

lib

822 BD90

**Routine monitoring of qualitative aspects
of the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme,
Bangladesh**

End of mission report
prepared for DANIDA by Marieke Boot, IRC
1989/1990

INTERNATIONAL WATER AND SANITATION CENTRE
P.O. BOX 348, 3720 BA ZWIJERTHE, THE NETHERLANDS
TELEPHONE: +31 (0)374 470200
FACSIMILE: +31 (0)374 470201
TELEX: 330000 IRC NL
ELECTRONIC MAIL: IRC@ZWIJERTHE.NL



IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, The Netherlands

822-BD90-8052

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the objectives of the IRC mission for DANIDA to the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Programme in Bangladesh was: "To develop measurable indicators for the routine monitoring of qualitative improvements in the implementation of the RWSS Programme (integrated approach, beneficiaries participation, involvement of women, etc.); to assist in the introduction of the use of these indicators into the UNICEF field monitoring system; to recommend improvements in the monitoring system where indicated." The mission took place in three subsequent visits to Bangladesh in May, September and November 1989.

During the mission two informal discussion notes were prepared. The first note served as a discussion paper for the improvement of routine monitoring of qualitative aspects of the RWSS Programme. The second note was specifically prepared for the Programme and Coordination Division of the Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE). It aimed to facilitate the process of decision making on the integration of monitoring of aspects of the Integrated Approach, into the overall monitoring system currently in use. Both notes are attached as annexes to this mission report.

This mission report presents summary considerations and recommendations in support of the further development of a monitoring system for the RWSS Programme.

The mission wishes to acknowledge with thanks the friendly and fruitful discussions with staff of DPHE, UNICEF and DANIDA.

2. CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Monitoring to be clearly defined

During the mission it became clear that monitoring does not mean the same to everybody, thus hampering decision making about possible improvements. For the further development of a monitoring system it will be a first requirement to decide on a common definition of monitoring. It is suggested to use the description provided by D. Casley and D. Lury for this purpose. The following quotations are taken from their book 'Monitoring and evaluation of agriculture and rural development projects' (1982):

'Monitoring is the provision of information, and the use of that information, to enable management to assess progress of implementation and take timely decisions to ensure that progress is maintained according to schedule. Monitoring assesses whether project inputs are being delivered, are being used as intended, and are having the initial effects as planned. Monitoring is an internal project activity,

an essential part of good management practice and therefore an integral part of day-to-day management.' (p.4).

'The initial steps for designing monitoring and evaluation systems are:

- (a) A review of project objectives; and
- (b) Identification of the users of the monitoring information.' (p. 4).

'The key to successful monitoring is the provision of regular, timely, decision-oriented information to the project management. This can be achieved if the necessary staff are in place early, are seen to be part of the management team, and are given guidance on the priority information needs of management. '

(p.6).

One implication of adoption of such a description of monitoring would be - amongst others - that management is playing a key role and therefore should be actively involved in any improvements of the monitoring system. Another implication would be that special studies on qualitative aspects of the RWSS Programme carried out by third parties (for example NGOs) are not a part of monitoring. This is not to say that special studies by third parties cannot be valuable, also for monitoring, but they should be discussed in a different context to regular, internal monitoring, according to specific needs.

Monitoring during various project phases

A monitoring system can be directed to the planning, implementation, and operational phases of a project. There seems to be a tendency to emphasise monitoring of qualitative aspects during the operational phase. (This is not only the case in Bangladesh, but also elsewhere.)

Whereas it is indeed important to have a monitoring system in place for this operational phase, it is questionable whether this is possible without first having a functioning monitoring system for the planning and implementation phases. One reason is that for these first phases a monitoring system is easier established, as the provision and use of information is more directly linked to the day-to-day activities and responsibilities of project staff and project management. A second reason is that the use of monitoring information from the operational phase will be more fruitful when it can be related to monitoring information from earlier phases. For example, it is easier to decide on corrective actions for lack of tubewell water use when information is available on community participation and hygiene education during project planning and implementation.

For the further development of a monitoring system it is therefore suggested either to first concentrate on monitoring

during the planning and implementation phases or to include all phases at the same time. The first option may be preferred when a more general monitoring system will be developed, whereas the second option may be selected for the development of a monitoring system for a specific subject. (See also below under 'Monitoring by DPHE'.)

Monitoring by UNICEF

UNICEF has a multi-purpose role in monitoring and in striving for possible improvements these different roles should be kept in mind:

- UNICEF's main role in monitoring is a support role to DPHE who bears prime responsibility for monitoring as implementing agency. This role may need strengthening, not only at the information collection and analysis levels, but especially at the management levels to improve the use of monitoring information. The new Water and Environmental Sanitation (WES) coordinator may wish to take the lead in paying more attention to these aspects.
- UNICEF is carrying out a number of monitoring activities mainly through their Field Assistants in their capacity of providing support to DPHE field level staff. The monitoring information thus obtained is used for staff guidance and project adaptations. Recently a so-called 'activity list' was introduced. Although this list may need adaptation to some extent to make it more user-friendly for monitoring purposes, it is advised to wait (for example one year) until more experience has been gained with the present list. In adapting the list it may be considered how to strengthen the monitoring role of DPHE while progressively reducing the direct monitoring role of UNICEF staff.
- An additional monitoring activity of UNICEF is the internal monitoring of their support role to DPHE. This was not included in the scope of the mission. UNICEF may however wish to review the monitoring of their support role, in the light of the two aspects mentioned above.

Monitoring by DPHE

The meetings with DPHE staff on monitoring showed that lack of motivation by lower level staff to complete monitoring forms and to send them in time to Dhaka is a serious constraint in the present monitoring system covering physical aspects. Another constraint is the lack of use of monitoring data for management decisions and a lack of feed back of information to the field levels.

To improve the present monitoring system and to also include qualitative aspects it was discussed that there should be a closer link between monitoring and supervision and that any

adapted monitoring system would require careful introduction, with appropriate training of field level staff and a try-out of at least a year in a limited area under close guidance of DPHE Dhaka staff. The need for data processing using computers was also considered.

If DPHE/UNICEF/DANIDA want to proceed with paying more attention to monitoring, it is suggested to have a Monitoring Adviser assigned to support the DPHE Programme and Coordination division in the development of their monitoring tasks and capabilities. If the principle of this is agreed, the first step would be to come to an agreement on what inputs the adviser should make over what period of time.

In the mission's view there are two alternative ways to proceed. The first is starting from a general level, with the Adviser providing assistance in the priority setting of information required for the management to be able to keep track of progress and to take timely actions if and where required. This would be followed by assisting in the working out of the monitoring system itself. The alternative approach is to start from a more practical level, (eg. the identified need for latrine monitoring), and then to build up a more general monitoring system. (See: Abdullah, T. and Boot, M. (1989).) Whatever way is selected, careful organization, adequate training and guidance of implementing staff, and sufficient time for try-outs and experimentation will be required to arrive at a monitoring system that is as simple and useful as possible. For that reason it is estimated that the adviser should be assigned part time or full time for a period of at least two years.

References

Abdullah, T. and Boot, M. (1989) Progress Review of the Integrated Approach, Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme, Bangladesh. Dhaka/The Hague, The Netherlands, IRC.

Casley, D.J. and Lury, D.A. (1982) Monitoring and evaluation of agriculture and rural development projects. A World Bank publication, Baltimore, USA, Johns Hopkins University Press.

ANNEXES:

- **Informal and internal discussion note on monitoring of DPHE activities.**

- **Discussion paper for the improvement of routine monitoring of qualitative aspects of the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme, Bangladesh.**

Informal and internal discussion note on monitoring of DPHE activities.

Marieke Boot, IRC, November 1989

INTRODUCTION

This note is based on earlier discussions with Mr. Rezaul Karim, Executive Engineer, Programme and Coordination Division, Mr. M. D. Khoda Bux, Executive Engineer, Survey Investigation and Research Division (monitoring urban water supply), Mr. Abdul Hakim, Assistant Engineer, P&C Division, Mr. Syed A. N. Md. Kabirushan, Chief Health Education Programme, and Mr. Andrew Seyles, Project Officer UNICEF.

The purpose of this note is to help structuring our follow-up discussions on monitoring by presenting an example. This example is meant only to facilitate focusing on what we want or not. By no means this example can be considered as a proposal.

Starting point in our discussions has been the general objectives of the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme, being:

- (1) to reduce the incidence of diarrhoeal diseases and parasitic infections in children by providing clean water and improved sanitation facilities integrated with and promotion of personal hygiene;
- (2) To strengthen the national capacity to provide water supply and sanitation facilities in a way that will achieve the maximum possible health impact.

(Consolidated project plans, 1988, p.3)

For this it is necessary to be well informed about:

- tubewell coverage and use;
- latrine coverage and use;
- additional personal and domestic hygiene practices.

Therefore the monitoring should be directed to these three broad areas.

In developing the monitoring example, two remarks from our meetings have been taken into account:

- monitoring should as far as possible also be used as a motivational tool. We may add to this that monitoring also can facilitate supervision, and the other way round that supervision may facilitate the correct and timely filling out of the monitoring forms.
- at present the emphasis of monitoring is on installation of tubewells. The need is felt to also pay attention to the other aspects of the Programme. Whereas some forms on other Programme aspects are available, such as on health education, these may need some adaptation in line with actual tasks and activities.

THE EXAMPLE

The example includes a set of monitoring forms, which are related:

1. Monthly monitoring form TWM: Form A. implementation;
2. Monthly monitoring form TWM: Form B. follow-up;
3. Tubewell card for hygiene education;
4. Monthly monitoring form SAE: implementation;
(Additional one needed for follow-up?)
5. Monthly monitoring form HE/SAE: communication and staff level training.

Ad 1 and 2: Monthly monitoring forms TWM

Considerations:

- It is understood that usually the TWM has most frequent contact with the people at the tubewell sites. Therefore he is made the central figure for monitoring of field level activities.
- The preliminary results of the Integrated Approach Progress Review show that there is a lot of contact between the SAE and the TWM, and that the quality of their contacts could be further improved by more regular/more structured supervision. The monitoring forms should serve this aim. Therefore it has been tried to develop the forms in such a way that they will give the SAE ample opportunities to structure his supervision of the TWM.
- In developing the forms, the form accepted by the TWMs at the October meeting on the Integrated Approach has been taken into account.

Clarification:

It is understood that often the TWM makes notes in his own diary on the progress of work. This seems to be a simple and effective way of recording day to day activities and may be stimulated as such. It crossed my mind that we could have a TWM diary with the monitoring forms included. We then have only one set of papers. It may help to give the TWM status, and motivation to keep records. It may help supervision, as the SAE needs part of the data from the diary for his own monthly monitoring form.

Of course the monitoring forms for the TWM will need thorough testing before it is possible to embark upon such a diary. For example, while typing form A, I already was thinking of changes, but only the use of the forms will show in the end whether the forms will serve our purposes or not. Of course we also should consider the costs involved. As emphasised before, this note is only meant for brainstorming.

Note:

Embarking on this type of monitoring would imply one set of forms (A+B) for each tubewell site.

Ad 3: Tubewell card for health education

Considerations:

- The TWM is asked to exercise a very new role. He no longer is only a technical person, but also a communication (motivation/education) agent. Therefore it is important to also monitor this role. The preliminary results of the Progress Review of the Integrated Approach indicate that the TWM appreciates his new role but could do with some more support, and this monitoring form may be used as a tool to this end.
- The SAE and HE also carry out educational tasks at the tubewell site level. Recording their activities may help to get a fuller picture of the health activities carried out by DPHE. Also, possible differences between TWM, SAE and HE may give us indications how to proceed in the future.
- We aim for cooperation with other organizations, both Government and Non-Government organizations. Therefore it is important to get an impression of their actual input. The card may provide that. It may also be used as a tool for motivation, because it is a sign that the inputs of third parties are acknowledged.
- Keeping a card at the tubewell site is also a sign for the families to take motivation and education serious.

Clarification:

This card is kept at the tubewell site and each time the TWM, SAE, HE, other extension agent is visiting the tubewell site, this form is filled out per activity. For example, if the HE visits the tubewell site for a demonstration on the safe disposal of baby's faeces, he puts his name in the first empty column together with the date of the visit, than he ticks demonstration and disposal of baby's faeces in latrine, and finally the no. of people participating in the demonstration.

The next person who visits uses the next column, etc. Then, when the TWM is visiting the tubewell site he uses this card to fill out his monthly monitoring form.

Note:

Maybe the list of subjects is much too long. If we want to use the form as a reminder for the extension agents what are important subjects, and if we want to prevent that the extension agents only use a few very general slogans, it probably is ok. Otherwise it may be overdone.

Ad 4. Monthly monitoring form SAE

Considerations:

- It was felt that the existing form should be used as a basis.
- A few monitoring items have been added to acknowledge the other activities of DPHE staff and to gain a better insight into activities and achievements by DPHE staff inputs for management purposes.

- The added monitoring items are also important items to be taken up during supervision, both EE/SDE by supervising the SAE and by SAE for supervising the TWM.

Clarification:

A large part of the required information can be obtained by using the TWM monitoring and supervision forms.

Note:

DPHE may wish to also have a monitoring form on other activities of the SAE, such as multi channel distribution. A monitoring form about cooperation with other departments and organizations, briefings, trainings, school education and motivation etc. has been made for the HE, but is probably equally suitable for the SAE (See below).

Ad 5. Monthly monitoring form HE

Considerations:

- The job description of the HE has been taken as a basis for this monitoring form.
- the time of the HE spent at the tubewell sites is covered by the tubewell card.
- It might well be that the HES would like to have more detailed monitoring forms about their daily work. This of course can also be developed, but I feel it would cost some more time and discussion, as the work of the HE is entering a new phase.
- The HE also should keep track of the distribution and use of motivation and education materials. The question is whether we also need a form for that.

Clarification:

Probably the form is self-evident.

Note:

As the SAE is usually very active in these type of activities, the form has been developed in such a way that it equally can be used by him.

TUBEWELL CARD FOR HYGIENE EDUCATION

Upazila: _____

Para: _____

Fiscal Year: _____

Union: _____

Bari: _____

Card no.: _____

Designation:
Name:
ACTIVITY	Informal talks						
	House to house visits						
	Group discussion						
	Demonstration						
	Slide/film show						
SUBJECT: Water use	Use of tubewell water for drinking & cooking						
	Use of tubewell water for washing up						
	Use of tubewell water for bathing small children						
	Use of tubewell water for hand washing						
	Use of tubewell water for food preparation						
	Safe storage of drinking water						
	Use of tubewell water for priming						

		Designation:
		Name:
SUBJECT: Latrine use	Latrine construction							
	Latrine use by all and always							
	Dispose baby's faeces in latrine							
	Fush latrine after every use							
	Clean latrine often							
	Wash hands after defecation							
	Spread ash in home made latrine							
	Keep pit hole covered							
SUBJECT: Additional Hygiene	Use soap or ash for hand washing							
	Wash hands before touching food							
PARTICIPANTS	Males							
	Females							
	Children 6-14 years							
SIGNATURE								

NB. This tubewell card could also be used for monitoring of tubewell repairs

**Discussion paper for the improvement
of routine monitoring of qualitative
aspects of the Rural Water Supply
and Sanitation Programme, Bangladesh**

Table of contents;

1. What is monitoring?
 - 1.1 Definition of monitoring
 - 1.2 Reasons for monitoring
 - 1.3 Yardsticks for monitoring
 - 1.4 Monitoring instruments
 - 1.5 Limits to monitoring

2. The present monitoring system
 - 2.1 Yardsticks for monitoring
 - 2.2 Parties involved and instruments used
 - 2.3 Observations on present monitoring system

3. Integration of qualitative aspects
 - 3.1 Need for monitoring of qualitative aspects
 - 3.2 Aspects to be covered
 - 3.3 Considerations
 - 3.4 Which way to go?

First draft, May 1989;

Integration of comments UNICEF staff, June 1989

Prepared for UNICEF/DANIDA
by Marieke Boot, IRC

1. WHAT IS MONITORING?

1.1 Definition of monitoring

Monitoring is the regular collection and analysis of information on project activities and achievements to be used for programme management and development.

Monitoring is a feed back mechanism to guide decision making by project management, policy makers and funders.

1.2 Reasons for monitoring

Monitoring of project activities and achievements will help us to know:

- what and how many activities have been carried out over time;
- how well activities have been carried out;
- what achievements have been made;
- what are common problems;
- what are common training needs;
- what actions are needed to improve the project;
- what decisions are needed to guide the project.

Thus, monitoring is a tool to learn how we are doing, how to proceed and how to do better.

1.3 Yardsticks for monitoring

To know how we are doing we have to make a comparison with how we are supposed to be doing. These yardsticks for comparison are provided by:

- general and specific project objectives;
- budget allocations;
- implementation procedures and guidelines;
- annual development plans and half-year work plans;
- job descriptions of staff.

1.4 Monitoring instruments

Collection and analysis of information can be done through:

- checking key-events (eg. have staff been trained according to plan? Have materials been ordered in time?)
- checking eg. monthly work programmes;
- progress meetings (discussion of work programmes);
- progress reporting;
- field trips;
- periodic surveys.

In addition to these specific instruments, a number of regular project activities can be used for monitoring purposes as well. Examples are informal communication, supervision, checks and inspection, stock inventories.

Information is easier collected and analysed through standardized monitoring formats, forms and/or checklists. An important side benefit of standardization may be that the users are reminded/stimulated to pay attention to all topics covered by the monitoring sheets, which otherwise may be neglected or forgotten.

1.5 Limits to monitoring

Collection of information is only useful when it can be quickly analysed and used for project guidance, adaptations and improvements. Therefore, no more information should be collected than can be analysed and absorbed by the programme.

2. THE PRESENT MONITORING SYSTEM

2.1 Yardsticks for monitoring

A wealth of yardsticks for monitoring appears to exist for the Rural Water and Sanitation Programme. To mention the basic ones:

- general programme objectives and specific project objectives for each of the six programme components as stated in the Project Plans of Action (September 1988);
- overviews of activities and yearly workplans as stated in the Project Plans of Action (September 1988);
- implementation guideline and specification for the six rural water supply and sanitation projects (December 1988)
- "project document" about the development of an integrated approach towards rural water supply and sanitation (November 1986);
- supplementary guideline for implementation of the integrated approach in rural water supply and sanitation projects (Draft, May 1989);
- Annual Development Plan (ADP) showing the annual physical implementation target for each Upazila;
- half yearly and quarterly workplans showing planned activities for one or more programme components and/or for key DPHE and UNICEF staff (Zonal level and country level);
- job-descriptions and training guidelines for both DPHE and UNICEF staff.

2.2 Parties involved in monitoring and instruments used

DPHE

According to the agreed Project Plans of Action, DPHE, as the principal implementing agency, will carry out routine monitoring of both physical progress as well as qualitative aspects of the project.

Monitoring instruments include field visits by various levels of DPHE staff and reporting of field visits. Details are described in: Consolidated project plans of action, Part B, page 7-8.

At Upazila level the SAE and TWM use a number of forms and report formats, including:

- Application forms for new tubewells and resinking, iron removal plant, pond sand filter;
- Site inspection reports;
- Completion reports;
- Register on the distribution and use of all forms and printed information materials;
- Tubewell register;
- Logbook on daily production and sales of latrines
- Logbook on latrine types installed and number of rings used per beneficiaries group and per Union;
- Caretaker family training forms;
- Stores verification reports;
- Monthly stock position reports;
- Monthly physical progress reports (by SAE to higher DPHE levels with copy to UNICEF Zonal Office;

- Monthly progress report and material statement for village sanitation schemes;
- Only in Jessore District, Chowgacha Upazila: progress form on latrine construction and use by beneficiaries per applicants group, together with fortnightly overall progress form on the same (filled out by TWM);

Also, weekly progress meetings are held between the SAE and TWMs and bi-weekly progress meetings between the SAE and SDE and/or EE.

UNICEF

Within UNICEF two parties are involved in monitoring: the Water and Environmental Sanitation (WES) Section and the Field Operations Section through the 7 Zonal Offices. The Field Assistants based at the Zonal Offices are most directly engaged in monitoring activities, including:

- Inspection of sites (3-5%) which includes some qualitative information;
- Inspection of completed works (3% for STW; 10% for DTW; 20% for VSST; 25% for SST; 100% for PSF) which includes some qualitative information;
- Monthly progress report on the basis of monthly SAE progress report (quantitative aspects only). Uniform monthly progress report forms are used to this end and sent to the Area Coordinator in the WES section;
- Periodic visits to the Upazila office and field visits which are recorded in a "project(s) field trip monitoring report". Some Qualitative aspects are usually covered. Since December 1988 an "Activity list" is being used to guide these visits. Reports are sent to the Area Coordinator who provides his comments through an interoffice memorandum;
- Periodic attendance of (and contribution to) meetings, training sessions, orientation workshops, seminars of which reports are made sometimes according to specific format;
- Monthly progress meeting of Zonal Office staff (Field Assistants, UNICEF Zonal Officer and/or Programme Officer Water and Sanitation) in addition to frequent informal consultation and communication.

WES Section staff at Dhaka level pay periodic visits to the Zonal Offices in addition to frequent informal consultation and communication. UNICEF Dhaka prepares overall quarterly reports.

Upazila Water Supply and Sanitation Committee

- bi-monthly progress review meetings (see TOR of UWSSC); (This seems theory only.)

DPHE and UNICEF

- Zonal Review Committee meeting (ZRC) for a quarterly (or more frequent) review of progress and preparation of next quarter workplan. Attended by Superintendent Engineer (chairman) Executive Engineers, UNICEF Zonal Officer, and UNICEF Area Coordinator;
- Informal review of progress during routine meetings at Dhaka level.

MLGRD, DPHE, UNICEF and WHO

- half yearly progress review including preparation of next half year plan.

2.3 Observations on present monitoring system

(i) It was not possible to get a full picture of the present monitoring system in the time available. For example, the above overview may include important gaps. Also it is not sufficiently known to what extent the various monitoring instruments are actually used and what channels are utilized (and how) to get the collected information fed into programme management and development. The observations below therefore are preliminary.

(ii) At Upazila level DPHE has an extensive monitoring system on quantitative aspects of the water supply and sanitation programme. The extent to which record keeping and monthly reporting is done regularly and correctly seems to vary from Upazila (SAE) to Upazila. Sometimes it is excellent, sometimes it is a headache, especially when not enough supervision can be provided by SDE and EE. In case reporting is lacking behind, this especially seems to apply to information the SAE feels it is "information to UNICEF". A positive example is the new progress reporting system on latrine construction and use, as developed by DPHE with assistance from Unicef in Chowgacha Upazila.

(iii) The monitoring system at the higher levels of DPHE seems to be limited to supervision visits as indicated in the workplan. Data received from the field levels are used mainly for compilation of total quantities of tubewells and latrines installed/functioning and people served. In Chittagong district DPHE voiced the need for more qualitative information about the progress made with the integrated approach to be able to contribute to its further development.

(iv) Monitoring by UNICEF is partly direct, partly indirect. The direct monitoring covers qualitative aspects to a limited extent. Indirect monitoring is done through the use of the monthly progress data provided by DPHE.

Direct monitoring is mainly through field inspections carried out by the Field Assistants. Two implications are:

- monitoring mainly covers results, and not so much the process leading to these results. For example, an inspection of a completed work shows the tubewell installed but does not reveal to what extent all households on the applicant form have contributed to its installation.
- monitoring necessarily is limited as one Field Assistant is covering 25 to 35 Upazilas.

The recently introduced "Activity list" is primarily intended as tool for the Field Assistants to motivate SAEs to pay attention to all programme aspects and to increase their capabilities. At Zonal and Dhaka level the filled out "Activity lists" and related reporting are mainly used (a) for information transfer to the UZO or PO and the area and project coordinators and (b) for supervision of the FAs. At the same time this "Activity list" provides a lot of information useful for monitoring purposes.

(v) Directly and indirectly received monitoring data are mainly compiled and analysed by UNICEF Dhaka level. The collected information is used for periodic programme review, planning and adaptation. Also it is used for example for the quarterly priority list sent to all Zonal Offices. Feedback from DPHE on the progress reviews and programme planning seems to be rather limited.

(vi) The above overview does not do justice to the monitoring system for training and refresher courses, briefing and orientation workshops, etc. as time was too limited to get more than a first impression.

3. INTEGRATION OF QUALITATIVE ASPECTS

3.1 Need for monitoring of qualitative aspects

Over the years the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme has been developed from a technical programme focused on the construction and maintenance of tubewells to a more integrated programme as is reflected in the general objectives of the fourth country programme covering 1988-1993. The General objectives are:

- (a) to reduce the incidence of diarrhoeal diseases and parasitic infections in children by providing clean water and improved sanitation facilities integrated with and promotion of personal hygiene;
- (b) to strengthen the national capacity to provide water supply and sanitation facilities in a way that will achieve the maximum possible health impact.

These objectives require an emphasis on qualitative aspects, such as focus on the underserved areas and socio-economic groups, participation of the target groups (both women and men), health promotion, linkages with relevant other government departments and NGOs. As a consequence the need for the integration of qualitative aspects in the routine monitoring system has become more urgent.

3.2 Aspects to be covered

From the project documents and guidelines and from discussions with various UNICEF staff and to a lesser extent DPHE staff the following overview has been prepared of **aspects that may be considered** for routine monitoring. As monitoring relates to the collection, analysis and use of information, the shortlist has been constructed in the question form.

Overview of main questions that may be considered:

- Are the underserved areas reached?
- Are the underserved socio-economic groups reached?
- Are the implementation procedures (IA and non-IA) followed?
- Are there any delays in the implementation process? Why, how often, for how long?
- Are other government departments and/or NGOs involved? By whom, which departments/NGOs, how, how often?
- Does the DPHE implementation process differ from that of other government departments and/or NGOs? How?
- Do all households in the applicants group participate in the implementation procedures? Who participates when, how and how often? (Specify households, men, women, children.)

- Is the tubewell used? By whom (households, men, women, children), when, how much, for how many people and for what purposes? Which households within 400 feet (?) walking distance are not using the tubewell? Why?
- Are other water sources used by the tubewell users? When, how much, for how many people, and for what purposes?
- Have caretakers been trained? How many men, how many women? Relationship between the male and female caretaker? What has been trained? Quality of training?
- Is the tubewell operating properly and is it well maintained? Has a platform been constructed? What design? Is it clean? Is there proper drainage? Are there special facilities for washing and bathing?
- Is human excreta disposed in a safe way? By whom, by whom not (households, men, women, children, toddlers)? How? (Why/Why not?)
- What types of latrines are used and what types of material? By whom? Upkeep of latrines? Physical status of latrines compared to construction date? Users satisfaction (men, women, children?) (NB. Is age of adults a factor?) What is done when latrine is flooded? What is done when pit is full?
- Is the environmental sanitation situation creating health risks? How?
- Is health promotion carried out? By whom, to whom (households, men, women, children), what, how, how often?
- Are hygiene education materials developed, available, distributed and used? What materials, by whom, for whom?
- Is personal and domestic hygiene practiced? By whom, what, how?
- Are water, sanitation and health education integrated, also in the view of the beneficiaries? How?
- Are special measures taken to increase women involvement? What, how, by whom?
- Are schools and UHFWCs encouraged to construct and use slab latrines? By whom, how?
- Is the UWSSC functioning? How?
- How is the manpower situation? Availability, capabilities, workload, motivation, performance of various staff (Specify men, women)?
- What is done to strengthen the manpower situation? Appointment of staff, supervision, career planning, compensation (Specify men, women)?

- What is done to strengthen manpower capabilities? By whom, to whom, when, what, what training methods, quality of training, quality of training materials, quality of training curriculum, what follow up?
- NB. Something specific to be added about communication and coordination between DPHE, UWSSC and UNICEF? Also about monitoring of monitoring system?

3.3 Considerations

(i) The above list of questions does not suggest that all this has to be done. Instead, it only is meant as a tool for responsible parties to make considerate choices. These choices will have to be influenced by the need for the information and its possible use, and by the people and time available to collect and analyse the information.

(ii) For five reasons DPHE would be the most appropriate organization to take the lead in the development of a monitoring system for qualitative aspects:

- It is part of the official agreement between the Government of Bangladesh and UNICEF;
- DPHE is in the best position to carry out routine monitoring of qualitative aspects because it is the implementing agency with manpower available at all levels. For example, the TWM would be in the position to record information on the number of visits to an applicant group and the motivation and participation of the people, the involvement of women.
- DPHE presently has an elaborate system for monitoring of quantitative aspects. It seems to be worthwhile to look into this monitoring system to see how it may be adapted to also include a number of qualitative aspects.
- Qualitative information collected and analysed by DPHE itself will more likely be used for programme management and development.
- Monitoring of qualitative aspects through DPHE will help DPHE staff to pay more attention to these aspects.

(ii) However, DPHE being the most appropriate agency for routine monitoring of qualitative aspects on paper, the reality may present many problems. Possible constraints are:

- The present monitoring system of quantitative aspects only, seems not to be used fully for programme management and development. This means that support would be needed to the actual use of monitoring data, be it quantitative or qualitative.
- DPHE being a technical organization with technical staff may feel no urgent need to integrate more qualitative aspects in their monitoring system.
- DPHE only has male staff members at all levels. This may make the monitoring of aspects like women involvement, health and hygiene more difficult.
- The relationship between DPHE and UWSSC seems to be complicated, making it more difficult to come to an agreement on responsibility for monitoring of qualitative aspects.

(iii) In the Terms of Reference of the Upazila Water Supply and Sanitation Committee mention is made of this Committee being responsible for monitoring. This option may be further investigated.

(iv) Involvement of other government departments and NGOs could be explored in two ways:

- Monitoring of qualitative aspects of their own efforts in water supply and sanitation in the framework of the DPHE/UNICEF programme. This option may provide good opportunities for data collection. The question will be who will provide the guidance and who will be responsible for analysis and feed back.
- Monitoring of qualitative aspects on a periodic survey basis. This option could be considered especially for the after-installation period to learn more about water use, latrine use and hygiene. The information collected will then primarily be fed to the policy level. In case this option will be further explored it is suggested that monitoring is combined with health promotion. Apart from NGOs the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Social Welfare (Women involvement officer) could be invited to play a role in this. The views of DPHE on the use of this option should be taken into account.

(v) UNICEF already includes some qualitative aspects in its monitoring especially through its Field Assistants. Opportunities for strengthening their monitoring role would basically consist of a review and adaptation of their inspection visits and of the use of the activity list. At the higher levels of UNICEF more thought will be needed (at least for me) how UNICEF's support role to the monitoring of qualitative aspects could be strengthened.

(vi) For any option to be selected, it should be made a part of the monitoring to feed back the analysed information to the information collectors for reasons of motivation and skills improvement.

3.4 Which way to go?

This is what I would like to discuss during our meeting Wednesday, 31 May 1989, 15.00 hours.