



CHALMERS

Chalmers Publication Library

Participation in sanitation planning in Burkina Faso: theory and practice

This document has been downloaded from Chalmers Publication Library (CPL). It is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in:

Journal of Water Sanitation and Hygiene for Development (ISSN: 2043-9083)

Citation for the published paper:

McConville, J. ; Kain, J. ; Kvarnstrom, E. et al. (2014) "Participation in sanitation planning in Burkina Faso: theory and practice". Journal of Water Sanitation and Hygiene for Development, vol. 4(2), pp. 304-312.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2014.125>

Downloaded from: <http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/publication/204095>

Notice: Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source. Please note that access to the published version might require a subscription.

Chalmers Publication Library (CPL) offers the possibility of retrieving research publications produced at Chalmers University of Technology. It covers all types of publications: articles, dissertations, licentiate theses, masters theses, conference papers, reports etc. Since 2006 it is the official tool for Chalmers official publication statistics. To ensure that Chalmers research results are disseminated as widely as possible, an Open Access Policy has been adopted. The CPL service is administrated and maintained by Chalmers Library.

(article starts on next page)

Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development
Participation in Sanitation Planning in Burkina Faso: Theory and Practice
 --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Participation in Sanitation Planning in Burkina Faso: Theory and Practice
Short Title:	Participation in Sanitation Planning in Burkina Faso: Theory and Practice
Article Type:	Research Paper
Corresponding Author:	Jennifer R. McConville, PhD Chalmers University of Technology Göteborg, SWEDEN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Chalmers University of Technology
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Jennifer R. McConville, PhD
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Jennifer R. McConville, PhD
	Jaan-Henrik Kain, PhD
	Elisabeth Kvarnström, PhD
	Lukas Ulrich
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	Stakeholder participation is commonly promoted as a means to boost outcomes of sanitation improvement projects, in particular in developing countries. However, there is little research on when or how this participation should occur during the process of planning and implementing a sanitation system in order to maximize the effect. This study develops a framework for analysing participation levels of different stakeholders throughout a planning process and applies it to sanitation planning guidelines and case studies from Burkina Faso. This analysis highlights that, particularly during designing of system options and selecting among these options, there exist potential weaknesses regarding who participates and how that participation may influence what type of sanitation is implemented.

Participation in Sanitation Planning in Burkina Faso: Theory and Practice

J. R. McConville^{*1}, J-H. Kain*, E. Kvarnström** and L. Ulrich***

* Department of Architecture, Chalmers University of Technology, 412-96 Göteborg, Sweden
(E-mail: jenmcc@chalmers.se; kain@chalmers.se)

** Urban Water Management Sweden AB, Årstaängsvägen 1A, 117 43 Stockholm, Sweden
(E-mail: elisabeth.kvarnstrom@urbanwater.se)

*** Department of Water and Sanitation in Developing Countries (Sandec), Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (Eawag), P.O. Box 611, 8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland
(E-mail: lukas.ulrich@eawag.ch)

¹ Corresponding author:
Jennifer R McConville
Chalmers University of Technology, SE-41296 Göteborg, Sweden
Tel: +46 73 672 9083
E-mail: jenmcc@chalmers.se
Website: www.chalmers.se/en/staff/Pages/jenmcc.aspx

Abstract

Stakeholder participation is commonly promoted as a means to boost outcomes of sanitation improvement projects, in particular in developing countries. However, there is little research on when or how this participation should occur during the process of planning and implementing a sanitation system in order to maximize the effect. This study develops a framework for analysing participation levels of different stakeholders throughout a planning process and applies it to sanitation planning guidelines and case studies from Burkina Faso. This analysis highlights that, particularly during designing of system options and selecting among these options, there exist potential weaknesses regarding who participates and how that participation may influence what type of sanitation is implemented.

Keywords

Participation, Planning Theory, Planning Practice, Sanitation

INTRODUCTION

1 Stakeholder engagement and participation is a popular concept in many disciplines, from
2
3 environmental planning and management to international development work. In the field of
4
5 sanitation, participation is promoted as a tool for overcoming some of the major challenges to
6
7 improved access to sanitation, such as low demand for sanitation infrastructure, poor hygiene
8
9 habits, weak institutional structures and low capacity for operation and maintenance of built
10
11 systems (Wright, 1997; Wood et al., 1998). Stakeholder participation in sanitation planning and
12
13 implementation is encouraged because it is believed that it will create demand, e.g. toilets that are
14
15 wanted will be used (Wright, 1997); it will lead to a better decision-making process where the
16
17 selected technologies are better adapted to the local context (WSSCC/Eawag, 2005); and it will
18
19 increase stakeholders' capacities to manage the system afterwards (Roma & Jeffrey, 2010). For
20
21 reaching the un-served in the sanitation sector, the participation paradigm is now widely accepted
22
23 and there is increasing promotion of collaborative design and policymaking among academics and
24
25 politicians as a way to increase sustainability (Murcott, 2007).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Although there is an abundance of empirical evidence from rural sanitation and water projects
36
37 showing the benefits of participatory processes (e.g. Wright, 1997; Narayan, 1995; WSP, 2007),
38
39 there has been little research on how different forms of participation affect project outcomes,
40
41 especially in urban areas. A preliminary exploration found that not all forms of participation are
42
43 equally influential in delivering successful urban sanitation services (Nance & Ortolano, 2007).
44
45 However, Nance & Ortolano also stated that further studies are needed. Just as sanitation experts
46
47 talk about unbundling sanitation investments and working along the entire chain of technologies
48
49 that make up the sanitation system (Wright, 1997), it is now time to start unbundling the planning
50
51 process in the same manner and raise questions about how participation is promoted and facilitated,
52
53 as well as when it should take place.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 To address these questions, this study will (i) introduce analytical tools for categorizing
2 participation levels and decision-making domains, (ii) use them to explain how and when
3 participation appears in sanitation planning processes, and (iii) suggest how this knowledge can be
4 used to improve planning processes in terms of more deliberate participation in sanitation planning.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK**

11 In order to assess how participation appears in sanitation projects, this paper develops an analytical
12 framework based on 1) various steps of sanitation planning, 2) a participation ladder to classify
13 levels of participation and 3) different decision-making domains of participating groups of
14 stakeholders. The framework is then employed to analyse the degree of participation in two
15 sanitation planning guidelines (theoretical sanitation planning) and in two case studies in Burkina
16 Faso (practice of sanitation planning). This will facilitate identifying potential weaknesses both in
17 how participation is understood and in how it is implemented, as well as finding opportunities for
18 increasing the benefits from stakeholder participation.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Planning steps**

40 This study recognizes that a sanitation planning process is typically made up of a variety of steps
41 and that different stakeholders may be involved to different degrees in each step. Therefore, this
42 paper applies a set of generic planning steps derived from a literature review of the planning
43 frameworks that are currently promoted by various sanitation agencies (McConville, 2008) as the
44 backbone on which to build the analysis. The five generic steps to planning and implementing
45 sanitation projects are (1) Problem identification, (2) Defining objectives, (3) Design options, (4)
46 Selection process, and (5) Action plan for implementation. The analysis uses the generic steps as a
47 backbone structure, so that how planning is done can be assessed within each step in the process.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Participation ladder

One of the most influential classifications of participation levels is the participation ladder developed by Arnstein in the 1960s (Arnstein, 1969). Although developed as a critique of top-down urban development projects in the United States, Arnstein's ladder is still widely applied today and often cited as a basis for developing newer participation typologies (e.g. Choguill, 1996; Hamdi & Goethert, 1997). There is some critique against the continued and sometimes indiscriminate use of Arnstein's ladder after more than 40 years, particularly regarding its failure to capture dynamics and differences between stakeholders (Tritter & McCallum, 2006). Accordingly, this study is using the ladder, not as a stand-alone classification, but as one of three complementary tools in the ambition to cover all stakeholder groups involved in a sanitation planning process.

There are eight rungs in Arnstein's ladder and each corresponds to a level of stakeholder power in influencing the planning process. The first two rungs are essentially levels of non-participation: (1) *Manipulation* is when power-holders use stakeholder advisory groups to "rubberstamp" projects for approval without clearly explaining all implications of the project. 2) *Therapy* strategies in participation involve stakeholders with the hidden purpose of educating them. The next three steps represent participation levels that are tokenistic: (3) *Informing* essentially means that stakeholders are provided with information regarding the plan, but the information flow is one-way and questions are discouraged. (4) *Consultation* invites stakeholders to give their opinions, but does not combine the consultation with other mechanisms that will assure that their ideas are taken into account. (5) *Placation* brings stakeholders one step closer to influence, but still without any rights to decide, e.g. minority representatives on advisory boards. The last three steps of the ladder see increasing degrees of stakeholder power and decision-making influence. (6) *Partnership* represents a re-distribution of power that results in planning and decision-making being shared between

1 stakeholders and power-holders. (7) *Delegated Power* means that stakeholders or their delegated
2 representatives have significant power to hold authorities accountable for the programs offered. (8)
3
4 *Control* is reached when stakeholder groups have direct control over programs/projects without
5 intermediaries between funding sources, planning and implementation. Note that Arnstein's original
6 term at this rung was "Citizen Control", but to accommodate a more differentiated analysis of the
7 participation levels of all involved stakeholders it is here changed to just "Control".
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Decision-making domains**

18
19 As discussed above, one of the criticisms directed at the Arnstein ladder is that it does not recognise
20 that different user groups may seek involvement in the process at different times and that it offers a
21 simplistic view of citizens as stakeholders (Tritter & McCallum, 2006). To avoid such
22 simplification, and to capture the dynamics of processes that typically involve more than just
23 citizens and city authorities, this study will look at participation from the perspective of several
24 different stakeholder groups. The definition of these different stakeholder groups is based on the
25 concept of different decision-making domains within the urban sanitation sector. This analysis will
26 use the stakeholder classifications from the IWA specialist group for sanitation in urban areas: (i)
27 Users, (ii) Neighbourhood, (iii) City, and (iv) Beyond the City (IWA, 2006).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

47
48 This analytical framework is applied to two sanitation planning guidelines and two implemented
49 sanitation projects from the field. The two guidelines for sanitation improvement have gained
50 recognition world-wide and are supported by international donors and sanitation research
51 organizations while the two implemented projects have been carried out by two well-respected
52 organizations involved in sanitation provision efforts in Burkina Faso.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The two planning guidelines are Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) and Community-Led Urban Environmental Sanitation (CLUES). The CLTS approach has received much attention as an innovative methodology that has shown positive results in eliminating open defecation (Kar & Chambers, 2008). Although originally aimed at rural populations, the success of this methodology has led to its application in urban areas (SEI, 2008). CLUES is a multi-sector planning approach geared towards service delivery in poor urban areas and was developed through a collaboration of the Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (Eawag), Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) and UN-HABITAT (Lüthi et al., 2011).

The first example of local practice is the Strategic Plan for Sanitation (PSAO) in the city of Ouagadougou (pop. 1,475,000), which is an on-going government initiated program that is run through the National Office for Water and Sanitation (ONEA) in Burkina Faso. Started in the early 1990s, this program is hailed as a success based on its innovative use of a sanitation surtax to fund on-site sanitation and the large number of latrines constructed (WSP, 2002). The second case highlights the efforts of the inter-state institution CREPA (Centre Régional pour l'Eau Potable et l'Assainissement à faible coût) to provide sanitation services in the small town of Tougan (pop. 16,000) in north-western Burkina Faso. CREPA is the leading applied-research institute for appropriate and affordable sanitation in French-speaking West Africa.

The main stakeholders in each case are shown in Table 1. Information regarding these sanitation projects was gathered from document reviews, interview studies and site visits to the project areas. Case study methodology (Yin, 2003) was applied during data collection and analysis to assure reliability and validity.

Table 1. Institutional map of the stakeholder domains in the two guidelines (CLTS and CLUES) and the two Burkina Faso field projects (Ouagadougou and Tougan). HH is household

	Users	Neighbourhood	City	Beyond the City	Power-holder
CLTS	HH	Community members	Municipal authorities	Regional/national authorities	External facilitator & support organisation
CLUES	HH	Local NGOs/CBOs	Municipal authorities	Sector experts, universities, regional/national authorities	Municipality or NGO
PSAO Ouagadougou	HH	NGOs, technical offices, masons social-marketers	Municipal authorities	ONEA, Ministries of Health, Agriculture & Water Resources	ONEA & WSP
CREPA Tougan	HH	Women's associations & masons	Municipal authorities	Decentralized technical services, ONEA, donors	CREPA

CLTS

CLTS process is led by an external facilitator who guides the community through three roughly defined steps: Pre-triggering, Triggering, and Post-Triggering (Kar & Chambers, 2008). During the pre-triggering step the facilitator examines the village to gain a sense of the overall sanitation problems in the community (problem identification). This step is initiated by the facilitator, but community members (Users/Neighbourhood) are invited into the process so as to build trust between the community and the facilitator. In this first two step City or Regional authorities have been informed of the intervention, but do not participate directly in the CLTS process (Figure 1). After the facilitator has led community members through problem identification, the triggering moment occurs and facilitator can step out of the power-holding role and let the community take

control of planning. Collective realization of the effects of open-defecation triggers community members to start defining their own objectives for changing the situation, taking control.

The process of designing and selecting technical options, as well as action planning, are labelled as post-triggering follow-up in CLTS language. At this stage the facilitator helps the community to direct the motivation released during triggering into concrete action. CLTS stresses the importance of allowing the community to dictate its own solutions, yet it also recommends working with the proper authorities and encouraging institutional support for training and capacity development (Kar & Chambers, 2008; Lüthi et al., 2009). Therefore, the level of participation of all various actors in the last three planning steps is most representative of delegated power.




Figure 1: Participation of stakeholders in CLTS and CLUES processes. Participation is in relationship to an external facilitator in the power-holding role who is not shown in the figure.

CLUES

The CLUES steps that represent problem identification and defining objectives involve Users and Neighbourhood stakeholders working in partnership with the process leader to identify current

1 deficiencies and community priorities. City and Beyond the City stakeholders participate in the
2 consultation meetings in the first step and are then informed of community priorities (Figure 1). The
3 design process is predominantly done in partnership between the process leader with the support of
4 sector experts, local and national NGOs (which can be Neighbourhood/Beyond the City) and
5 specialists (Beyond the City). The other stakeholder groups appear to be absent in this step.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 Once possible service plans are identified, the process leader presents feasible options to the
15 community for discussion and selection of the best option. Participation levels for Users thus return
16 to the partnership levels established during the initial steps. Although it is not specified in the
17 guidelines, it is assumed that participation levels for City and Beyond the City stakeholders will be
18 similar to their initial involvement, i.e. consultation. The action plan is then developed through a
19 moderated discussion with stakeholders, including community members and regulatory bodies,
20 regarding the best way to achieve implementation. City and regulatory agencies (Beyond the City)
21 are specifically invited to participate in this step to clarify technical issues and institutional
22 capacities. Each of the stakeholders thus has a specific set of issues and priorities that they bring to
23 the discussion and they make decisions related to their capacities, i.e. delegated power.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Strategic plan for sanitation in Ouagadougou (PSAO), Burkina Faso**

42
43 The process of problem identification was primarily conducted by ONEA with the help of expert-
44 led baseline studies supplemented with consultative dialogue with City and Beyond the City
45 authorities (Figure 2). Besides households answering questions about willingness-to-pay (therapy),
46 there is no evidence of community involvement in problem identification. Subsequent project
47 objectives were developed under the leadership of ONEA with the consultative support from high-
48 level stakeholders (City and Beyond).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

As far as could be understood from interviews conducted and documentation available (WSP, 2002), the designing and selection steps were carried out by ONEA in consultation with principle stakeholders from the initial dialogues (City and Beyond). The only exception is during the designing step where technical options were designed through delegated power between experts from both CREPA (Beyond the City) and ONEA. Development of the action plan was a more participatory process. A critical element in the action plan was the use of contracted private consultants or CBOs (Neighbourhood level) to run a campaign to raise awareness among the Users of the need for sanitation and promote the ONEA technologies (informing Users). The field workers were involved in regular project which gave them more influence in the project (placation) than a strict consulting would have done.




Figure 2: Participation of stakeholders in Ouagadougou (PSAO) and Tougan (CREPA) processes. Participation is in relationship to ONEA and CREPA in the power-holding roles (not shown in the figure).

CREPA program for Basic Community Services in Tougan, Burkina Faso

CREPA initiated activities in Tougan with consultations and a baseline study to identify problems

1 related to water and sanitation situation from the perspective of all stakeholders. Community
2 objectives were defined through a consultative day of public dialogue between the Users,
3
4 Neighbourhood groups and municipal council (City). Partners Beyond the City were informed of
5
6 the results of this dialogue but did not participate in the consultation (Figure 2).
7
8
9

10
11 Technical options were identified by a small groups of experts from CREPA. Although they include
12
13 perspectives from the participatory activities earlier in the planning process, actual participation of
14
15 other groups was low (informing at City and Beyond the City levels) or non-existent
16
17 (Users/Neighbourhood) at this stage. The final descriptions of alternatives for action were presented
18
19 to the municipal authorities, so as to allow them to select (control) the actions that matched the
20
21 municipal priorities (Commune de Tougan, 2007). Beyond City stakeholders were informed of the
22
23 decision. It is not apparent that community members participated directly in the design or selection
24
25 process.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 The main efforts of action planning focused on a social marketing campaign for educating and
34
35 mobilizing demand for the technologies among Users (i.e. therapy), carried out by two local
36
37 women's associations. The women (Neighbourhood) also participated in monitoring and feedback,
38
39 thus forming part of an advisory committee for the project, although without having any official
40
41 decision-making power (placation). The City maintained a key role in the action planning by
42
43 delegated power sharing with CREPA. Beyond the City stakeholder remained informed of the
44
45 action planning process, but did not participate directly in its development.
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 53 54 55 **DISCUSSION**

56
57
58 When using the three-tier analytical framework to compare the guidelines and implemented
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 projects, it becomes clear that there is no dominant style of participation or common approach.
2 Instead, a number of interesting similarities and differences become highlighted, which indicates a
3 potential for improving the provision of sanitation by improving the process of sanitation planning.
4
5
6
7
8

9 First, there are striking differences between the two guidelines reviewed in this study. CLTS starts
10 the process at a lower level of participation than CLUES, but quickly moves to high levels of
11 control and power sharing. CLTS is also the only example studied that gives Users the delegated
12 power during the designing step. However, both CLTS and CLUES recommend that Users and
13 Neighbourhood groups participate at a level greater than or equal to city and government actors
14 throughout most of the process (only exception is problem identification in CLTS). This highlights
15 the fact that both are community-based approaches. A previous study of these two approaches
16 suggests that a combination of them could result in an improved process (Lüthi et al., 2009). The
17 results of this study support this argument, especially during Steps 2-3 where a combined approach
18 might serve to smooth out dips in the participation curves (Figures 2 & 3).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Second, and in contrast to the guidelines, the analysis of the implemented projects generally shows
37 that Users and Neighbourhood groups have a lower level of participation than city and government
38 stakeholders. Moreover, with the exception of the municipality in the CREPA case, these practical
39 cases also have lower participation levels for all stakeholders than was found in the guidelines. It is
40 possible that the social structures and traditions in Burkina Faso do not encourage a more
41 participative approach. A review of projects implemented in neighbouring Mali found that there
42 was no tradition of community participation, and hence no expectation of it either (Paul, 1987).
43 Further study of power structures in Burkina Faso, as well as in CLTS and CLUES projects, would
44 be needed to determine why these differences between sanitation guidelines and sanitation practice
45 exist.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Third, with the exception of the CLTS approach, there is a significant decrease in participation
3
4 levels during the design and selection steps of planning. A similar study of sanitation planning
5
6 styles has also shown that these steps tend to be dominated by expert-driven planning procedures
7
8 with limited participation and a focus on quantitative analysis (McConville et al., 2011). Although
9
10 such expert-led procedures may be deemed necessary in the design of sanitation systems to assure
11
12 that sanitation meets environmental and health criteria, it may also mean missed opportunities to
13
14 improve the design in accordance to the needs of the population, e.g. in terms of cultural and
15
16 socioeconomic dimensions of sanitation. From one perspective, the exclusion of the Users during
17
18 the designing phase may not matter so much when the designing experts (i.e. the engineers) belong
19
20 to the same social groups as the people receiving the designed system, as is the case in Europe and
21
22 much of North America. However, in Burkina Faso this is often not the case since the experts
23
24 generally live in quite different environments compared to the un-served populations for whom they
25
26 are designing. Therefore, it can be argued that non-participation when designing the different
27
28 options for sanitation may obstruct the overall success of the system and that reconsidering how this
29
30 planning step is carried out may be a key opportunity for positive change in terms of effective and
31
32 sustainable sanitation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Fourth, previous research has provided some hints to guide the interpretation of the participation
44
45 curves in Figures 1-2. A study of community participation in condominal sewer services in Brazil
46
47 suggests that participation in initial planning and decision-making have greater positive impacts on
48
49 the project outcomes than participation during construction and maintenance (Nance & Ortolano,
50
51 2007). This is an interesting observation considering that the participation curves in this study show
52
53 greater community-level (Users, Neighbourhood) participation during action planning than during
54
55 decision-making. The exception is CLTS which calls for community-led decision-making
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 throughout the process. However, CLTS has been criticized within the sector for lacking technical
2 guidance in designing systems and weak institutional strength in urban settings (Lüthi et al., 2009).
3
4 Still, the rapid success and popularity of CLTS combined with the results from Nance & Ortolano
5
6 indicate that it is worth looking closer at participation within the design and selection steps.
7
8
9

10
11 A final issue with the observed low levels of participation during the design and selection steps in
12
13 the implemented Burkina Faso projects is how this contrasts with the increased power roles and
14
15 responsibility of certain stakeholders during action planning, implementation, and finally operation
16
17 and maintenance. In both projects, the household Users are expected to take ownership for
18
19 operation and maintenance of latrines after the project is completed. It has been argued that
20
21 participation will lead to improved user ownership and maintenance of the systems (Wood et al.,
22
23 1998). Yet is it reasonable to expect user ownership of a system when these Users have only been
24
25 asked about their problems and then been informed about a subsidized solution? Here, a critical
26
27 question becomes when participation should take place.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **CONCLUSIONS**

39
40
41 This study has highlighted that sanitation planning has a weak tradition of including stakeholders
42
43 during the design and selection steps of the planning process. However, there are indications that
44
45 these are exactly the steps where participation can make a critical impact on improving project
46
47 outcomes. There is evidently a need to get a clearer understanding of when and how participation
48
49 should be present in sanitation planning. This study has presented a potential avenue for attaining
50
51 such a capacity by providing a tool for a process-level understanding of decision-making roles and
52
53 relationships between stakeholders at different points in the planning process. However, while the
54
55 analytical framework developed in this study would contribute to a better understanding of the finer
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 details of participation in sanitation planning, this needs to be combined with long-term evaluations
2 of implemented projects and with studies of power relations in local contexts. In this way, it
3 becomes possible to provide better insights regarding, not only how project outcomes may be
4 improved, but also how participation in sanitation could be made more efficient and effective.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

15
16
17 The authors gratefully acknowledge the help of Christoph Lüthi (Eawag) and Karim Savadogo
18 (CREPA) for reviewing the case descriptions for accuracy in presentation.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 REFERENCES

- 26 Arnstein, S.R. (1969). "A Ladder of Citizen Participation". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, **35**, 216-224.
27 Choguill, M.B.G. (1996). A Ladder of Community Participation for Underdeveloped Countries. *Habitat International*,
28 **20**(3), 431-444.
29 Commune de Tougan. (2007). *Projet d'Assainissement Autonome et de Développement de la Commune de TOUGAN*,
30 *Document de Projet*. Commune de Tougan.
31 Hamdi, N. and Goethert, R. (1997). *Action Planning for Cities: A Guide to Community Practice*. John Wiley & Sons.
32 Chichester, UK.
33 International Water Association (IWA). (2006). *Sanitation 21: Simple Approaches to Complex Sanitation, a Draft*
34 *Framework for Analysis*. International Water Association London.
35 Kar, K. and Chambers, R. (2008). *Handbook on Community-led Total Sanitation*. Institute of Development Studies at
36 the Univ of Sussex and Plan UK, Brighton, UK.
37 Lüthi, C., McConville, J., & Kvarnström, E. (2009). Community-based approaches for addressing the urban sanitation
38 challenge. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, **1**(1-2), 49-63.
39 Lüthi, C., Morel, A., Tilley, E., and Ulrich, L. (2011). Community-Led Urban Environmental Sanitation Planning
40 (CLUES). Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (Eawag), Dübendorf, Switzerland.
41 McConville, J. R. (2008) *Assessing Sustainable Approaches to Sanitation Planning and Implementation in West Africa*.
42 Licentiate Thesis in Land and Water Resources Engineering. KTH Architecture and the Built Environment,
43 Stockholm, Sweden, TRITA-LWR LIC 2043.
44 McConville, J., Kain, J., Kvarnström, E. and Renman, G. (2011). Bridging sanitation engineering and planning: theory
45 and practice in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*, **1**(3), 205-212.
46 Murcott, S. (2007). Co-evolutionary Design for Development: Influences Shaping Engineering Design and
47 Implementation in Nepal and the Global Village. *Journal of International Development*, **19**, 123-144.
48 Nance, E. & Ortolano, L. (2007). Community Participation in Urban Sanitation: Experiences in Northeastern Brazil.
49 *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **26**, 284-300.
50 Narayan, D. (1995). *The contribution of people's participation. Evidence from 121 rural water supply projects*. The
51 World Bank, Washington, DC.
52 Paul, S. (1987). *Community participation in development projects: The World Bank experience*. In: *World bank*
53 *discussion paper no. 6*. World Bank, Washington, DC.
54 Roma, E. and Jeffrey, P. (2010). Evaluation of community participation in the implementation of community-based
55 sanitation systems: a case study from Indonesia. *Water Science and Technology*, **62**(5), 1028-1036.
56 Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI). (2008). *Proceedings from SEI/EcoSanRes2 workshop: planning and*
57 *implementation of sustainable sanitation in peri/semi-urban settings – a need for development of existing tools?*
58 SEI, Stockholm, Sweden.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Tritter, J. Q. and McCallum, A. (2006). The snakes and ladders of user involvement: Moving beyond Arnstein. *Health*
2 *Policy*, **76**, 156 –168.
3 Wood, S., Sawyer, R., and Simpson-Herbert, M. (1998). *PHAST step-by-step guide: a participatory approach for the*
4 *control of diarrhoeal disease*. World Health Organization, unpublished documents WHO/EOS/98.3, Geneva.
5 Wright, A. (1997). *Toward a Strategic Sanitation Approach: Improving the Sustainability of Urban sanitation in*
6 *Developing Countries*. UNDP-World Bank Water and Sanitation Program, Washington, DC, USA.
7 Water and Sanitation Program (WSP). (2002). *Field Note: The Ouagadougou Strategic Sanitation Plan: An Holistic*
8 *Approach to a City's Problems*. WSP Africa Region, Nairobi, Kenya.
9 Water and Sanitation Program (WSP). (2007). *From Burden to Communal Responsibility: A Sanitation Success Story*
10 *from Southern Region in Ethiopia*. Water and Sanitation Field Note, Sanitation and Hygiene Series, WSP Africa
11 Region, Nairobi, Kenya.
12 WSSCC/Eawag. (2005) *Household-Centred Environmental Sanitation: Implementing the Bellagio Principles in Urban*
13 *Environmental Sanitation*. Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (Eawag), Dübendorf,
14 Switzerland.
15 Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*, 3rd edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65