

SFD Promotion Initiative

SFD Review Procedure

Instructions & guidelines for SFD authors and reviewers

Effective: November 2017

SFD Promotion Initiative

sustainable
sanitation
alliance

giz Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

On behalf of



Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development


UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

 **WORLD BANK GROUP**
Water

 **wsp**
water and
sanitation program

 **WEDC**  Loughborough
University



eawag
aquatic research

Sandec
Sanitation, Water and
Solid Waste for Development

**BILL & MELINDA
GATES foundation**



SFD Review Procedure, Effective: November 2017

© Copyright

All SFD Promotion Initiative materials are freely available following the open-source concept for capacity development and non-profit use, so long as proper acknowledgement of the source is made when used. Users should always give credit in citations to the original author, source and copyright holder.

This document is available from

www.sfd.susana.org

Content

1. Introduction	4
2. User's Checklist.....	6
3. User self-assessment of data sources used	8
3.1. Brief description of the procedure.....	8
3.2. Rubric to evaluate the credibility of data and information sources	8
3.2.1 Municipal, utility or private local service provider records	8
3.2.2 Documented studies	10
3.2.3 Interviews and FGDs	11
3.2.4 Observation (incl. potential related interviews).....	13
4. Review process	14
4.1. Overview.....	14
4.2. Reviewer's Checklist	14
5. Practicing the Procedures - Examples	16
5.1. User self-assessment of data sources used	16
5.2. Review Process	18

List of Tables

Table 1. Municipal, utility or private local service provider records	9
Table 2. Municipal, utility or private local service provider records ranking	9
Table 3. Documented studies.....	10
Table 4. Documented studies ranking.....	10
Table 5. Interviews and FGDs.....	11
Table 6. Interviews and FGDs ranking	12
Table 7. Observation	13
Table 8. Observation ranking	13

List of abbreviations

FGD	Focus Group Discussion
KII	Key Informant Interview
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
SFD	Shit Flow Diagram

1. Introduction

This document, the Review Procedure, presents the procedure to review an SFD report for users who want to receive feedback on their SFD reports prepared regarding credibility and transparency of assumptions made.

This process is compulsory for publishing SFDs on the SFD Webportal as it represents the Quality Control Mechanism of the SFD PI.

This document is divided into four parts:

- Part 1. [User's Checklist](#), **checklist for authors** preparing an SFD report and SFD graphic.
- Part 2. [User's self-assessment of data sources used and brief description of the procedure](#), describing the **user** self-assessment of data sources to assess the quality and credibility of the sources used.
- Part 3. [Review process](#), providing guidance for the **reviewer** of the SFD narrative report to control and improve the quality of reporting.
- Part 4. [Practicing the Procedures – Examples](#), showing the **application** of the self-assessment and the reviewers guidance (“Checklist”) questions in terms of an example.

The aim of the Review Procedure is to ensure transparency of credibility of SFD Reports by evaluating the credibility of the sources used to develop the SFD (Report and Graphic). This procedure is an opportunity to have your SFD report reviewed by a team of experts and it obligatory, in case you would like to publish the results of your work SFD web portal, making it available to the general interested public. This process is complimentary for every SFD author and user. To start the review procedure, the SFD user/ author is asked to submit the following four documents either uploading them to the SFD Helpdesk (www.sfd.susana.org/toolbox/sfd-helpdesk) or sending them via Email to helpdesk@sfd-susana.org:

1. The SFD files (json file, including graphic, matrix and selection grid, see below)
2. The SFD Report (templates to be found here <http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357> (report template), <http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357> (lite template))
3. The completed user's checklist (to be found here <http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357>)
4. The source evaluation (to be found here <http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357>)



The production of the SFD Report, as well as the SFD graphic (the Graphic Generator online and offline versions are available here www.sfd.susana.org/data-to-graphic) has to be completed by the user according to the methodology available on the SFD Webportal: <http://www.susana.org/en/resources/library/details/2357>

2. User's Checklist

Before preparing an SFD we recommend to read through the "[How to make an SFD](#)" chapter on the [SFD Webportal](#). There you find a general introduction as well as tutorial videos and the templates for the SFD reports, the source evaluation and the user's checklist.

Before uploading an SFD for review, we request you to answer the following questions and add the answers (and explanations why you may have done things differently from the SFD PI methodology) to your upload-materials on the SFD Helpdesk. A template to be completed can be found here:

<http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357>

1. Is your SFD the first produced for the city? Yes No
 - a. *If not:* Are there significant changes in facts and figures? Yes No
 - b. *If not:* Does it progress the previous report, i.e. has additional primary and secondary data been collected?

Please, write here
2. Are all 4 parts of the SFD (SFD Report, SFD Graphic, SFD Source Evaluation, User's Checklist) provided? (this is necessary for starting the review process) Yes No
3. Was the SFD methodology used? Yes No
If not, are the reasons for the change explained? Yes No
4. Have you included the self-assessment of data sources? Yes No
5. Regarding the SFD report:
 - a. Does the report follow the template provided? Yes No
Are all chapters provided? Yes No
 - b. Is the executive summary informative (short, focused on the main points) and follows the template provided? Yes No
If not: Please provide a reasonable explanation why.

Please, write here
 - c. Have you used the terminology as defined in the glossary consistently throughout the report? Yes No
 - d. Are all data sources you used to produce the SFD graphic and report referenced according to the template given? Yes No
 - e. What is the quality of the references following the user's self-assessment?

Please, write here
 - f. Are table and figure headers and legends short, concise and informative and referenced? Yes No

- g. Does the SFD Report include explanations of the SFD Graphic and of all assumptions made? Yes No
- h. Does the report provide information on all stakeholders? Yes No
- i. Does the report include an overview of stakeholders engaged in the process?
Yes No
If no stakeholder engagement was possible, please explain why.

Please, write here
- j. Is the report an appropriate length (main, necessary facts included, brought to the point, not too long)? Yes No
6. Regarding the SFD graphic:
- a. Have you used the graphic generator for preparing the graphic? Yes No
If not: please provide the data used for preparing the graphic.

Please, write here

3. User self-assessment of data sources used

3.1. Brief description of the procedure

The self-assessment is a procedure to evaluate the credibility of the data sources used in the SFD Report and hence the data used to generate the SFD Graphic. The procedure is described within this chapter.

To fulfil the procedure, you can use the “Source Evaluation Tool” which can be downloaded from the SFD Webportal here <http://www.susana.org/en/knowledge-hub/resources-and-publications/library/details/2357>.

The purpose of this procedure is to produce an annotated bibliography, which would include the following information:

(A) Source: Reference to the source. The user enters the citation of the source. E.g.: (Peal et al. 2012).

(B) Type: The user chooses the type of source used.

Types of sources are:

1. Municipal, utility or private local service provider records
2. Documented studies
3. Interviews or Focus Group Discussions (FGD).
4. Observation

(C) Credibility of data and information sources: According to different criteria (representativeness, depth of data, confidence, scale and documentation), the user chooses one of three options (scores). The scores available are:

1. Low (value 1)
2. Medium (value 2)
3. High (value 3)

The total score for any single source is calculated as the sum of all individual scores for each criterion. The final value for quality and credibility (poor, medium and high) is provided in each of the types of source and explained in the next section.

3.2. Rubric to evaluate the credibility of data and information sources

3.2.1 Municipal, utility or private local service provider records

Types of data: policies, regulations, design documents, legislation, yearly reports, data sheets, licenses, etc. The classification of these data is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Municipal, utility or private local service provider records

			Score
Representativeness	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information is up to date, e.g. <1 years old. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information is 1- 5 years old. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information is >5 years old. 	1
Confidence/ Reliability	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report contains independently obtained performance data of existing infrastructure. ○ Key stakeholders and/or local external experts are in strong agreement and acceptance. ○ Data confirmed through cross verification multiple data sources. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report contains information on existing infrastructure. ○ Key stakeholders and/or local external experts agree it is credible. ○ Data confirmed through cross verification from one additional source. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report contains plans for infrastructure prior to construction. ○ Key stakeholders, and /or local external experts are dubious of data. ○ Information cannot be cross-verified. ○ Data not consistent with other sources. 	1
Documentation	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data is readily available, verifiable, and easily tracked. ○ Process of data production is documented (i.e. chain of command for lab samples). 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Records and data are difficult to accurately collect and verify, but a reasonable method has been followed to estimate it (e.g. number of onsite sanitation facilities in informal settlement). ○ Responsibility for data handling through entire chain of command is not clear, or not adequately documented. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Records of poor quality, or not traceable. 	1

The total score for this type of source is calculated as the sum of scores of representativeness + confidence + documentation. Once this total is calculated, the credibility corresponds to values 1 (Poor), 2 (Medium) or 3 (High) according to Table 2.

Table 2. Municipal, utility or private local service provider records ranking

Total Score	Credibility
total ≤ 4	Poor
4 < total ≤ 7	Medium
total > 7	High

3.2.2 Documented studies

Peer-reviewed journal papers, conference papers, grey literature i.e. external and internal reports from organisations, etc. can provide recording and valuable information. The classification of these data sources is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Documented studies

			Score
Representativeness	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cited references are credible and up to date. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cited references not the most up to date. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cited references are not credible and/ or out of date. 	1
Confidence/ Reliability	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documented studies from highly reputable sources, e.g. peer- reviewed. ○ Was conducted by professionals with adequate training, expertise, and knowledge of field. ○ There are no inconsistencies within the reported information. ○ Explained well, with no uncertainty after reading. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Article from a reputable organization, but without peer-review. ○ There are no obvious mistakes within the reported information. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was conducted by professionals/ organizations exhibiting inadequate knowledge of the field. ○ There are inconsistencies in the reported information. ○ There are many remaining uncertainties after reading. ○ Although not used for this SFD, facts are reported in the report that are not correct. ○ Data collection or measurements are inadequate to support the stated conclusions. 	1
Documentation	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodology clearly reported in a fashion that study would be easily replicable. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodology understandable, but not reported in full. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodology is not clear. 	1

The total score for this type of source is calculated as the sum of scores of representativeness + confidence + documentation. Once this total is calculated, the credibility corresponds to values 1 (Poor), 2 (Medium) or 3 (High) according to Table 4.

Table 4. Documented studies ranking

Total Score	Credibility
total ≤ 4	Poor
4 < total ≤ 7	Medium
total > 7	High

3.2.3 Interviews and FGDs

Interviews with city authorities, local government departments, NGOs, experts, community representatives, service providers. The classification of these data is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Interviews and FGDs

			Score
Representativeness	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interviews and FGDs were open and free-flowing, participants were actively involved and engaged in open debate and were conducted with diverse group of stakeholders' representative of stakeholder mapping. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interviews and FGDs were open and free-flowing, but only possible with a limited number of stakeholders that was not fully representative. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In FGDs a participant was controlling or dominating conversation, there was no free-flowing conversation. ○ Interviews were only conducted with one person, or representing only one viewpoint/sector. 	1
Depth of data	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions and interviews were conducted until saturation, where no new information was revealed. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions and interview results were not in agreement, but a reasonable interpretation of results could be made. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions and interviews did not result in convergence of data; answers were not in agreement among participants. 	1
Confidence	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants were selected based on their expertise, length of experience, and direct responsibility and active involvement with topic. ○ More than one interviewer working together and were in agreement and confident of reported data. ○ Participants reported consistent data/information throughout. ○ Participants appeared well-informed, willing to express opinions against their own interest, and clearly stated when they did not want to answer or that they did not know the answer. ○ Data sources were provided that validated answers. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants had a reasonable knowledge of topic. ○ Participants were not sure of answers, but seemed reasonably accurate. ○ Participants could not be questioned in their mother tongue – inaccuracies may have occurred due to translations. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants were preselected by another party. ○ Data collectors not in agreement on data interpretation. ○ Interviewees and/or participants contradicted themselves with inconsistent answers throughout session. ○ Participants provided some answers that appeared the author to be clearly wrong. 	1

Documentation	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sessions were well documented and written up within 24 hours. ○ Accurate records were kept of methods including length, number of interviews/participants and recording method. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notes were taken during interviews and FGDs. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notes or records were not kept during interviews or discussions. 	1

The total score for this type of source is calculated as the sum of scores of representativeness + scale + confidence + documentation. Once this total is calculated, the credibility corresponds to values 1 (Poor), 2 (Medium) or 3 (High) according to Table 6.

Table 6. Interviews and FGDs ranking

Total Score	Credibility
Total ≤ 6	Poor
6 < Total ≤ 10	Medium
Total > 10	High

3.2.4 Observation (incl. potential related interviews)

Observation only applies for comprehensive studies. The classification of these data is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Observation

			Score
Representativeness	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Observation was open, non-intrusive, and occurred with minimum or no prior arrangement. ○ Additional expert interviews were conducted during observation to determine effectiveness and understand process. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Examples of technology were observed, but expert interviews to determine effectiveness were not possible. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited observations, arranged by people who had an incentive to influence findings. ○ Examples of technology were observed, but not during usage. 	1
Scale	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A significant number of examples were observed to confirm distribution and usage. ○ Observations have been made in representative areas of the city. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Multiple types of technologies were observed, but not in replication. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was not possible to make observations in representative areas of the city. 	1
Confidence	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In-field measurements or proofs/ checks have taken place during observation. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In-field measurements were not possible, but visual observation of performance was possible. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Observations were conducted by only one person with no verification by local experts or without reasonable expertise. 	1
Documentation	high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notes were taken and/ or photographs and/or videos were made during observation. 	3
	medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some notes were taken, but no visual evidence documented. 	2
	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No notes were taken. 	1

**Note: observations can include interviews that take place during the observation.*

The total score for this type of source is calculated as the sum of scores of representativeness + scale + confidence + documentation. Once this total is calculated, the quality and credibility corresponds to values 1 (Poor), 2 (Medium) or 3 (High) according to Table 8.

Table 8. Observation ranking

Total Score	Credibility
total ≤ 6	1 (Poor)
6 < total ≤ 10	2 (Medium)
total > 10	3 (High)

4. Review process

4.1. Overview

This process has been created in order to evaluate, assess and improve the quality of reporting, by providing comments for authors and giving constructive criticism. In order to provide a common basis for assisting the review process, reviewers can use the checklist below and on this basis make a recommendation to upload or modify the SFD.

4.2. Reviewer's Checklist

Reviewers should answer the following questions while preparing their review of each SFD.

1. Is the SFD the first produced for the city? Yes No
 - a. *If yes*, is it reasonable, credible and adequately explained?
 - b. *If not*, are there significant changes since the preceding SFD and have these been adequately explained?
2. Are all 4 parts of the SFD (SFD Report, SFD Graphic, SFD Source Evaluation, User's Checklist) provided? (this is necessary for starting the review process) Yes No
3. Was the SFD methodology used? Yes No
If not, are the reasons for the change explained?
4. Are data sources appropriately referenced? Yes No
5. Is the report well-written and understandable?
6. Regarding the SFD report
 - a. Does the report follow the template provided? Yes No
Are all chapters provided? Yes No
 - b. Is the executive summary informative (short, focused on the main points) and follows the template provided? Yes No
If not, are explanations given?
 - c. Is the terminology used as defined in the glossary consistently throughout the report? Yes No *If not: Are reasons given to do it differently?*
 - d. Are all references given using the appropriate format? Yes No
 - e. What is the overall user assessment of the quality of the references and data sources? Yes No Does this seem appropriate? Yes No

Please, write here
 - f. Are table and figure headers and legends referenced in a short, concise and informative way? Yes No Does the SFD Report include explanations of the SFD Graphic and of all assumptions made? Yes No
 - g. Does the report provide information on all stakeholders? Yes No
 - h. Does the report have the tracking of engagement of stakeholders? Yes No
If not: Is this change explained?

- i. Is the report an appropriate length (main, necessary facts included, brought to the point, not too long)? Yes No
7. Regarding the SFD graphic:
 - a. Has the graphic generator been used to prepare the graphic? Yes No
If not: please provide the data used for preparing the graphic.

Please, write here

5. Practicing the Procedures - Examples

A comprehensive example of the procedures presented on the previous chapters is presented here to serve as a basis for both the user (section 4.1) and the reviewer (section 4.2).

5.1. User self-assessment of data sources used

In this example, five sources are used (A, B, C, D and E) for the city of Bishoftu (Ethiopia).

- A. BCP (2015). Socio Economic Profile of Bishoftu City Administration. A **documented study** from the municipality of Bishoftu. (Section 2.2.2)
- B. **Interview** with the process owner of beautification in the **municipality** of Bishoftu. (Section 2.2.3)
- C. **Interview** with an urban **health extension worker** of Bishoftu. (Section 2.2.3)
- D. **Interview** with the owner of a **private company** providing emptying services in Bishoftu. (Section 2.2.3)
- E. **Field visit** to the dumping site of Bishoftu. First-hand impressions on the final disposal of the faecal sludge were observed. This was cross-checked with previous data reported in literature, interviews and documented studies.

The credibility and quality for each source, according to its type, are put by the user based on the guidelines previously described:

Source A:

Source	Type				Score
A	2	Representativeness	medium	Cited reference is up to date	3
		Confidence	medium	Article from a reputable organization	3
		Documentation	low	Methodology is not clear.	1

The total score is $3+3+1=7$. According to Table 4, the quality and credibility of this source is **High**.

Source B:

Source	Type				Score
B	3	Representativeness	high	Interview was conducted with diverse group of stakeholders' representative of stakeholder mapping.	3
		Depth of Data	medium	Discussions and interview results were not in agreement, but a reasonable interpretation of results could be made.	2
		Confidence	high	Data sources were provided that validated answers.	3
		Documentation	high	Sessions were well documented and written up within 24 hours.	3

The total score is $3+2+3+3=11$.

According to Table 6, the quality and credibility of this source is **High**.

Source C:

Source	Type				Score
C	3	Representativeness	medium	Interviews and FGDs were open and free-flowing, but only possible with a limited number of stakeholders that was not fully representative.	2
		Depth of Data	medium	Discussions and interview results were not in agreement, but a reasonable interpretation of results could be made.	2
		Confidence	medium	Participants were selected that had a reasonable knowledge of topic.	2
		Documentation	low	Notes or records were not kept during interviews or discussions.	1

The total score is 2+2+2+1=7. According to Table 6, the quality and credibility of this source is **Medium**.

Source D:

Source	Type				Score
D	3	Representativeness	medium	Interviews and FGDs were open and free-flowing, but only possible with a limited number of stakeholders that was not fully representative.	2
		Depth of Data	low	Discussions and interviews did not result in convergence of data; answers were not in agreement among participants.	1
		Confidence	low	Data collectors not in agreement on data interpretation.	1
		Documentation	low	Notes or records were not kept during interviews or discussions.	1

The total score is 2+1+1+1=5. According to Table 6, the Quality and Credibility of this source is **Poor**.

Source E:

Source	Type				Score
E	4	Representativeness	High	Only one dump site exists and was the focus of this observation	3
		Scale	High	Field observations were made in several locations but only one location was identified where dumping was taking place	3
		Confidence	Medium	In-field measurements were not possible, but visual observation of performance was possible.	2
		Documentation	Medium	-Notes were taken, but no visual evidence documented.	2

The total score is 3+3+2+2=10. According to Table 8, the quality and credibility of this source is **High**.

Quality and credibility summary for all sources

Source	Type	Quality and Credibility
A	2	High
B	3	High
C	3	Medium
D	3	Poor
E	4	High

5.2. Review Process

The report of Bishoftu (Ethiopia) follows the template provided and it is written in good English. Although the methodology used by the authors to produce the SFD is slightly different from the SFD methodology, the assumptions made are reasonable and all data are well referenced.

Example:

1. Question

ANSWER

1. Is the SFD the first produced for the city? **YES and it is adequately explained.**
2. Are all 4 parts of the SFD (SFD Report, SFD Graphic, SFD Evaluation, User's Checklist) provided? **YES**
3. Was the SFD methodology used? *If not*, are the reasons for the change explained? **YES**
4. Are data sources appropriately referenced? **YES**
5. Is the report well-written and understandable? **YES**
6. Regarding the SFD report
 - a. Does the report follow the template provided? Are all chapters provided? **YES**
 - b. Is the executive summary informative (short, focused on the main points) and follows the template provided? **YES**
 - c. Is the terminology used as defined in the glossary consistently throughout the report? **YES**
 - d. Are all references given using the appropriate format? **YES**
 - e. What is the overall user assessment of the quality of the references and data sources? Does this seem appropriate? **YES**
 - f. Are table and figure headers and legends referenced in a short, concise and informative way? **YES**
 - g. Does the SFD Report include explanations of the SFD Graphic and of all assumptions made? **YES**
 - h. Does the report provide information on all stakeholders? **YES**
 - i. Does the report have the tracking of engagement of stakeholders? **YES**
 - j. Is the report an appropriate length (main, necessary facts included, brought to the point, not too long)? **YES**
7. Regarding the SFD graphic: Has the graphic generator been used to prepare the graphic? **YES**