

Questions	Response
<p>Q: Is re-triggering an option in a community? I guess not because the community will already be aware of the entire triggering process and therefore CLTS outcomes such as a 'matchbox in a gas station' may not still be achieved.</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: I think we covered your question in the webinar. It is not generally the case that a community can be re-triggered. As you note it is not likely that the same trigger moments would be achieved a second time. Although beyond the scope of this review there is some work going on to find ways to address unsuccessful triggering (for example in Mali). Some of the other frontiers issues cover this issue as well</p>
<p>Q: Are there cases where the ODF status has been maintained through follow up only without sanctions? And what is the acceptable slippage?</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thank you for your question. Regarding sanctions, in terms of removing ODF status of communities or locations when slippage is observed, I found that this rarely happens. In most countries the process of declaring ODF is one way. The exception to this would be the flag system adopted in Ethiopia, but even that may not be applied consistently in all areas. On your second question on what is “acceptable slippage”, countries do not tend to have a set cut-off point for slippage for example if 10% of households slip then the location is considered slipped. More usually that any level of slippage is a concern, with a return to open defecation for any reason being the most serious slippage. The focus is on identifying the problem and getting back on track I hope that answers your questions, let me know if you would like to discuss further.</p>
<p>Q: The Jirani Sanitation Groups is not any different from the Umoja approach. Basically it is a Household cluster methodology which has been tested but still hiccups prevail.</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: Indeed a JSG is a cluster of neighbouring households with a group leader. And yes, it has hiccups highlighted in the published case study. Despite hiccups, let us acknowledge that there are many “Neighbour’s cluster groups” that are functional in many African Countries. The majority address issues unrelated to sanitation such as security, politics issues etc. In Tanzania, 13 Local Government Authorities chose to pilot assigning JSGs a sanitation role. They are doing a good job in tackling slippage and improving the quality of sanitation monitoring data.</p> <p>Sophie Hickling: Thank you for this observation, indeed there are several similar approaches including the Follow-up MANDONA in Madagascar and WASHComs in Nigeria. It would be interesting to compare how these groups are established in different contexts – there may be the opportunity for cross learning that could help to tweak the approaches to address the prevailing hiccups.</p>
<p>Q: Thanks for this session! Sophie, your typology of slippage is very helpful. Separately, what did you uncover in terms of measured evidence of the extent and nature of slippage? We have some academic studies of CLTS that tracked OD and toilet coverage longitudinally, and several ODF</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for your feedback. I didn’t find any new sources or evaluations that quantified slippage. WSSCC/GSF are starting to get results from a couple of studies that might contribute to this. I believe there has also just been a fairly large evaluation in Zambia, although not yet released I am sure it would contribute some interesting results.</p>

<p>sustainability studies commissioned by implementers (Robinson, Tyndale-Biscoe, etc.) Did you come across new or previously unreleased programmatic reports that document slippage in a meaningful way?</p>	<p>I hope that the patterns and typologies framework developed for this review might at some point help with the process of evaluating extent and nature of slippage.</p>
<p>Q: who was responsible to establish JSG, is it government or NGO</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: The JSGs are established by the local government. The local government also provide the refresher trainings.</p>
<p>Q: When do you conduct the fresher training is it quarterly?</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: Refresher trainings are done yearly depending on availability of funds.</p>
<p>Q: In TZA how does quality of monitoring data get checked and verified as it gets rolled up from sub-villages to district levels?</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: The quality of monitoring data in Tanzania is checked through quarterly field spot checks by the local government authority (LGA) staff at the Ward and District levels. Data cleaning is also done at the village, ward and district levels. Field spot checks are many a time hindered by unavailability of funds. With the JSG approach, the JSG leaders visit every household and enter the sanitation status in the sub village sanitation registers. Local leaders undertake spot checks on the quality of data entered in the registers by the JSG leaders. This has enhanced the quality of the monitoring data.</p>
<p>Q: Generally, what percent/proportion of the slippage are these techniques able to fix/resolve?</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this question. During the review I found that slippage isn't yet monitored and tracked at a level that would be able to then formally evaluate a response. Taking the example of the JSGs, the aim is for <i>any</i> slippage to be reversed immediately that it occurs. For other slippage reversal techniques, for example training masons to deal with durability issues, BCC campaigns around children's faeces or access for disabled persons – I agree that it would be useful to evaluate the extent to which slippage is reversed (provided you have quantified the slippage in the first place).</p>
<p>Q: Please could you confirm if the JSG members are now different from before including the 10 h/h/cell members as well as the previous members? Did you face any problems with this transition?</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: In the beginning, we supported the LGAs to train and mandate the 5 environment health committee members in each sub villages to mobilize, monitor and report on sanitation progress. It turned out that the 5 committee members were not geographically spread evenly in the sub villages. They failed to monitor and report on all households and started demanding to enable them to cover their transport and cater for their lunches. It also turned that committee members were selected by the local leaders and the community viewed them as agents of local leaders' out to harass them. The JSG approach helped address the problem of distances and acceptability. The transition was smooth as some of the environment committee members ended up being JSGs leaders in the areas where they live. Some realized that there were no monetary gains and were happy to be out.</p>
<p>Q: Can you share monitoring frameworks used?</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: Sanitation registers have been existence in Tanzania since 2012 when the government launched the first phase of the National Sanitation Campaign. The registers are available on line.</p>

	Sophie Hickling: https://www.wsp.org/sites/wsp/files/publications/WSP_UtilizingRegisters_TSSM.pdf
Q: Is there turn over issue of JSG leaders?	Jackson Wandera: Turnover happens but is not at an alarming rate. The JSG's quickly replace the leaders who opt out. Local leaders make follow ups and ensure that replacement is done
Q: at point 4, when you say" enforcement at all levels, how is this done and by whom?	Jackson Wandera: The local government administrative structure in Tanzania has 4 levels: District, Ward, Village and Sub village. Each level has sanitation targets to achieve. The LGA staffs at a higher administrative level follows up and enforces achievement of results on the lower level. This creates pressure to deliver results at all levels.
Q: What are cells? how many houses would compose a community	<p>Jackson Wandera: I am not sure in which context the cell concept is being asked. If it is about JSGs, each FSG group/cell has on average 10 households. In Tanzania, a sub village could be conveniently be referred to as a community because in most cases they have similar development needs. The number of households in a rural sub village will range from 30 in sparsely peopled areas to 150 in densely peopled areas. An average household has 5 members.</p> <p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this question. The “10-cell groups” in Tanzania are a pre-existing sub-village system which groups 10 neighbouring households together. The system was originally established for political purposes.</p>
Q: Were there any efforts made to support people who were unable to build or rebuilt toilets such as older people living on their own with no families?	<p>Jackson Wandera: Yes households with difficulties have been supported with materials or labour to construct toilets. Where the JSG group is unable to address the issue, the JSG leaders report the difficulties to the village development committees (VDC). We have examples where VDCs have allowed very poor households to access community resources such as trees for construction for free.</p> <p>Sophie Hickling: This is a good question. I believe there is a move away from the assumption that “community spirit” will mean that the least able are supported <i>ad infinitum</i> in order to maintain ODF in a community. Several countries and organisations are beginning to look at how financial or material support can be provided to the poorest / least able – normally once ODF behaviour is achieved – within the framework of the community-led approach. It is something that the review flags an area for further research.</p>
Q: Are they paid volunteer or pure volunteer?	Sophie Hickling: Thank you for your question. The Jirani leaders do not receive financial remuneration for their work. In order to be sustainable the approach ensures that expectations are clear in terms of how much time they will volunteer, which areas they cover etc. There have been instances where Jirani leaders have stepped down due to being too busy to commit enough time, in these cases they have been replaced by someone else in the neighbourhood.

<p>Q: What was the process adopted to identify persons to create JSG and how much time it took for operationalising a committee?</p>	<p>Jackson Wandera: JSGs are established in a sub village community meeting. The meeting is facilitated by a sub village head (an elected leader). Through discussions 10 neighbouring households are clustered into a group. Those households not in attendance are also grouped. The groups are then asked to go consult and agree on their leader and communicate the name to the sub village head within a week. Once the sub village head receives the names of the leaders, he/she invites them for a training at the village level. On average a village has 4 sub villages. Thus about 40 JSG leaders assemble in a village for a one-day training on their roles. The training is provided by the village executive officer (VEO) or a community health promoter. The sub village heads also do participate in the training. At the end of the training, the JSG leaders are given note books in which they record on a monthly basis, the sanitation status of the 10 households. The information collected is same as the information in the government sanitation registers. On a quarterly basis they fill the sanitation status data in the sub village sanitation registers.</p> <p>Sophie Hickling: Thank you for your question. We did not have time to go through the details of the process during the presentations, however the steps taken are included in the frontiers issue itself. You may also be interested to read the case study on the JSGs which can be found at the following link https://www.communityledtotalsanitation.org/resources/jirani-sanitation-groups-sustaining-open-defecation-free-status-tanzania</p>
<p>Q: The solutions identified by both presenters seem to focus on the project level. To what extent are system-wide problems affecting slippage - for example, lack of Government engagement or funding; lack of private sector services to provide more durable facility options, or emptying services – ETC.</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this question, these system-wide problems certainly affect slippage. One of the key recommendations of the report is the need to establish monitoring systems that better identify slippage patterns and factors driving them. Most monitoring stops at ODF declaration, therefore the issue is not on the table in the first place (for example without a clear picture of the extent to which lack of emptying services is reversing ODF gains, there is little traction to address it). However, there are exceptions that we could learn from – for example in Mali slippage trends are analysed at higher level with partners, govt etc. The other recommendation is to shift focus beyond ODF towards universal access targets, and higher levels of service provision which demands longer-term commitment and planning. The example is given in the review of the formalisation of the post-ODF strategy in Mali, which secures buy-in and galvanises support at different levels.</p>
<p>Q: Assumption is that there is more or less similar approach followed by all for addressing sanitation issues in different parts of the world. Can we have a evolution of program from slippage to non slippage? Our program more or less looks the same but with some slippage, what program changes were made to address slippage?</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for your comment. While every context is indeed unique the framework put forward in the review tries to look for patterns which might help determine what types of response might be most effective to reverse slippage. We would be very interested to hear more about your experiences in addressing slippage in your programme.</p>

<p>Apologies as missed initial part of the webinar if this aspect was discussed at the start</p>	
<p>Q: What specific initiatives have been/could be asked from local government officials to provide the "enabling environment" in addressing slippage? (In my area, it's quite difficult to engage officials once they have already "published" an ordinance.</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: This is a very good point. While carrying out the review I found that the process of declaring ODF tends to be unidirectional. Without subsequent post-ODF monitoring, slippage is addressed in a more ad-hoc way rather than as an (expected and) planned part of the overall drive towards sanitation targets.</p> <p>The review examples and recommendations give more details but I would say in brief I would say the two main strategies would be to: 1) Build capacity of local government and community support structures to assess slippage patterns and underlying factors at the local level, and provide them with tools to deliver context-specific responses. 2) Establish monitoring systems that provide nuanced data that decision makers require – for example is the slippage something minor that can be addressed by local support groups or does it require a larger programme adjustment?</p>
<p>Q: How to measure slippage? if we see OD in in 2 households out of 10 households can it be called slippage? Any experience from other countries.</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thank you for your question. In general countries do not tend to have a set cut-off point for slippage (for example if 10% of households slip then the location is considered slipped). More usually any level of slippage is a concern, with a return to open defecation for any reason being the most serious slippage. The focus then becomes on identifying the problem and getting back on track. It would be really interesting to know whether you have any set parameters for defining slippage in Afghanistan.</p>
<p>Q: We should consider whether this issue is 'slippage' or just the human condition more generally. .Calling it 'slippage' means that we expect behaviour change to be a permanent condition. Health campaigns against tobacco, or unsafe sex, or drink driving are continually repeated in most societies. Why shouldn't ODF campaigns be looked at the same way? In other words, achieving ODF is not a one-time event, but a continual effort requiring repeated messaging, reinforcement, and applying new solutions such as better supporting services like pit emptying, better private sector supply of toilet products and services, etc.</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this comment. I think this was clear from the review that ODF is an important waypoint but that continued support to reinforce hygiene behaviours and encourage movement up the sanitation ladder, matched by higher level environmental sanitation services is essential to long term achievement of sanitation goals.</p>
<p>Q: rebuild rates are a good metric to compliment slippage rates to determine if the levels of slippage are "acceptable".</p>	<p>Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this comment – rebuild rates are indeed a good metric although this only deals with slippage caused by latrines collapsing, filling or otherwise needing rebuilding. The more</p>

	difficult aspects are other ODF criteria such as use of facilities by all people at all times, handwashing etc. It is definitely a conversation that will continue!
Q: A question to Jackson: how do you plan to address the sustainability of the group to address slippage after the external support stopped?	Jackson Wandera: Sustainability is addressed by advocating local government authorities (LGAs) to buy in and own the approach. The LGAs capacity to establish, train and monitor the functioning of the JSGs is also being build.
Q: can Jackson speak to SNV's experience with getting villages officially certified as ODF by government authorities -any challenges?	Jackson Wandera: Tanzania has a protocol for verification, certification and celebration of ODF. Certification is done for 3 levels of ODF: level 1 when 100% of the Households use improved toilets with washable slabs, Level 2 when all household use toilets but 75% use improved toilets with washable slabs and level 3 when all households use toilets but only 50% use improved toilets with washable slabs. SNV follows the government protocol. So far there have been no major challenges except that finances to get the teams to the villages for certification are often limiting. Also, level 1 ODF is rarely celebrated because it is very difficult to get 100% of the households using improved toilets with washable slabs in rural areas.
Q: Regular and continuous follow up is the key to address slippage, this follow up is usually done with local government staffs working near the community. In our experience, the local government is doing more regular follow up done when there is external support, other wise very few staffs did the follow up work. Is there any experience to address this challenge?	Sophie Hickling: Thank you for this observation and indeed this is an important issue when looking at sustained follow-up. I know there are examples of including sanitation targets in government worker performance targets which would help ensure follow-up continues. Other frontiers publications that also deal with the issue of sustainability of follow-up include frontiers issue 4, and the sustainable sanitation for all book.
Q: Isn't upgrading actually a way to address slippage? Rather than making a distinction.	Sophie Hickling: Yes I tend to agree which is why I included the case study on Mali as an example of post-ODF planning for continual upgrade as a way of "mopping up" slippage. The review was to look at experiences in reversing slippage specifically, however as I noted there are many areas where the prevention and reversal of slippage overlap.
Q: in the survey Sophie ran earlier technical issues was the highest, doesn't this suggest that there should be a focus on durability?	Sophie Hickling: Thanks for this comment – indeed also when I was carrying out the review the issue with durability of locally constructed facilities was a recurrent theme, especially in Africa. The frontiers issue itself includes an example from Kenya of how this is being addressed but I would love to hear other examples you may have come across.