



# **Partners for Water and Sanitation**

## **Note on project reports**

The following report has been prepared by Partners for Water and Sanitation in response to a project Terms of Reference.

The content of the report is based on the opinion of the author(s) and does not necessarily represent the opinions of the wider PfWS partnership, or the project funders.

Any extracts from the report should only be used with prior permission of the report author(s).



# **Partners for Water and Sanitation**

## **Capacity Building Support to Ethiopia's National WASH Coordination Office 23<sup>rd</sup> - 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009**

**Submitted by:**

**Steve Arthur (Wessex Water) &  
David Thomas (Severn Trent Water)**

Version 1.01 Draft report – 95% material included. 31.3.09. 10am

Version 1.02 Draft report – only delegate list now missing. 31.3.09. 1pm

Version 1.03 Draft report – Delegate list included. No Table of Contents. 6pm Tues 31st

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>THE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND WASH CULTURE DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS ON WASH PROGRAMME</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>APPENDIXES</b>	<b>7</b>
Appendix A	Feedback	7
Appendix B	Itinerary	9
Appendix C	Training Programme	10
Appendix D	Summary of Key Learning Points for delegates	12
Appendix E	TOR for Logo Competition and News Letter	14
Appendix F	– Group Working Summaries	15
Appendix G	– Register of Delegates for capacity Building Workshop	18

## **1 1 Introduction**

Following the PAWS capacity building needs assessment visit in Aug-Sept 2008, the following recommendations were made during the previous report:

1. Key members of the National and Regional WASH structure should be identified and offered the opportunity to attend a tailored, focused and relevant Change Management and Programme Management course.
2. The National WASH Coordination Office should take the lead role (and be allowed the necessary resources) in implementing a series of initiatives designed to familiarise and promote a wider sense of belonging to a shared WASH culture,
3. Ministerial attention should be re-focussed on the WASH programme to re-vitalise the overall initiative and to strengthen the WASH structure at both Federal and Regional level as the focus is placed upon the regional implementation of the national strategy and guidelines.
4. Once the regional co-ordination capacity has been established, a further capacity needs assessment at the regional level should be conducted.

In addressing the above recommendations, a programme of training was agreed between PAWS and the NWCO which was given priority to introduce the successful programme Management and the WASH culture. Accordingly, the focus of the training/workshop was to be on two areas

- developing the programme management skills and knowledge base of those involved at the federal level within the WASH programme.
- raising awareness of the need, tools and benefits of developing a more visible WASH culture for those involved with the programme.

## **2 2. The Programme Management Training and WASH Culture Discussions**

The programme Management training and the WASH culture discussions were conducted at the MoWR in Addis Ababa between Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> March and Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> March 2009. Delegates from all ministries involved in the GoE WASH programme attended, as did representatives from the Water Resources Bureaux of SNNPR and Oromiya regions. See Appendix G for a full list of delegates.

The training sessions involved a twin-track approach of teaching core programme management principles interspersed with contextual presentations. The latter ranging from the background of aid-based WASH programmes to institutional behaviour and the differences between projects and programmes. This approach was aimed at breaking up the more theoretical elements of the workshop with more wide ranging, but relevant, thought provoking interludes.

A detailed schedule of the three day workshop can be found in the Appendices to this report.

The programme management element of the training focussed on principles documented in the MSP (Managing Successful Programmes) approach, developed and published in the UK by the Office of Government Commerce (OGC). This utilises a model of key programme elements including Mandate, Definition and Governance.

These elements were broken down in turn, and key parts of them were applied to the WASH programme in Ethiopia. These included the Communication Plan, Quality Management approach and Risk Management principles.

Syndicate working was also used during the workshop to solicit feedback, and ignite discussions between the cohorts, on subjects including:

- Suitability of, and options for strengthening, existing WASH structures
- Clarity of WASH roles and responsibilities
- The concept of a WASH logo competition and WASH newsletter

All delegates actively participated throughout the duration of the course and provided invaluable insight and direction on the topics discussed. There was a very strong element of inter-sectorial interaction throughout the 3 days of training, which a high degree of professional respect shown between delegates. The trainers felt that these behaviours are a good indication that WASH culture is starting to become embedded within the upper tiers of the GoE's WASH structure.

The trainers also want to acknowledge the support offered by Ato Gelebo, who attended for the full duration of the course and was on hand to receive feedback from the delegates and respond to issues and questions raised.

A summary of the feedback from this syndicate work can be found in Appendix F



**Picture 1: Group Photo of Program Management Trainees**



**Picture 2: Group Discussions on WASH Culture issues**

### **3 Observations on WASH Programme**

There has clearly been considerable progress made regarding the implementation of the MoU in the seven months since the authors' previous visit in September 2008. Some of the positive steps taken include:

- Visits by federal delegations to the regions to officially launch the regional WASH management and co-ordination structures
- The release of the first trenches of donor funding through the '1B' channel<sup>1</sup>
- The near completion of the consultant recruitment to undertake a Management Information System (MIS) studies by the MoWR to complement those belonging to MoE and MoH, and so assist in meeting the targets laid out in the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual.
- The approval to fund and fill 5 full time positions within the NWCO
- The successful completion of a timely bi-annual Joint Technical Review in January 2009. This wide ranging review achieved broad participation across the WASH community and its findings were discussed and agreed at Ministerial level.

---

<sup>1</sup> Channel 1B passes money directly to regional implementing bureaus via the regional Bureau of Financial and Economic Development, as opposed to Channel 2 which passes money through respective line ministries.

Although it is obvious there is still significant effort required to fully implement the MoU, those attending the training course appeared committed to seeing the WASH programme succeed and contribute to the GoE's UAP and MDG initiatives.

Besides providing training, the presence of PAWS within the NWCO offers an opportunity to provide impartial, neutral and informed observations on the MoU's implementation. These observations are drawn from interviews the authors conducted whilst in-country, plus feedback and comments made during the training course itself. The authors of this report are aware of the Joint Technical Review's Jan 09 findings, and aim not to duplicate issues raised in that report. The three main issues that we wish to comment upon are:

1. Although there are understandable reasons for the low frequency with which the NWSC and NWTT meet<sup>2</sup>, the fact of the matter is that the **perception** amongst those from the PMU's on downwards is that the WASH programme is lacking strategic guidance. Whether this perception matches reality, or whether another body – say the NWCO – could be made responsible for communicating strategic decisions is not the key issue; rather, those being asked to implement the MoU need to feel there is a strong sense of strategic direction in order to maintain their high level of drive and commitment.
2. It is appreciated that the NWCO will imminently be employing a number of staff, including a communications expert. However, it was noticeable during PAWS second visit that key findings from Jan 09's Joint Technical Review had not been widely disseminated.
3. There are signs that the rate of expenditure of the disbursements between the three key components of WASH - water, sanitation, and health promotion – are becoming skewed, with sanitation and health lagging behind water. This is understandable given Water Resource's historical role in handling WASH funding. This is an example of a number of 'bottlenecks' that were highlighted during the PAWS visit, and PAWS recommends that a systematic approach is taken to quickly highlight and tackle bottlenecks now that the MoU has entered its implementation stage.

## 4 Next Steps

At the end of PAWS second visit a meeting was held with Ato Teferi – the chair on the NWTT – and Ato Gelebo – the National WASH Co-ordinator – to discuss future assistance. The following points were agreed:

1. Assistance from PAWS will always be demand based rather than supply driven;
2. There will definitely be a need for further input from PAWS, particularly given that PAWS has build up a good understanding of the GoE's efforts to implement the 2006 MoU;
3. Precise future needs cannot be assessed until the NWCO has got its five new full time positions filled, and drawn up an annual plan based on the available resources. This annual plan will be shared with PAWS, at which point discussions will be held on how PAWS can assist in delivering this plan.
4. Progressing the logo competition and news letter will be responsibility of the NWCO's new communication expert. PAWS resources could be made available, if required, to further assist in the design and implementation of this work.

---

<sup>2</sup> Size of committees; priority of Business Process Re-engineering

## 5. Appendixes

### Appendix A Feedback

	Responses	Score (1-6)
<b>Regarding relevance of course content</b>		<b>4.9</b>
<i>What I learnt in this course will help me improve my performance?</i>	15	4.7
<i>Material and issues were current and worthwhile</i>	16	4.9
<i>The course was relevant to my needs</i>	16	4.9
<b>Regarding the quality of course design</b>		<b>4.5</b>
<i>The structure and institutional modes of the course encouraged learning</i>	15	4.8
<i>The course objectives were fully addressed</i>	16	4.9
<i>The course actively and effectively engaged me through-out</i>	16	4.7
<i>The duration of the course was just right</i>	16	<b>4.1</b>
<i>Overall this was a high quality course</i>	16	4.3
<i>Relative to other training that I have attended I would rank this course as one of the best</i>	16	4.4
<b>Regarding the quality of the instructors</b>		<b>5.4</b>
<i>The instructors encouraged and responded well to questions</i>	15	5.3
<i>The instructors have knowledge in the course content</i>	14	5.4
<i>The instructors treated participants with respect</i>	14	<b>5.5</b>
<i>The instructors were well prepared and organised</i>	14	5.2
<i>The pace of instruction was just right</i>	13	5.4
<b>Comments</b>		
<p>Please comment on any of the statements in the previous sections, particularly those you disagree with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The course duration was limited. I think this course needed at least a month in order to roll out all aspects as well as integrate with other work.</li> <li>The duration of the course is too short. The time given for programme management is so short – I didn't grasp much (<i>note – respondent did stay for whole course!</i>)</li> <li>It was good, but make it more elaborate.</li> <li>WASH programme management should include both planning, implementation, process and evaluation systems so the time could be scheduled to address these management systems – overall time too short.</li> <li>Duration is not as of scheduled initially</li> <li>The duration is good especially focusing on the highlights, but you need to go further into detail with a more 'adult' approach and focus on group discussions.</li> <li>Duration of course should increase to 4-5 days.</li> </ul>		
<p>Where there any aspects of the course that you think should be improved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The course of "project management" should incorporate other related subject matter</li> <li>Programme management – should be more detailed.</li> <li>If the course is run again, it would be better to incorporate the higher officials and regional participants too.</li> <li>Copy of presentations.</li> <li>Material should be current or in advance</li> <li>Suggest distributing some documents in addition to the slides would help more.</li> <li>The course had the important issues of WASH, but if you add other experiences and failures it would be good to relate these to our progress.</li> <li>Provide readable hand-out in advance.</li> </ul>		



<p>Which parts of the course did you find useful?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance management – risk, communication, organisational behaviour; WASH culture.</li> <li>• The 'programme approach', especially quality management, communication, and benefit management.</li> <li>• Programme management</li> <li>• Management approach</li> <li>• WASH problem is global.</li> <li>• Quality and risk management</li> <li>• Programme management principles and WASH culture</li> <li>• The difference between project management and programme management</li> <li>• Programme management; participatory approach</li> <li>• Project quality management</li> <li>• Programme management; WASH programme management; AID history</li> </ul>
<p>General comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For future when you organise such training please think about <i>per diem</i> for participants.</li> <li>• Further training has to be given for the regional WASH groups.</li> <li>• Involve Ethiopian trainer.</li> <li>• Try to include cross cutting themes of HIV/AIDS and gender.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B      Itinerary

DA = David Thomas, SA = Steve Arthur

Day		Date	Itinerary
0	Sun	22-Mar-09	SA arrive in Addis
1	Mon	23-Mar-09	DT arrive in Addis <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planning meeting with NWCO</li></ul>
2	Tue	24-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DAY 1 of Capacity Building</li></ul>
3	Wed	25-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DAY 2 of Capacity Building</li></ul>
4	Thu	26-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DAY 3 of Capacity Building</li></ul>
5	Fri	27-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meeting with Ato Belete</li></ul>
6	Sat	28-Mar-09	DAY OFF
7	Sun	29-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Report Writing</li></ul>
8	Mon	30-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meeting with MoWR</li><li>• Meeting with MoFED</li></ul>
9	Tue	31-Mar-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meeting with DAG &amp; report writing</li></ul>
10	Wed	01-Apr-09	DT and SA leave Addis

## Appendix C Training Programme

### Day One – Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> March

Time	Activity	Presenter
0830-0900	Registration	
0900-0915	Welcome & introduction	MoWR PAWS
0915-0930	Trainer introductions	Steve Arthur David Thomas
0930-1000	Background to PAWS involvement & previous visit to Ethiopia	Steve Arthur and Melkamu Jaleta
1000-1015	Aims of training course	Steve Arthur
1015-1045	Icebreaker – What difference can WASH make?	David Thomas
<b>Break for tea/coffee</b>		
1115-1145	MoU Recap & Roles and Responsibilities	David Thomas
1145-1200	WASH Structures	Steve Arthur
1200-1300	Group working Discussion & presentation on WASH	Steve Arthur
<b>Lunch</b>		
1400-1430	WASH Challenges Globally and generally	David Thomas
1430-1445	Client/Deliverer model	David Thomas
1445-1530	Programme Management principles & benefits	Steve Arthur
<b>Tea/Coffee</b>		
1600-1630	Introduction of day Two (Defining a Programme)	Steve Arthur

### Day Two –Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> March

Time	Activity	Presenter
0900-0910	Introductions, recap and review schedule for day	Steve Arthur

0910-0930	"Decades of Aid"-WASH in a historical context	David Thomas
0930-1015	Programme Management Principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recap selection of Programme Definition principles</li> <li>Relevant Governing a Programme sections</li> </ul>	Steve Arthur
1015-1100	Options for strengthening WASH structures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal Level</li> <li>Regional level</li> </ul>	David Thomas
<b>Break for tea/coffee</b>		
1115-1120	Project to Programme – key differences	David Thomas
1120-1200	Applying programme approach to WASH in Ethiopia	Steve Arthur
1200-1215	Power Over/To concept	David Thomas
<b>Lunch</b>		
1330-1415	Who needs what from whom  Federal & Regional requirements	Steve Arthur
1415-1430	Recap	Steve Arthur
1430-1500	Briefing on Day 3 – WASH Culture	David Thomas
<b>Tea/Coffee &amp; Close</b>		

### Day Three – Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> March

	Topic	Time	Led by:
1	Summary of PAWS conclusions from first visit	9:00 – 9:15	SA
2	What is it about WASH that can bring together professionals working in health, education and water resources?	9:15 - 9:30	DT
3	Two ideas raised by PAWS and endorsed by NWCO – logo competition and newsletter. Produce the outlines of a feasible plan that NWCO can then develop	9:30 – 11:00	GROUP WORK
	TEA BREAK	11:00 – 11:20	
4	Summary.	11:20 – 11:40	SA/DT
4	Closing Remarks	11:40 – 12:00	Ato Gelebo

## Appendix D      Summary of Key Learning Points for delegates

**Client – ‘Service Provider’ model.** From the MoU “In signing this MoU the parties commit themselves to work together in the spirit of cooperation to...achieve national objectives through decentralised service provision.”

GoE is the client, represented by the federal WASH structure. ‘Service Provider’ is the regions. Client pays for service; sets expected standards; creates environment (policies) for getting the job done; does not dictate but expects results; provides incentives. Service Provider understands client’s needs; works effectively within the policy framework; gets the job done and provides evidence; works with client to improve programme.

**International Context** WASH struggles internationally for funding and recognition. The sector is seen as being complicated and difficult to deal with due to a lack of inter-ministry cooperation. GoE’s MoU and related WASH programme tackles this problem, and has the potential to make Ethiopia an attractive country for WASH donors to work in. Ethiopia could become a model for other countries to modernise their WASH sector.

**Aid in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century** Donors are looking for new and successful ways of working with governments. In particular, they want the MoU and WASH programme to work. This places the Ethiopian WASH sector in a strong negotiating position and incentive to present a united and professional front to the donor community to become equal partners with the donor community.

### **The THREE C MODEL**

Competition – to be avoided

Co-ordination – the technical delivery of the MoU

Co-operation – the ‘spirit’ of the MoU (both between ministries, and between regional and federal levels).

Programme’s success will require not just co-ordination, but also co-operation.

**WASH Programme Sustainability** WASH is not a separate parallel structure, but sits within existing ministry planning processes. This is vital for the sustainability of the WASH programme.

### **Project and Programme Difference**

#### **BOUNDARIES**

- a project has a tight and easily defined boundary (geographical area, beneficiaries etc)...you only need to work with a relatively limited number of people
- a programme has a wide boundary, and will involve a lot more interested parties...you need to get good at working with people outside your normal circle of contacts

#### **EXTERNAL FACTORS**

- variables critical to a project are generally under your control
- a number of variables critical to a programme are likely to be under someone else’s control – need to get used to dealing with uncertainty

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

- you don’t really need to know that much outside your project to get it completed
- they’ll be many issues in the external environment affecting a programme...you need to be well informed and prepared to share your own learning

### **PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES**

**Mandate needed.** WASH programme is seen as having a strong mandate following the MoU in 2006. This will continue to support a programme of improvements.

**Programme Definition.** The concept of defining a programme is vital. The approach involves including a strong vision, clear portfolio of projects within the programme, an understanding of the benefits being delivered by the projects and their inter-dependencies. Documenting this defined programme is vital and these elements need to be constantly reviewed to confirm their coverage and appropriateness.

**Programme Governance**

The management or governance of a programme involves technical principles and cultural ones. Governance principles include the need for a clear approach to Communications. A Communications Plan should be drafted, discussed and agreed by key parties. This should be one of a set of new Key Documents retained at federal level by the NWCO or NWTT. These should be approved by NWSC.

An approach to Quality Management was presented. The need to constantly review the quality and the fitness for purpose of the programme, its governance and the outputs from it. Benefits Management was introduced as a concept relating to the WASH deliverables. The need for projects delivering benefits to clearly detail these outputs into the programme plans is clear. Risk Management is an area of key potential value for WASH. Understanding, recording, discussing and communicating the risks to the WASH programme would engender a sense of clear ownership for potential obstacles to achieving the MDG and UAP targets.

## Appendix E TOR for Logo Competition and News Letter

The following TORs are included to act as starting points for when the NWCO's Communication Officer takes post – it will be their responsibility to progress these two initiatives.

LOGO COMPETITION
<p><u>Purpose</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to create a logo that can then be used on all GoE WASH literature and communication material, to create a sense of shared identity across ministries and at each level of government (Federal-Regional-Zonal-Woreda-Kebela).</li> <li>2. to use the actual process of the logo competition itself to create awareness of the GoE's WASH programme and MoU on inter-ministry co-ordination.</li> </ol>
<p><u>To Whom Should the Competition be Open</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. all interested parties</li> <li>2. both national and international parties</li> </ol> <p><i>Note from authors – we feel its important that the competition is focused mainly on those working</i></p>
<p><u>What should the logo convey?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the interconnectedness of water, sanitation and hygiene promotion</li> <li>2. ownership by Government of Ethiopia, i.e. it must be differentiated from the NGO sectors' WASH programme</li> <li>3. inter-ministry co-operation</li> <li>4. should contain the word 'WASH'</li> </ol>
<p><u>Considerations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is already an Ethiopian WASH movement with a logo (showing a pair of hands being washed), but this is largely an NGO owned affair aimed at promoting public health messages within communities. This logo competition is about creating a government owned logo that symbolises inter-ministry coordination to achieve successful WASH outcomes.</li> </ol>

News Letter
<p><u>Purpose</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To further demonstrate integrated GoE WASH approach</li> <li>2. Provide updates on WASH progress</li> <li>3. Share success stories</li> <li>4. Highlight individuals</li> <li>5. Communicate summaries of key reviews</li> </ol>
<p><u>Who should the news letter be aimed at?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All government employees working on the implementation of the MoU, right down to the Kabele level</li> </ol>
<p><u>How should it be distributed?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Directly out of the NWCO in hard copy format, but using email where possible.</li> </ol>
<p><u>How often should it be produced</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Initially, twice a year to coincide with the findings of the bi-annual Joint Technical Reviews, but maybe expanding to 4 times if capacity, demand and funding allow.</li> </ol>

## Appendix F – Group Working Summaries

### **DAY ONE**

#### **Syndicate Working**

##### **Question 1**

**What is your role and responsibility for WASH activities?**

##### **Responses**

Generally a very clear understanding from the delegates of their roles and responsibilities and the role of their Ministries/Bureaux in delivering WASH.

All parties saw that they had a role for building WASH capacity in their sectors and for training trainers who could take capacity down into Regions.

There was a clear understanding from Health and Education representatives that they were responsible for initiating awareness raising strategies for health and sanitation.

##### **Question 2**

**Which parts of WASH approach are working well for you and your department?**

##### **Responses**

This created mixed responses from groups.

The NWCO was seen as functioning well and largely fulfilling its co-ordination remit. The three sector PMU's were also seen to be operating well.

Another group believed that there was good evidence of community ownership for WASH projects and that these were becoming demand driven..

##### **Question 3**

**Which parts of WASH structure & delivery are a challenge?**

##### **Responses**

A reasonable consensus formed around problems in gaining timely reports from the Woredas and Regions.

It was also agreed that high level WASH steering meetings were not happening and there was a risk of losing inertia gained following the MoU signing.

Real integration of WASH and the conveyance of this message to implementers was also seen as a real challenge.

##### **Question 4**



### **Do you think the WASH structures need to change? How?**

#### **Responses**

There were two different opinions here. One view was that the federal structures should remain unchanged but should be strengthened whilst another group believed the WASH Technical Team and Coordination Offices should be merged as there was believed to be duplication in their remits.

A common view was that of the need for more full time posts in the federal level of WASH coordination and implementation.

### **DAY TWO**

#### **Syndicate Working**

#### **Question**

#### **How would you strengthen the federal WASH structure?**

#### **Responses**

Delegates were given a list of potential ways of strengthening the Federal WASH structure, and ask to comment on which they felt most appropriate, plus offer ideas of their own.

- Full time positions in key areas
- More frequent WASH advocacy visits to regional bureaux
- Merge parts of structure (TT with CO?)
- Programme of regular meetings to be held at Steering committee level and TT level
- NWTT and NWCO to have simple email addresses – [nwco@mowr.gov.et](mailto:nwco@mowr.gov.et) ?
- NWTT to issue an annual planning calendar of events.
- NWTT, NWCO, N-PMUs and NCs to hold an annual planning workshop to produce joint annual workplans, with regular review and planning meetings.
- NWCO to develop and issue a logo and newsletter.
- NWCO to hold a regular monthly progress update meeting with DAG Water & others.
- NWCO to maintain a register of key documents
- NWTT, NWCO, N-PMUs and NCs to develop their presentation and other management skills through management and leadership training.
- NWTT, NWCO, N-PMUs and NCs to hold an annual retreat for internal lesson learning and skill development.
- NWTT to appoint a communication specialist among the WASH National Consultants.
- The availability of a fully implemented Management Information System (MIS)

In general, delegates welcomed all of the above measures, with the key areas felt to be:

- the need for full-time posts within the NWCO and PMUs;
- regular meetings on the NWTT;
- more frequent WASH advocacy visits to the regional bureaux.

There was lively debate around the need for both a NWCO and NWTT, in part reflected by the low frequency with which the NTWW has recently met.

### **DAY THREE**

#### **Syndicate Working**

**LOGO COMPETITION**

Who should the competition be open to?

What should the logo convey? example, inter-sectorial co-operation

Who should co-ordinate the competition?

**Responses**

All delegates agreed that the development of a WASH logo to convey the message imbued by the MoU was a good idea.

It was believed that it could help in developing an increased sense of unity and integration. It was also seen as a useful tool in advocacy work.

There was also a consensus that the logo competition (which should be open to all employees) should be co-ordinated by NWCO.

**NEWS LETTER**

What should be its main purposes?

How often should it be produced?

How should it be distributed?

**Responses**

Feedback was very positive about the concept of a WASH newsletter. There were small differences in its proposed frequency (quarterly or twice yearly)

It would need to convey successes, lessons learned, messages of unity and progression and be relevant to all regions.

One group believed that Regional WASH offices should be responsible for distributing out to the Woredas under their responsibility whereas the other group felt that the NWCO would be best placed to distribute it using both electronic and hard copy means.

It was commented that whilst this was a promising concept, it would need to be cognisant of available resources and ensure that whilst the WASH culture approach was vital to the success of the programme, it should not compromise the availability of personnel for implementing activities.

## Appendix G – Register of Delegates for capacity Building Workshop

### Participants List for PAWS Capacity Building Training Support on WASH Programme Management

March 24<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup>, 09

No	Name	Organisation	Responsibility	Address	
				Tele No	email
1	Erkyhun Desta	MoE	PMU Chair Person	0911 869011	erkdesred@yahoo.com
2	Chanyallew Tadesse	MoH	PMU member/expert/	0911 566994	chantad2003@yahoo.com
3	Yared Tadesse	MoH	PMU member/expert/	0911 649824	Yarkhz@yahoo.com
4	Ayalew Jifar	MoE	PMU member/expert/	0911 159929	MITTAMEKLIT@yahoo.com
5	Nega Gichile	MoE	PMU member/expert/	0911 882716	Negag2005@yahoo.com
6	Zinare Mamo	MoWR	PMU /FMSS//	0913 472027	Zinare.mamo@yahoo.com
7	Shewanesh Demeke	MoWR	PMU /Expert/	0911 825771	Shewi55@yahoo.com
8	Abate Benti	MoH	PMU /Expert/	0911 994511	ababenti@yahoo.com
9	Alemayehu Assefa	MoFED	Senior Accountant	0911 420384	alemayehu.assefa@yahoo.com
10	Berhanu Berihun	MoFED	Senior Accountant	0911 613220	berryvia@yahoo.com
11	Robel Waktola	MoWR	Coordinator	0911 626310	robeltwak@yahoo.com
12	Teketel Mathewos	SNNPR WRDB	WASH Coordinator	0911 763356	m_teketel@yahoo.com
13	Tamene Hailu	MoWR	ADB Sup. Focal person	0911 434154	tamenehf@yahoo.com
14	Tegene Gebre	MoWR	IDA Financial Officer	0913 24 20 88	tegenegebremariam@yahoo.com
15	Nuredin Mohammed	MoWR	PMU Focal person/RWSS/	0912 205583	Nuredinmohammed@yahoo.com
16	Abdulkadir Memhur	MoWR	National WASH Consultant	0911 440105	Safemales2007@gmail.com
17	Aklilu Beyene	MoWR	PMU /Financial Specialist/	0911490048	akliluzew@yahoo.com
18	Gelebo Sengogo	MoWR	WASH Coordinator	0916 823387	sengogog@yahoo.com
19	Shimeles Kebede	OWRB	WASH M&E Specialist	0911 891521	shimkebede@yahoo.com