TERMS OF REFERENCE

Urban sanitation capacity analysis in three Bangladeshi cities

13th April 2017
(revised version of TOR originally issued on 6th Feb 2017)

This research project will be an analysis of current practice, current capacity, and capacity barriers/aspirations as regards pro-poor urban sanitation in three Bangladeshi cities (Chittagong, Dhaka North and Rangpur). The analysis will require background information from secondary sources (about the current urban sanitation situation, institutional framework, etc.), but primary data collection should focus on organisational attitudes towards pro-poor sanitation; current organisational practices around sanitation planning and implementation; and organisational capacity for sanitation planning, sanitation investment planning and sanitation management. The primary institutions of study will be the City Corporations of each city; but the study should also consider national/divisional government institutions with relevant planning and technical support roles. This research will contribute a) to better understanding of how Bangladeshi City Corporations (and relevant technical support/planning agencies at higher levels of government) can work to improve their capacity for pro-poor urban sanitation planning, investment and management, and b) to assess what types of support/tools would be useful to City Corporations and relevant technical support/planning agencies.

1 Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP)

WSUP is a non-profit partnership between the private sector, NGOs and research institutions focused on solving the global problem of inadequate water and sanitation in low-income urban communities. WSUP brings lasting solutions to low-income areas by working in partnership with service providers, including water utilities, local authorities and businesses, and the communities they serve. WSUP strengthens the capacity of service providers to deliver sustainable city-wide water and sanitation services, promote good hygiene and raise the environmental standards of low-income communities.

From incorporation in 2005, WSUP has grown rapidly to a £10-12m organisation and has plans for greater expansion over the next few years. The organisation is now at a pivotal stage in its growth. In the business plan period 2016-2020, WSUP’s ambition is to raise £65 million (an annual turnover of up to £18-20 million in FY2019-20), but more importantly be recognised as a key player in the water and sanitation sector globally. It presently operates six well-developed, respected country programmes in Africa and Asia to strengthen public and private sector service providers to improve the delivery of affordable services to low-income consumers. WSUP has recently expanded its portfolio of operations to include the building and strengthening of private sector provision in urban water and sanitation services and the sale of consulting services on all aspects of low income urban WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) to disseminate learning and increase impact. All of these operations are supported by research, communications, funding and finance and resources teams.

For more information about WSUP’s vision and approach, see www.wsup.com
2 Context

Over the current business period 2016-2020, WSUP will place strong emphasis on policy influence in the urban WASH sector in its six focus countries. Tied to this, over the same period WSUP will be rolling out an urban sanitation research programme, core-funded by UKaid from the Department for International Development (Research & Evidence Division, RED), in three WSUP focus countries, namely Bangladesh, Ghana and Kenya. The core aim of this research programme will be to create national evidence-and-influence bases to drive urban sanitation sector change in the three countries. Full details of this research programme can be found in WSUP’s Research Strategy 2016-2020, which can be downloaded [here](#). This Terms of Reference describes a small piece of start-up research to be carried out in Bangladesh, to support future decision-making about useful research under this programme, and more specifically as a basis for possible future research around sanitation investment planning.

2.1 Sector influence aim

To build towards improved pro-poor urban sanitation investment in Bangladesh, and to lay the foundation for possible future research aimed at developing urban sanitation investment planning tools/guidance for use in low-income contexts in Bangladesh and elsewhere. These aims may be supported by continued WSUP research and/or influencing work beyond the lifespan of the current project.

3 Research content

3.1 Scope of work and overall approach

This will be an assessment of the current practice, current capacity, and capacity barriers/aspirations as regards urban sanitation, and in particular pro-poor urban sanitation, in three Bangladeshi cities (Chittagong, Dhaka North and Rangpur). How are sanitation investments currently made? What are major current barriers to capacity for pro-poor urban sanitation planning, investment and management, and how might these barriers be overcome? Capacity here should be understood in a broad sense, to include not only a) staffing/resourcing but also b) attitudes of leadership, management and staff and c) external factors including clear mandates and autonomy, and sufficient financial flows from national government. The study should consider not only the City Corporations, but also technical support agencies in national or divisional government.

This work will require review of secondary sources to answer background questions of the following type:

1) What are the basic geographical and demographic characteristics of the city, in term of aspects including i) size, topography, climate and water resources, ii) population size, wealth distribution, low-income population, low-income settlements, iii) administrative boundaries and administrative units, iv) nature/typology of low-income settlements?

2) What is the current urban sanitation situation (coverage, coverage disaggregations by type of service, dependence on public-communal/household toilets, existence of sanitation infrastructures, etc.)? [We require only approximate assessments of sanitation service levels (i.e. proportion of population within each major sanitation service level category). Budget will not be sufficient to run household surveys in each city, such that this assessment will need to be based on existing data and stakeholder interviews.]
3) What is the current institutional framework for urban sanitation? How are institutional responsibilities defined in national and subnational policy guidelines/standards? Which national, subnational and city-level institutions have responsibility for sanitation services? What exactly are responsibilities? How are these met? What are current challenges with the institutional framework? What is the governance arrangement within responsible institutions as regards accountability for pro-poor service delivery? [See also 5e below.]

The above questions should be considered background questions to be answered essentially through review of existing secondary sources. Primary data collection should focus on the following core questions:

4) Is there any national/city government investment in urban sanitation? If so, what amount, and what exactly is the money spent on? Are there ongoing sanitation investments in the city? What are those investments? Who has financed those investments? [This component is likely to require detailed primary analysis with access to budget information, detailed interviews with stakeholders, and efforts to identify exactly what money has been spent on, even if the budget coding is unclear.]

5) Within institutions (most notably City Corporations, but also possibly WASAs and relevant departments of national government with a role in planning and technical support to City Corporations) what is the capacity for sanitation planning in general, and more specifically for sanitation investment planning? Capacity assessment should include a) detailed evaluation of staffing, including partial allocations of staff time, and assessments of the level of expertise and commitment of relevant staff members, including identification of key staffing bottlenecks; b) detailed evaluation of resourcing, including factors like IT resources, office space and facilities like printers, availability of vehicles or other solutions for fieldwork, budget for out-sourced work (e.g. surveys), including identification of key resourcing bottlenecks; c) detailed evaluation of process constraints (for example, formal paperwork requirements for sanitation-related activities and decision-making), including identification of key process bottlenecks; d) detailed evaluation of knowledge and knowledge gaps: do relevant staff have access to the required knowledge and tools required for effective sanitation planning, investment and delivery; e) detailed evaluation of leadership and management capacity; and f) detailed evaluation of institutional and political economy constraints on leadership decision-making (e.g. unclear mandates, and/or lack of political will), including consideration of how future leadership changes might affect policy implementation.

6) Capacity should be considered broadly to include attitudes and perceptions. Within key institutions, what are individual and organisational attitudes to the following, considering decision-makers at all levels in the hierarchy:

a) Pro-poor sanitation. Is there serious individual/organisational/political commitment to improving sanitation for poor communities? Is this expressed through any sort of formal commitment (pledges, policies, KPIs, etc)? What attitudes are expressed by decision-makers and staff at different levels in the political and institutional hierarchy? Do decision-makers understand the reasons for investing in sanitation (e.g. health reasons, women’s security reasons, other reasons)? If there is any commitment, to what extent is this a genuinely pro-poor commitment and a genuine understanding of sanitation needs? For example, is pro-poor sanitation considered to equate merely to public toilets (which we would expect to typically offer a low level of service quality)? Is there any understanding of the need to go beyond public toilets to compound/household solutions? Is there any commitment to FSM, as opposed to sewerage?

b) Sanitation financing. What do decision-makers consider to be the nature of current or possible future investment in sanitation: will this primarily ODA-funded, or City Corporation-funded, or national government-funded? Alternatively, decision-makers may consider that sanitation investment is expected to come from largely low-income households. Importantly, do decision-makers recognise national/city
government responsibility to subsidise sanitation improvements for low-income communities, or do they consider that finance should primarily come from other sources (ODA, households, private investment)? Is there clear understanding that a reliance on private investment in reality translates to a reliance on household finance? Are attitudes towards the degree of responsibility of government for sanitation financing affected by judgements around settlement legality? Are attitudes (around responsibility of government for sanitation financing, around responsibility to provide basic services to people living in low-income settlements) freely expressed, or is there a feeling that this is a political decision in which technical staff should not be involved? [We here note WSUP’s view that pro-poor urban sanitation improvement is likely to require a realistic combination of a) private sector investment and associated payments by low-income households, and b) substantial government investments coupled with rich-to-poor cross-subsidy arrangements. Is this the view of key decision-makers in Bangladesh?]

c) Sanitation planning. In the view of decision-makers, whose role is it to coordinate and plan sanitation investments? What is decision-makers’ understanding of the meaning of the term “city sanitation planning”? Is this essentially a technical process, or a consultative process? What is decision-makers’ understanding of the meaning of the term “sanitation investment planning”? In the view of decision-makers, does city-level sanitation planning by the City Corporation make sense at present, or does lack of finance (or other constraints) make this meaningless? If not the City Corporation, who should take responsibility for sanitation planning? In the view of decision-makers, would it be of value to start a sanitation planning and sanitation investment planning process at the city level? Would this help access better funding, from City Corporation budgets, or from national government, or from donors? More specifically: if some sort of software tool or guidance document or other support resource were available to support sanitation investment planning (for example a software tool which allowed comparison of the costs and impacts of different investment scenarios), would this be of value? Would City Corporation teams, or technical support teams in central government, have capacity (time and skills) to effectively manage such a process? “A common criticism of donor-supported city sanitation planning processes is that these produce beautiful plans which are then not implemented. Do you see any way in which sanitation planning could be introduced in your city in a genuinely useful ways that supports real change?” How does coordination take place among different city service providers in sanitation planning? What are the existing conflicts among service providers in executing sanitation plans?

We would expect all of these components (6a, 6b, 6c) to require detailed interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, probably with transcription and rigorous textual analysis of responses.

7) Drawing on the above: what [in the view of the researchers] are the major capacity/attitude barriers to pro-poor urban sanitation improvement? What are perceived barriers to pro-poor urban sanitation improvement among the mandated institutions? How might these barriers be overcome, and what are opportunities over coming years?

The above key questions are listed in informal order to illustrate the core objectives of this research. In Appendix 1A and 1B, we propose a more structured question framework based around the Burke-Litwin model of organisational capacity.

### 3.2 Deliverables

We require three deliverables: a) an inception report for WSUP (about 5 pages) detailing the methodology to be followed, by 30th April 2017; b) an interim 3-page report of progress by 30th June 2017; c) the main final report on the findings, of anticipated maximum length 50 pages, by 31st August 2017 (draft by 31st July); d) a
research paper\(^2\) in the publication format required by a named peer-reviewed journal by 30\(^{th}\) October 2017 (draft by 31\(^{st}\) September). \(\text{[We note that a research paper will typically have maximum length of 6000 words, so that the paper will have to condense extensive detail into a short space. A possible title for this paper would be “Institutional capacity and attitudes around pro-poor sanitation planning in three Bangladeshi cities”; information around questions 1-3 above would be treated as framing information, cited as appropriate in the Introduction and possibly Discussion. Clearly documentation of findings for Bangladeshi audiences is important, but WSUP will take full responsibility for this, drawing on the researchers’ reports and verbal conversations. We would not require the research paper to be submitted to the named journal before 30\(^{th}\) September 2017, and we will make full payment on delivery of a-b-c-d to acceptable quality; but we will expect the report to be of sufficient for journal acceptence (in terms of research concept, methodology, results and analysis, and writing quality). We expect to have full opportunity, with sufficient time allocation, to review and respond to the final report in journal article format; we reserve the opportunity to withhold payment until we are satisfied with the quality of the final report, which may require no modifications, minor modifications, or major modifications. Clearly the likelihood of our requiring major modifications will be reduced by early consultation with the WSUP team at the outline planning stages (which we would suggest should already include full text of Introduction, and draft text of Abstract); WSUP will be very happy to provide detailed guidance and support on article concept, design and wording; see Appendix 2 for an initial suggestion. If there is any disagreement about interpretation of findings and questions of judgement, we will request that our views be given sensible consideration, but in the final analysis respect the researchers’ academic independence. We note the potential possibility of disagreements between WSUP and the researchers around reporting sensitive issues that might negatively affect the reputation of WSUP’s Bangladeshi partners including the City Corporations: though we will respect the researcher’s academic independence and eventual right to publish their views as they see fit, we will require careful consultation on any issue which might be considered sensitive.]}

\(3.3. \text{Location}\)

Desk-based, and stakeholder interviews (also possibly focus groups and detailed analysis of documentation) in the three cities and at national government level in Dhaka.

\(3.4 \text{Methodology}\)

We envisage that this research will be centrally based on a) detailed review of existing information (mainly in the grey literature and unpublished documents, possibly in the academic literature) on sanitation coverage levels and other relevant aspects in the three cities; and b) extensive Key Informant Interviews, and possibly focus groups, in each of the three cities and also including any relevant departments of national or divisional government. Key Informant Interviews will be expected to be rigorously designed, implemented, recorded and analysed: i.e. this should be structured qualitative data collection subject to careful design and analysis. Among other things, this will require i) structured consideration of key questions to be answered by this study; ii) careful identification of informants to be interviewed; iii) development of semi-structured question guides for each category of interview; iv) recording of all interviews (with interviewee consent) and transcription of all interviews\(^2\) to provide a solid basis for analysis. In Appendix 1 we present a possible conceptual model to be used for structuring this work: the Burke-Litwin model.

Assessment of organisational capacity and attitudes is the core focus of this work, and we anticipate that the team should include at least one person with experience/expertise in assessing organisational capacity and attitudes, i.e. the aggregated capacity and attitudes of the organisation, and of key departments and

---

\(^1\) For example, *Journal of Water, Sanitation & Hygiene for Development.*

\(^2\) We accept that for some interview types full transcription may not be required (for example, conversations about sanitation coverage); but where the focus is on capacity, attitudes and perceptions of barriers, transcription will be necessary. The proposed methodology should identify which interviews will be transcribed, and which not.
individuals at different levels within the organisation. We would expect capacity and attitudes to be assessed in a structured and rigorous way: see the example approach given in Appendix 1.

### 3.5 Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone/deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30th April 2016</td>
<td>Start date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th May 2017</td>
<td>Inception report (about 5 pages) detailing methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th June 2017</td>
<td>Interim report on progress (about 3 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st July 2017</td>
<td>Draft final report (probably about 50 pages) submitted to WSUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st August 2017</td>
<td>Final version of final report submitted to WSUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th September 2017</td>
<td>Draft journal paper (probably maximum 6000 words) submitted to WSUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st October 2017</td>
<td>Final version of journal paper submitted to WSUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We stress that this is a 6-month project with no possibility of costed or no-cost extension, and research design will need to take this into account.

### 4 Team profile

The team should include the following expertise:

A) A Lead Researcher from the Lead Institution, with strong understanding of the overall aims of the project, and capacity to coordinate a team with specific expertise in particular areas and major inputs to research thinking and outcomes. The Lead Researcher may take responsibility for intellectual oversight and high-level management and also responsibility for day-to-day management; alternatively, the team may include a Project Manager responsible for day-to-day management.

B) A researcher (within the Lead Institution or subcontracted) with strong experience and expertise around the rigorous assessment of organisational capacity and attitudes. See also D.

C) A researcher or sector expert (within the Lead Institution or subcontracted) with strong experience and expertise around approaches to city sanitation planning. [This could possibly be the same person as A or B.]

D) A social/political sciences researcher with strong experience and expertise around design of rigorous qualitative data collection processes (key informant interviews, focus group discussions). [This could possibly be the same person as B.]

E) A team member with strong capacity to support production of high-quality English-language written reports, with careful attention to clear structure and clear wording.

In addition to team members, the Lead Researcher may choose to get inputs from key sector experts. Nonetheless, this should be primarily seen as a primary research study collecting high-quality data on organisational capacity and attitudes; not as a study based primarily on consultation of a panel of experts. The primary expertise required is assessment of organisational capacity and attitudes, following a rigorous qualitative research methodology.

---

3 See:

- [http://www.wateraid.org/](http://www.wateraid.org/)
- [http://citysanitationplanning.org/](http://citysanitationplanning.org/)
If necessary, WSUP can directly contract members of the team who do not form part of the Lead Institution.

5 Intellectual property

We would expect the researchers to retain intellectual property rights for this research, subject to the deliverables requirements indicated above, and with full rights granted to WSUP to reproduce and use the findings of the research as we see fit, including in WSUP publications drawing on the research findings.

6 Reporting and liaison

The Task Manager for this work will be Guy Norman, WSUP Director of Research & Evaluation. There will also be close liaison with Farzana Begum, Research & Policy Lead, WSUP Bangladesh, and Habibur Rahman, Sanitation Lead, WSUP Bangladesh.

7 Contract terms

A standard WSUP research contract format will be used, subject to the Consultant's agreement with the terms.

8 Payments

8.1 Payment schedule

Payment will be 20% on contract signature, 30% on delivery of acceptable inception report, and 50% on acceptance by WSUP of final deliverables of acceptable quality. All payments will require prior invoicing.

8.2 Budget

Up to GBP 45,000, inclusive of VAT (sales tax) or other taxes; this amount will be expected to cover all costs including travel costs and any sub-contracting. We note that the Lead Institution’s total overheads should not constitute more than 15% of total budget. If the Lead Institution requires WSUP to separately contract individuals from other institutions, these amounts must be subtracted from the total of GBP 45,000. Over and above the budget of GBP 45,000, WSUP will additionally consider bearing a cost of up to GBP 1,500 for journal publication, if the selected journal for publication of this research requires payment for open-access; this will be subject to a time-limit of article acceptance for publication within 6 months of the termination of this contract.
APPENDIX 1A: The Burke-Litwin Model of Organisational Performance and Change

The Burke-Litwin Model is one possible conceptual framework for this research. It is a causal model, which encourages consideration of the causal dependencies between the different “boxes”.

The schematic below is simplified; the original schematic shows more complex causal relations (indicated by arrows); see: https://www.slideshare.net/alexanderravesteyn/a-rough-guide-to-organizational-development


For a possible approach to using this framework to structure the present research, see next page.
APPENDIX 1B: Proposed methodology using Burke-Litwin framework

We here suggest an approach by which the Burke-Litwin framework might be used to provide a conceptual structure for the present research:

- The assessment should consider two things (conceptually separate, but very possibly explored in the same interviews): \(a\) what are current capacity/attitudes, including external enabling/resourcing factors, and \(b\) what future capacity/attitudes (again including external enabling/resourcing factors) are required to achieve strong progress in pro-poor urban sanitation? Question \(b\) may consider the perceptions of individuals within the organisations, individuals outside the organisations, and the researchers’ own analysis. We note that it is very possible that current capacity/attitudes are judged highly inadequate, in view of external and internal factors. It is possible that City Corporations receive very little finance from national government, and/or have little control over how to spend investment finance coming from national government, such that there is currently little scope for them to play a significant role in sanitation; if that is the situation, it will clearly be important for this study to assess what might need to change.

- The assessment should focus on capacity for pro-poor urban sanitation, but in some contexts this may require wider consideration of the City Corporation’s capacity/attitudes as an organisation. For example, attitudes around city government responsibility for supporting improved sanitation in informal settlements and formalised low-income communities are likely related to wider attitudes around the level and nature of city responsibility in these areas. Similarly, understanding capacity for sanitation planning may require wider consideration of capacity for urban planning more generally.

- The assessment requires careful definition of exactly what current and future mandates/responsibilities of the City Corporation are as regards pro-poor sanitation. Initially, we suggest that the focus should be on sanitation planning, sanitation investment planning, and sanitation management. But this may evolve as the researchers gain a better understanding of current and future responsibilities: indeed, understanding how city governments view the nature of their future responsibilities is an important component of this work. We note a particular interest in \(a\) attitudes around city budget allocation to pro-poor sanitation, and \(b\) attitudes around the level of responsibility of city corporations (do they accept strong responsibility including significant financing/management/delivery responsibility, or do they essentially displace all responsibility to private operators and associated poor household payments?).

- We note our particular interest in assessing what type of tools and guidance around sanitation planning and sanitation investment planning might be useful, as a basis for possible future research around development of sanitation planning tools. If there is value in development of some sort of sanitation investment planning tool, who would use it? It may be considered that City Corporations simply have inadequate resourcing and autonomy to enable them to play a significant sanitation planning role, such that sanitation investment planning tools or guidance would likely be of little value. It might be considered that tools and/or guidance could be of value, but for technical support agencies rather than City Corporations. This area should be considered an important component of the work, but embedded within the wider assessment of capacity and attitudes.

- As noted, the study should consider not just City Corporations, but also relevant technical support in national and divisional government. One possible approach here is to consider each City Corporation plus the relevant technical support agencies as a single functional organisation, whose capacity needs to be considered as a whole. But clearly this is somewhat complex, and may require some consideration of alternative future scenarios (i.e. alternative future distributions of responsibilities and skills, alternative future relationships between City Corporations and technical support agencies). The researchers may also consider that separate evaluation of the capacity of technical support agencies is necessary (instead of, or in addition to, their consideration as a functional component of each City Corporation’s capacity).
Below, we list the different areas of the Burke-Litwin model, and example questions in each area. However, this is just an initial outline, and will require significant further work. Clearly, the researchers may decide that some areas require more detailed exploration than others: for example, if the current staffing of urban sanitation is minimal, there may be little value in detailed assessment of current 4A) Tasks and Individual Skills. We encourage the researchers to use the Burke-Litwin model as their framework, but to use it in a flexible and responsive way; it should not get in the way of clear thinking about how to meet the objectives of this research.

1. External Environment. This includes such factors as markets, legislation, competition and the economy. All of these will have consequences for organisations. In the specific context of the present research, key elements here are a) high-level political commitment, and strongly dependent on this b) institutional framework/s, mandates and national policies, and c) national government budget allocations to urban sanitation and to City Corporations, and any associated rules round how these budget allocations should be spent.

Example questions:
- Is there high-level political commitment to pro-poor urban sanitation?
- What is the current institutional framework for urban sanitation? What institutional frameworks and national policies exist, and to what extent are these followed?
- Which national, subnational and city-level institutions have responsibility for sanitation services? What exactly are responsibilities? How are these met?
- What are current challenges with the institutional framework?
- What are current national government budget allocations to City Corporations for urban sanitation? Are these allocations sufficient? Are there any associated rules round how these budget allocations should be spent?

We stress that the Burke-Litwin model, and the study design approach outlined above, are one possibility: the researcher is free to propose some alternative model/approach if they consider it more appropriate. However, our view is that the Burke-Litwin model, with its clear representation of causal relationships (“external factors influence leadership influence management influences staff influences outcomes”) is a strong and readily comprehensible model that can provide a useful framework for this research.

In what follows, we briefly outline the different areas of the Burke-Litwin model, and suggest example questions in each. As noted, these are just example questions, and this will need significantly more work.
2A. Mission and Strategy. An organisation’s mission articulates its reason for existing. It is the foundation upon which all activity should be built. The strategy then sets out, in broad terms, how the organisation will go about achieving its mission. In the specific context of the present research, key elements here are any documented statements of the City Corporation’s mission and strategy, in regard to its entire functions, and in specific regard to sanitation and more generally to basic services for low-income settlements including informal settlements/slums.

Example questions:
- At the City Corporation level, is there any sort of formal commitment (pledges, policies, KPIs, etc) to improving sanitation for poor communities, including informal communities? Are there any wider commitments to provision of basic services to low-income communities, and to urban development more generally? [Note here that we would expect City Corporation mission to be defined not only internally, but also by national government legislation, policies and attitudes, i.e. external factors.]

2B. Leadership. This considers the attitudes and behaviour of senior leaders and how these behaviours are perceived by the organisation as a whole. The way in which change is implemented and accepted through the organisation will be largely influenced by the top team. In the specific context of the present research, this relates primarily to attitudes/perceptions of senior CC decision-makers towards sanitation and towards sanitation and more generally to basic services for low-income settlements including informal settlements/slums; this would include perceptions around degree of CC financing responsibility for such services.

Example questions:
- Is there serious leadership commitment to improving sanitation for poor communities, including informal communities? Do leadership decision-makers understand the reasons for investing in sanitation (e.g. health reasons, women’s security reasons, other reasons)? If there is any commitment, to what extent is this a genuinely pro-poor commitment and a genuine understanding of sanitation needs? For example, is pro-poor sanitation considered to equate merely to public toilets (which we would expect to typically offer a low level of service quality)? Is there any understanding of the need to go beyond public toilets to compound/household solutions? Is there any commitment to FSM, as opposed to sewerage? If there is strong commitment to private sector solutions, is this a nuanced understanding that recognises that the City Corporation will need to invest significant resource alongside; or is it a simplistic view that the private sector (and associated poor householder payments) will essentially be able to resolve the issues without major City Corporation investment?
- What do leadership decision-makers consider to be the nature of current or possible future investment in sanitation: will this primarily ODA-funded, or City Corporation-funded, or national government-funded? Alternatively, decision-makers may consider that sanitation investment is expected to come from largely low-income households. Do decision-makers recognise national/city government responsibility to subsidise sanitation improvements for low-income communities, or do they consider that finance should primarily come from other sources (ODA, households, private investment)? If ODA finance is considered key, to what extent will this align to and be governed by city-led planning? Is there clear understanding that a reliance on private investment in reality translates to a reliance on household finance? Are attitudes towards the degree of responsibility of government for sanitation financing affected by judgements around settlement legality? Are attitudes (around responsibility of government for sanitation financing, around responsibility to provide basic services to people living in low-income settlements) freely expressed, or is there a feeling that this is a political decision in which technical staff should not be involved? [We here note WSUP’s view that pro-poor urban sanitation improvement is likely to require a realistic combination of a) private sector investment and associated payments by low-income households, and b) substantial government investments coupled with rich-to-poor cross-subsidy arrangements. Is this the view of key decision-makers in Bangladesh?]
- In the view of leadership decision-makers, whose role is it to coordinate and plan sanitation investments? What is decision-makers’ understanding of the meaning of the term “city sanitation planning”? Is this essentially a technical process, or a consultative process? What is decision-makers’ understanding of the meaning of the term “sanitation investment planning”? In the view of decision-makers, does city-level sanitation planning by the City Corporation make sense at present, or does lack of finance (or other constraints) make this meaningless? If not the City Corporation, who should take responsibility for sanitation planning? In the view of decision-makers, would it be of value to start a sanitation planning and sanitation investment planning process at the city level? Would this help access better funding, from City Corporation budgets, or from national government, or from donors?
- More specifically: if some sort of software tool or guidance document or other support resource were available to support sanitation investment planning (for example a software tool which allowed comparison of the costs and impacts of different investment scenarios), would this be of value? Would City Corporation teams, or technical
support teams in central government, have capacity (time and skills) to effectively manage such a process? A common criticism of donor-supported city sanitation planning processes is that these produce beautiful plans which are then not implemented. Do you see any way in which sanitation planning could be introduced in your city in a genuinely useful ways that supports real change?”

2C. Organisational Culture. Organisational culture can be described as “the way we do things around here”. It considers the beliefs, behaviours, values and conventions that prevail in an organisation. In the specific context of the present research, this may relate to attitudes, perceptions and behaviours of people throughout the organisation, not just leadership (compare 2B).

Example questions:
- Is there an organisational culture which favours creative and effective progress, and which includes genuine commitment to poor communities including informal settlements?

3A. Structure. Structure relates to the way in which relationships and responsibilities are structured within the organisation. The study of structure should not be confined to hierarchical structure; rather it should be a function-based approach to structure focusing on the responsibility, authority, communication, decision-making and control structure that exists between people in the organisation.

Example questions:
- How are responsibilities for sanitation decision-making structured within the current organisation?
- How might such responsibilities be structured in future?

3B. Management Practice. How closely do managers conform to the organisation’s strategy when dealing with employees and resources? Most notably in the context of the present research: is the mission/strategy as regards urban sanitation (and basic services for the poor more generally) translated into management priorities, budget allocation decisions, etc?

Example questions:
- How are pro-poor sanitation investments in the city currently planned, developed, financed and implemented?
- Is there any government investment in urban sanitation? If so, what amount, and what exactly is the money spent on? [This component is likely to require detailed primary analysis with access to budget information, detailed interviews with stakeholders, and efforts to identify exactly what money has been spent on, even if the budget coding is unclear.]
- Do management allocate internal resource (budgets, staff time, etc) that is consistent with mission/vision and consistent with leadership attitudes?
- Independently of whether internal resource allocation is consistent with vision and leadership attitudes, is it sufficient and appropriate to achieve progress in pro-poor urban sanitation? Is pro-poor urban sanitation under-prioritised?
- [Here it may be useful to repeat some of the attitude/perception questions outlined under 2B above, probably with appropriate wording modifications, considering the attitudes/perceptions of middle management as opposed to senior leadership]

3C. Systems. Systems includes all types of policies and procedures with regards to both the people and the operations of the organisation. In the specific context of the present research, what policies and procedures govern pro-poor sanitation planning, investment and management.

Example questions:
- Are teams governed by any sort of informal policies and procedures around sanitation and pro-poor sanitation?
- What are current systems and processes as regards sanitation planning, investment and management? What are formal paperwork requirements for sanitation-related activities and decision-making, what are key process bottlenecks?
- What knowledge and decision-support tools do teams currently use? Is there potential value in development of additional resources and tools, and more specifically for development of tools to support sanitation investment planning?

4. Work Unit Climate. This relates to the attitudes and feelings of employees as a group: also relationships of employees with their team members and members of other teams.

Example questions:
Does the current team work effectively as a team, and in relation to other teams? If not, how might the situation be improved?

4A. Tasks and Individual Skills. What are the demands of specific (current and potential future) roles, what skills and knowledge do employees need in order to fulfil task responsibilities, are roles and employees well matched?

Example questions:
- What is current staffing, including partial allocations of staff time?
- What is the level of expertise of relevant staff members, what are key staffing bottlenecks?
- Are staff adequately supported with basic work infrastructure (IT resources, office space and facilities like printers, availability of vehicles or other solutions for fieldwork, budget for out-sourced work e.g. surveys), what are key resourcing bottlenecks?
- What should future staffing and resourcing look like?
- Is there capacity for use of tools to support sanitation investment planning? Is there appetite for this? What sort of tools and resources might be useful? Would this need an expansion of team size/skills? Would such expertise best be located in the City Corporation, or in technical support agencies, or in both?

4B. Motivation Level. Are employees well motivated? Are incentives in place? What might appropriate motivational triggers be?

Example questions:
- Are staff currently motivated and incentivised? If not, how might motivation be improved?

4C. Individual Values and Needs. What are individuals’ own perceptions about their role and function? What factors might increase job satisfaction and motivation?

Example questions:
- Are staff currently motivated and incentivised? If not, how might motivation be improved?
- [Here it may also be useful to explore some of the attitude/perception questions outlined under 2B above, with appropriate wording modifications, considering the attitudes/perceptions of staff, as opposed to management and leadership]

We stress once again that these are just example questions, and mapping out the full question set will require further work.
APPENDIX 2: Thinking about the final journal article

In designing this research, we suggest that maybe be useful to have in mind a picture of what the eventual peer-reviewed journal article might look like. Here we suggest a possible guide-wording for the eventual title and abstract:

**Applying the Burke-Litwin model to assess city government capacity for pro-poor urban sanitation improvement: experience from three Bangladeshi cities**

The Burke-Litwin model of organisational capacity was used as a conceptual framework for an assessment of the capacity of three City Corporations in Bangladesh (Dhaka North, Chittagong and Rangpur) for pro-poor urban sanitation improvement. Capacity is considered in a broad sense, including not only staffing and resourcing, but also external constraints, and attitudes of leadership and staff towards pro-poor service provision. The research was based primarily on extensive semi-structured interviews with key informants in the City Corporations and relevant technical support agencies in national government, and considered what additional resourcing and organisational change would be required to make strong progress towards universal sanitation coverage. The findings indicate [etc etc etc] [including general conclusion about key capacity gaps and key ways forward] [including any conclusion about the potential value of sanitation investment planning tools] Finally, we briefly discuss the usefulness of the Burke-Litwin model as a framework for capacity assessment in the municipal urban services context.