place with the village leaders only. Cuong village is also from the Thai ethnic group and has 56 households. Prior to triggering in 2009, open defecation was widespread and only a few households (10 latrines/47 households) had simple pit latrines. CLTS was successful in reducing open defecation and motivating households to build toilets. The response to CLTS, whilst good, did not achieve universal sanitation coverage in Cuong. Seven households, considered by the village leaders to be the poorest in the village, had not built toilets but had been restricted to a set open defecation in one part of the village. The other 49 households had built a basic toilet. Post-triggering had occurred one month prior to the review consultation and had included construction of a demonstration septic tank toilet in the home of the Village Head. Many households had registered to upgrade their toilets and three households had already completed doing so.

3.1.2 Na Tau Commune, Dien Bien

In Na Tau commune CLTS was supported financially by UNICEF and with technical assistance by SNV. Unicef Triggering training and supervision was provided by Xuan Mai College using the same processes and techniques as for SNV's other communes. UNICEF's approach was reported during the review to use a different financial modality that included financial incentives. Triggering occurred in April 2010. Commune data provided during the review showed that prior to triggering the coverage of toilets was approximately 35%. Within one month of triggering almost an extra 500 households had built a toilet, lifting sanitation coverage to above 80% across the commune and to 100% in the most successful villages. Almost all of these were VIP latrines which households could build themselves from local materials. Villages visited during the review—Natau 4, Natau 5 and Hong Liu 2—were identified as amongst the most successful.

⁸ The emphasis on urine diversion follows MoH guidance and is discussed in Section 4.3

⁹ Quai Cang was one of three communes in three provinces where WASH Action Groups were established under NTP-II.

In Natau 4 village, all those households without a toilet (22 of 35 households) registered immediately at the triggering to build a toilet. Pre-existing latrines were of very basic construction (two bamboo slats above a pit) and these households decided to upgrade. Households worked together to help each other during construction. Households used local materials that were low cost and readily available. Community members were convinced of the health benefits of ending open defecation, reporting their perception that the incidence of disease had noticeably reduced.

Similar responses were reported in Natau 5 and Hong Liu 2. In Hong Liu 2, the village leaders passed a regulation supporting CLTS. The Village Head, VHW and WU were very active in encouraging households to build toilets and played a strong role in monitoring behaviour change. After triggering, sanitation coverage increased from six households with a hygienic latrine to twenty. Women from Hong Liu 2 noted that ending open defecation and improving sanitation had benefitted everyone and women in particular. The last village visited, Natau 5 increased sanitation coverage from 40% to 100% after triggering (24 households). Women participants in the consultations cited shame and avoiding disease as the significant factors in causing the community to end open defecation. They said that due to their new awareness and experience of having a toilet they would never return to open defecation. The village authorities, including leadership by women (WU and the VHW), played a strong role in motivating the community's response.

3.1.3 Hop Thanh Commune, Lao Cai

The rural commune of Hop Thanh is within the administration of the Lao Cai City district. There are 17 villages and 908 households, mostly from three ethnic groups—Xa pho, Tay and Thai. Hop Thanh is one of the two poorest communes in Lao Cai and a fifth of the households are formally recognised by the government as 'poor'. The commune includes villages that are part of the NP 135 program for poverty reduction. Separate to the NTP II Program, these two communes receive direct subsidies for sanitation from the Lao Cai City. Triggering commenced late in 2009 and a post-triggering pilot was conducted recently. Commune leaders reported that prior to triggering sanitation coverage was as low as 10% but now averaged 80% across the commune, with CLTS having been successful in 15 of the 17 villages.¹⁰

The situation in Hop Thanh was perhaps the most complex of any commune visited during the review. The increased sanitation coverage is a result of both CLTS-driven demand and heavy government subsidies and the timing was a key consideration. Prior to triggering in 2009 the commune had access to a sanitation subsidy of 500,000 VND (approximately USD25) for four MoH-approved toilet designs. This was accessed by 306 households but was not fully utilised. The triggering events commenced from August 2009. At the start of 2010, with support from a large donation from the private sector for roads and sanitation, and in response to a directive from the government, the Lao Cai City administration increased the sanitation subsidy for a 12 month period for these two poorest communes. The subsidy was offered for all households to build the sub-structure only for either septic tanks or pour flush toilets. The subsidy amount was linked to poverty status and offered in one of three amounts – 1 million, 1.5 million and 2 million VND (USD50; USD75 and USD100) and administered by the Commune. At the same time the villages were encouraged to achieve "Cultural and Healthy" status of which one of the criteria is to have sanitation coverage above 70%.

As a result of these measures, in 2010 a further 451 households in the commune registered for subsidies for septic tanks or pour flush toilets or to upgrade their existing toilets. Construction is planned to be completed by the end of October 2010 and all but 61 of the registered households had commenced construction. Households that received the initial subsidy in 2009 were also able to access this second subsidy to upgrade to the approved toilet models. The demand creation through

¹⁰ Those considered not so successful were remote upland villages. A range of suggestions were made as to why triggering had been less successful in these two 'upland' villages including poverty, poor access to masons, and cultural factors.

triggering prior to the full subsidy being offered and the demonstration models built during post-triggering were considered significant factors in the uptake of the subsidy program. Commune leaders reported an improved uptake of the subsidy compared to the neighbouring commune where no CLTS activities had been carried out.

One of the two most-successful villages selected for the consultation was Tuong 1 village which is a Tay ethnic community and where the Village Head is a woman. In 2009 there were only two households in the village with a hygienic toilet. At the time of the review 49 of the 50 households had either built or were building a septic tank toilet with the remaining household sharing one of these toilets. The community members reported always having been aware that open defecation was a bad practice but that this awareness had not been strong enough to motivate action. CLTS had converted that awareness in a priority for action. Households contributed their own labour for construction, provided their own local materials for the superstructure and suggested that even without the subsidy people in their village would still have built a toilet in response to the increased awareness through CLTS.

Peng 2 village was even more heavily subsidised than Tuong 1. It is part of the government's National Program 135-II for poverty reduction. As a consequence, households receive significant subsidies including the full cost of housing construction for the poorest families. There are 62 households in this village of Tay and Kinh ethnicities. In 2008 there were only four households with toilets. Through CLTS and the government subsidies, 50 new toilets have been completed and a further eight will be completed soon taking coverage from 6% in 2008 to above 90% now. There are six families below the poverty line and a further four families just above the declared poverty line. It is these four households who are yet to commence building a toilet. In contrast to Tuong 1 village households gave examples of investing their own funds in addition to the subsidy to improve the quality of the toilets constructed. Community members reported that everyone uses their toilets (including babies' faeces being disposed of in the toilet) and that benefits include the convenience, health improvements and a cleaner environment. As with Tuong 1 village, community members said that they would not have changed their behaviour without the CLTS triggering. Women participants reported the CLTS triggering as a major factor in enabling them to mobilise their husbands to build a toilet.

3.1.4 Na Hoi Commune, Lao Cai

Na Hoi Commune is two hours drive from Lao Cai in mountainous Bac Ha District. At the time of the review only triggering had occurred in this commune (in July 2010) and more than doubled sanitation coverage in Na Hoi's fifteen villages (up from 20% prior to triggering to 50% now). Following triggering, 174 households registered to build a new toilet and a further 250 households to upgrade their toilet. The commune leaders reported that the messages of 'shame and disgust' had been effective in convincing people to cease open defecation and that the awareness of good sanitation and hygiene practices had increased significantly. Commune leaders reported that the changes in sanitation practices were clearly evident in the villages. The Commune Chairman noted that there had been high levels of collaboration between the Commune People's Committee and the District Department of Health. Together they had formed a Sanitation Steering Committee which also included representation from mass organisations and village heads and this committee continued to provide direction for implementation of CLTS. There was a very high level of ownership of the CLTS program by the Commune and District Health leaders. The CLTS training that commune and district staff received was seen as relevant and successful and had ensured that the commune representatives had both the ability and understanding to lead the CLTS program in their commune.

The review team visited Na Hoi Nung village (from the Nung ethnic group). Prior to triggering, open defecation was common, as was the practice of defecating in animal pens so that animal and human excreta could be easily combined and used as fertiliser. Village leaders reported that after triggering open defecation had completely ceased. Most households had built simple pit latrines with a fly-

proof cover next to their animal pens. Approximately ten households had upgraded to more substantial latrines using a government subsidy of VND 1 million. The opportunity to receive this subsidy (which is paid after work is completed) will cease in December 2010 and is a strong incentive for households to upgrade their toilets soon. At least two further households built expensive flushing toilets with septic tanks in response to CLTS triggering.¹¹

Na Hoi Nung village had a very high involvement of women in the triggering—90% of participants were women, including the Village Health Worker. Reportedly, this is common in Na Hoi Nung with women regularly participating in community affairs, and village meetings generally benefiting from a balance of women and men's involvement (on average 60% women). Women who participated in the review consultations noted that within households when it comes to a decision about whether to build a toilet, men make the final decision and women can only seek to influence, despite their demand for a toilet generally being greater than that of men.

The second village visited was Ly Chui Phin. This was a Dao and H'Mong ethnic community and in contrast to Na Hoi Nung women were entirely absent from the triggering process. Despite this, the response to CLTS triggering was equally impressive. Prior to triggering taking place (July 2010) not a single house of the 23 households had a latrine and open defecation was practiced universally. In response to triggering every household built a basic pit latrine. The Village Health Worker led by example, being the first to build a latrine and ensuring that it was well constructed.¹² Households worked together in small groups and built their latrines in three or four days using locally available materials. The village leaders had some awareness of the potential for receiving the government subsidy. This was reported to have had little if any effect on their decisions to build toilets. None of the households had received a subsidy nor were they aware of the requirements or process for doing so. Ly Chui Phin is remote by the standards of other villages visited in the review. Access to commercial resources and levels of education are low. CLTS proved highly effective in what may have been considered previously a difficult setting.

3.2 Factors of success

The strengths-based consultations across the four communes and in the two provinces uncovered a wide range of factors that had contributed to the success of CLTS. These are presented below, grouped thematically. Although none of the consultations produced an identical set of factors—and different groups within communities identified different factors—some factors were reported in several settings. The frequency with which any of the factors was repeated is indicated by the asterisks after repeated factors.

Commitment

- Mutual support between households to build toilets ***
- Community spirit and participation***
- Self-monitoring by community members
- Sense of competition between households
- Community prestige *
- Participation and commitment of government from provincial to village level; enthusiastic and pro-active *
- Collective action in villages to support poor households
- Determination, commitment of local authorities

Knowledge—sanitation benefits

¹¹ For further details of one such household refer to the case study in Annex B.

¹² Further details are provided in the case study in Annex B

- New awareness of links between sanitation, disease links and good health *
- Communication approach is effective in explaining effects of OD *****
- Change in awareness amongst leaders *
- Triggering with visual aids, techniques
- People well-trained in the CLTS approach (very special and successful)

Knowledge—construction

- Technical advice on construction of latrines *
- Low cost, easy to build latrine model promoted with the option of using local materials (bamboo ventilator, etc)
- Sharing construction knowledge between neighbours
- Demonstration models that people can visit (to show people how to build hygienic toilets)**

Leadership

- Mobilisation of community by village resource people (Village head, village WU and VHW****)
- Mobilisation of village resource people by the Village Head
- Monitoring by commune, district, province *
- Good instruction and guidance by Commune leaders
- Good instruction and guidance by village head and other mass organizations in the village
- Actions of sanitation steering committee at Commune level
- Regular communication, follow-up and monitoring within the village **
- Sanitation and hygiene is integrated as one of the main topics during village meetings
- Good example set by members of village authority/mass organizations **
- WASH Action Group (within village) setting an example by building and using latrines
- WASH Action Group mobilising households and helping to overcome obstacles
- Mobilisation and leadership by the Village Head
- Close direction of leaders
- Leadership roles and responsibilities clearly assigned and understood (commune level)
- Close collaboration between commune and village heads

Other factors

- Village regulation established on building and using latrines ***
- Commune regulations
- Government subsidy program
- Integration of CLTS into broader government sanitation and hygiene programs
- Commune health station continually promoting sanitation at each meeting

As described above, the consultations at commune and village level provided an opportunity for participants to rank the factors of success in order of importance. The main purpose in undertaking this ranking was to deepen the investigation into the factors of success. As participants explained the rationale behind their rankings, facilitators were able to further explore and clarify the hidden elements of success factors. Understandably, different groups and different facilitators had varying levels of success with the ranking exercise. Whilst the exercise served its purpose in deepening discussion, it would be inappropriate to compare the rankings between groups, villages or communes.

Rather than considering rankings directly, from a scaling-up perspective it is valuable to recognise those factors of success which are important and can also be influenced by different stakeholders. During the Hanoi Sharing and Analysis Workshop, participants were presented with the consolidated list above and asked to consider which factors they could influence and which of those were most important. The result of this analysis is presented below.

Commune and district officials

- New awareness of links between sanitation, disease links and good health
- Determination, commitment of local authorities
- Close collaboration between commune and village heads

Provincial agencies

- New awareness of links between sanitation, disease links and good health
- Communication approach is effective in explaining effects of OD
- (Systematic) monitoring by commune, district, province
- Determination, commitment of local authorities

Xuan Mai College

- Capacity building through training and mentoring for all different level of stakeholders
- New awareness of links between sanitation, disease links and good health
- Demonstration toilet models that people can visit (built at the right time)

The SBA adopted for the review could have been used to explore the factors behind success of the capacity building approach and relationships within the pilot (as was originally intended). Whilst this was not undertaken explicitly due to the limited time available, many participants in the review noted factors that related to these aspects of the program. Consequently, the factors presented above provide a useful insight into these issues, as is explored further in the following section.

3.3 Institutional strengths and resources

During the Sharing and Analysis Workshop conducted in Hanoi participants were asked to consider assets, strengths and resources that their organisation or institution could contribute to scale-up of CLTS. This work was conducted in groups according to the institutions they represented at different political levels, namely central, provincial and district/commune. The strengths and resources identified at each level are set out below, with the first three in each list being those considered by participants to be most important.

Provincial institutions (IEC, CPM, pCERWASS)

- **Responsibility and authority [for rural sanitation and hygiene]**
- **Well-trained and experienced staff**
- **Existing monitoring capacity and network**
- Good capacity in planning and providing training courses for district and commune staff
- Capacity to provide technical support for demonstrating sanitation options
- Financial support from NTP II [ability to access this]
- Health worker network from central to village level

Women's Union

- **Systematic organisation with WU groups at all levels**
- **Enthusiastic and very active members to work on programs**
- **Sanitation and hygiene is one of WU's existing program activities**
- Experienced and skilful in communications and mobilisation

Communes

- **Experienced staff with good capacity on CLTS**
- **Best awareness of the sanitation [situation in the] community**
- **Good relationships with communities**
- Able to demonstrate hygiene and appropriate latrines in the village
- [Understanding that] local people could build hygiene latrine by themselves
- Cooperation and coordination among related offices; from province to village level

Xuan Mai College

- **Experienced in training and triggering CLTS in different areas**
- **Six experienced CLTS trainers and teachers**
- **Good collaboration and relationships with other organisations and authorities**
- Have developed a range of different documents on CLTS
- Experienced in delivering CLTS ToT in seven provinces on CLTS
- Skills for working in remote areas as well as with ethnic minority groups
- Available to arrange time to carry out CLTS training and planning
- Experienced in monitoring and supporting CLTS

When considering how these assets can contribute to success in scaling up CLTS in new areas it should be noted that some were acquired only after CLTS had been introduced (e.g. staff trained in the CLTS approach). Aside from the strengths of Xuan Mai College, however, most of the strengths noted above exist at the province/district/commune level prior to CLTS being introduced and hence are entirely relevant to scale-up.

4 Reflecting on success

The SBA review process generated a wide range of factors that support the success of CLTS, as described above. For SNV to make use of this information, thought must be given to which of those factors can be replicated or encouraged as CLTS is scaled-up and how that might be done. A number of ideas are presented below for each of the factor thematic areas.

Overarching these themes is the opportunity that CLTS provides for communities take on the issue of open defecation. First and for most, the program has been successful in creating opportunities for communities to talk freely about their sanitation challenges and then to facilitate communities to overcome the challenges collectively. The realisation by communities that they needed to, and can, change their living conditions was the critical element behind the achievements. Making communities comfortable to talk openly about sanitation practices has been a critical factor.

It is also recommended that SNV develop a conscious practice of monitoring the most important success factors. It would be useful to trial an approach that analysed, monitored and managed factors of success much in the same way that risks are commonly dealt with in the development practice.

4.1 Commitment

Community spirit and the willingness of households to support each other was amongst the most commonly cited factors of success and easiest to appreciate. Understanding how this spirit is generated or can be leveraged by a CLTS program was more difficult to determine. Two potential underlying sub-factors are the galvanising role of community leadership (discussed below in Section 4.4) and the ‘total community’ aspect of CLTS. As noted below, the CLTS triggering tools were found to be effective in changing attitudes about what constitutes ‘good’ behaviour. A key principle of CLTS, however, is that your neighbour’s defecation practices are every bit as important to your

health as those of your own household. This element of CLTS strongly promotes communal action. Whether this is as potent in generating community commitment as respect for the authority of leaders remains an open question.

As CLTS is scaled-up into other districts, two actions may help to reinforce community commitment. Firstly, the growing number of successful ODF communities offer increasing opportunities for visits by people from non-ODF communities. The stories of whole-of-community success in these ODF villages are likely to inspire commitment in others. Secondly, securing formal government recognition for ODF status (e.g. government certification and perhaps celebrations) may also work to build community spirit. Communities that have been successful in achieving ODF will also offer lessons for others about how to support poor households to eliminate OD. It is recommended that SNV work closely with clients to consciously capture these experiences and build a 'library' of successful approaches to supporting poorer households that can be incorporated into training of CLTS facilitators.

Commitment was found to extend well beyond communities. Where CLTS has been effective commune leaders, district authorities and staff of provincial agencies were also found to be highly committed. As with community commitment, this seemed to result from a blend of leadership from higher authorities combined with personal and institutional commitment to the objectives and execution of CLTS. Observing the successes of CLTS, such as occurred during this review, can help build this commitment. Training government staff members at each level as Triggering Facilitators or Master Trainers also appears to have contributed to the high levels of commitment reported during the review. The SNV pilot has been successful not just in identifying suitable government agencies at provincial, district and commune level to implement CLTS, but also in equipping their staff with the skills to contribute meaningfully and successfully.

4.2 Knowledge—behaviour change

Participants remarked regularly that the CLTS triggering approach was highly successful in generating understanding that OD leads to ingestion of shit and that this has consequences for health. The effectiveness of the approach was one of the most commonly cited factors of success. Ms Thu, Director of IEC in Lao Cai noted that this made CLTS remarkable. She explained that past hygiene campaigns, conducted over many years and providing detailed instruction on how people should behave, had had little if any effect. In contrast, in a single day CLTS imparts sufficient knowledge (along with the commitment noted above) for people to change their defecation behaviour.

One of the principles of CLTS, and a factor which distinguishes it from other hygiene promotion techniques, is that the health message is kept deliberately simple—'eating shit is bad and makes you sick'. Most people, irrespective of their formal education will accept such a principle. There is no requirement to teach people about the disease theory that explains how ingesting shit causes ill-health. Hence, the CLTS message remains simple and powerful.

Review participants also noted that practical, participatory tools used within CLTS triggering were also effective in imparting knowledge. In several locations village members recalled the exercise where a human hair is placed first in shit and then in a glass of water. In one community in Hop Thanh, participants reported physically vomiting in response to the triggering exercise and that their aversion to open defecation now prevented them from even defecating in the rice fields during the day.¹³

During the Hanoi Sharing and Analysis Workshop the IEC Director for Lao Cai, Ms Thu, illustrated the success of CLTS in changing attitudes towards sanitation with a story from a community visit. Prior to CLTS being triggered one of the women in the community explained 'we defecate in open, the waste

¹³ This response, however, was atypical. Other communities reported continued open defecation in the rice fields during the day.

will be washed away by surface water and the left over will be picked up by our dogs. The dogs also need to eat. Why do we need a latrine?'. After triggering, however, the same women reported that attitudes had changed and that every household in her community had constructed and were using a latrine.

Whilst the technique and exercises are simple, they will only work if well facilitated. The success with behaviour change at village level observed during the review suggests that the capacity building and mentoring of Triggering Facilitators has been highly effective. As CLTS is scaled-up, care should be taken to ensure that those who are responsible for triggering in communities are well-trained, have had ample opportunity to observe successful triggering before taking on the responsibility themselves; and are well supported, mentored and supervised. The approach adopted in the SNV pilot, where master trainers are created at provincial level and in turn train triggering facilitators at district and commune level, appears suitable for replication.

There was little, if any, mention amongst participants about changed behaviour for hand washing or other WASH-related hygiene. Given that triggering has been highly successful in reducing open defecation and driving latrine construction, it would be a risk to complicate the triggering messages with stronger hand washing promotion. The post-triggering session, however, seems well-suited to promoting hand washing with soap or soap substitutes. Given the very positive response described below to carrying out 'improvements' to basic latrines after post-triggering, it is not unreasonable to expect that many households would also be willing to invent and construct effective, inexpensive hand washing stations using locally available materials.

4.3 Knowledge—construction

The value of construction advice being provided through CLTS is well summed up by the Village Health Worker in Ly Chui Phin village in Lai Cao who said, 'we didn't know a toilet could be this simple. If we did, we would have made one sooner'. Rather than imposing toilet construction techniques that are complex or expensive, CLTS unleashes the creativity and resourcefulness of local communities to meet their own needs. The response in villages such as Phung and Ly Chiu Phin suggest that this occurred during the SNV pilot.

The pilot approach was far less open to varying design options in the post-triggering phase where households are expected to upgrade their latrine in one of four MoH-approved designs presented in the post-triggering (septic tank, pour-flush, double vault composting, or ventilated improved pit). These options remain expensive for rural households and it will be worth SNV investigating in the coming months whether only those relatively affluent households upgrade their toilets whilst poorer households slip back into open defecation. It was also noted in Hop Thanh commune that the septic tanks there had been built directly below the toilets with no provision made for emptying sludge. As SNV and its clients continue to build their experience with post-triggering, these sorts of technical issues should be identified along with examples of best practice so that the level of technical advice offered to communities is steadily improved.

Post-triggering also appeared somewhat prescriptive regarding upgrading of simple pits in the period before building one of the four 'approved' models. This involved adding vent pipes to pits and creating urine separation devices. It was impressive to see the responsiveness of communities to these recommendations. Even in the village of Ban Han in Quai Cang, where all houses are soon to be relocated due to construction of a dam, households had still added locally devised vent pipes to their pits and diversion devices for urine separation. There is an argument for reviewing this aspect of post-triggering in consultation with the government partners. A range of ineffective vent pipes were observed, including those installed at ground level, those fitted to pits with no covers and others of a diameter that would preclude any significant airflow. Encouraging households to install vent pipes in these circumstances on the basis that they would reduce odour is likely to create disillusionment. Likewise with urine separation, whilst the principle of keeping pit contents dry may

be sound, the added complication and cleaning requirements involved with urine separation may well exceed any benefit from a slight reduction in odour. Given that most toilets where urine separation has been set up use unlined pits, the impact of urine separation may be minimal. It would be worth exploring this with households directly and encouraging community members to learn from each other. Alternatives such as adding ash or other dry material may well be preferable.

Two further issues were raised during the village consultations and final review workshop regarding transfer of construction knowledge through post-triggering. Firstly, it was generally agreed that demonstration latrines in the communes should be built shortly after triggering so that they are operational at the time of post-triggering and user households have accumulated sufficient experience with each model so that they are able to share their insights with other community members during post-triggering. It was also suggested that an interval of four to six months be maintained between triggering and post-triggering—long enough so that households have an opportunity to build their own latrines but not so long that in the absence of technical advice households lose their enthusiasm for upgrading.

4.4 Leadership

Along with community spirit, mobilisation of communities by the village leaders was the most commonly cited factor of success for CLTS. 'Leaders' in this context extended well beyond the Village Head and included Village Health Worker, officers from the broad range of mass organisations found in villages, and, in Quai Cang, members of the WASH Action Groups. These leaders were reported to have led both by example (being the first to stop OD and to build toilets) and by encouragement. The experience of centralised government in Vietnam seems to benefit CLTS with people being accustomed to providing and to accepting leadership. The way in which latrines had been upgraded in some villages, with every household fitting a vent pipe and urine diversion, provided a good illustration of this cultural aspect. Several villages reported having declared village regulations concerning CLTS, lending weight to the encouragement and coercion leaders exerted. Leadership beyond the village level was also an important factor. Commune leaders provided direction, support and encouragement to the Village Heads and to through the mass organisations and some communes made regulations in support of CLTS. Provincial government staff led with advice and encouragement and legitimised CLTS for commune leaders.

Leadership was closely linked to commitment, as noted above. Leaders became committed to CLTS and hence provided strong leadership. Other aspects of the way in which CLTS was implemented also supported strong leadership. The Bac Ha Director of Health and the Na Hoi Commune Chairman both noted that people at commune level clearly understood their leadership roles and responsibilities. They stressed that it was not sufficient just to appoint leaders but that their experience of success came from leaders being providing the content and skills to implement CLTS effectively. The capacity building approach, which draws CLTS triggering facilitators from the commune (and in some cases district) level has been effective in promoting strong leadership. This also applies to leadership within the village. Providing triggering training for the Village Head and Village Health Worker to act as motivators before triggering takes place in a village seems likely to be linked to the subsequent quality of their leadership.

During the review, women leaders were prominent at all levels: as master trainers from provincial health department, CLTS triggering facilitators amongst district health and commune staff, Women's Union representatives, Village Heads and Village Health Workers, and also within households. The review did not suggest that CLTS success was dependent upon leadership by women any more than by men. In Na Hoi commune, women were very prominent in the success of Na Hoi Nung village. The VHW was female and 90% of participants at the CLTS triggering were women. Equally successful Ly Chui Phin, in the same commune, had no leadership by women within the village and triggering was attended exclusively by men. During the scale-up of SNV's program, however, attention to participation at the triggering events and leadership by women could be improved by engaging more

strongly with the women's union, monitoring this specifically and emphasising this further in the motivator training ahead of triggering. Women are already strongly represented amongst those trained as CLTS Triggering Facilitators and Master Trainers. Adding a representative from the WU to the group of village leaders who receive CLTS motivator training will ensure that women are represented amongst the CLTS village leadership group and encourage greater engagement with women as decision makers following triggering and post-triggering.

The issue of providing financial incentives at the village and commune level to provide CLTS follow up was raised regularly during the review. SNV's experience suggests that this initial CLTS success is not necessarily dependant on making such payments—in some villages, strong leadership had been shown without any such payment. It is possible to argue, however, that payment of an allowance for a limited period to encourage follow-up at the village level may strengthen relationships between commune and village and increase the level of support that village leaders provide. The suggestions from within SNV that any payment be output based and tightly time-bound (e.g. perhaps just for the interval between triggering and post-triggering) are sound.

Creating a government certification process for declaring ODF status in villages may also be an effective strategy to strengthen the leadership role of the commune during CLTS implementation. Particularly if in the future CLTS is adopted by the government through the NTP, formalising a certification process and training commune/district staff to apply it would enhance the engagement of commune leaders.

4.5 Other factors

Of the 'other' factors identified during the review and presented in Section 3.2, the most significant is the issue of how CLTS can operate effectively in heavily subsidised environment. This was raised as an area of interest for SNV when the review objectives were clarified and is an important consideration given the government's widespread subsidy program. Adoption of village and commune regulation was reported to have occurred spontaneously and can be encouraged during the facilitator training, as can integration of CLTS into other aspects of government and MO sanitation and hygiene programs.

CLTS 'purists' are highly critical of any form of subsidy for households to construct toilets, arguing that this overwhelms the other motivating factors triggered by CLTS and stifles household action. Nonetheless, in Vietnam subsidies for households considered 'poor' remain part of the government sanitation response, particularly in ethnic minority communities where SNV's current entire WASH program is focused. If CLTS is eventually adopted on a national scale, triggering will occur in many communities with some experience or expectation of government financial assistance. Hence, learning about how to deal with subsidies cannot be ignored.

This issue was not investigated in depth during the review. The SNV pilot, however, provides an interesting opportunity to explore the interaction between CLTS and subsidies. In Lao Cai, households in Hop Thanh commune were fully subsidised to build their toilets (as was the case with their housing). This did not stop community members engaging with the CLTS process and nor did it stop them from investing additional funds in addition to the subsidy. Given that they were being strongly encouraged to build heavily subsidised toilets anyway, the significance of CLTS as a motivating factor is open to further debate. The review found no suggestion, however, that households looked unfavourably upon CLTS in Hop Thanh commune. In some other communities SNV encountered reluctance by households to build toilets in advance of a subsidy being granted due to concern that households would subsequently be disadvantaged. In Na Hoi commune, communities such as Ly Chui Phin had a vague understanding of the government subsidy program but enthusiastically built their toilets in response to CLTS triggering without any firm expectation of future financial assistance. CLTS in this case clearly operated very successfully in an environment of partial government subsidy.

Whilst further investigation into this topic is warranted, the review suggests that it is possible to use CLTS to drive sanitation demand where the government is willing to provide financial assistance to some households. To be most effective, CLTS ought to be triggered independently of the subsidy program. The success of Hop Thanh commune and its villages suggest that subsidy programs can be effectively incorporated into post-triggering follow up. Even in those cases where the expectation of subsidy inhibits successful triggering, no harm is done in applying the CLTS approach. Further research into these areas is commended to SNV prior to scaling up.

5 Recommendations

The Hanoi Sharing and Analysis Workshop provided participants with an opportunity to consider the review findings and to respond with recommendations. Two sets of recommendations were invited: one relating to scaling up of sanitation in Vietnam generally and the other specifically for scaling up by SNV. A number of other issues arose during the review which is internal to the review. Each of these sets of recommendations are presented below.

This review report draws short of making specific recommendations in any of the three areas discussed below. As the scale-up program is further developed and implementation commences the SNV WASH team will decide what action, if any, should be taken in response to the issues raised here.

5.1 Scaling up CLTS in Vietnam generally

1. **Share and disseminate experience and lessons learned.** Continuing to share CLTS experience from successful provinces was the most frequently mentioned recommendation. Given the wealth of success observed during this review, arranging such provincial visits should not be difficult. Care should be taken, however, that the work of sharing success is shared around the different provinces, communes and villages so that this does not become a burden (particularly successful villages close to provincial centres).
2. **Provide a support fund for commune and village-level motivators.** As noted during the Review Preparation Workshop, the concept of providing financial incentives at the village or commune level for local authorities to follow-up CLTS activities remains contentious. Currently, UNICEF provide a payment for follow up when implementing CLTS. Whilst the review takes no position on whether these incentives are required, it is recommended that SNV coordinate with UNICEF (and other donors considering use of CLTS) to adopt a standard approach to this issue, which remains very sensitive. Most of the recommendations concerning payment were directed at SNV, as noted below.
3. **Integrate CLTS into NTPII and III.** There was considerable discussion at the Hanoi workshop about the weight that this recommendation should carry. A range of verbs were trialled including 'institutionalise', 'encourage' and 'incorporate'. It was clear that participants believed CLTS was a useful intervention and should become part of the government's sanitation program.
4. **Build CLTS capacity at provincial, district and commune levels.** This recommendation recognised that if CLTS is to be scaled-up nationally, a considerable increase would be required in the number of skilled facilitators and CLTS trainers of trainers. This could involve both expanding the capacity of Xuan Mai College by taking on more staff and also identify other agencies that could replicate the work of Xuan Mai College in the central and southern provinces, including the Vietnam Women's Union.
5. **Document the CLTS methodology.** Three of the recommendations noted above—integrating CLTS into NTP; building the capacity of the training sector to implement it; and disseminating lessons learned—each rely on the CLTS approach being documented and easily shared.

Whilst there is much literature on CLTS available internationally, this documentation does not yet exist in Vietnam and will make an important contribution once developed.

6. **Adapt CLTS to different contexts.** This recommendation recognises that the WASH context in Vietnam is diverse and that agencies must continue to reflect and learn as they implement CLTS. Whilst the overall approach will not change, different geographic and cultural conditions will require adaptation of some elements. The sector should resist a rigid, 'one-size-fits-all' approach and retain flexibility as CLTS is scaled-up nationally.

5.2 Scaling up CLTS within SSH4A

1. **Document the CLTS methodology.** This recommendation was made both for SNV and for scaling up in Vietnam generally. It is particularly relevant to SNV as the agency which now has the greatest knowledge and experience of CLTS implementation in Vietnam. The review suggests that some further experimentation and reflection is required regarding the post-triggering phase. Nevertheless, SNV has ample experience to now document its CLTS practice and is strongly encouraged to do so, including reviewing the existing training materials and adapting them to local contexts. It would be particularly valuable if this was done in conjunction with the government and other agencies practicing or planning to practice CLTS, particularly UNICEF, so that a common approach can be promoted within NTP-III.
2. **Develop the approach to monitoring.** This issue did not feature strongly in the SBA review. Given the number of recommendations made in this category, however, it is clear that those working with SNV on CLTS believe that the monitoring approach could be strengthened. The recommendations span both increasing the number of visits to communities and also developing the mechanisms by which other agencies will continue to provide long-term follow up after ODF status has been achieved.
3. **Build capacity.** This set of recommendations echoed the recommendation for capacity building noted above but focused on implementation at the facilitator level rather than national training capacity. One recommendation in particular urged strong collaboration between SNV and national, provincial, commune representatives as SNV prepares the capacity building for its impending scale up.
4. **Provide financial support for follow-up activities.** This set of recommendations repeated those made for the national scale up (refer to point 2 above).
5. **Implement CLTS within a broader Environmental Health program.** It was noted during the review that CLTS had been highly effective in mobilising communities to build toilets and eliminate open defecation. To achieve long-term health benefits this must be accompanied by improved hygiene practices (especially hand washing after defecation) and ongoing improvements to sanitation infrastructure ('scaling of the sanitation ladder'). This recommendation recognises that CLTS is not an end in itself but must be complemented with a broader environmental health agenda, such as that being promoted in SNV's SSH4A.

5.3 Follow up for the SNV WASH team

1. **Reflect on the SBA experience.** Use of SBA for this review was new for most of the SNV WASH team. It would be useful to provide an opportunity in the near future for the WASH staff to analyse their SBA experience. This should consider what kinds of learning SBA is effective at capturing, where other tools are required, and those contexts for which it may or may not be appropriate in future.
2. **Take decisions on actions arising from the review.** In the coming weeks it is recommended that the senior staff identify areas that require further investigation and take decisions on

any follow up action that appropriate. In particular, this should include analysis of the recommendations presented above and identification of where the approach should be reinforced or altered during the impending scale up.

3. **Identify areas for further investigation.** Not all the areas of interest listed during the planning workshop (refer to Section 2.2) were addressed by the review. These include issues such as whether the costs of CLTS are justified by the benefits and how SNV can best learn about and improve the quality of triggering. During the reflection on the review process it would be appropriate that these issues are revisited and areas requiring further investigation by SNV are identified.

Annex A Review participants

SNV planning workshop, 27 September

| Name | Institution | Position |
|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Bruck Aregai | SNV | Programme Leader , Senior Adviser WASH |
| Pham Thi Van Lan | SNV | Senior Advisor WASH |
| Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | Advisor WASH |
| Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator |
| Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | Advisor WASH |
| Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant |
| Pham Thanh Hai | Xuan Mai College | Consultant |

One day preparation workshop at Dien Bien CPM on 29 September 2010

| Name | Institution | Position |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator |
| Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | Advisor |
| Pham thi Van Lan | SNV | Workshop facilitator |
| Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | workshop co-facilitator |
| T.N Thuy Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant |
| Nguyen Thu Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant |
| Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant |
| Luong Thi Hong Nhung | Dien Bien WU | Officer |
| Nong Thi Thinh | Dien Bien WU | Officer |
| Đong Thi Minh Thu | Dien Bien CPM | Officer |
| Nguyen Thi Đào | Dien Bien CPM | Officer |
| Vu Duc Long | Dien Bien CPM | Officer |
| Lo Van Tam | Quai Cang CPC | Vice chairman |
| Trinh Thi Mai | Na Tau Commune | Officer |
| Nguyen Van Kien | Muong Ang CPC | Chairman |
| Nguyen Huu Hiep | Muong Ang DOA | Officer |

Annex A Review participants

Dien Bien Province review field visit, 30th Sep – 1st October

| Name | Institution | Position | Commune team |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant | Quai Cang |
| Luong Thi Hong Nhung | Dien Bien WU | Officer | Quai Cang |
| Nong Thi Thinh | Dien Bien WU | Officer | Na Tau |
| Đong Thi Minh Thu | Dien Bien CPM | Officer | Quai Cang |
| Nguyen Thi Dao | Dien Bien CPM | Officer | Quai Cang |
| Vu Duc Long | Dien Bien CPM | Officer | Na Tau |
| Pham Van Lan | SNV | Advisor | Team facilitator, Quai Cang. |
| T.N Thuy Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant | Quai Cang |
| Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | Advisor | Na Tau |
| Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | Advisor | Team facilitator, Na Tau team. |
| Nguyen Thu Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant | Na Tau |
| Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator | Quai Cang team |
| Lo Van Tam | Quai Cang CPC | Vice chairman | Na Tau |
| Trinh Thi Mai | Na Tau Commune | Officer | Na Tau |
| Nguyen Van Kien | Muong Ang CPC | Chairman | Na Tau |
| Nguyen Huu Hiep | Muong Ang DOA | Officer | Na Tau |

One day preparation workshop at Lao Cai PCERWASS on the 4th Oct 2010

| Name | Institution | Position |
|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Julian Galindo | IPADE | Country Representative |
| Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | Advisor |
| Pham Thi Van Lan | SNV | Workshop facilitator |
| Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | Advisor. |
| T.N Thuy Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant |
| Nguyen Thu Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant |
| Pham Quang Nam | SNV | Advisor |

Annex A Review participants

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant, co-facilitator |
| Pham Thanh Hai | Xuan Mai College | Consultant, |
| Nguyen Thi Thu | IEC Lao Cai | Director |
| Pham Van Hong | IEC Lao Cai | Officer |
| Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao | Lao Cai pCERWASS | Officer |
| Mai Anh | Lao Cai pCERWASS | Officer |
| La Van Dung | Hop Thanh CPC | Officer |
| Than Dang Quyen | Na Hoi CPC | Officer |
| Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator |

Lao Cai Province review visit, 5 – 6 October 2010

| Name | Institution | Position | Commune team |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Julian Galindo | IPADE | Country Rep. | Hop Thanh team |
| 2. Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | Advisor | Hop Thanh |
| 3. Pham Thi Van Lan | SNV | Advisor | Hop Thanh team facilitator. |
| 4. Pham Thanh Hai | Xuan Mai College | Consultant | Hop Thanh |
| 5. T.N Thuy Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant | Hop Thanh |
| 6. Nguyen Thi Thu | IEC Lao Cai | Director | Hop Thanh |
| 7. La Van Dung | Hop Thanh CPC | Officer | Hop Thanh |
| 8. Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao | Lao Cai PcerWASS | Officer | Hop Thanh |
| 9. Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator | Na Hoi team |
| 10. Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | Advisor | Na Hoi team facilitator. |
| 11. Nguyen Thu Trang | SNV | Translator/ Assistant | Na Hoi |
| 12. Pham Quang Nam | SNV | Advisor | Na Hoi |
| 13. Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant | Na Hoi |
| 14. Pham Van Hong | IEC Lao Cai | Officer | Na Hoi |
| 15. Than Dang Quyen | Na Hoi CPC | Officer | Na Hoi |
| 16. Mai Anh | Lao Cai PcerWASS | Officer | Na Hoi |

Annex A Review participants

Hanoi sharing and reflection workshop, 8 October

| Name | Institution | Position |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Vu Thi Quynh Anh | SNV | Deputy Country Director |
| Bruck Aregai | SNV | Programme Leader |
| Pham Thi Van Lan | SNV | Workshop facilitator, Senior Advisor. |
| Matthew Bond | FH Designs | Consultant, review facilitator |
| Gabrielle Halcrow | SNV | WASH Advisor |
| Doan Trieu Thanh | SNV | Advisor |
| Mrs. Ha Thanh Hang | RWSS NTP, MARD | General secretary NTP II, MARD. |
| Mr. Julian Galindo | IPADE | Country representative |
| Dang Duc Hanh | Xuan Mai College | Consultant, co- facilitator |
| Pham Thanh Hai | Xuan Mai College | Consultant, |
| Vu Duc Long | Dien Bien CPM | Head Unit. |
| Doan Ngoc Hung | Dien Bien CPM | Director |
| Nong Thi Thinh | Dien Bien WU | Officer |
| Lo Van Tam | Quai Cang CPC | Vice chairman |
| Trinh Thi Mai | Na Tau Commune | Officer |
| Nguyen Van Kien | Muong Ang CPC | Chairman |
| Bui Van Thao | Na Hoi Health centre | Director |
| Luong Thi Hong Nhung | Dien Bien WU | Officer |
| Đông Thị Minh Thu | Dien Bien CPM | Officer |
| Nguyen Thi Đào | Dien Bien CPM | Officer |
| Nguyen Thi Thu | IEC Lao Cai | Director |
| La Van Dung | Hop Thanh CPC | Officer |
| Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao | Lao Cai PcerWASS | Officer |
| Pham Van Hong | IEC Lao Cai | Officer |
| Than Dang Quyen | Na Hoi CPC | Officer |
| Mai Anh | Lao Cai PcerWASS | Officer |

Annex B Case study

Transforming sanitation practices in two villages in Na Hoi Commune

A story from Na Hoi Nung village

Mrs Vang A Sung and her husband- Mr. Then Van Nhung live in Na Hoi Nung village in Na Hoi Commune of Bac Ha District. They have two teenage children living at home—one daughter and one son—and a second daughter studying at university in Hanoi. The Nhung family are of the Nung minority ethnic group, one of the many different ethnic groups represented in Lao Cai province. The family have lived in the village since the time of their grandparents and are one of about fifty households. Na Hoi Nung is situated within walking distance of Bac Ha Town but the way of life is very different from that of their urban neighbours in Bac Ha. People live a very rural existence next to their farmland and with animals penned close to their houses. Agriculture focuses on cultivating rice, livestock, vegetables and fruit (notably plums).



Mrs and Mr Nhung are active members of the community. Whilst they don't hold positions of leadership, Mrs Sung is a village member of the Vietnam Women's Union and Mr Nhung a member of the Elders Union. Typical of his generation, Mr Nhung completed primary school only. Mrs Sung, however, completed secondary school and worked for some time as a primary teacher. Her two teenage children attend secondary school in Bac Ha, about half an hour's walk away. By village standards their house is spacious

and well-constructed. They have running water within the house (via a gravity water supply system that serves the village) and access to electricity. Whilst they don't own a motorcycle, they have their own rice mill and a television.

Annex B Case study

Until recently, sanitation practices in Na Hoi were very unhygienic. Householders defecated either in the fields or bush near their house or in their animal pens. For the Nhung family, defecation was carried out in a small alcove adjacent to their pig pen. Human and animal faeces were collected in a single container and used as agricultural fertiliser. Members of the Nhung family found this quite convenient. The animal pen was right next to their house and the location for defecating private and secluded. Nothing about it struck them as being disadvantageous.



When CLTS triggering occurred in June 2010 Mrs Sung represented her household at the village triggering session. In Na Hoi Nung, where the village health worker is a woman and was trained to be a CLTS facilitator, most of the other participants were also women. Mrs Sung did not recall walking through the village looking at evidence of open defecation (the 'footsteps of shame' exercise) but did remember mapping defecation in the village and particularly the part of the triggering where a human hair is transferred from faeces to a glass of water. In response to the triggering, Mrs Sung and her husband registered to build a toilet inside their house. It is connected to a three chamber septic tank. Main motivating factor for Mrs Sung was that the CLTS triggering had convinced her that open defecation is bad for the health of her family and that of her neighbours.



The Sung family's toilet is beautifully constructed. They built both a bathroom and a toilet inside their house at a cost of VND 20 million (approximately USD1000). They received no subsidy from the government and the toilet was built in about a month by skilled masons from Na Hoi Nung village. The family find the new toilet much more convenient to use than the animal pen, especially at night or in bad weather. The whole household converted to use of the toilet without any hesitation. Mrs

Annex B Case study

Sung has added cleaning the toilet to her many other responsibility for cleaning. They are not sure what they will do when the septic tank is full (there is no one in the village that has a machine for de-sludging septic tanks) but they expect the tank to last 15-20 years before it fills up and requires emptying. The Nhung family are very happy with their new toilet. They had long had sufficient resources to build a toilet but it took CLTS triggering to motivate them to act.

A story from Ly Chu Phin village

Ly Chu Phin is part of the same commune as Na Hoi Nung village but sits high in the hills, about 700 metres above sea level, far above Bac Ha in the valley below. Mr Giang Van Lo is the Village Health Worker for Ly Chu Phin. He is 22 years old and married to Mrs Sung Thi Ban who is two years older. The couple have three children, all boys, aged 6, 4, and 1, and share their house with Mr Lo's parents, his brother and sister-in-law and their one-week-old baby son. Mr Lo's family has lived in the village since his great-grandfather's time. They make their livelihood from agriculture, based around rice, corn and livestock. As with nearly all of Vietnam, Ly Chu Phin has access to electricity and the Lo family own a television. Their water supply is an open pipe from a gravity water supply scheme across the road from their house. Since they are such a long way from town, the family has two motorcycles.



Neither of Mr Lo's parents attended school and neither did his wife. The couple's oldest son, however, now attends the nearest primary school which is about 40 minutes walk away. Mr Lo takes his son there on his motorcycle in the morning and he walks back with his classmates in the afternoon. Mr Lo completed four years of secondary school and then left school to become married. Shortly afterward he was selected by the commune to be trained as the Village Health Worker which required one year of health schooling.

As the Village Health Worker, Mr Lo attended a five day CLTS triggering training course in Na Hoi Commune. Prior to triggering everyone in the village practised open defecation. There were many places used by the family within a five minute walk, the closest being the bushes near the stream in

Annex B Case study

front of their house. Mr Lo said that no one found this problematic, certainly not the male members of the household. Privacy was not an issue. It was unpleasant seeing other people's shit from time to time and somewhat inconvenient at night but it was a practice that everyone had grown up with and went unquestioned.

Two months ago CLTS triggering took place in the village. Mr Lo attended and, having been trained in CLTS, played a supporting role for the facilitators. His father and brother also attended but none of the women in the village were involved. Everyone in the village found the CLTS triggering very powerful and immediately committed to building a toilet. Mr Lo led by example, building a well-constructed VIP latrine across the road from his house (there is very little flat land around the houses in Ly Chu Phin and siting and building a toilet takes some effort). He said that the biggest motivating factor for him was that through CLTS he discovered just how easy it was to build a toilet. Before CLTS they thought toilets were complicated and expensive and had no idea that they could build something perfectly hygienic with their own skills and largely from locally available materials. Mr Lo's toilet cost only about VND 400,000 (about USD20) which purchased some cement, bricks and reinforcing steel. It took three days to build using design principles that Mr Lo learnt in his CLTS training in Bac Ha.



The whole family immediately switched from open defecation to using their new toilet, including the children and Mr Lo's parents. They even dispose of the infants' faeces in the toilet. Following the triggering and leading on from Mr Lo example, everyone of the 23 households in Ly Chui Phin has now built a toilet. Most are simple pit toilets rather than the ventilated improved version that Mr Lo built but everyone has plans to upgrade in time. The Lo family, along with neighbours have completely given up open defecation within the village, ending in a few short months a practice that has existed for generations.

These two stories offer powerful examples of how CLTS motivates people to give up open defecation and build toilets. In a range of contexts, it works equally well with poor and rich households and with women and men. The change happens quickly and is reinforced by the whole-of-community requirement that CLTS encourages. People build toilets in accordance with their own means, drawing upon their own resources and resourcefulness. In the process CLTS is highly effective mobilising people to take charge of their environmental health outcomes and hence presents a good platform for introducing further change.

Annex C Consolidated recommendations

Recommendations for scale up in Vietnam generally

Share and disseminate experience and lessons learned

- Study tour to different countries where CLTS is implemented
- Study tour for experience sharing (*cited twice*)
- Visit successful CLTS modules
- Study tour for experience sharing
- Share experiences from successful provinces (*cited five times*)
- Conducting workshop for experience sharing

Support fund for village-level facilitators

- SNV to provide an allowance for workers at communes and villages supporting CLTS follow up

Integrate CLTS methodology into NTP

- Integrating CLTS in NTP3 (*cited three times*)
- Mobilise CLTS as a methodology for NTP3
- Work closely with the government to integrate CLTS into NTP
- Developing network [for CLTS promotion]
- Promoting CLTS as a support program in sanitation and hygiene
- Take the lead in scaling up

CLTS capacity building for staff at provincial, commune levels

- Capacity building for staff at provincial, commune levels
- Produce more Xuan Mai [agencies, TOT staff]
- Organise field trips for commune staff to visit the demonstration latrine models

Document the CLTS methodology

- Documenting CLTS results for advocacy
- Documents method and introduce in health school training
- Conducting work shop at district level
- Conducting work shop on CLTS for leaders, directors at provincial, district, commune levels

Creatively adapt CLTS to different contexts

- Adapt CLTS practice to the province setting/situation in collaboration with government programs
- Reviewing CLTS results in provinces where CLTS has been implemented to mobilise other provinces to register interest
- Take into account CLTS approach/specifications in the design of new support programs related to sanitation
- Find and introduce good models
- Implementing CLTS together with other sanitation clusters
- Transform “hardware” to “software”

Annex C Consolidated recommendations

Recommendations for SNV scale up

Document the CLTS methodology

- Formally document lessons learned and experience sharing
- Provide support at different levels for institutionalizing CLTS
- Integrate CLTS in NTP
- Document and publish a CLTS manual in partnership with Ministry of Health

Develop the approach to monitoring

- Regular training for trained areas 1-2 per year in the period of 3-5 years
- Develop M&E system from commune to villages level
- Develop M&E system
- M&E after implementing
- SNV to pay more visit to project sites
- Visit successful CLTS modules
- Promoting experience and lesson learn to different households

Build capacity

- Strong collaboration between SNV and national, provincial, commune levels for Capacity building and implementing CLTS
- Keep up with training and monitoring
- Keep up with training, capacity building in CLTS
- Training on communication skills
- Training support for implementing staff in CLTS at commune (*cited twice*)
- Providing at least one model of demonstration latrine in each commune
- Sharing and learning trip

Provide financial support for follow-up activities

- Financial support for monitoring activities at different levels (*cited twice*)
- Allowance support from SNV for local authority workers (*cited twice*)
- Financial support

Implementation approach

- Implement and integrate CLTS to other sanitation clusters such as sanitation behaviour management, waste management, water quality control management...
- Conduct training and triggering in the untrained areas

Review planning workshop

1 Overview and introductions

2 Review purpose

- Why is SNV conducting this review;
- Review objectives (cross-reference to the TOR); are these achievable?
- What it's not
- What sort of information does the WASH Team need from the review
- What are the two or three important questions that we want to answer

3 Facilitation

- who will be facilitating
- team(s) approach
- experience as facilitators,

Exercise: facilitation within the Vietnamese culture—individually, think of an example of great Vietnamese facilitator. Share with the group: what were their strengths; what about their style, approach, technique made them a great facilitator.

4 Strengths-based approach;

- Why has SNV proposed a strengths-based approach?
- What's at the core of the SBA recommended for this review
 1. What has worked well (in this context) and why?
 2. What resources and strengths are available?
 3. What do we want to achieve in future?
 4. What steps do we need to take to achieve these objectives?
- SBA compared to other approaches
- Aspirations and concerns about the SBA

5 SNV's CLTS program

- Overview of the SNV WASH and CLTS program

Exercise: prepare a 3 minute presentation to the Prime Minister that explains SNV's Sanitation Demand Program and describes:

- what are the main steps in the SNV process
- what are the strengths of the SNV CLTS program
- What does SNV already know about the CLTS program
- Other aspects to share

6 Who will we learn from

- Who can tell us about the program and its strengths; from what perspectives?

Exercise: brainstorm and record on a flip chart different informants and areas of knowledge that they can teach us

Annex D

- Who will we consult with in the review
- Where will we learn (villages, communes selected)

7 How will we learn

Return to the SBA questions:

1. What has worked well (in this context) and why?
 2. What resources and strengths are available?
 3. What do we want to achieve in future?
 4. What steps do we need to take to achieve these objectives?
- Clarify these questions and ideas for different informants at various levels;

Processes

- In Vietnam, what tools or approaches have been successful in getting different stakeholders to engage in analysis and discussion?

Exercise. Brainstorm and then review the learning tools and approaches used by the team; what were the strengths of each; what worked well and why?

- working successfully with groups

Exercise. For each type of informant (and for the information sought); work out the process(es) to be adopted.

- Bringing common understanding and prioritising findings at the district level

8 How will we document and share our findings

- written reporting (outline)
- post-review workshop
- case study

9 Logistics

- materials
- participants
- travel arrangements

Provincial planning workshop

1 Opening and introductions

Introduction from client and from SNV. Welcome to participants

Ice breaker. Find a partner, prepare an introduction for them—including one strength. Pairs introduce each other to the large group.

2 Review overview (inc division into teams)

Provide an overview of the purpose of the review.

- Explain what activities we will carry out, including a detailed description of the planning workshop and a more general overview of what will happen in the village visits.
- Review the schedule for the commune and village visits (locations and timing).

Divide participants into two teams—one for each of the two commune/village visits: Allow self selection but facilitate to ensure a mix of women/men; client/commune/MO; SNV on each team.

3 SNV WASH and CLTS programs

Provide a brief introduction to the SNV WASH and CLTS programs.

For CLTS, invite participants to comment from their own experience about whether the process described matches with what occurred in their own practice (particularly from the CLTS trainers)

4 Strength-based approach—an introduction

Provide a brief introduction to SBA

- What does it involve
- How is it different from other approaches
- Contrast with ‘problem-based’ approaches common to WASH engineering and medical models
- Emphasise learning experience—i.e. learning about SBA

Invite feedback from Dien Bien participants about their success in retaining a strengths focus.

5 CLTS successes—stories and factors

Participants to work in their two groups (one for each commune to be visited).

Identifying success. Ask each group to think about their experiences of CLTS, ideally in the commune they will visit. Identify a village that was very successful. Discuss the team members’ experiences of this success; describe in detail what occurred and what the outcomes were. Those team members not directly involved with this village to ask questions and clarify the details provided. Each team to jot down on a flipchart the brief details about this CLTS success.

Brainstorming factors of success. Continuing to work in two groups, brainstorm the reasons behind the success in this village. Ask questions such as: What were the factors that lead people to change

Annex D

their behaviour, build or upgrade latrines? Why was this village more successful than others? What steps in the triggering/post-triggering process worked especially well? etc. Jot down the factors on a flipchart.

Ranking. Ask team members to review their list of factors and select the four factors that were most important in contributing to the success story. Ask the group to discuss and rank these factors in order of importance. Suggest that groups use objects to represent different factors of success and that they physically move these during the ranking process. (Note that the ranking is not critical. Ranking in this instance is to be used as a tool to promote discussion and clarification of the success factors.)

Each group to select a spokesperson and present back in plenary their success story and the ranked factors. Facilitated discussion to examine the rationale behind each group's thinking.

6 Commune and village visits—process and planning

With the whole group, explain that the process they have just been through models the approach that will be taken at the commune and village meetings. In the large group ask for comment about this: how will it work, how will commune and village representatives respond to it.

Working in two teams, ask each team to prepare an action plan for their visits. These plans should describe:

- what villages will be visited
- who will introduce the review at the start of each meeting
- what sub-groups will be formed, by whom and how
- who will facilitate each sub-group; sample questions they will use to identify success stories and factors
- who will take notes to record discussions and findings
- what visits will be made to households before or after the sub-group discussions
- logistics including timing, materials, travel arrangements

Each team to share their detailed plan with the other team. Discuss any differences and adjust as necessary to build on the strengths of each plan.

7 Other strengths—capacity building and relationships

Continuing to work in two teams. Allocate one of the following questions to each team (each team only works on one question). This exercise has two purposes—firstly it provides practice in using the strength-based approach; secondly, it addresses two questions that SNV wants to investigate.

- Think about the capacity building process (i.e. training and support of master trainers, triggering facilitators and motivators). Identify a story of success where the process has worked very well. Then brainstorm what has contributed to the success. Rank these factors of success.
- Think about the relationships between institutions (IEC at district and province, commune leaders, SNV, Xuan Mai, village leaders). Identify a story of success where the relationship is very strong and has been important for CLTS. Brainstorm the reasons why such a strong relationship has been developed. Rank these factors of success.

Each group to note down their main findings on a flip chart and present to the big group. Facilitate a brief discussion to share understanding and clarify reasoning.

Annex D

8 Administrative matters

Present information on the payment of allowances to team members and information regarding use and acquittal of funds.

Provincial data consolidation workshop

1 Assets of institutions (90 mins)

1.1 Brainstorming institutional assets

Working in two groups (IEC and LWU + People's Committees), discuss the following two questions:

- what strengths/assets/resources does your agency have to contribute to the CLTS process? (for example, these 'assets' might be knowledge, staff, commitment, networks, authority, material resources, finances, etc)

Discuss in the two groups. Use index cards to note down the assets. Return to the large group, categorise the assets into similar groups, combining the index cards from the two sub-groups.

Discuss which of the assets are most important for scaling up CLTS.

1.2 Contributing to CLTS scale-up

Discuss in large group the following question. Build the discussion around each category of assets developed above.

- how can we make these assets contribute effectively in the scale up of CLTS?

2 Successes and strengths (60 mins)

2.1 Sharing our experiences (10 mins)

Work in pairs with someone from the other group. Discuss what happened during your field trip about:

- what were the strengths and successes; particularly note anything in addition to stopping OD and building latrines
- what were the most interesting factors for success that you came across; particularly anything unexpected

2.2 What were the factors that led to success? (40 mins)

Working in two teams; prepare a flip chart that lists the factors of success that you came across for each grouping. Note the factors that were given the highest rankings. (10 mins)

- Commune
- Village resources
- Village women
- Village men

Report back on findings for each group, referring to the summary on the flip charts. Facilitate discussion and clarification, invite questions from the other group (30 mins).

2.3 Conclusions (10 mins)

Note on index cards a response to the following questions. Get responses to question 1 before moving to question 2.

- What factor of success did you find most surprising or unexpected?

Annex D

- What was the best aspect of the process we used in our visits to villages and communes
[n.b. in Dien Bien this was 'What would you recommend we repeat in Lao Cai?']

Hanoi sharing and analysis workshop

1 Opening

1.1 Welcome and introductions

Welcome by the senior-most SNV staff member and client representatives

Participants to briefly introduce themselves. For those who were part of the provincial visits, include in your introduction one thing they found useful about the SBA process.

1.2 Purpose and overview

Present the purpose of the workshop:

- share and consolidate the findings from each province
- analyse the factors of success and institutional strengths
- make recommendations for creating an enabling environment

Provide a brief overview of what we will cover in each session

- [refer to the agenda]

Emphasis participation. Explain that:

- all participants have valuable knowledge; we encourage everyone to share and contribute. We will use small group work to facilitate that
- we will try to do all the work in Vietnamese; we will have an English language group for those who can't speak Vietnamese.

2 Findings from the provincial visits

2.1 Process overview

Matt to provide an introduction to the provincial visits, explaining:

- the methodology and why it was selected
- observations about how it was carried out in each province
- highlights of the overall success of CLTS compared to other experiences

2.2 Sharing from Dien Bien

Provide a brief presentation from the provincial visit

- who was involved and where did we visit
- what were the main stories of success
- what factors of success were identified by different stakeholders
- what institutional assets/strengths were identified

Facilitate questioning and clarification for those who were not part of the visit to Dien Bien. What do participants find interesting or surprising in these findings?

Annex D

2.3 Sharing from Lao Cai

Repeat the process above for Lao Cai

3 Where are we going with CLTS

Introduce the session by explaining that we want to make recommendations for the enabling environment. Before doing that we need a shared vision of what we aim to achieve.

SNV to present a brief overview of the scaling up program for sanitation demand. What do they hope the situation will look like in Lai Chau in 12 months.

4 Building on strengths and assets

Introduce the session by using the example of a household from the case study to describe how one household combined their assets with the factors of success to create change. Describe both the factors and the assets in detail. Explain that we now want to do that at institutional level and think about how each institution can contribute to the CLTS scale-up.

Divide into groups by institution (CPM and/or IEC, Xuan Mai, Gov, SNV). Within each group:

- Brainstorm the strengths and assets that your institution can contribute to CLTS scale-up.
- From this list, select the three most important strengths/assets
- Outline the actions that your institution could take to contribute the most important of these three strengths/assets

Each group to document on a flipchart their three strengths/assets and the associated actions.

Groups to provide brief feedback. Facilitate a discussion to explore and clarify the ideas presented.

5 Creating an enabling environment

Divide into two provincial teams (assign those who did not participate in the provincial visits to one of the two teams). Consider the scaling up in Lai Chau and discuss the following questions:

- What relationships between institutions are the most important for effectively combining the strengths and assets of all stakeholders at provincial and district level
- Considering the findings from the review, make two recommendations for how SNV can best support an enabling environment for CLTS scale-up in Lai Chau.

Each team to present back their findings. Facilitated discussion.

6 Closing remarks

Reflection on the review and use of the SBA

What will happen next

Thank you to all participants

Annex D

Schedule – 8 Oct 2010

| <i>Time</i> | <i>Topic</i> | <i>Responsible</i> |
|-------------|--|--|
| 8.00-8.30 | Registration | |
| 8.30-8.45 | Welcome and introductions | Quynh Anh |
| 8.45-9.00 | Purpose, Overview of the day Overview of SNV WASH and CLTS program | Lan and Matt Lan Lan |
| 9.00-10.30 | Overview of the Review Process Success stories and highlights of CLTS (10 mins each): Ms Thu (Dien Bien) Ms Thu (Lao Cai) Mr Thao; Bac Ha District <i>coffee break</i> Mr Tam; Quai Cang Commune Mr Dung; Hop Thanh Commune Mr Quyen; Na Hoi Commune Mr Hai; LCB successful capacity building | Matt Participants Participants Participants Participants Participants Participants Participants |
| 10.30-12.00 | Success factors—overview and analysis Sharing with other groups. | Group work Participants |
| | <i>lunch break</i> | |
| 1.00-2.30 | Building on strengths and assets | Group work |
| | <i>coffee break</i> | |
| 3.00-4.00 | Creating an enabling environment Summary and recommendations | Group work Matt, Lan |
| 4.00-4.30 | Closing remarks | Bruck |

Annex F Terms of Reference

Annex E Provincial review schedules

Kế hoạch làm việc chi tiết tại Điện Biên từ 29/9 đến hết ngày 1/10

| | Nhóm 1: Xã Quang Cai, Huyện Tuần Giáo (ở lại qua đêm ở Tuần Giáo vào ngày 30/9) | Nhóm 2: Xã Nàtau, Huyện Điện Biên (trở về Điện Biên ngày 30/9). |
|--|---|---|
| 29/9 8.30 – 11.30 Ăn trưa: 11.30 -13.30 13.30 – 17.00 evening | Họp tại văn phòng Trung tâm y tế dự phòng-cả nhóm Ăn trưa chung Ở lại tại khách sạn Mường Thanh | Họp tại văn phòng Trung tâm y tế dự phòng-cả nhóm Ăn trưa chung Ở lại tại khách sạn Mường Thanh |
| 30/9 Buổi sáng | 7.00 am Đi Tuần Giáo, 9.00 am – 11.00: Họp với UBND Xã Quài Cai và trạm y tế xã tại VP Ủy Ban xã. | 7.30 am Đi huyện Điện Biên 9.00: Họp với trung tâm y tế huyện, UBND xã Na Tau và Trạm y tế tại VP UB Xã Na Tau |
| Ăn trưa: 12- 13.30 | Ăn trưa | Ăn trưa |
| 13.30 – 17.00 | Thăm 2 thôn ở xã Quai Cang | Thăm 2 thôn ở xã Na Tau |
| Buổi tối | Nghỉ tại nhà nghỉ Tuần Giáo | Nghỉ lại tại thành phố Điện Biên |
| 1/10 8.00 -9.30 | Thăm 1 thôn ở xã Quai Cang | Thăm 1 hoặc 2 thôn ở xã Na Tau |
| 9.30 – 11.30 | Quay về thành phố Điện Biên | Quay về thành phố Điện Biên |
| Ăn trưa 12.00 – 13.30 | Ăn trưa nhóm 1 | Ăn trưa nhóm 2 |
| 13.30 – 17.00 | Họp nhóm/thông báo kết quả chuyến đi tại văn phòng Trung tâm y tế dự phòng (cả nhóm) | Họp nhóm/thông báo kết quả chuyến đi tại văn phòng Trung tâm y tế dự phòng (cả nhóm) |
| 2/10. Buổi sáng: | Về Hà Nội (đoàn SNV) | Về Hà Nội (đoàn SNV) |

Annex F Terms of Reference

Kế hoạch làm việc tại Lào Cai từ ngày 4/10 đến hết ngày 6/10

| | Nhóm 1: Xã Hợp Thành, thành phố Lào Cai | Nhóm 2: Xã Na Hoi, huyện Bắc Hà (ở lại qua đêm ngày 5/10/2010). |
|---|---|--|
| 4/10 8.30 – 11.30 Ăn trưa: 11.30 -13.30 13.30 – 17.00 Buổi tối | Họp tại văn phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và truyền thông-cả nhóm Họp tại văn phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và truyền thông-cả nhóm Nghỉ đêm tại khách sạn Quỳnh Mai | Họp tại văn phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và truyền thông-cả nhóm Họp tại văn phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và truyền thông-cả nhóm Nghỉ đêm tại khách sạn Quỳnh Mai |
| 5/10 Buổi sáng | 7.30 am: Đi xã Hợp Thành 8.15 am – 11.00: Họp với UBND xã Hợp Thành và trạm y tế tại VP UB Xã. | 7.0 am: Đi Bắc Hà. 9.00 – 10.00: Họp với trung tâm y tế huyện. -10.30 – 11.30: Họp với UBND xã Na Hoi và trạm y tế tại VP UB xã. |
| Ăn trưa: 12- 13.30 | Ăn trưa | Ăn trưa |
| 13.30 – 17.00 Buổi tối | Thăm 2 thôn ở xã Hợp Thành Nghỉ đêm tại KS Quỳnh Mai, thành phố Lào Cai | Thăm 2 thôn ở xã Na Hoi Nghỉ đêm tại huyện Bắc Hà |
| 6/10 8.00 -9.30 9.30 – 11.30 Lunch 12.00 – 13.30 13.30 – 16.30 20.00pm | Thăm 1 thôn ở xã Hợp Thành Về thành phố Lào Cai Nhóm 1: ăn trưa Họp nhóm/thông báo kết quả chuyến đi tại phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và Truyền thông (cả nhóm) Về Hà Nội (Đoàn SNV) | Thăm 1 thôn ở xã Na Hoi Về thành phố Lào Cai Nhóm 2: ăn trưa Họp nhóm/thông báo kết quả chuyến đi tại phòng Thông tin, Giáo dục và Truyền thông (cả nhóm) Về Hà Nội (Đoàn SNV) |

Annex F Terms of Reference

*TOR for Facilitator for review of critical success factors for creating sanitation demand and behaviour change in North West Province of Northern Vietnam
September / October 2010*

1 Introduction

SNV Netherlands Development Organisation is working in 35 developing countries in the world. As a capacity development organisation, SNV predominantly invests in kind. SNV supports local organizations (state and non-state), mostly at the meso level, through a combination of advisory, knowledge brokering and advocacy services with a focus on ability to work at scale. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), is one of the five major sectors that SNV invests to contribute to pro-poor development results in improved access to basic services and production, income and employment'. In the WASH sector, SNV works within the context of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Strategy – 2020 and the National Targeted Programme (NTP II) on RWSS, 2006-2010, of the Government of Vietnam.

The overall objective of SNV's engagement in the WASH sector is to contribute towards improved health and livelihoods of poor people through effective, efficient and sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation services. Since 2007, SNV has been working closely with the provincial Standing Office (SO) for RWSS NTP II in Lai Chau, Lao Cai and Dien Bien provinces, under the leadership of respective Provincial Steering Committees (PSC), in the delivery of capacity development services with a focus on following interrelated areas:

- Development of strategies and models for the promotion of sanitation and hygiene at households' level.
- Establishing effective systems and mechanism for operation and maintenance (O&M) of drinking water and sanitation systems;

With respect to sanitation and hygiene, SNV promotes participatory approaches in motivating changes in practices, attitude and behavior. SNV's approach aims at creating local demand for sanitation solutions combined with market based solutions for the supply side of latrine/toilet construction technologies to enable communities to stop open defecation. SNV is piloting the Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach with the government as part of the National Target Program aiming to generate demand and demonstrate innovative approaches to accelerate current progress towards increasing sanitation access. CLTS uses various participatory tools and concepts of 'shame and disgust' in order to 'trigger' collective actions of the communities to make their localities totally free from open defecation. In late 2008, SNV together with its local capacity builders (LCB) - Research Centre for Family Health and Community Development (CEFACOM), and in close consultation with local authorities of Lai Chau and Lao Cai provinces, carried out CLTS triggering events at 2 villages in these provinces. In 2009, SNV developed further the CLTS program for sanitation demand creation and implemented with 43 villages, 4 communes of Dien Bien, Lao Cai and Lai Chau provinces in collaboration of Xuan Mai College. SNV also supported MOH/UNICEF piloting programme of the CLTS approach in Kontum and Dien Bien provinces.

In preparation for a scaling up of efforts to 159 villages in 2011/11 SNV plans to engage an external consultant to facilitate a participatory review and learning process with the team, partners, local capacity builders and communities of the sanitation demand creation process to date. The review will take a strength based approach to understanding key successes, positive change and critical success factors to form the basis of the next phase and to create a supportive environment for positive change. Strength based approaches will bring value to the review through being founded on the belief that people involved in development processes are more likely to achieve sustainable and relevant change or development when they have:

Annex F Terms of Reference

- A good (and shared) understanding of what works well in a particular context and the contributing success factors (why)
- A good sense of what resources are available in the context
- Agreement among stakeholders about what objectives they want to achieve
- A clear understanding about what steps are necessary to achieve their objectives, based on the evidence available.

The intent is for the review to build an increased sense of ownership and thus a greater sense of engagement with the scaling up of the project which will be critical for the achievement of sustainable development outcomes. This review will be conducted in 2 of the three Provinces of the North West and will complement a current in depth research process with the communities. It is beyond the scope of the review to evaluate the project or to duplicate existing surveys and research but rather to add value and build momentum at this stage of the process.

2 Background

Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) an innovative approach based on the principle that communities must be empowered to stop open defecation (OD) and to build and use latrines without the support of any external hardware subsidy. Various participatory tools such as ‘shame and disgust’ are used in order to ‘trigger’ collective actions of the communities to make their localities totally free from open defecation. The key aim of CLTS is to reduce disease, facilitate a change in attitude and behavior leading to intense local community action, cross subsidization of the poor by the rich and clean ODF villages. Since 2000 it has flourished globally and has all the makings of a development success story however there are documented factors that impact on its success such as the quality of training for facilitators, the appropriateness of shame in given cultures, motivations, and operating within a sanitation subsidy context such as in Vietnam. SNV is seeking to adapt the approach which is new to Vietnam – through practical application and informed by research. This review will contribute to this with its focus on learning, knowledge building and experience sharing so as to document and share good practices and ensure key lessons for success and incorporated in the scaling up process.

In 2009, with the intent of learning and adapting the approach to the context SNV conducted an anthropological consultation¹⁴ of the CLTS piloting program in North-West Vietnam to examine the socio-cultural differences between provinces and ethnic groups in order to understand their values and beliefs systems to inform facilitators of the CLTS programme not only of prospective challenges but also of areas of potential success.¹⁵ In August 2010 a further in depth research study commenced aiming to build on this initial consultation and document the effectiveness and appropriateness of CLTS in these regions in terms of socio-cultural perspectives and to incorporate the findings of the study into the approach used and post triggering approaches. At the same time the process has been informed through monitoring, reporting and household surveys of coverage.

In 2010, SNV was successful in its proposal to significantly scale up its program with the expanded Sustainable Sanitation and Hygiene for All Project which commenced in June 2010 across five countries in the region. In Vietnam the aim is to expand from 43 to 159 villages, reaching 11,000 households in the three Districts to improve access to sanitation and safe hygiene practices in Muong Ang district (Dien Bien province), Bac Ha district (Lao Cai province) and Than Uyen District

¹⁴ The draft report will be available for reference during this review

¹⁵ Using anthropological participatory techniques of observation, interviews, focus group discussions and a survey of 280 households across 9 villages, the key motivators, sanitation and hygiene beliefs and practices of different age, income, gender and ethnic minority groups were documented.

Annex F Terms of Reference

(Lai Chau province). These provinces are chosen on the basis of their being home to the underserved ethnic minorities in the country as well as their being the provinces where SNV and its clients agreed the piloting of CLTS under the National Targeted Programme on Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (NTP II - RWSS).

The sanitation demand activities will be incorporated into a more comprehensive approach that includes the following objectives

- Creating demand for sanitation and hygiene improvements in 175 villages;
- Strengthening market-based supply chains for a variety of sanitation options and hygiene consumer needs, including establishing at least 15 SMEs;
- Developing, testing and scaling up of innovative localised behavioral change communication strategies that will lead to sustainable hygiene behavioral changes;
- Improving district-level WASH governance for local business development and pro-poor support systems;
- Learning, documenting and sharing of best practices of the programme within existing national and regional platforms.

3 Aim of the Review Process

Facilitate a participatory learning and review demand process using CLTS approach with key partners and stakeholders using appreciative inquiry to understand successes, enablers and positive change as the basis of scaling up sanitation demand strategies as part of a broader program.

3.1 Objectives

To review the effectiveness of the sanitation demand creation strategy in terms of supporting the government to increase demand for sanitation enhance access to, affordable sanitation options and enable the poorest household to step by step move up on the sanitation ladder.

To understand the strengths of the evolving strategy for triggering and post triggering including the cascade training methods, integration of hygiene messaging, demonstration approaches, gender sensitivity, role of key stakeholders at each level and the use of motivators at the village level

To ensure key factors and enablers for a long-term success in generating sanitation demand inform the scaling up process and linkage to the broader program components and health system.

To contribute towards strong partnerships and enabling environments for the next phase through facilitating strength based learning, knowledge building and experience sharing process with key partners and stakeholders.

3.2 Key Deliverables

Detailed methodology, associated tools and review plan

Review process facilitated with active team engagement at three levels in 2 provinces over 10 working days.

A one day review workshop organised in Hanoi to be facilitated with review team representing key stakeholders to analyse findings, agree on conclusions and key recommendations.

Workshop report(s) summarizing points covered, main findings, and recommendations made.

Case study documentation (2000 words)

Draft review report (20 pages) outlining a) objectives of the assignment b) the main findings and conclusions in relation to assignment objectives 1 and 2 (above) and b) a set of prioritized

Annex F Terms of Reference

recommendations (objective 3) for scaling up demand creation (and supply side strengthening??) in the Northwest region and recommendations on how to strengthen enabling environment, including partnerships.

Final report incorporating comments.

4 Methodology:

The review will take a strength based approach (SBA) and will utilize appreciative inquiry tools and strength based research methods where possible. Strengths based approaches concentrate on the inherent strengths of individuals, organisations, communities, groups, sectors or networks as the basis for identifying, connecting and mobilising them, for planning to achieve development or change and for working in partnerships¹⁶. SBAs encompass both a philosophy about how to engage constructively with people, as well as a set of tools for practical application. For the review the methodology should enable the team as key stakeholders to become clearer about the desired future, building on previous or existing success and mobilizing what resources are available in the particular context. The methodology should provide a set of methods and a framework for a review to move forward which does not ignore the realities, complexities and/or challenges inherent in each context. Strengths based thinking acknowledges that a detailed analysis of the complexity of a

situation (all the causes of all the problems and all the risks) is not a necessary pre-condition for

positive change to be achieved. Rather approaches should be based on the belief that there is always something that has worked or is working well in every context and that people move in the direction in which they focus, e.g. “focus on the positive and you will move in a positive direction”.

In developing the methodology the review could incorporate using appreciative inquiry questioning to understand articulate successes and stories of positive change as the basis, for example.

- What has worked well (in this context) and why?
- What resources and strengths are available?
- What do we want to achieve in future?
- What steps do we need to take to achieve these objectives?

The first two AI questions (what has worked well and why; and what resources are available

above) can provide often-rare opportunities for stakeholders to discuss and deepen an

understanding of their current situation in positive terms and therefore draw out both specific information about the existing context and a positive attitude and sense of starting capacity and optimism. It is important for discussion to include consideration of why things have worked well, so they might apply these factors in future planning.

4.1 Key Activities

The review process will incorporate the following activities

- Development of strength based methodology for the review process including consultation with the team to clarify goals, approach and purpose.

¹⁶ Methodology is based on a draft paper by Rhodes D (2009), Discussion Paper for AusAID: Strength Based Approaches: Advantages and Possible Uses.

Annex F Terms of Reference

- Secondary review of available documentation of the project progress to date and current available research findings.
- Facilitating the team to undertake the review at three levels – community, district and province.
- Facilitating a team workshop including consolidation of the findings, group analysis and agreement on key strengths, enablers and recommendations.
- Documentation including preparation of a case study and final report.

4.2 Review Team

SNV will coordinate the formulation of a review team including,

- Facilitator – External Consultant
- SNV – Sector Leader, WASH Advisors
- Clients – CPM / IEC representatives from Department of health in the two provinces (Dien Bien and Lao Cai)
- Local Capacity Builders – Xuan Mai
- National Targeted Program
- Dien Bien Women’s Union
- Partners (unicef, Plan)
- Beneficiaries representatives

4.3 Workplan

The review will be conducted in Mid September - Early October 2010 with a work plan is split into four sections over 2 weeks (not including travel days) summarized as follows:

| Days | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Activity Description | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Travel | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | |
| Methodology development and preparation with team | | x | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review Process at village, commune/district and province level | | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | |
| Analysis Workshop (Days) | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| Documentation | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x | x |