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1. What is PEA?
2. Why is it useful?
3. FSM examples
1. Context of this work

- WSP commissioned OPM/WEDC to do FSM research in 5 cities
  - Balikpapan, Dhaka, Hawassa, Lima, Santa Cruz

Find out more in **Workshop 1a on Thursday**
“FSM Planning and Diagnostic Tools”
09:00 – 12:30

- Follow-up to WSP “12-city study” but collecting primary data in 5 cities
  - Survey of 720 households per city (360 city-wide, 360 in slums)
  - 40 x transect walks to understand public health risk
  - Observation of service providers
  - Qualitative work (interviews and focus groups)
2. What is Political Economy Analysis (PEA)?

PEA is using tools/frameworks to explain:

• how “institutions” function
  o “Rules and norms governing human interaction”
  o Formal (codified laws), e.g. by-law about where you can dump FS
  o Informal (social norms), e.g. attitudes to reusing FS in agriculture

• incentives which institutions provide to stakeholders
  o “individual, or group with an interest in outcome of a policy”
  o e.g. a truck company, the City Council, female slum-dwellers

• how stakeholders exert influence
  o “Formal or informal power to cause/prevent something happening”
  o e.g. council FS by-laws ignored (formal power, low influence)

Why use PEA? To support better-informed action
3. Dhaka’s FSM challenge

• 9m people in Dhaka City,

• Rapid change flattening old areas for high-rise

• 99% using a toilet (Census, 2011), but
  – 20% pay sewer bill (but 70% pump stations non-functional)
  – 50% have pits/tanks connected to drains (OPM/WEDC, 2015)
  – 21% directly to drains/ditches (OPM/WEDC, 2015)

• There is almost zero market for FSM services
  – One functioning vacutug operator
  – Manual sweepers fill in the gap
4. PEA tool 1 – Process mapping

**Objective**: understand interaction of formal/informal “moments” in a key process, and entry points for engagement:

- Identify roles of stakeholders – how/where they exert influence,
  - e.g. HH, vacutug company, manual emptier, city council
- Identify incentives stakeholders face, i.e. the informal system
  - e.g. price of service, the law, likelihood of punishment
- Summarise entry points for engagement
  - e.g. regulation, enforcement, payment for safe disposal

**Other key processes in FSM which could be mapped**:
- Getting a permit to reuse FS as fertiliser
- Transporting emptied FS to a safe discharge point
- Constructing a new building
### 5. FSM example - process mapping for building construction (with or without septic tanks) in Dhaka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry points</th>
<th>Formal Process</th>
<th>Informal Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve application scrutiny</td>
<td>Developer applies to RAJUK for permit</td>
<td>RAJUK expects DCC/DWASA to provide services, without asking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by all parties</td>
<td>RAJUK reviews application and consults other relevant authorities linked to FSM service provision (e.g. DCCs, DWASA)</td>
<td>Developer connects toilets or septic tanks directly to the storm water drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAJUK approves construction</td>
<td>Not enough RAJUK staff to do proper inspections &amp; enforce compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developer constructs building with septic tanks &amp; leach pits not connected to drains</td>
<td>Occupants do nothing, as all waste goes to drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAJUK inspects during and after construction for compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupants of completed building arrange for emptying of septic tanks when req'd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: to identify stakeholder interests/incentives, and the degree of their influence on an issue:

- Consider a reform direction and assess stakeholders’ relative...
  
  • Influence (power to facilitate or impede FSM service provision)
  • Interest (gain/loss from any change)
7. FSM example – stakeholder influence over changing FSM status quo in Dhaka
8. Example of “thinking and working politically” in urban sanitation


- **Objective:** improve ‘pro-poor’ urban sanitation through strategic planning
- **Activity:** assistance to develop demand-responsive City Sanitation Strategies
- **Results:** 300% increase in municipal sanitation expenditure in first 6 cities

Halfway through, PEA problem diagnosis

- Bappenas (planning agency) lead rather than MoPW (traditional sanitation)
- MoPW still uncooperative after one year of advocacy effort

Thinking and working politically – the action

- **Idea:** recruit former govt. official, not a sanitation guy but knows MoPW
- **Action:** informal approaches (breakfast/dinner meetings)
- **Lessons:** personal ties, facilitator not expert as champion

“But that’s obvious...” – it wasn’t in 2006
9. Conclusion – lessons for policy-makers and FSM advocates

1. Anyone can use PEA
   • Getting beyond “what we all know”, writing it down
   • Can be brief – don’t have to use (i) all the tools, (ii) consultants

2. Using PEA helps focus attention on informality
   • Informal institutions and processes
   • Informality is key in FSM, under the radar etc.

3. Using PEA can avoid mis-targeted interventions
   • Better understand reasons for blockages in FSM services
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