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## DEFINING ADVOCACY

**Advocacy is the process of strategically managing and sharing knowledge to change and/or influence policies and practices that affect people’s lives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Is:</th>
<th>Advocacy Is NOT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deliberate</td>
<td>• Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence based</td>
<td>• Behavior Change Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused on Changes in Policies, Policy Implementation, Increasing or Disbursing Budgets</td>
<td>• Community Education and Mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Influencing Decision Makers</td>
<td>• Demand Generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LOBBYING VS ADVOCACY

Not all advocacy is lobbying but all lobbying is advocacy.

Diversity in Advocacy
- Lobbying
- Campaigns
- Meetings with government officials
- Translation of research
- Consensus building
- Creating champions
1. Identify the Issues & Review Available Information
2. Identify Allies & Target Audience
3. Set Objectives
5. Resource Identification
6. Plan Implementation
7. Monitor & Evaluate
WHY A LANDSCAPE

• WASH Advocates Sunset in 2015
• Follow-up from WASH advocacy assessments in 2010
• To identify gaps and work towards closing them
• Mechanism to document the momentum
• Advocacy for future advocacy
One Hundred Ninth Congress
of the United States of America

At the First Session

An Act

To authorize assistance to the United States missions, agencies, and departments to work to eliminate child mortality and morbidity due to unsafe drinking water and sanitation and to increase access to safe drinking water and sanitation.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Health and Sanitation Act of 2019."
## WASH ADVOCACY HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>UN Water Conference <em>Action Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980’s</td>
<td>International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>First World Water Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>WaterAid Launched First Advocacy Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Freshwater Action Network Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2008</td>
<td>Regional WASH Networks Emerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals Launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Advocates Began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sanitation and Water For All (SWA) Partnership Launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UN Declaration Human Right to Water and Sanitation and First SWA High Level Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Launch of the Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CURRENT SITUATION
THE CURRENT SITUATION

Global Snapshot
• Advocacy around the Sustainable Development Goals
• Sanitation and Water For All Partnership
• Keep Your Promises Campaign
• Scaling Up Nutrition and WASH

US and European Advocacy
• Policy and budget advocacy
• Grassroots and Grasstops
• New advocacy focus from non-advocacy organizations
• Continued engagement of WASH advocates (dedicated staff)
• Capacity building for civil society in developing countries
• Funding increases for WASH advocacy
THE CURRENT SITUATION

Advocacy in Developing Countries
• Reinvigorated regional networks
• Local to national level policy and budget advocacy
• National dialogues and joint sector reviews
• National level civil society coordinating mechanism
• Community advocacy around citizens rights

Integration Advocacy
• WASH in Schools
• Nutrition
• Conservation and Biodiversity
• Neglected Tropical Diseases
GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES

1. Lack of human resources and organizational capacity
2. Knowledge sharing and communications
3. Funding for advocacy
4. Advocacy with donors on sustainability, integration, systems change, and multiple uses of data
5. Institutionalizing and mainstreaming advocacy at national and sub-national level in developing countries
6. Disjointed messaging to inform policy and practice
7. Lack of strong grassroots movements in developed and developing countries
8. Coordinating mechanisms are not coordinating
THANK YOU

Elynn Walter
Sustainability Director
WASH Advocates
ewalter@WASHadvocates.org
Moving the Needle on Municipal Finance for Sanitation
Practical Action Research for Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor

Presentation: Tanvi Nagpal and Rachel Rose
Research by: Ben Edwards, Tanvi Nagpal, Rachel Rose, and Jamie Boex
Evidence Gathering

Why we proposed an Action Research Method
Evidence Identification

• Adding value to the evidence that exists
• How can strategic communications (including advocacy, lobbying) add value? How does Action Research add value?
• We developed a systematic approach to analyze the …
  • political economy
  • intergovernmental frameworks
  • and broad array of actors
    … that influence decisions to provide pro-poor sanitation services using municipal budgets.
• Used similar analysis to understand the current state of advocacy, opportunities and limits in each city.
Baseline data gathering in three cities
Urban Service Delivery Framework Sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A1 | According to the legal framework, is the ULG responsible for providing or delivering the service (in accordance with the subsidiarity principle)? | 0 - The legislative framework is unclear about the legal assignment of functions  
0 - Inconsistent with the subsidiarity principle. The responsibility for service provision is assigned to the center (central ministry / central parastatal / local entity directed by central ministry)  
0.5 - The responsibility for service delivery is legally shared by the ULG and higher-level authorities  
1 – Yes, the ULG (or a SDU under ULG) is fully legally responsible for delivering the service in accordance with the subsidiarity principle | If the ULG is only legally responsible for part of the service delivery function (e.g., if the ULG is assigned the responsibility for the recurrent aspects of service provision but not for capital investments), please assign only half point.  
Note, the indicator asks which level is responsible for the provision or delivery of the service. The question does not pertain to whether higher levels set policy standards, regulate, or finance the service. The question also does not pertain to whether the service is produced by the ULG itself (for instance, the production of the service may be contracted out to a private sector provider). |
| A2 | In practice, is the ULG responsible for the recurrent provision of the service?              | 0 - No, in practice, this responsibility is performed by a higher-level entity (e.g., central ministry / central parastatal / local entity not under ULG)  
0.5 - The responsibility for recurrent provision is *de facto* shared by center and ULG  
1 – Yes, in practice the recurrent provision of this service is done by the ULG (or SDU under ULG) | Recurrent provision includes human resources, operation, and maintenance.  
If the local government level in reality provides only part of the service delivery function, please assign half the points indicated.  
Again, the question also does not pertain to whether the service is produced by the ULG itself (for instance, the production of the service may be contracted out to a private sector provider). |

For complete framework see here.
Expenditure findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures – 2014 - USD</th>
<th>Maputo</th>
<th>Nakuru</th>
<th>Ga West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total capital development</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total salaries</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operation and maintenance</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total supplies (if separate from O&amp;M)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Revenue findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues – 2014 - USD</th>
<th>Maputo</th>
<th>Nakuru</th>
<th>Ga West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total municipal own source</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$28,178,783</td>
<td>$1,100,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which, sanitation-specific</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total central government transfers for sanitation</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-governmental finance for sanitation</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$50,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All of Ga West’s sanitation-related capital expenditures are donor-funded
## Framework from “Message, Method and Messenger” Literature Survey

### Theory, Method, Audience, and Tools Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of change assumption</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information gaps</td>
<td>Information and knowledge transfer</td>
<td>Policymakers, elected officials, community leaders</td>
<td>Communication campaign, media advertising, public address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak political will</td>
<td>Advocacy and lobbying</td>
<td>Technocrats, bureaucrats, politicians</td>
<td>Letter writing campaigns, citizen satisfaction surveys, site visits with policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of demand</td>
<td>Social marketing</td>
<td>Civil society, community-based organizations, and community members</td>
<td>Media mobilization, coalition of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power imbalance</td>
<td>Social mobilization and participatory models</td>
<td>Target communities and social networks</td>
<td>Two-way media exchange (radio call-in, etc.), community meetings and forums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advocacy findings

- Weak political will
  - Weak media
  - Weak civil society capacity
  - Great political opportunities

- Strong political will
  - Strong media
  - Moderate civil society capacity
  - Great political opportunities

- Ongoing discussion (limited political will)
  - Interested media
  - Limited civil society
  - Limited political opportunity
Challenges
Scale of Problem

• Even problems that seem small (e.g. municipal revenue) may actually be tangled up in much larger, systemic problems → necessity of comprehensive analysis

• Organizational resources alone may not be sufficient to tackle the core problem at the root of the situation you’re trying to address

• Need to assess whether your organization is willing to take on coalition advocacy approach in order to address systemic issues that are not resolvable alone
Nature of Problem and Goal Definition

Need to match leverage approach to nature of problem
• If intergovernmental problem, local political influence insufficient to resolve

Need to match organization capacity to nature of problem
• Can’t influence without access however fine line of personal vs. organizational influence (clout vs. brand) and being tied to one individual

Need to clearly align advocacy goal with political and functional reality
• Even if increase revenues for sanitation, is there clear functional assignment, effective administration, accountability mechanisms etc. to ensure revenues are spent on pro-poor sanitation?
Successes
Grassroots Mobilization Advocacy

- Advocacy Materials and Implementation in Ga West
  - Building accountability pathways between community and assembly
  - Developed clear actions for community members to take

We deserve a dignified community.

Demand to know what your assembly and community are doing to address the toilet and sanitation challenge. Join us.

Take action now.
U.S. WASH Advocacy

The Senator Paul Simon
Water for the World Act of 2014

The Future of WASH Advocacy
UNC Water and Health Conference
October 2015
WaterAid’s Approach

Influencing work is core to WaterAid:

Our vision

is a world where everyone, everywhere has safe water, sanitation and hygiene.

Our mission

is to transform the lives of the poorest and most marginalized people by improving access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene.
WaterAid’s Advocacy Priorities

1. Sector Strengthening and Governance
2. Financing
3. Equality and Non-Discrimination
4. Climate Change
5. Sustainability
6. Health
Water for the World aligned with our priorities:

- Improved pro-poor targeting (equality)
- Increased focus on women and girls (equality)
- Principles for lasting benefits (sustainability)
- Capacity building (sector strengthening)
- U.S. institutional commitment and predictability (sector strengthening)
- Increased integration with health outcomes (health)
Why were we successful?

- A safe issue
- Strong analytical basis
- Political interest in aid effectiveness
- Committed Congressional champions
Why were we successful?

A huge and diverse coalition, all with their own reasons to care about WASH!
How did we win?

- Preexisting trusting relationships with USAID, State, Congress, NGOs and FBOs to build on
- Careful and strategic selection of Congressional champions
- Integrated language to attract people and partners with diverse interests
- Diverse voices to speak to integrated issues
- Allies talking to allies, Members reaching across the aisle
- Media/social engages supporters in advocacy
- Negotiation negotiation negotiation...based on solid understanding of technical and political issues
Why are partnerships key to success?

• Access to a voice already trusted by your target (based on faith, geography, priority, etc)
• Volume is harder to ignore
• Diverse coalitions show the multiple benefits/impact of your change objective
• Share the burden, strategy, ideas generation and be smarter together!
PANEL DISCUSSION
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