

Urban Sanitation Research Initiative

RESEARCH CALL Research around sanitation surcharges included in property taxes in Ghana

29th January 2018

This research project is commissioned under the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative, a 2017–2020 research programme (www.wsup.com/research) core-funded by UK aid from the UK government, and managed by Water & Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) in formal partnership with the Environmental Health & Sanitation Directorate, the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources (EHSD), Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), and the Institute of Local Government Studies (ILGS). This project will deliver research around property tax ‘sanitation surcharges’ in Ghana. This should include consideration of the sanitation surcharge introduced in Ga West Municipality from January 2017, but may possibly also include parallel research a) around similar surcharges elsewhere in Ghana (Akwapim North Municipality?), and/or b) around the potential for introduction of a surcharge of this type in another Ghanaian municipality (Kumasi?). In Ga West, the surcharge is a 10% additional amount on property tax, and the revenue generated is stated to be ring-fenced for sanitation. In each study location (1-3 locations, to be determined), researchers will a) [*where relevant*] assess the history of the surcharge to date (notably amounts raised and how spent); b) explore taxpayer attitudes to the [*existing or potential*] surcharge, through both qualitative research and large-scale survey; c) explore decision-maker attitudes to the [*existing or potential*] surcharge; and d) identify, through structured stakeholder consultation and financial analysis, possible expenditures of revenues generated. In addition, researchers will lead, in liaison with WSUP, a structured process to support decision-makers in Ga West and elsewhere in Ghana in thinking about how to take this model forward in a cost-effective and pro-poor manner.

Maximum budget under this Call: GBP 80,0000

Bids due: Before UK 1700 hours on Monday 19th February 2018.

1 About Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP)

WSUP is a not-for-profit company that helps transform cities to benefit the millions who lack access to water and sanitation. We were created in 2005 as a response to the unprecedented urban explosion that has left cities unable to provide basic services, such as access to a toilet or drinking water, to low-income communities. We are based in the UK with offices in six countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. Since inception we have helped nearly 15 million people access better water and sanitation services.

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 to 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 About the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative

This research is being commissioned under the WSUP-led Urban Sanitation Research Initiative (www.wsup.com/research). The Urban Sanitation Research Initiative is a 2017–2020 research initiative currently focused in Bangladesh, Ghana and Kenya. The primary aim of this initiative is to deliver research that builds national evidence bases around pro-poor urban sanitation, and that drives policy change and wider sector change in the three focus countries. The initiative is managed by Water & Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) and core-funded by UK aid from the UK government.

Within this wider initiative, the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Ghana is designed to feed into the national evidence base around pro-poor urban sanitation in Ghana, helping to drive policy change and wider sector change. The Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Ghana is managed by WSUP in strategic partnership with the Environmental Health & Sanitation Directorate (EHSD) of the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources (MSWR), Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), and the Institute of Local Government Studies (ILGS).

The Urban Sanitation Research Initiative focuses on five broad areas: 1) sanitation businesses and market development; 2) institutional frameworks and capacity; 3) sanitation models, user behaviour, and user experience; 4) public finance and sanitation planning; and 5) regulation and smart enforcement. This Call is in Area 4.

For more information about the vision and aims of the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative, and for information about other Calls, see www.wsup.com/research

2.1 Sector influence aim

To generate evidence that supports development of the recently introduced sanitation surcharge in Ga West, such that it proves effective in terms of revenue generation, and cost-effective and pro-poor in terms of expenditure. To generate evidence that will enable other Ghanaian municipalities to consider replication of this model.

3 Work required under this contract

3.1 Background

The majority of Ghana's urban residents (73%) rely on shared sanitation facilities, which are either compound toilets (shared by a few households) or public toilets (usually fee-paying and accessible to all). Most toilet facilities (including individual toilets) are onsite technologies. Faecal sludge management services (related to onsite sanitation facilities) are beginning to develop, but face significant barriers to achieving scale-up. Municipalities, together with private operators, increasingly offer emptying services in the form of mechanical suction and manual collection, and there are over 100 privately-operated vacuum trucks registered in Accra and Kumasi. Such services are not appropriate for low-income areas that large trucks cannot access. Treatment services remain inadequate; in Accra and Kumasi respectively, an estimated 72% and 43% of the sludge produced ends up untreated in the environment.

Institutional reform of the water and sanitation sector followed a general election in December 2016, and a new Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources was created. Given the seriousness attached to sanitation service delivery, there are plans to create a National Sanitation Authority, potentially in 2018. The MSWR has (informally) indicated that the NSA will have a regulatory function – setting national standards for sanitation – and will manage a National Sanitation Fund (although it is not entirely clear what role this proposed fund would have). At the local level, Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDA) are responsible for implementing sanitation policy and strategy.

The main sources of public funds (excluding donor funding) for urban sanitation are: government transfers to MMDAs; MMDAs' expenditure from own funds; and government transfers to national institutions responsible for sanitation (the EHSD, now incorporated into MSWR). MMDAs have full discretion over their spending and there is no obligation to spend on sanitation. TrackFin estimates that domestic public expenditure on sanitation in Ghana amounted to around USD 11.3 million in 2014, which represents only 2% of national expenditure on sanitation. The bulk of national sanitation spending comes from households rather than governmental bodies.

The Ga West Municipal Assembly (a district of Greater Accra) approved in October 2016 a "10% surcharge on property rate to be ring-fenced for sanitation services within the Municipality", with effect from January 2017. The Assembly documentation states that "the aim of this surcharge is to ensure adequate funding for sanitation services"; note that there is no explicit reference to pro-poor services. Our current understanding is that the surcharge has been added to the property tax, and property tax rates have increased as a result, but it is not described as a 'sanitation surcharge' or similar on taxpayers' bills; and we do not currently know what amounts have been allocated to sanitation (see also Footnote 1 on next page). We understand that a similar model may have been applied in Akwapim North Municipality in Ghana's Eastern Region, but we do not currently have information on this.

3.2 Aims, approach and design

We are seeking research that helps identify ways of ensuring that surcharges of this type are **a)** collected effectively (i.e. in significant amount), and **b)** disbursed in a cost-effective and pro-poor manner. This reflects our corresponding understanding of the risks **a)** that administrative or other issues may mean that the amount collected is sub-maximal, and **b)** that the money collected may in fact not be ring-fenced for sanitation, and/or may be spent in non-cost-effective ways, and/or may not be spent to the benefit of poorer communities. We are seeking research that supports effective development of this surcharge in Ga West and potentially other Ghanaian municipalities; but we are also looking for research that contributes to international understanding of taxation/cross-subsidy models of this type for urban sanitation.

To achieve these goals, we require research that responds to the following questions, in Ga West alone, or in Ga West and 1-2 other locations (see “Locations” below):

- 1) History and process:**¹ What has been the history of the surcharge to date, in terms of **a)** messaging, **b)** revenue generation (process, demographics, amounts), **c)** revenue management, and **d)** revenue expenditure? How is the surcharge being messaged to taxpayers, if at all? Has revenue collected to date been ring-fenced for sanitation; if so, how is sanitation defined? Is there any specific commitment or process to ensure pro-poor expenditure of all or a subset of amounts raised? What processes are in place for control of revenue expenditure? [This component may require wider consideration of budgetary processes within the municipality or municipalities of study. It will clearly require access to budgetary data, which in the case of Ga West GWMA are committed to provide.]²
- 2) Taxpayer attitudes:** What are taxpayer attitudes to this surcharge, and to what extent are these aligned with pro-poor expenditure of this surcharge? What factors affect taxpayer judgements about this surcharge and the way it is spent? What might encourage taxpayers to accept a more pro-poor model (implying reduction of direct own-benefit)?³ [Taxpayer attitudes to the surcharge will of course be embedded within wider attitudes to property tax, so we would expect this research component to look at both general attitudes to property tax and specific attitudes to the ring-fenced sanitation component.]
- 3) Decision-maker attitudes:** What are decision-maker attitudes to this surcharge, and in particular to the ways in which it should be spent? Is there strong commitment to strict ring-fencing for sanitation? If so, what is “sanitation” understood to mean? Do decision-makers have a sufficiently strong understanding of effective sanitation models? Do decision-makers consider that this should be spent in a pro-poor manner (i.e. all expenditure targeted at low-income communities and/or at service

¹ This question is of course only relevant to municipalities in which a surcharge exists, i.e. Ga West and possibly Akwapim North; it is not relevant to *potential* locations (such as Kumasi); by contrast, the remaining questions 2-4 are equally relevant to potential locations.

² A recent consultancy study by Ghanaian consultancy People’s Dialogue on Human Settlement (commissioned by WSUP for GWMA) notes the following: “It was observed that the property rate bill sent to property owners [does] not have any information in respect of the 10% surcharge. There was also no evidence of documentation [of the] 10% surcharge on property rates in the financial statement of the Assembly. In addition, [there was] no evidence of an account and or money from property rates set aside or ring-fenced to support sanitation services. Information gathered revealed that the 10% surcharge for sanitation is deducted from the property rate only when the Assembly has actually received the money. The money is then [reported to be] applied directly to support expenditures in sanitation service, mainly as part of Income Generation Funds. There was no evidence to show how resource from the surcharge is apportioned to the different types of sanitation-related services.” Thus there currently appears to be no clear tracking of revenue generation and allocation; however, this situation may change by the time this research starts. Property tax revenue collected over the first 7 months of 2017 was around 153,000 GHS = \$33,700, which is about 43% of budgeted collection; 10% of the collected amount is about \$3,400 over 7 months. Potentially (if budgeted collection were fully achieved), the surcharge could raise about 53,000 GHS = \$11,700 per annum. [The full consultancy report will be shared with the successful bidder.]

³ In particular, we should note that many low-income people, as tenants, do not pay property taxes directly themselves. Furthermore, the property tax database in Ga West is out of date and incomplete: we understand that many properties are either not on the census or not assessed, and there are big disparities in assessed rate between properties assessed recently and 20 or 30 years ago.

types relevant for low-income households; or partially pro-poor, in that low-income people benefit more than they pay, and higher-income people and businesses pay more than they benefit? If not, what factors might encourage decision-makers to spend the funds in a pro-poor manner?

4) Possible expenditure models: In order to explore in a meaningful way the questions in (2) and (3) above, it will be important to have an understanding of cost-effective and pro-poor ways in which these revenues could potentially be spent. We do not expect this research to become a detailed sanitation planning exercise, but we envisage that this research will include structured consultation with key urban sanitation specialists including but not limited to WSUP Ghana, to identify possible expenditures of the revenues raised. In particular, this will allow reasoned judgements about whether decision-makers' have a good understanding of what appropriate, cost-effective, pro-poor expenditures might be; about decision-makers' attitudes to these types of expenditure; and about whether decision-makers' expectations are reasonable in view of the revenues that could be generated by this route.

Locations: We know that a property tax sanitation surcharge model is being applied in Ga West, and certainly this research should look at the Ga West case. However, we also encourage a wider view. We understand that a similar model has been applied in Akwapim North in Ghana's Eastern Region, and it would clearly be of interest to additionally respond to questions 1-4 in that context. Furthermore, if the researchers (in liaison with WSUP or other stakeholders) identify another municipality with strong appetite to introduce this model (Kumasi?), then questions 2-3 could also be very usefully considered in that location. We request that bidders make an initial judgement on this at bidding stage, but ideally the proposal should retain flexibility to expand from Ga West to 1 or 2 other locations (within available budget, i.e. this would require resource allocation modifications to achieve this within the existing budget). Bidders are free to submit a proposal with more than one methodology/budget option; but equally, we are happy with proposals that present a single option, but retain flexibility for modifications during the first few months of this research contract. If you wish to submit a proposal for Ga West only, without flexibility to expand, please make this explicit in your bid.

This is a brief outline of the central questions to be answered by this research, and we would expect a more detailed understanding to be developed by bidders at proposal stage, and then in more detail by the selected research team (in consultation with WSUP and other key stakeholders including Ga West Municipality) over the first few months of this research.

We stress our core interest in research around the extent to which this surcharge is (or could be) pro-poor, and in research that generates recommendations around how to ensure that this surcharge is raised in significant amount and spent in ways which are cost-effective and pro-poor.

We also stress that we will favour proposals with a strong empirical quantitative component, because in our view such approaches **a)** tend to enhance rigour and **b)** tend to be perceived as more rigorous and interesting by policy-makers. As an example of this, we refer bidders to a somewhat similar piece of previous research carried out for WSUP by Aquaya,⁴ looking at willingness of water utility customers in Kenya to pay a little bit extra on their water bill as a pro-poor sanitation surcharge. In line with this, we envisage that this research in Ghana would look at all four questions above, but would dedicate significant resource to structured questionnaire survey of taxpayer attitudes.

⁴ <https://www.wsup.com/blog/are-water-utility-customers-in-kenya-willing-to-pay-more-to-improve-sanitation-in-low-income-communities/>

We envisage that this research contract will also include a structured consultation/dissemination process through which relevant actors (including from Ga West and any other municipalities included in the study, and relevant national government agencies including EHSD-MSWR) are guided through a process of analysis to identify ways forward to ensure that this sanitation surcharge is raised effectively, and spent cost-effectively and equitably.

Finally, we note that the research questions outlined above, and associated methodology proposals, reflect our own understanding of the most appropriate research to meet the over-arching aims described in the first paragraph of this section 3.2. However, we are open to other research approaches which meet these aims. We are very happy to respond to clarification queries prior to bid submission (erl@wsup.com)

3.3 Core requirements for work under the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative

The following are core requirements for work carried out under the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative:

- 1) Research must fully meet relevant research ethics requirements:** All research must be carried out in compliance with research ethics standards as rigorous as would be applied in a UK setting, and in compliance with the law and with best practice in the country or countries in which research is carried out.
- 2) Research design should pay careful attention to gender equality/equity considerations:** Bidders should explicitly ensure that their proposed design, analysis and research-into-policy work is taking full account of gender equality and equity.
- 3) Research-into-policy should be considered a core element:** Research-into-policy should be considered a core element at all levels and stages of research design; not an after-thought once the “real research” has been completed.

For more detailed explanation, see the Core Requirements Form attached as Appendix A, which must be completed by all bidders and submitted with the bid (see Section 9).

3.4 Deliverables

Under the present Call, we require the following deliverables: **a)** an *inception report* (about 5 pages) detailing the methodology to be followed, within 2-4 weeks of contract signature, **b)** brief *monthly updates* on progress, **c)** a *research paper* in the publication format required by a named peer-reviewed journal, and **d)** a *final report* written for Ga West Municipality and/or for the Ghanaian urban WASH sector more widely (to be decided subsequently), giving full detail of findings. The *inception report* (a) must include a specific short section indicating how the Core Requirements (Appendix A) are being met. The *research paper* is a requirement under this contract: we would expect this to focus on a particular aspect of the research (for example, taxpayer attitudes to the surcharge), and we would expect initial thinking about the nature of this research paper to start at proposal stage. We would expect the *final report* to be wider in scope than the research paper, and written to present findings to Ghanaian stakeholders (including a carefully written Executive Summary with key findings and policy recommendations).

Over and above this, bidders may choose to offer other appropriate print and other deliverables designed for technical dissemination and for policy-influence within Ghana. Bidders may also choose to offer PowerPoints, workshop presentations, blog posts or videos for the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative website. We certainly have a preference for some sort of interim dissemination deliverable that can enhance the potential of this work to impact on policy.

All deliverables should be written and laid out to publication-ready standard, with strong attention to clarity of structure, quality of wording, and professional layout; reports of poor quality will not be accepted.

If the researcher judges it necessary, WSUP will respect embargo on reporting findings to be published in a peer-reviewed journal. However, this is a policy influence programme, and WSUP will expect to be able to make public headline findings (typically understood to mean any content that is included in the Abstract, though with re-wording, and potentially including basic methodology detail and headline findings not included in the Abstract but required for reasonable understanding of the study's central findings) before journal publication. We expect a mutually constructive approach on this: WSUP recognising that the researcher may not be able to make full findings public before journal publication, the researcher understanding that WSUP must have the option to immediately disseminate headline findings to key audiences.

3.5 Schedule

| Date | Milestone/deliverable |
|---|---|
| Before UK 1700 of Monday 19 th February 2018 | Bid submission |
| 5 th February 2018 | Contract signature and start date |
| 5 th March 2018 | Inception report outlining methodology to be used [<i>in the event of uncertainty about locations for this research, WSUP may allow more time for preparation of the Inception Report; to be discussed with winning bidder</i>] |
| Main implementation phase | [<i>Schedule for print and other dissemination deliverables to be indicated by bidder, see guidance above; note preference for phased deliverables</i>] |
| 20 th December 2018 | Final deliverables received: Note 1: The deliverables schedule proposed by the bidder should specify draft report submission dates as well as final report submission dates, with draft reports submitted to WSUP for review <u>at least 4 weeks prior to the final submission date</u> ; final reports will be expected to respond adequately to review/improvement comments from WSUP and other reviewers identified by WSUP. Note 2: Where a deliverable is an article for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, this should be submitted to WSUP and partners in draft and final form, like other types of deliverables. ⁵ |

⁵ We do not require research papers to be submitted to the named journal by the specified deliverable date; but we will non-contractually expect publication, and will favour bidders who have a significant academic publication record and own-incentives for prompt journal publication. We (WSUP and the partners of the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Ghana) expect to have full opportunity, with sufficient time allocation, to review and respond to research papers in journal article format; we reserve the opportunity to withhold corresponding payment until we are satisfied with the quality of each paper, which may require no modifications, minor modifications, or major modifications. Our focus will be on methodological/intellectual quality and readability; 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 stress that this is a 10-month project with no possibility of costed or no-cost extension, and research design will need to take this into account.

4 Team profile

We are open to bids from any type of organisation (universities, research institutes, research consultancies, or individual consultant teams) that provides the required skills and capacity. We require a single lead through which all contracts, negotiation and invoicing should be managed. Bidders should demonstrate strong academic/research expertise relevant to the present work (with demonstrable record of academic publication) and strong understanding of the Ghanaian WASH/finance policy context. Ghanaian involvement will almost certainly be essential, in view of the nature of the research: this might be as lead or subprime. Our experience with previous research procurement processes is that the best bids tend to come from teams with both international and in-country partners: however, this is not an absolute requirement.

5 Intellectual property

This is an academic research contract, and as such the researchers will retain full intellectual property rights for this research, subject to the deliverables requirements indicated above, but with full rights granted to WSUP immediately and in perpetuity to reproduce and use the findings of the research as WSUP deems fit, including in WSUP publications drawing on the research findings, and including by partners of the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Ghana. In any use by WSUP or partners of findings arising from this research, the researchers will be duly credited. For full details of intellectual property rights, bidders should review WSUP's standard Research Agreement, available on request. [See also comments above under Section 3.4, in regard to publication of headline findings by WSUP and partners before journal publication.]

6 Reporting and liaison

The Task Manager for this work will be Rosie Renouf, WSUP Research Officer. Close liaison will also be expected with Azzika Tanko, Research & Policy Lead, WSUP Ghana and Issaka Balima Musah, Country Programme Manager, WSUP Ghana, and Guy Norman, WSUP Director of Research and Evaluation.

7 Contract terms

A standard WSUP Research Agreement format will be used, subject to the Researcher's agreement with the terms. Where the bidder is a consortium, a contract (Research Agreement) will be signed with a single prime; we cannot consider multiple contracts under a single Call.

8 Payments

8.1 Payment schedule

Payment will be 20% on contract signature, 30% on delivery of interim deliverables (to be negotiated with winning bidder), and 50% on acceptance by WSUP of final deliverables of acceptable quality. All payments will require prior invoicing.

8.2 Budget

Up to GBP 80,000, inclusive of VAT (sales tax) or other taxes; this amount will be expected to cover all costs, including any sub-contracting of staff, any travel costs, and the full costs (including venue and participant travel costs as required) of any workshops or similar meetings. Over and above this budget, WSUP will additionally consider bearing a cost of up to GBP 1,500 for journal publication, if the selected journal/s for publication of this research require payment for open-access; this will be subject to specific negotiation with the selected bidder (likely including a time-limit of article acceptance for publication within 6 months of the termination of this contract). We note, however, the existence of several possible open-access journals which are free to authors.

9 Bidding procedure

9.1 Bid format

Bid format is designed to make bidding relatively easy, with a focus on the proposed methodology. Bids should be submitted to erl@wsup.com before UK 1700 hours (5 pm) of 14th February 2018. We stress the importance of adhering strictly to the instructions below, including word counts; we do not expect to receive long standard texts detailing bidders' previous experience, over and above the requirements indicated.

The bid document should contain only the following numbered sections:

- 1) Name of lead bidding organisation**
- 2) Name and email of primary contact**
- 3) Brief summary of relevant experience of lead organisation and other participating organisations or key individuals, indicating and describing 3 recent most-relevant projects (*max 750 words*)**
- 4) Statement of the justification for and aims of this research as expressed by the bidder.** We are interested primarily in academic justification, not ethical justification (*max 300 words*)
- 5) Statement of the approach and methodology to be used (*max 1500 words*).** This statement can include decisions left open pending more detailed analysis, but we encourage bidders to develop a strong methodology (including clear statement of the duration and likely scheduling of all work including in-country work). [See also Section 3.3 and Appendix A.]
- 6) Statement of the available start-up date and anticipated final completion date.** See Deliverables section.
- 7) Statement of anticipated day allocations of all participants in the research.** Include any sub-contracted participants, with participants named as far as is possible.

- 8) Summary budget breakdown in tabular form.** Clearly indicate total budget (maximum GBP 80,000).
- 9) Indication of first-choice named open-access journal for publication of this work.** Please indicate any requirement for payment for open-access.

You should also separately attach the following two documents:

- A) Up to three CVs** including **a) the lead researcher** (i.e. person who will take primary responsibility for design and management oversight of this research, and for research journal publication) and **b) the person with highest allocation of days.** [*This may in some cases be the same person.*]
- B) A completed copy of the Core Requirements Form:** see Appendix A.

In summary: your submitted bid should comprise 2 documents plus 1-3 CVs.

Please name your files as follows, where XXXXX is a single-word no-spaces summary bidder name (e.g. JENKINSON, CUNIKRI, URBANRT) of up to 10 letters:

XXXXX-bid
XXXXX-core-requirements-form
XXXXX-CV1 (etc)

9.2 Bid scoring criteria

Bids will be scored on the following criteria:

| CRITERION | Points |
|--|------------|
| a) Adherence to requirements for bid format and demonstration of clear writing/formatting skills | 10 |
| b) Quality and appropriateness of research team, as evidenced by Bid Sections 3, 7 and CVs | 30 |
| c) Strength of understanding of the research concept, and strength of methodology, as evidenced by Bid Sections 4 and 5 | 30 |
| d) Demonstration that this research will effectively meet the core requirements, as evidenced by the Core Requirements Form (Appendix A) | 20 |
| e) Value for money | 10 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

9.3 Pre-submission consultation

We are very happy to respond to clarification queries of any sort prior to bid submission: please email erl@wsup.com. Where we consider that the response to a query should (for reasons of fairness) be shared with all bidders, we will do so by emailing all bidders who have already contacted us to express an interest in bidding: so if you want to be included in any such mail-out, please let us know promptly.

Appendix A: Core Requirements Form

As indicated in Section 9.1, all bids should include a completed copy of this Core Requirements Form, which asks you to briefly clarify how your proposal will meet the three core requirements of research under the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative, as outlined in Section 4.

Requirement 1: Research must fully meet relevant research ethics requirements

All research must be carried out in compliance with research ethics standards as rigorous as would be applied in a UK setting, and in compliance with the law and with best practice in the country or countries in which research is carried out. We note that some types of research (*for example, a study involving invasive treatments or biopsy sampling of human subjects*) will have extremely stringent research ethics requirements; other types of research (*for example, a desk study of institutional frameworks*) will have minimal research ethics requirements, beyond the need for due rigour, balance and consultation, and informed consent in any interviews; other types of research (*for example, a study involving household survey to collect information about slum communities*) will have research ethics requirements intermediate between these two extremes. We note also that researchers must take full responsibility, at the bidding and research implementation stages, for ensuring that relevant research ethics requirements are duly met, in letter and in spirit.

QUESTIONS YOU NEED TO ANSWER: How will you ensure that your research is carried out in compliance with research ethics standards as rigorous as would be applied in a UK setting, and in compliance with the law and best practice in the country or countries in which research is carried out.

write here, maximum 150 words (please adhere strictly to this maximum word count)

Requirement 2: Research design should pay careful attention to gender equality/equity considerations

Bidders should explicitly ensure that their proposed design, analysis and research-into-policy work is taking full account of gender equality and equity. This is NOT a tick-box requirement for “including gender” in all research (indeed, bids may be scored down for “including gender” in tick-box ways which unhelpfully divert the research from its primary focus). Rather, our goal is to ensure that all bidders demonstrate that they have given serious thought to the possible implications of their research for women and girls, and include gender considerations in appropriate ways where this is important to exploration of the primary research question/s.

i) If this research in any way develops, or feeds into development of, a sanitation technology, sanitation service delivery model or sanitation policy, then this should be done in ways that ensure that that technology or model or policy fully meets the needs of women and girls; specific requirements of women and girls (including, but not restricted to, menstrual hygiene management and safety after dark) should be given due attention.

ii) If this research in any way assesses sanitation service quality, or recommends ways in which sanitation service quality should be assessed, then this should be done in ways that fully explore and disaggregate possible differences in sanitation service quality as experienced by women and girls and by men and boys; again, specific requirements of women and girls should be given due attention.

iii) If this research in any way uses or promotes some form of community consultation or expert consultation, then this should be done in ways that ensure that women’s voices are heard as loudly as men’s.

iv) More generally, researchers should interrogate their designs to consider gender implications in all respects and at all levels: for example, a WTP study might (or might not) find it relevant and useful to explore whether WTP differs between women and men; an organisational capacity study might (or might not) wish to explore whether women are represented in high-level decision-making. Again, we stress that we do not require tick-

box “inclusion of gender” in all projects; rather, we require that bidders give serious thought to possible gender implications, and include gender-disaggregational elements or other gender-related considerations in their design and analysis where this is important to exploration of the primary research question/s.

QUESTIONS YOU NEED TO ANSWER: In what ways are gender considerations relevant to your proposed design, analysis and research-into-policy work? If you have included gender-disaggregational elements or other gender-related elements in your design, please briefly list these elements.

write here, maximum 150 words (please adhere strictly to this maximum word count)

Requirement 3: Research-into-policy should be considered a core element

Research-into-policy should be considered a core element at all levels and stages of research design; not an after-thought once the “real research” has been completed. Bidders should demonstrate that they have given serious thought to policy influence and policy translation of their findings: this may include [*among other possible elements*] **a)** appropriate consultation at the start-up phase, to ensure that key actors are “on board”, or at least that their needs and attitudes have been meaningfully taken into account; **b)** detailed analysis at the design stage of policy context and policy-influence aims and challenges, with consideration of relevant specific aspects such as “windows of opportunity”; **c)** detailed analysis of how in-country actors might need to be involved in the research and/or its subsequent dissemination, in order to maximise chances of policy influence outcomes; **d)** due consideration of dissemination of methods and findings throughout the project, not just at the end; and **e)** inclusion within the team of individuals with specific responsibility for editing to ensure high-quality text. Larger projects may choose to include individuals with specific responsibility for policy translation. We note that WSUP Research & Policy Leads in each of the research countries will expect to be closely involved in research-into-policy work, and you can depend on some support in this area: this can reasonably include WSUP responsibility for preparation of non-academic publication materials summarising key aspects of aims, methodology and eventual findings. [*Here we draw attention to Section 8.2, which states i) that any workshop events included within your bid must be fully funded from your budget, but ii) that WSUP will consider requests over and above budget to cover the costs of open-access academic publication.*]

QUESTION YOU NEED TO ANSWER: In what ways does this project ensure a pro-active research-into-policy focus?

write here, maximum 150 words (please adhere strictly to this maximum word count)

Please submit a completed copy of this form attached as a separate file to you bid.