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Why to integrate all FSM stakeholders?

- Many FSM projects fail...

Main reasons:

- Top-down approach, blueprint designs
- Same approach as for wastewater projects
- Lack of consideration of FS stakeholders’ needs and priorities

FS ≠ wastewater
FS stakeholders ≠ wastewater stakeholders
Why to integrate all FSM stakeholders?

Source: www.sandec.ch/clues

ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

- Government Support
- Legal and Regulatory Framework
- Institutional Arrangements
- Financial Arrangements
- Skills and Capacities
- Socio-Cultural Acceptance

Source: www.sandec.ch/clues
Diversity of needs and priorities

AUTHORITIES: municipal, national, ethnic/religious leaders, Utilities, Police...

SERVICE PROVIDERS: public, private, manual, mechanical, in/formal...

HOUSEHOLDS: tenants /landlords

ENDUSERS: farmers, breeders, fuel consumers,...

DONORS, NGOs, universities...

Synergies BUT ALSO conflicting interests and goals
Typical problems faced by FSM stakeholders

- Lack of **agency to participate**
- **Constraints** in the sludge emptying business
- Lack of **resources /capacities**
- **Tensions** between stakeholders
- **Awareness** and behaviour
GERER SES EAUX USEES ET SA LATRINE SANS NUIRE A SES VOISINS C'EST UN SIGNE DE BONNE FOI

حفظلك بياءهك المستعملة ومرحفك
ولده الإساءة بالجريان علامة حسن الجوار
Characterisation: which information?

- Main interests
- Opportunities and threats
- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Involvement needs (e.g. capacity-building)
- Relationships between stakeholders
- Impacts
How to determine the KEY-stakeholders?

- A simplified approach -

- Influence
  - C3: Potential support or threat
  - C4: Ability to get funding
  - C5: Ownership of a potential treatment site

- Interest
  - C1: Activity linked with FSM
  - C2: Political power
  - C6: Potential user of a treatment endproduct
An iterative process!

Different project phases

Different participatory stages

Evolution of stakeholders’ role and responsibilities

- Assessment of the initial situation
- Identification of service options
- Action planning
- Implementation
2007: Collaboration between the Municipality and CREPA

2008: Three months of participatory planning

2013: Funding through the African Water Facility

Now: Detailed design study
Example from Sokodé, Togo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>C1 Activity FSM</th>
<th>C2 Political power</th>
<th>C3 Support threat</th>
<th>C4 Funding</th>
<th>C5 Ownership site</th>
<th>C6 Enduse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle breeders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Directorates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical service provider 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical service provider 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Farmers
- Cattle breeders
- Households
From Analysis to Involvement

- Which participation level, which tools?

  - Low influence: Information
  - High influence: Consultation – Empowerment / Delegation

  - Low interest: Information
  - High interest: Consultation – Collaboration
## FSM planning from A to Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Preliminary assessment of the initial situation and first inventory of stakeholders</td>
<td>Overview of the situation; facilitators are identified</td>
<td>14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Identification and preliminary characterisation of the stakeholders and their relationships</td>
<td>All stakeholders are identified and characterized</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Initial launching workshop, including field visit with all the stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders are sensitized to sanitation reality and aware about the project’s objectives</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **D** Assessment of:  
- Sanitation practice and needs, reuse interests  
- Institutional setup, government support  
- Legal and regulatory framework  
- Existing organisational modes  
- City structure and heterogeneity of sanitation practices  
- Existing financial flows  
- Climate | Sanitation practices are identified, as well as urban heterogeneity;  
Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are identified (SWOT analysis);  
The enabling environment is described | 14 |
| **E** Selection of potential organisational modes | Orientation of the process towards realistic options | 12 |
| **F** Identification of sites for treatment | Stakeholders have indicated existing and potential sites | 14.4 |
| **G** Characterisation and selection of key stakeholders | Stakeholder who have indicated existing and potential sites on the process are identified | 15.4 to 15.5 |

### Preliminary studies report

- **H** Quantification and characterisation of sludge
- **I** Characterisation and selection of sites
- **J** Preselection of combinations of technologies, organisational modes and financial mechanisms
- **K** Detailed evaluation of selected options, including:  
  - Requirements of technology combinations, pros and cons, O&M  
  - Organisational mode and institutional setup; roles & responsibilities

- **L** Participation of the planning force
- **M** Establish a city sanitation force
- **N** Launch of the planning process
- **O** Understand the existing context

### Inception report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUES</th>
<th>SAN21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process ignition force</td>
<td>Establish a city sanitation force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of the planning process</td>
<td>Understand the existing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the existing context</td>
<td>Establish a city sanitation force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a city sanitation force</td>
<td>Launch of the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a city sanitation force</td>
<td>Process ignition force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard project phases

- **Exploratory study**
- **Preliminary (pre-feasibility) studies**
Conclusions

- **Investment** leading to *save money* and *time* later
- **Simplified** approach for *quick* results
- **Empowerment** of often neglected stakeholders
- Creation of an **enabling environment**
- In Sokodé, **opened the way to funding** through the African Water Facility
Thanks for your attention!
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