



AFRICAN MINISTERS' COUNCIL ON WATER
CONSEIL DES MINISTRES AFRICAINS CHARGES DE L'EAU

Sub-Committee of the AU Specialized Technical Committee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Water and Environment



www.amcow-online.org

AFRICA SANITATION POLICY GUIDELINES (ASPG)

COUNTRY CONSULTATION SYNTHESIS REPORT

MAY 14, 2020

ASPG Country Consultation Synthesis Report

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms & Abbreviations	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1. Introduction to AMCOW	6
1.2. Introduction to the Africa Sanitation Policy Guidelines (ASPG)	6
1.3. Relevance of ASPG Stakeholder Engagement	7
1.4. Objectives & Outcomes of Country Consultation Workshops	7
2. Background Information.....	8
2.1. Structure & Attendance of Workshops	8
2.2. Approach of Synthesis and Presentation of Report	9
3. ASPG Thematic Outcomes of Country Consultation.....	9
3.1. Basic Principles and Policy Objectives.....	9
3.2. Sanitation Service Levels	11
3.3. Hygiene: Handwashing and Menstrual Hygiene Management.....	13
3.4. Sustainable Financing and Funding for Sanitation	14
3.5. Institutional Roles and Responsibilities.....	16
3.6. Regulation of Sanitation.....	18
3.7. Capacity Development	20
3.8. Monitoring, Reporting & Periodic Review	22
3.9. Policy Development Process	24
4. Other Key Themes Not Included ASPG Outline	25
4.1. Advocacy	25
4.2. Alignment to Goals.....	26
4.3. Climate Change	27
5. Suggested AMCOW Roles for Country Support.....	27
5.1. Coordination	27
5.2. Technical & Financial Support.....	28
5.3. Monitoring Support.....	29
5.4. Advocacy	29
5.5. Communication	30
5.6. Learning & Sharing	30
6. Summary of Other Valuable Observations	31
7. Conclusion.....	31

List of Acronyms & Abbreviations

AMCOW	African Ministers Council on Water
ASPG	African Sanitation Policy Guidelines
AU	African Union
BCC	Behaviour Change Communication
BMGF	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
CNC	Clean Nigeria Campaign
CSOs	Civil Society Organization
CWSC	Center for Water Security and Cooperation
EQND	Equality and No Discrimination
FSM	Faecal Sludge Management
FSTP	Faecal Sludge Treatment Plant
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HWWS	Handwashing with Water and Soap
JMP	Joint Monitoring Programme
LNOB	Leaving No One Behind
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MHM	Menstrual Hygiene Management
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PLWDs	People Living With Disabilities
PPPs	Public-Private Partnerships
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SWM	Solid Waste Management
WAEMU	West African Economic and Monetary Union
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

This synthesis report combines the discussions of 12 ASPG country stakeholder consultation workshops held in Ethiopia, Uganda, Ghana, Malawi, South Sudan, Rwanda, Liberia, Zambia, Nigeria, Kenya, Niger, and Senegal. The workshops were held between November 2019 and March 2020.

The primary target audience for the stakeholder consultations were individuals that are responsible or have an interest in the development of sanitation and hygiene policies. Attendance included ministers and directors in charge of ministries of sanitation, water and health, in addition to other government representatives, civil society organizations, international development agencies, private sector and academia.

This synthesis report attempts to distil and combine the views from all the 12 country workshop reports to build the common themes proposed across the countries. These themes and other observations are expected to form the pillars of stakeholder inputs into the ASPG and enable the inclusion of relevant information to the already existing draft guideline outline.

The stakeholders emphasized on cross-cutting issues such as equality and equity, accountability, governance and inclusive consultations as basic principles for an effective sanitation and hygiene policy. In terms of sanitation service levels, the solid waste and menstrual hygiene services management inclusion and prioritization of sanitation access in public places were emphasized. Broadening of sanitation investment financing was requested, that may include the introduction of subsidies and tax incentives to the private sector to become more proactive in investment and service delivery.

Lack of clarity in institutional mandates was perhaps the most significant challenge identified by stakeholders. Sanitation sector is riddled with scattered and overlapping mandates that confuse responsibilities and introduce unhealthy competition amongst institutions. This not only stands in the way of identifying the anchor ministry for the policy, but also in rallying stakeholders during its development process.

It is therefore imperative that ASPG looks at how the advocacy process for its adoption by member states includes building political goodwill towards clarification and alignment of sanitation responsibilities in every country. It was primarily proposed that the establishment of a single sanitation regulatory authority would be one of the ways to strengthen institutional and regulatory frameworks, as well as reduce institutional overlaps. This body should regulate all aspects of full sanitation service chains.

Capacity development needs were identified as crucial to policy development and implementation process. Development of research, technology and innovation should not be the role of the state actors alone, but should proactively include the private sector and the civil society. Sanitation and hygiene policies should also strongly focus on strengthening

sustainable supply chains for goods and services in the sector alongside the development of infrastructure and improved management of services.

There is an apparent absence of data collection and management systems in the sector within the countries. This seems to be the reason stakeholders emphasized the need to develop elaborate monitoring and reporting systems in-country. The adopted frameworks should strongly link with continental and global monitoring initiatives, as well as with national statistical bureaus.

There were other issues raised in the consultations outside of the proposed for inclusion in the ASPG. These include: advocacy for political support; alignment of sanitation policies to development and political goals; and climate change adaptation. These themes are the ones independently introduced by stakeholders and have been highlighted for serious consideration by the drafters.

The stakeholders also made numerous requests for support by AMCOW to enable adoption of the ASPG in members states. The required areas of support include: coordination of national and continental stakeholders; technical and financial backing in review and development of policies; monitoring of the progress of guidelines adoption and country frameworks development; advocacy; communication; and facilitation of peer learning and sharing of policy development experiences.

In general, consulted member states gave a clear impression that ASPG is a much needed and valuable process. This holds true for both the countries with policies (or semblance of the same for that matter) that desire to carry out a review, and those that have none alike.

In the end, there was also a universal call for AMCOW and its stakeholders to critically look into the issue of actively supporting the countries in policy development process beyond the drafting and launching stages of the ASPG.

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction to AMCOW

The African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) was formed in 2002 in Abuja Nigeria, primarily to promote cooperation, security, social and economic development and poverty eradication among member states through the effective management of the continent's water resources and provision of water supply services.

The executive organ of AMCOW, the Executive Council, is led by a President and five Sub-regional Vice Presidents in each of the five sub-regions of Africa. The Secretariat is led by an Executive Secretary and is based in Abuja, Nigeria. AMCOW's initiatives include Africa Water Week, the AfricaSan Conference, and the Africa Water Sector and Sanitation Monitoring and Reporting System.

1.2. Introduction to the Africa Sanitation Policy Guidelines (ASPG)

With only 28% of over 962 million people living in Sub-Saharan Africa having access to basic sanitation, and about 31.9% practising open defecation, increased effort is required to establish the enabling environment that will support ongoing efforts to accelerate access to safely managed sanitation¹.

Some form of sanitation policies exists in many African countries, but many are unclear, and incomprehensive, hence not robust to effectively support large scale sanitation programming and implementation. A combination of poor policies and non-costed plans cause significant developmental barriers to Member States and prevents countries from reaching their global and national sanitation targets.

A review of country policies by AMCOW (2019) pointed to the fact that most countries that had some form of policy in place, they were not adequate and comprehensive enough to move the sanitation sector forward. Most of the documents are weak on several critical aspects including institutional framework, elements of financing and other cross-cutting issues. Further, most of the reviewed policies and strategies are still based on MDGs, which in the case of sanitation only addresses the containment part and not the full-service chain.

The Africa Sanitation Policy Guidelines (ASPG) is an AMCOW effort and initiative geared towards demonstrating the processes and content of what an adequate sanitation policy should incorporate. Also, it is an effort which will set and shape the best practices for the future, leading to stronger comprehensive sanitation policies that will facilitate accelerated progress towards achieving the Ngor and eThekweni commitments, the country targets, and ultimately, SDG 6.2 and other associated goals.

It will also harness these commitments and improve on existing guidelines to provide foundational and progressive policy suggestions that can be actively used and adapted by the Member States to develop or strengthen their sanitation policies.

¹ WHO and UNICEF (2017). Progress on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene: 2017 Update and SDG baselines.

AMCOW is developing the ASPG in collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO), the Center for Water Security and Cooperation (CWSC) and Speak Up Africa (SUA). Additionally, an ASPG Task Force is made up of experts, and key stakeholders from various organizations and governments constituted to ensure that the ASPG receives the necessary comprehensive input and review.

1.3. Relevance of ASPG Stakeholder Engagement

The purpose of developing the ASPG document is to create a guideline that is fit for purpose for easy adoption by the Member States to enhance their sanitation policies. A good sanitation policy should provide the context within which safely managed sanitation programs can be developed and implemented at a national scale. Considering that the ASPG is a resource for the WASH sector and African countries in general, critical stakeholders from Member States and the industry should be allowed to actively participate and make meaningful inputs in the guideline development process.

The engagement of stakeholders, including government and non-government actors in the development of the ASPG will generate broader awareness, allow for inputs into the content, and increase understanding and ownership of the policy directions amongst stakeholders. AMCOW intended to conduct in-country consultations in 29 countries across the 5 African regions. 12 countries have been covered completed before the travel restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic, with 17 more to go.

The purpose of the stakeholder consultation has been to provide an opportunity to highlight the importance of clear and comprehensive sanitation policies, create awareness about the ASPG and the rationale and provide an opportunity for stakeholders to contribute to the ASPG content.

Aside from the content of the ASPG Outline, the consultation workshops discussed the requests by countries to AMCOW on the support mechanisms necessary to adapting the guideline in the development of clear and comprehensive sanitation policies in the countries.

1.4. Objectives & Outcomes of Country Consultation Workshops

1.4.1. Objectives

- To highlight the roles that a comprehensive sanitation policy can play in the immense task of achieving SDG 6.2 and the need for a sanitation policy guideline.
- To provide an overview of the state of sanitation policies on the continent and raise awareness on the importance of the ASPG in offering guidance on developing transparent and inclusive sanitation policies.
- Create awareness, gather feedback, and buy-in from relevant stakeholders to improve the ASPG development.
- To identify country support needs during the process of adopting the ASPG

1.4.2. Expected Outcomes

- Increased understanding of the importance of a 'good' sanitation policy in creating the enabling environment to support large scale sanitation programming and implementation strategies for safely managed sanitation.
- Feedback obtained from Africa members states to enrich the content of the ASPG and ensure that it is more responsive to generic sanitation policy needs
- A better understanding of the rationale for developing the ASPG
- Increased awareness, buy-in, and a way forward for adapting the ASPG amongst the Africa Member States.
- A better understanding of the support needs required by countries in the process of developing sanitation policies.

2. Background Information

2.1. Structure & Attendance of Workshops

The one-day workshops adopted a participatory approach to ensure that participants made contributions both to the content of the ASPG and the policy development process. The workshops commenced with welcome remarks by AMCOW's Executive Secretary and high-level government officials from the host country. The facilitators presented the ASPG rationale and overview of the draft ASPG outline document.

The first session was a presentation by consultants aimed at providing participants with information on the background and content of the ASPG outline, which has three major sections:

- Part 1: Background information, the purpose and scope;
- Part 2: Guidance on the process for developing a sanitation policy;
- Part 3: Core elements of sanitation policy.

Participants were then grouped to discuss and brainstorm inputs on the core elements of the policy guideline outline, which are:

- Basic principles and policy objectives
- Sanitation service levels
- Hygiene – handwashing and menstrual management
- Sustainable financing and funding for sanitation
- Institutional roles and responsibilities
- Regulation of sanitation
- Capacity
- Monitoring, reporting, and periodic review

The groups were also tasked to discuss all cross-cutting issues, including Basic Principles; Implementation Strategy; Country Support Needs; Process of developing a sanitation policy and requests for support by AMCOW. In the end, each group was presented their discussion summaries to the plenary.

The primary target audience were individuals that are responsible or are involved in the development of sanitation and hygiene policies. Examples of participants included ministers and directors in charge of ministries of sanitation, health, water resources, environment, local government, finance and others with responsibility for sanitation. In addition to the government representatives, relevant stakeholders were drawn from NGOs in the WASH sector, Civil Society Organizations, Development agencies, private sector, media outlets and academia.

2.2. Approach of Synthesis and Presentation of Report

Each of the workshops produced an independent report covering various aspects of the ASPG thematic areas. The synthesis process began with reviewing all the reports and noting the critical messages in each one of them separately. A total of 62 key messages were documented.

These messages were then collated and tabulated into themes to create a coherent stakeholder suggestion list. During this process, it emerged that some themes were well aligned to the draft ASPG Outline as expected, while others were new altogether. Both are presented in this report.

These themes are developed around the context cross-cutting messages and linked to the countries where they emanated from. A table showing the countries originating the messages is included at the end of every discussion section, and a consolidated matrix is annexed to the report.

3. ASPG Thematic Outcomes of Country Consultation

3.1. Basic Principles and Policy Objectives

3.1.1. Definition of Principles

Two countries would like to see the principles behind the ASPG and policy development in the country spelt out in the document. Zambia recommends that ASPG refers to the format of the definition from its national Water Supply and Sanitation Policy for further guidance.

3.1.2. Planning of Services & Investments

A suggestion was made that ASPG should highlight inclusive sanitation planning (Zambia and Nigeria) while Kenya would like to see sanitation investment planning included. Niger asserted that sustainable financing is crucial to ensure projects and programs are fully implemented and proposes that the ASPG should consist of a framework for effective financial planning.

3.1.3. Equality & Equity

Nine countries suggested the inclusion of all vulnerable groups and considerations for people in fragile contexts in sanitation policy. There is a need for policies to include PLWDs, refugees, the poor, and people in other emergencies bearing in mind that Africa is a continent be known for all sorts of emergencies.

Eight countries suggested that ASPG should emphasize on mechanisms to reduce inequalities and explicitly adopt the principles of LNOB and EQND. Nomadism is a common way of life, and sanitation for nomadic communities should be included in some country policies.

Country policies should also be hinged on human rights to sanitation as the starting point, and this should come out in the ASPG. South Sudan and Niger would like to see the inclusion of MHM as a way of explicitly engendering sanitation policies.

Three countries would like to see the incorporation of social-cultural considerations in national sanitation policies. Liberia, for example, would like to the ASPG to give serious consideration to cultural adaptability, while Niger would like to see social inclusion.

3.1.4. Safety

Six countries would like to see issues of safety addressed. Kenya would particularly like to see safely managed sanitation captured in ASPG. Uganda goes further to suggest re-writing the first sentence of the chapter to read, "This chapter guides the process for developing a National Sanitation Policy that targets increasing access to safely managed sanitation, involving a wide range of stakeholders." Ghana suggests that there should eventually be standards for safety and health across the chain, including levels of E. Coli.

3.1.5. Accountability

Rwanda asserts that accountability mechanisms are crucial even though they are lacking in many countries and suggests that there should be guidelines to manage this in the sanitation sector. Zambia suggests that ASPG should strengthen the accountability mechanism in the sector so that there's better reporting of progress, and ultimately, sharing best practices and lessons.

3.1.6. Governance

On the structure of the draft outline of the ASPG, Kenya noted that it misses a section on governance that will give direction on regulation and tariffs. Uganda also cites it as a critical element of sanitation policy.

Table 1: Country Suggestions on Basic Principles and Policy Objectives

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Clearly define the principles					x							x
2	Include sanitation investment planning				x								
3	Highlight Inclusive Sanitation Planning					x							x
4	Inclusion of all vulnerable groups/people in fragile contexts in policy	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
5	Reduce inequalities (LNOB/EQND principles)		x	x		x	x		x		x	x	x
6	Explicitly engender the policy							x					x
7	Incorporate Human Rights to sanitation			x									x
8	Incorporate social-cultural considerations					x					x	x	
9	Emphasis on safely managed sanitation			x	x	x	x		x			x	
10	Accountability mechanisms				x	x			x				
11	Include governance aspects				x		x						

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.2. Sanitation Service Levels

3.2.1. Inclusion of Solid Waste Management (SWM)

Seven countries recommended that ASPG should go beyond human excreta and include solid waste management. Malawi observed that solid waste management is an emerging issue and proposed that ASPG includes solid wastes wholesomely, specifically the household wastes and the disposal of diapers.

Ethiopia would also like to see solid waste management in urban areas covered from on-site handling to disposal/re-use. This matter received a lot of push from Liberia and mentions from Kenya, Niger, and South Sudan.

The approach of combining FSM and SWM services is not unique in the African context. In Rwanda, for example, sanitation is inclusive of all waste streams like nuclear waste, health care waste, excreta, industrial waste, solid waste, hazardous waste, e-waste, and stormwater. This matter seems to have received quite a lot of push from the countries.

To avert this situation in future consultation workshops, the facilitator in Liberia recommended that a clear explanation should be provided in the ASPG document and presentations to avoid a lot of questions and arguments about the focus on human waste sanitation alone.

3.2.2. Prioritization of Sanitation in Public Places

Public sanitation priority appeared to be critical in 7 countries. Senegal recommended that sanitation issues should be considered before any public development project is carried out to ensure transparent management of development issues in general. Uganda would like the definition of sanitation to include access to sanitation at a public level alongside institutional and household levels. South Sudan proposes the construction of latrines in public places such as markets and other local centres and at road border exits.

Besides, there is a need to define, for a common understanding, that public sanitation includes roadside sanitation needs for motorcycle (*bodaboda*) riders, passers-by,

markets, and petrol stations. Zambia would like to see institutional responsibilities extended to all public markets and bus stations.

3.2.3. Inclusion/Linkage of Sewerage Services

This matter was raised by four countries in a range of discussions spanning across planning, financing, and regulating. All in all, the message was that ASPG should either include or form a strong policy link with sewerage services as a way of promoting sanitation for all.

Kenya observed that sanitation provision should focus on both sewerage and non-sewerage services – hence categorization of various wastes with clear roles and mandates of different service providers is imperative. Ghana sounded this by stating that sewer systems should be incorporated into the town and country planning approval system, including estate development, institutions, schools, and shops.

Zambia reckons that for African governments to make good progress towards attaining universal sanitation, they need to invest in expanding sewer networks and Faecal Sludge Treatment Facilities (FSTPs) for on-site sanitation.

Malawi considers that sanitation policies and regulations should rationalize investments in both on-site and sewer services by outlawing the installation of septic tanks in locations where main sewers exist and specify on-site technologies for areas without any.

3.2.4. Urban and Rural Sanitation Nexus

Nigeria suggests that there should be clear and specific guidelines for urban and rural contexts. Zambia indicates that there must be different strategies for rural and urban (inclusive both planned and unplanned settlements) due to their diverse dynamics. Uganda observed that there are huge gaps between rural and urban sanitation coverage, and this requires policy attention. Rwanda noted that sanitation policies must consider differences in infrastructure requirements, availability of land, the strength of skills, and livelihood lifestyles. Further, the definition and delivery of urban sanitation should distinguish the needs of rural and small towns.

Table 2: Country Suggestions on Sanitation Service Levels

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Broaden the policy to include Solid Waste Management (SWM)	x	x		x			x	x		x	x	
2	Public sanitation should be prioritized		x	x		x	x	x		x			
3	Include sewerage services		x	x	x	x							
4	Consider diversity of urban and rural sanitation nexus					x	x		x				x
5	Urban sanitation definition to include rural and small towns						x		x				

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.3. Hygiene: Handwashing and Menstrual Hygiene Management

3.3.1. Strengthening Behavior Change & Communication (BCC)

Seven countries sharply raised the observation on the need to strengthen the BCC component in ASPG. In terms of definitions, Uganda suggests that ASPG drafters should establish from experts whether the name "behaviour change communication" is an all-encompassing term whose outcome is the adoption of the desired behaviour or not. Zambia wants the ASPG to emphasize the use of evidence-based decision-making and strategies for improving sanitation behaviour change.

Zambia additionally suggests that member states should develop some type of a National Information Education System towards continuous investment to support behavioural change through awareness and sensitization in the sanitation sector.

Ethiopia recommends that BCC should come as a core component in the ASPG.

3.3.2. Inclusion of Full MHM Service Chain

Six countries indicated that incorporation of MHM in sanitation policies is the way to go. Even though it is not explicitly put, the general message seems to suggest that more considerations should be given in the planning and design of MHM infrastructure, as well as service chain development for product and services.

Kenya recommends that the MHM definition in ASPG be expanded to include more elements than currently depicted. Uganda would like the ASPG and, by extension country sanitation policies, to encourage investment in facilities with incinerators and safe burial places for use in disposal of MHM products.

Ethiopia suggests the development of a national MHM Guideline and engagement of the private sector in supplies like sanitary pads and other supplies to schools. Zambia also recommends that the hygiene section should elaborately address the issue of access to MHM products.

3.3.3. Strengthening Hand Washing with Soap (HWWS)

The fact that the consultations were held before the global explosion of COVID-19 pandemic did not leave HWWS unaccentuated. This suggestion was particularly coincidental that the countries wanted HWWS in public places enforced and private sector included in this drive. Ghana would like to see the provision of soap in public sanitation infrastructure while Zambia wants access to handwashing facilities increased.

3.3.4. Strengthening & Expanding Hygiene

Kenya recommends that the document should look at hygiene more broadly and not just narrowing it down to issues of handwashing, MHM, and behaviour change communication. Ethiopian participants further suggested strengthening the position of hygiene in the ASPG than it is now. Nigeria recommended the development of standards for streamlining hygiene components in sanitation investments.

Table 3: Country Suggestions on Hygiene

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Strengthen Behaviour Change & Communication (BCC)	x		x	x	x	x			x			
2	Include entire MHM service chain		x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	
3	Stronger inclusion of Hand Washing With Soap (HWWS)	x	x	x		x		x					
4	Hygiene to be expanded beyond HWWS and MHM	x			x								x

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.4. Sustainable Financing and Funding for Sanitation

3.4.1. Broadening Finance Sources

More sources of finance beyond public sources were cited most in this thematic area.

Rwanda proposes that ASPG should encourage governments to put in place systems and mechanisms for financial recovery in the provision of sanitation services. Ethiopia would like sanitation finance sources to be households, ministry of finance, regional finance bureaus, private sector, donors, and NGOs. Ethiopia feels that the current section in the draft outline is more focused on government financing, but it should also include private sector financing, especially banks and micro-finance institutions.

Nigeria proposes the development of non-traditional and more accessible finance models. At the same time, Kenya suggests that the government works closely with the private sector and commercial banks to develop models for financing of sanitation products.

Liberia proposes government, donors, and users to finance sanitation while South Sudan earmarks the government, donors, and the private sector. However, the government should take full responsibility to produce sanitary slabs for communal usage in rural towns and villages at the *Boma* (lowest-level administrative division) and *Payam* (second-lowest administrative division) levels.

According to Niger, financing for sanitation should be innovative and broader and proposes a wide range of options such as Tontines (sorts of community banks mainly for women groups), establishing a national sanitation fund, individual infrastructure windows, mechanisms for easing access to credit and introduction of water and sanitation tax on building permits. Senegal proposes the establishment of internal crowdfunding mechanisms.

3.4.2. Build-in Subsidies

Subsidies were mainly proposed for enabling access to poor households. South Sudan would like grants to go to all households for the construction of pit latrine slabs.

Uganda offers a logical targeting approach that identifies those who need or not need subsidies along the entire sanitation service chain. This entails conducting mapping of the

most vulnerable members of communities (women and children headed households, elderly, terminally ill people, PLWDs). Nigeria also hinted on subsidies that based on an established eligibility criterion.

Similarly, Malawi identifies the need to include subsidizing of sanitation materials for local communities. This consists of the setting of reasonable tariffs by councils for the private sector operators for pit emptying. The governments should identify and put in place targeted subsidies rather than universal subsidies, and users should be made to pay reasonable fees for operation and maintenance cost recovery.

Interestingly, Ghana opposes the introduction of subsidies, expecting the government should establish a market financing mechanism that allows the poor to borrow at little or no interest.

3.4.3. Build-in Tax Incentives

Nigeria opines that a sanitation policy should talk about incentives to users from both the state and the private sector, such as access to land, new technologies, and output-based financing. Additionally, the government should also structure incentives to the private sector.

Kenya proposes ambitious incentives by governments for sanitation services through tax rebates for service providers such as zero-rating of products and services. Similarly, Senegal recommends that the point on facilitated finance for private sector service providers in the draft ASPG should include fiscal incentives. This was further echoed by Senegal, where stakeholders want the ASPG point on "facilitated finance for private sector service providers" to include budgetary incentives.

South Sudan wants governments to provide tax exemptions to the private sector entities that are actively engaged in and investing in sanitation. This can include a raft of tax exemptions on raw materials for producing MHM products to enhance access to sanitary pads and zero-rating all environmentally friendly hygiene packaging materials.

3.4.4. Stipulate % of Budget Allocation for Sanitation

Ghana would like the government commitment to Ngor principles explicitly pronounced in the policy by allocating 0.5% of the GDP to sanitation, water, and hygiene services. Similarly, Kenya states that a sanitation policy should explicitly provide a % budget allocation to the sanitation sector at both the national and county level.

3.4.5. Establish a Sanitation Budget Code

Uganda observes that a budget code is significant in solving the problem of diversion of funds, and to avoid this, ASPG should include its development. Similarly, concurs that sanitation policies should highlight arguments for sanitation problems to foster the creation of budget lines dedicated to sanitation management. As such, ASPG should propose a process for the formation of a budget line for sanitation management in countries.

3.4.6. Include Resource Mobilization

Uganda recommends that resource management and financing should be expanded to include mobilization of resources. In Zambia's sanitation policy, the financing section also includes resource mobilization. Ghana believes that countries should put in place an independent institution responsible for resource mobilization for sustainability in the financing of sanitation.

Table 4: Country Suggestions on Sustainable Financing and Funding

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Broadening and improve access to finance to beyond public sources	x	x		x		x	x			x	x	x
2	Build-in subsidies		x		x			x					
3	Targeted subsidies for poor households			x			x			x			x
4	Build in tax incentives especially for private sector				x			x		x			x
5	% of exchequer budget allocation for sanitation set			x	x								
6	Establish a national sanitation budget code						x			x		x	
7	Include Resource Mobilization/ combine with financing section			x		x	x						

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.5. Institutional Roles and Responsibilities

3.5.1. Clarify Institutional Mandates and Enhance Coordination

Institutional conflict and lethargy due to lack of clarity in mandates and poor coordination was high on the agenda of consultation workshops.

During discussions in Malawi, it became evident that the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation, and Water Development was the lead for the sanitation/policy formulation. However, it does not seem to get sufficient cooperation from the Ministries of Health or Education despite the fact two Ministries have a significant role in sanitation management. It was thought imperative that both should be brought on board, and their cooperation with the lead ministry beefed up.

According to Ethiopia, there should be a coordination office or unit at the President's or prime minister's office to drive sanitation, over and above, and providing clarity on the ministerial responsibility for sanitation sectoral leadership.

Kenya proposes that there should be the categorization of various sanitation wastes with clear roles and mandates of different service providers. The country model would be the establishment of a coordination mechanism to bring all players together – such as a National Sanitation Council, which should draw from government and stakeholders since sanitation issues are spread in many other sectors/subsectors.

Uganda observed that sanitation is a multi-sectoral issue and therefore needs a principle of coordination and integration. Therefore, improvement in sanitation and hygiene sectors will require adequate coordination of all players. Senegal wants consideration for

the establishment of a platform for knowledge sharing as a coordination mechanism for clarity of roles and responsibilities.

Rwanda suggested that the ASPG needs to include guidelines for sanitation coordination and that multi-sectoral coordination should be structured and managed at the ministerial level. This is worth listening to since Rwanda has made much progress in the sanitation sector, but from the consultations, it appears that the country is still finding coordination a big challenge that needs tackling.

One of the models worth looking at is the National Task Group on Sanitation (NTGS) in Nigeria that functions as a national coordination body for promotion and streamlining of sanitation-related activities in the country. It has members cutting across all sector-related ministries, agencies, development partners, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector.

Further, to make the Clean Nigeria Campaign (CNC) take root, the President has issued an executive order that has been sent to all Ministries to work with CNC, and this has resulted in inter-ministerial coordination meetings being held quarterly.

3.5.2. Promote Private Sector Inclusion in Sanitation Service Provision

The role of private sector inclusion in sanitation service delivery was highly raised in most countries. This came up through calls for Public Sector to Delegation (PSD) - an arrangement where mandated institutions delegate part of service provision to the private sector. The formation of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) that include investment and management of services was also raised.

Ethiopia proposed that ASPG should consider support needed for the private sector, such as business and technical training, supply chain analysis, market intelligence, introduction to a new product, and service technologies.

Stakeholders in Malawi said that lack of clarity in sanitation roles and responsibilities leads to conflict in the laws of a land. Consequently, there is a need for a clear distinction of roles and responsibilities that translates to clarity in policies and regulations that enable governments and the private sector to develop workable PPP arrangements.

Nigeria wants the sanitation policy to promote adoption of full sanitation value chain in the sector as this would present business opportunities for the private sector and enable its ease of access to finance. In general, private sector participation should be more emphasized in non-traditional elements of the sanitation value chain such as containment in public places, treatment, and re-use. Uganda also suggested that PPPs should be structured along the entire sanitation chain and should as well include rural services.

Ghana also indicated that private sector players should be encouraged to see sanitation as a business. Governments should create an enabling environment for non-sewered sanitation businesses and set reasonable incentives for small businesspeople along the sanitation value chain. Similarly, Kenya found the need to map out who are the relevant private sector actors and include them in every step of the value chain.

Senegal suggests that points 4 and 5 on sanitation service levels in the ASPG outline should be reviewed. The advice given is that guidelines should not lead to interpretation; they should propose clear and concise policy directions. To facilitate the understanding of the point on sanitation service providers, ASPG should clearly explain that the recommended sanitation service levels would rely on services provided by both state and private sector actors.

The Senegalese stakeholders further held the view that the ASPG point regarding the possible roles for NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector and their management should be directive. That these stakeholders have a crucial role in sanitation management and sanitation policies often, states fail to define these roles hence the importance of bring prescriptive.

In South Sudan, the consultation also came out clear that support for an active private sector involvement in the sanitation sector must include political will, adequate policies to guide their role and participation, and good infrastructure to facilitate inclusion. The private sector also needs to be proactively involved in policy development processes.

Some countries seem to have the spirit going on in this direction. During the opening remarks in Uganda, the Principal Environmental Health Officer emphasized the fact that the government is committed to working in partnership with the private sector to improving sanitation and hygiene. The presence of the private sector in the room was a clear indication of this evolution.

Table 5: Country Suggestions on Institutional Roles and Responsibilities

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Clarify institutional mandates in policy	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x
2	Coordination of Institutions/Multi-Sector Frameworks	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x
3	Explicitly identify Lead Ministry/Institution	x			x	x	x	x				x	
4	Public/Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Sanitation	x	x		x	x	x	x		x			x
5	Public Sector Delegation (PSD) to private sector	x	x	x	x		x	x		x		x	x
6	Include enabling environment for sanitation SMEs			x	x								
7	Include a business case for sanitation							x					x

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.6. Regulation of Sanitation

3.6.1. Establish a Sanitation Regulatory Authority

In Ethiopia, participants spoke of the need to establish an over-arching body to regulate sanitation. They considered a similar establishment like the Climate Change Commission, whose regulatory mandate cuts across sectors and including sanitation where it regulates pollution. They also noted the need to strengthen institutional and regulatory frameworks to ensure a clear division of roles and responsibilities between institutions, improve accountability, and address other issues such as mandate overlaps.

Ghana also wants countries to put in place a specific regulator for sanitation. The participants noted the irony that in most countries in Africa, when it comes to the water sector, there is a national regulator. When it comes to sanitation, there is no national regulator, Ghana being one of them.

In Liberia, institutional roles are currently conflicting between the regulators and service providers, so there is a need for a legal framework to clearly define the role between these institutions. Participants called for the establishment of a governmental regulator/leader that would take responsibility for regulating, monitoring, and supervision of sanitation services.

Rwanda proposed the creation of a regulatory framework on institutional collaboration in sanitation services to avoid eventual overlaps. The established regulator should regulate sanitation tariffs to make them affordable by all.

In Malawi, unlike other sectors, there is a lack of a sanitation regulator, and participants require this to be put in place.

Interestingly, Zambia noted that there should be regulations on disaster mitigation and preparedness (in-country and cross-border) in the WASH sector.

3.6.2. Regulate the entire FSM (MHM) service chain

Interestingly, this is the only issue raised or somehow intimated by all the 12 countries, showing how highly considered it is across the continent. The general feeling was that sanitation regulation is either never done or done in pieces leaving out critical elements of the FSM chain informal or totally unattended. This was similar to the call to establish regulation for MHM in several countries.

Malawian participants stated that regulation should cover all the elements in the sanitation service chain. This should specify the tariffs for members connecting to the main sewer line. It should outlaw the installation of septic tanks in locations where main sewers exist and specify on-site technologies for areas without sewers. The regulations should cover the collection and conveyance of sewage, the points of treatment, re-use and disposal, and the discharge of effluent meeting acceptable limits on quality.

The regulations should also give guidance on the installation of potable water lines where sewer or septic tanks exist to avoid contamination. Other issues to be covered include pit emptiers or transporters on fees, quality of vehicles, safety of staff, reporting, inspection, and GIS tracking of emptiers.

Further, Malawi wants ASPG should provide guidance on the regulation of private sector participation and clearly point out the need to support the formation of an association of small private sector entities for more effortless engagement and coordination.

In Ghana, participants noted that regulation should link to local, national standards, e.g., Building codes (GS 1207); and the effluent standards (GS 1212). It should also regulate re-use products such as organic fertilizers/compost that are being produced for re-use of faecal sludge.

Niger also considers regulation to define technical conformity and safety standards for sanitation infrastructure such as septic tanks, building permits, faecal sludge treatment plants, treatment, and valorization of sanitation by-products.

Similarly, Rwanda wants countries to put up clear standards for regulating sanitation technologies in collection, containment, transport, and disposal or treatment. South Sudan noted that all elements in the sanitation value chain should be controlled.

Senegal emphasized the need for regulating pit emptying activities and specifically emptying service pricing.

3.6.3. Devolve policies and regulations beyond the national level

Stakeholders in 4 countries proposed that regulatory mandates should go beyond the national level and devolved to local echelons. Ghana suggested that the ASPG should cover different levels of regulations; for instance, National; Metropolitan Municipal and District Assembly (MMDA) as well as private sector involvement.

Liberia called for decentralization of policy enforcement and regulations to cut across all levels of state/county, and local government areas. Rwanda sent the same message proposing that practical regulatory tools should be developed to regulate sanitation services at the individual, household, institutional, public, and industrial levels.

South Sudan, in particular, did not mention regulation as a national function and proposed that regulation should be led by City Councils in Urban areas and Local Governments in Rural areas.

Table 6: Country Suggestions on Regulation of Sanitation

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Establishment of Sanitation Regulatory Authority	x	x	x			x	x					
2	Regulate entire FSM service chain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3	Devolve policies and regulations beyond national level			x	x						x	x	
4	Include tariff setting & regulation		x	x	x				x				
5	Strengthen enforcement of policy/regulations				x								x
6	Link ASPG to other sanitation regulatory processes (ESAWAS)		x		x								

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.7. Capacity Development

3.7.1. Promote Innovation & Technology

Rwanda opines that the best way to tackle unplanned settlements is to do an assessment that is specific to sanitation to generate contextualized, evidence-based, and innovative interventions to address the real challenges. This would also help in decision-making on ways to subsidize sanitation services.

In hygiene, the private sector's role should be in driving innovation to increase access to hygiene products and services. NGOs should also complement in play this role.

Kenya would like ASPG to include a policy element to encourage innovations on technologies that will address existing sanitation challenges. Zambia echoed this by proposing the inclusion of innovative technology for challenging geologically and geographically contexts such as waterlogged and sandy areas.

Liberia recommends that the ASPG should provide a specific framework that helps incentivize innovations and more creative ways of introducing new Sanitation Services models.

3.7.2. Include Research and Development (R&D)

Ghana noted that there is still a big gap between science, research, policy/decision making, and practice. Alternative sanitation options should be pursued through research and innovation to address the needs of the people.

Uganda proposed that ASPG should include an element on continuous research in sanitation with a strong linkage to universities and other training institutions. Research should cover sanitation development and investment, including Cost-Benefit Analysis as a strategy. It should also address valorization and use of sanitation products. Studies should be designed to inform the policy development process, identify capacity gaps, generate baseline data.

Kenya proposed that research should be prominent in the ASPG and should be inclined towards the needs of the people and not understanding from the implementers.

3.7.3. Include Local Levels and Non-State Actors

Zambia identified the need to include provision/framework for the assessment of existing capacity, which would then inform the approach to capacity building. Moreover, this should be broadened to include developing the role of non-state actors, particularly NGOs.

Uganda suggested that capacity building should cover both national and local governments. It should also cover the sector's relevant training institutions and include trainings for all CSOs and utilities. Rwanda was also for the opinion that capacity development should be handled by institutions at every level.

Liberian stakeholders opined that capacity building should be captured in sanitation policy to focus primarily on technicians/sector actors and not political appointees.

Nigeria and South Sudan identified capacity building for policy development as a requirement for member states that should be part of the ASPG process. Nigeria requested support for capacity development across all levels – training of trainers to support states and districts develop policies/plans and policy review processes. Similarly, South Sudan identified required forms of support as capacity building for wash experts in the country.

3.7.4. Strengthen Supply Chain for Sanitation Goods and Services

Malawi finds restrictive procurement laws as one of the critical barriers to attaining universal access to sanitation in the country. Policy does not allow local governments to buy pre-owned vehicles, which could be instrumental in the delivery of sanitation services.

Ethiopia suggested that supply chain management aspects should be seen clearly in sanitation policies.

Table 7: Country Suggestions on Capacity Development

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Promote Innovation & Technology				x	x			x		x		
2	Include Research and Development (R&D)			x	x		x						
3	Non-State Actors (NSAs) capacity development					x	x				x		
4	Local level capacity building inclusion								x		x		x
5	Strengthen supply chain for sanitation goods and services	x	x										

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.8. Monitoring, Reporting & Periodic Review

3.8.1. Develop an Elaborate and Inclusive M&E Framework

Complexity of monitoring sanitation was a subject of discussion in South Sudan. The stakeholders identified the critical constraint to monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing sanitation is the fact that there is no stand-alone sanitation policy as the sector's components have been split into several ministries.

To resolve this, they decided that there is a need to develop and enforce monitoring mechanisms for all stakeholders. This means that harmonized tools for monitoring with clear performance indicators will need to be developed and involve more stakeholders, including the private sector.

Similarly, the fragmentation of sanitation mandate was also identified as the critical barrier in Ethiopia. The country has no stand-alone sanitation policy, and the mandate lies within different sectors. There is no harmonized standardized performance indicator or monitoring tool. The starting point would be the establishment of a sanitation baseline and monitoring data disaggregated by gender. This would then lead to the development of a monitoring, evaluation, and review framework with clear indicators.

Monitoring has been the missing item in terms of sanitation policymaking and program implementation at the national level, according to Senegal. The stakeholders advised that ASPG should pay serious attention to this fact and include a clear framework with a multi-sectoral approach for countries to adopt.

This proposed framework should standardize the monitoring of indicators at the national and local levels. A monitoring unit can also be established and modelled around the Sectoral Coordination and Planification Unit that sits within the Ministry of Water and Sanitation in Senegal.

The multi-sectoral framework should provide a key role for civil society organizations and the media in monitoring the provision of sanitation services. However, civil society and the media require empowerment to ensure they can play their role better in monitoring and relaying information to the public.

Nigeria identified a lack of critical indicators, tools, and a system in general as the crucial barrier to adequate monitoring of sanitation in the country.

Kenya identified the key monitoring constraints like lack of government coordination, absence of policy monitoring tools, undefined monitoring levels, lack of inclusion, lack of data collection and verification mechanism, and absence of a coordinating unit.

Like in other countries, this situation would be resolved by the creation of an inter-ministerial collaboration structure, formulation of harmonized policy monitoring tools, and definition of monitoring levels.

Discussions in Zambia requested that critical stakeholder engagements at all levels of monitoring and evaluation process should be outlined in the ASPG. Similarly, Ghana proposed that monitoring and evaluation should be done from national to all sub-national levels.

3.8.2. Link Sanitation Monitoring to National & Global M&E Frameworks

There was a general call by three countries to link the proposed sanitation monitoring framework to the national research bureaus and global sanitation monitoring initiatives. This is even though some of the latter were openly considered foreign and having little regard for inputs by domestic actors.

Zambia proposed that sanitation monitoring initiatives should work closely with the country statistics office so that indicators are aligned for comprehensive monitoring and reporting. They should also adopt the Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) system as it has been widely used.

Liberia acknowledges the need for data in the policy development process, but without a national database, JMP data would be a good starting point. During times of dwindling resources, it is wise for countries to look at creative ways of getting the data in the interim, and this is what the stakeholders sought to do through this suggestion.

Table 8: Country Suggestions on Monitoring, Reporting & Periodic Review

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Develop an elaborate and inclusive M&E Framework					x		x		x	x		x
2	Monitor policy implementation and across all levels		x	x	x	x		x		x			
3	Link sanitation M&E frameworks to national & global ones		x			x	x						
4	Baseline data to be collected for sanitation monitoring	x			x								
5	Make sanitation M&E data open source					x		x					
6	Institute an independent body for sanitation monitoring							x				x	

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

3.9. Policy Development Process

3.9.1. Clearly Outline Policy Preparation Process

Zambia recently developed a sanitation policy, and the participants were excited about their achievement in the sector. One of the key points raised is that ASPG needs to outline how a policy development process is structured clearly. A suggestion was raised that the ASPG drafting team can borrow some ideas from a Zambian cabinet memo that explains the process of how to develop a policy.

Liberia would also expect to see this process somehow spelt out. Participants made the suggestion that the steps could include: composing a multi-stakeholder policy formulation/drafting committee; development of a policy guideline/outline content; convening first stakeholders meeting to produce the first draft; convening second stakeholders meeting to create the second draft, and holding a final stakeholder's validation meeting to create the final policy document.

Once this is completed, national validation, submission for enactment into law by legislature, implementation, and enforcement would then follow. Liberia suggested that ASPG should also include a policy development checklist for governments.

3.9.2. Make It Participatory and Inclusive

Ghana suggested that while adapting the ASPG, countries should use the bottom-up stakeholder consultations to bring in breadth, depth, and local knowledge into policy. Liberia similarly considered discussions at all levels, including desk review of existing associated policies, research, awareness creation, community, and media engagement.

Kenya noted that defining and mapping of stakeholders is critical. Particular attention should be made to include the community and their needs and not just base the policy on the implementers' point of view. Participants requested ASPG to ensure a comprehensive process of mapping out Country stakeholders for proper engagement in policy development.

Uganda stakeholders recommended that the first steps of ASPG should have been in-country consultations first with different stakeholders such as national utilities, local government, and other grassroots associations.

Rwanda equally observed that the policy development process should be a consultative approach based on specific country needs. That should start with a needs assessment or gaps identification at the onset of policy formulation. The needs assessment should consider a consultation with all stakeholders, including targeted users of the sanitation facilities.

Senegal noted that ASPG should include mechanisms to engage gender experts, women, and people living with disabilities in the review and development of sanitation policies, especially MHM and hygiene in general.

Table 9: Country Suggestions on Policy Preparation Process

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Clearly outline policy preparation process					x							x
2	Include public participation/grassroots consultation			x	x		x		x		x	x	x
3	Conduct a pre-process Country Needs Assessment				x		x		x		x		x
4	Include member states Peer Reviews		x		x								
5	Include national and AU validation for ASPG									x	x		x
6	Include a Policy Development Checklist										x		

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

4. Other Key Themes Not Included ASPG Outline

4.1. Advocacy

4.1.1. Include Advocacy in Policy Development

Nigeria consultation suggested that there should be an element of advocacy on resource allocation for implementation of policies.

Similarly, Rwanda workshop noted that public funds are limited, and there is a need to use advocacy tools like policy-briefs to inform decision-makers about the importance of sanitation. These should propose clear plans for sanitation and engage ministers of finance when they are planning for them to positively consider better allocations to the sanitation sector.

Table 10: Country Suggestions on Advocacy

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Build in advocacy for financing sanitation								x				x
2	Engage media and CSOs in advocacy												x

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

4.2. Alignment to Goals

4.2.1. Continental & Global Goals

A few countries suggested that ASPG should be anchored in more goals than SDG 6.2. This is a fact already stated in ASPG presentations at the beginning of the workshops. For some reason, it still came out in several discussions and is worth mentioning in this report.

Uganda and Senegal suggested that ASPG should make firm reference to Agenda 2063 of the AU to resonate a bit more strongly with the member states. As Senegal puts it, AMCOW is a structure of African States, so ASPG should be positioned in such a way that it is considered by all the African States that are initiating this sanitation policy development conversation.

4.2.2. Country Political Priorities

There is no doubt that policies should align to national plans. Uganda, for example, highlighted that the critical issues standing in the way of sanitation sector progress mostly hinge on high-level political commitment and this should be key in ASPG.

However, a very pertinent subject raised by five countries is how the policies can better adapt to shifting national priorities that are primarily driven by politicians through election manifestos.

Rwanda suggested that sanitation should also be linked to the security and political manifestos of decision-makers to make it gain greater political credibility. Uganda proposed that it should connect to the constitution, strategic goals and a country's development vision.

Nigeria recommended that sanitation policies should form a stable linkage and offer incentives to political priorities such as embracing a circular economy that reasonably contributes to job creation and poverty alleviation.

Table 11: Country Suggestions on Policy Goals Alignment

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Link ASPG to AU Agenda 2063						x			x			
2	Policy to align to national devt/political context	x		x		x	x						x

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

4.3. Climate Change

4.3.1. Climate Change Adaptation

Rwanda put it clear that the country's sanitation sub-sector has been facing some challenges related to climate change and therefore would like to see climate change resilience well captured in ASPG.

ASPG should also develop guidelines on climate-resilient sanitation; further, countries should add sanitation investments to the national climate change adaptation package as an opportunity to target additional funding to the sub-sector.

Table 12: Country Suggestions on Climate Change

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Include Climate Change Adaptation/Resilience								x			x	

Key – X means issue raised/mentioned in the country consultation report

5. Suggested AMCOW Roles for Country Support

5.1. Coordination

5.1.1. Coordinating In-Country & Continental Stakeholders

Uganda pointed out that policy development processes are multi-sectoral and require strong collaboration between various government agencies and non-state actors like CSOs and the private sector.

This is not an easy task to facilitate due to the inherent fragmentation of sanitation mandates across the countries targeted by ASPG. Poor coordination or lack of it is likely to stand in the way of the next stages of the guidelines, going by the expressions of stakeholders. Kenya and Malawi opined that support in coordination and facilitation of stakeholder consultations would assist the countries to have an integrated, all-inclusive nationwide policies.

Ghana suggested that mobilization and coordination by AMCOW should also be done amongst member states as another cohort of stakeholders. The reason being that provision of adequate information to various countries and encouraging them to accept the ASPG is what will make the entire process a success. Participants stated that they foresee a significant risk in advancing ASPG if several countries do not support and embrace it.

Senegal and Kenya observed that AMCOW typically convenes 54 African Ministers of Water and Sanitation, and therefore, has a crucial responsibility to actively advocate to these Ministers for both the endorsement and adoption of the ASPG by AU Member States.

5.1.2. Coordinating Support by CSOs and Regional Bodies

Stakeholders in various countries noted that civil society participation in development, implementation, and monitoring is crucial. This holds to the success of the ASPG process.

Malawi indicates that CSOs are critical in sanitation policy development and should carry out awareness and education of masses during the process. To echo this further, Ghana suggested that AMCOW should help to bring on board various actors such as CSOs, NGOs, and academicians.

Senegal suggested that AMCOW, with its network of partners, could widely mobilize civil society and should play that role. Niger asserted that AMCOW should take responsibility for the leadership and coordination role at the regional level by garnering political support from ECOWAS, AU, AMCOW, and WAEMU.

5.2. Technical & Financial Support

5.2.1. Support for Review & Development of Policies

Nine countries suggested that AMCOW should assist in the review of existing policies and the development of new ones in countries where none exists. The general opinion of stakeholders was that AMCOW and its partners could spearhead technical support across the continent, which gives credibility to the process and outcome of sanitation development.

Malawi requested technical and financial aid, specifically on the assessment of existing policies and developing preliminary draft policy. Liberia sought AMCOW's help in reviewing existing literature or support new needs assessment studies to ascertain current sanitation policy gaps across its counties.

Similarly, Kenya asked AMCOW to commission a review of its existing policy to identify gaps and develop a roadmap to align it with the ASPG. In a broader sense, the country requested AMCOW to provide pre-policy development needs assessment support to countries on-demand basis.

Niger sought technical consulting support, facilitation, and mentoring for financial resource mobilization during the implementation of the national policy. South Sudan

asked for technical support in the form of capacity building for wash experts in the country to take up the ASPG initiative forward.

5.2.2. Guidance/Support Beyond Policy Development

Several countries suggested that ASPG should not end with the development of guidelines but should extend to the development of laws, regulations, guidelines, and monitoring processes. This came along with requests for both technical and financial support.

5.2.3. Establishing a Country Support Mechanism

Countries like Kenya requested AMCOW to structure a country support mechanism that can be adopted and used to review the national policy and steer implementation. This should be backed by a vibrant support system based at AMCOW Secretariat.

Niger observed that the process of developing the guidelines is relatively long, and AMCOW should reflect on the possible mechanisms for supporting countries wishing to amend their policy documents immediately.

Rwanda proposed that AMCOW can provide a platform for capacity building, information sharing, technology transfer, and awareness-raising to advance sanitation services across the continent.

5.3. Monitoring Support

5.3.1. Technical Support in Development of Monitoring Frameworks

Kenya sought support in the development of a policy implementation framework, which will include monitoring indicators and the need for reporting and data collection systems. AMCOW should support countries on the capacity to adapt the use of international standards and indicators for monitoring sanitation.

Malawi mainly requires AMCOW support in the capacity development of the M&E personnel from the central government on the data capture and harmonization with JMP.

5.3.2. Tracking the progress of sanitation policy development

One of the suggestions from Kenya is that AMCOW facilitates peer reviews of sanitation development progress across the AU membership. Malawi also suggested that a peer mechanism be established by AMCOW for close monitoring of ASPG utilization to strengthen country implementation. Zambia observed that AMCOW would need to do periodic checks with countries in consultation with the country sanitation focal points to track usage of the ASPG.

5.4. Advocacy

Several countries requested AMCOW to support advocacy at national and regional levels. According to Rwanda, one of AMCOWs key support role to the country would be conducting advocacy for sanitation policy financing. Similarly, Kenya requested support in advocacy for the appropriation of policy implementation budget to the government.

Uganda sees AMCOW having a responsibility to elevate the issue of sanitation to the highest duty bearers. This would require advocacy, and to openly emphasize this shift, and it should change to "AMCOWS" by adding sanitation to its acronym.

5.5. Communication

There was a general call for AMCOW to keep stakeholders informed of the progress of ASPG to keep the momentum. Ghana expressed the view that the process of ASPG consultation is excellent, and countries need to be updated throughout the process. The state suggested that stakeholders should be put on a social media platform to inform and engage them quickly and regularly.

5.6. Learning & Sharing

Ghana observed that AMCOW should continue to share the best practices from other countries to enable the Government of Ghana to raise its ambitions in dealing with the sanitation challenge.

Nigeria suggested that the ASPG initiative should coordinate the dissemination of knowledge materials and sanitation models and possibly develop a database for easy access .

Table 13: Country Suggestions on AMCOW Support

Number	Issue	Country											
		Ethiopia	Malawi	Ghana	Kenya	Zambia	Uganda	South Sudan	Rwanda	Senegal	Liberia	Niger	Nigeria
1	Support in mobilizing & coordinating stakeholders		x	x	x		x	x		x			
2	Coordinate support by CSOs & regional bodies									x		x	
3	Support review & development of sanitation policies		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
4	Guidance/support beyond policy development			x	x						x		x
5	Establish a country support mechanism				x						x		
6	Monitor progress of sanitation policy development			x	x	x		x	x	x	x		
7	Advocate for increased funding								x			x	
8	Advocate for establishment of sanitation lead agency			x	x			x					
9	Mobilize political support for policy development										x		x
10	Communicate regularly on ASPG progress			x	x								
11	Promote learning & sharing of policy best practices		x	x	x	x	x	x	x				

6. Summary of Other Valuable Observations

- i. Priority of issues for inclusion in ASPG can be considered either from the number of countries that raised it (quantitative) or from the perceived weight of ideas proposed by the nations (qualitative). It is, therefore, essential that both options be weighed carefully by drafters. This is the reason why this report has not put priority or weight on the issues, but instead, tried to capture nearly all the key messages from the country reports.
- ii. Hard decisions must be made between some good suggestions by countries and what is practically feasible for inclusion in the guidelines. The critical agenda is the inclusion of SWM in ASPG.
- iii. Taxation as a source of sanitation financing was hardly mentioned in most countries, despite the new push by the development sector to go in this direction. Is it just not feasible or just unknown to the majority of sector leaders?
- iv. Rwanda suggests that there is a need for a section in the ASPG, probably in the appendix section, where sanitation success stories can be presented. The stories can be from different elements such as financing, coordination, and responsibilities and technologies.
- v. The composition of stakeholders in the workshops could have been an indicator of how well the governments in those countries perceive inclusion in service provision. In Kenya, for example, there was limited representation from the private sector, and everyone noted. In Uganda, it was the other way around, somehow depicting how the public and private sector work together in the delivery of sanitation services.

7. Conclusion

In general, the consultation process seems to have met the outlaid objectives. The workshops communicated the importance of the ASPG in providing guidance on developing transparent and inclusive sanitation policies in the countries. This elicited several reactions, mostly complementary and emphasizing the need for such guidelines in the continent.

The opening and closing sessions of workshops have provided the general feeling of the countries in terms of anticipated support at the adoption phase. Most of the policymakers who made the keynote and closing remarks, particularly the ministers, made a strong commitment and called on the participants fully to support the ASPG process.

Judging from these addresses and the assessment of the facilitators, it can be concluded that the consulted member states have created an impression that ASPG is a valuable process. This holds true for both the countries with policies (or semblance of the same for that matter) that desire to carry out a review, and those that have none alike. This notwithstanding, there are several critical issues raised herein that are worth key consideration of both drivers and drafters of ASPG.

To start with, stakeholders were curious to know the next steps after country consultations and production of the final guidelines. There are many reasons for this apprehension. The major one being that without proper political driving strategies, this is just another document that will end up doing little to advance the sector. Stakeholders needed assurance that there are strategies already planned by AMCOW to make policy review and development process in members states a reality. This ties to the type of requests and recommendations made throughout this report.

The general expression of stakeholders was that there is a need for AMCOW to carry out serious advocacy to ministers to lead the way in adoption of ASPG and development of sanitation policies. This means that the proposed AU Council of Ministers planned meeting should not just endorse the guidelines but should have a mechanism for a commitment by ministers to pursue the next steps in their countries. On the other hand, AMCOW should steadfastly follow up with a clear monitoring procedure on the progress of these pledges.

It has come out clear that the issue of weak sanitation policy development in the continent is not just because there is little interest by governments to organize the sector. It is indeed a difficult one to handle due to the existing institutional complexity of overlapping mandates. This leaves the question-begging whether the starting point for AMCOW should be the development of sanitation policies, or lobbying and supporting African governments to deal with misalignment of institutional roles and responsibilities which appears to be the elephant in the room in all the conversations. This matter requires serious consideration by AMCOW since it was clear that the adoption of ASPG will not be a straightforward affair and is likely to be derailed by institutional competition and sabotage.

The content of the guidelines, and in extension, the country policies, was also a big debate. Several countries raised how broad the definition of sanitation and compounded responsibilities will stand in the way of a policy solely focused on sanitation. Several countries particularly mentioned that solid waste management is an integral part of sanitation, and the only way ASPG can be of help is by providing guidance on the other elements.

Bearing in mind that the consultations were conducted before the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, it is interesting to observe the weight given to handwashing with water and soap and other hygiene issues such as menstrual hygiene management. There was a general call to

strengthen public hygiene by providing facilities for handwashing and menstrual hygiene management. Promoting and enforcing public sanitation access was also a critical area that may require attention in the guidelines.

In general, the opinions of the stakeholders do not fundamentally deviate from the draft ASPG Outline, and this should provide a significant relief. It is commendable that most of the issues raised can be easily integrated without necessarily causing a considerable shift from the original structure of the guideline. However, the strategies to support member states in the next steps of policy review and development process may need deeper reflection or elaboration than what appears to be coming out in the ASPG outline and in the presentations by workshop facilitators.