

Urban Sanitation Research Initiative

RESEARCH CALL

Barriers to women adopting decision-making roles in sanitation-related public bodies and attitudinal differences between male and female decision-makers

This research project is commissioned under the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative, which is a 2017–2020 research programme (www.wsup.com/research) core-funded by UK aid from the British people and managed by Water & Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP). This research project will deliver an analysis of the barriers that prevent women in Kenya taking leadership roles in sanitation (particularly urban), and aim to identify ways in which those barriers might be overcome. ‘Leadership roles’ are understood to mean positions of significant executive/managerial authority or technical responsibility within national, regional or municipal levels of government, or in public bodies with significant roles in sanitation provision, regulation or oversight (e.g. utilities, regulators, or similar sector bodies). This project aims to assess 1) the gender balance in decision-making/technical roles in Kenya’s sanitation-relevant public bodies, 2) the key barriers to female participation in those roles, 3) how attitudes to urban sanitation vary between male and female decision-makers, and 4) how existing barriers might be overcome. There has been little research to date on this nexus of WASH and gender, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa; this project could therefore have significant influencing potential on Kenyan and international bodies, given the impetus to mainstream gender equity in the Sustainable Development Goals and national targets.

Maximum budget under this Call: GBP 100,000 inclusive of VAT

Bids due: Before UK 1700 hours on 15th February 2019.

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 more than 19 million people access better water, sanitation and hygiene services.

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 British people.

Within this wider initiative, the **Urban Sanitation Research Initiative Kenya** is managed by WSUP in strategic partnership with the Water Services Regulatory Board (WASREB) and the Ministry of Health (Division of Environmental Health).

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 Areas 2 and 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 assess the current gender balance at leadership and high-level technical levels within Kenya's sanitation sector; to identify institutional, social and cultural barriers to women's advancement; to identify ways in which those barriers might be overcome; to explore the extent to which improving that gender balance within Kenyan institutions could have a positive impact on national sanitation outcomes.

3 Nature of the research

3.1 Background

3.1.1 Gender equity in service access and in decision-making: international overview

While there is a specific Sustainable Development Goal to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (SDG5), gender equity is key to the attainment of all the SDGs. SDG6 aims to reach targets that are directly and indirectly linked to gender: 1) universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all, and 2) access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations. This stems from the fact that the burden of inadequate access to water, sanitation and hygiene falls disproportionately on women, in terms of health impacts (e.g. lack of WASH facilities in healthcare facilities when giving birth, insufficient materials and/or education to aid menstrual hygiene management), time and labour (much of which is unpaid e.g. travelling and/or queuing to collect water, taking care of family members who have fallen ill due to poor environmental sanitation), and personal safety (e.g. forced to defecate in the open or use poorly managed public toilets, potentially risking abuse). As such, WASH interventions - governmental or non-governmental – now commonly consider gender as a matter of course in their design, implementation and impact measurement, and a substantial body of research in the WASH area reflects this focus (e.g. studies of the impact of menstrual hygiene management on education and health outcomes¹ or minimising women's vulnerabilities to

¹ Hennegan et al (December 2016) Measuring the prevalence and impact of poor menstrual hygiene management: a quantitative survey of schoolgirls in rural Uganda. *BMJ Open* 6:12 <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/6/12/e012596>

WASH-related violence).² On a practical level, achieving SDG6 and sustaining the progress made to date will require much more human resource than is currently allocated to the sector – alleviating the barriers to wider participation in the workforce will go some way to bridging that gap.³

In terms of the effect of gender diversity at key decision-making levels, there have been numerous studies examining the impact of quotas in boardrooms,⁴ the role of gender in political parties and party leadership,⁵ and whether the actions of legislatures/executive governance bodies change with increased gender representation.⁶ However, most such studies have focused on Europe or North America. These studies have provided indications of how increasing gender diversity in the political or decision-making process can have a trickle-down impact, although we should be careful not to uncritically overstate the impact of women in decision-maker roles: female political leaders do not act homogeneously and may not be interested in, and/or able to, enact gender-sensitive policies or budget decisions; furthermore, apparently “pro-woman” decisions may not equitably benefit *all* women, given that gender is only one characteristic of potential decision beneficiaries (class, race, ethnicity, or sexuality may continue to stymie access for an individual, even under ostensibly “pro-woman” policies).⁷

Despite these considerations, some studies have indicated that female political leadership can lead to an increase in provision of goods and services commonly judged to be favoured by women e.g. drinking water, education, and health,⁸ although other studies have suggested that gender has little impact on how politicians/decision-makers act in office.⁹ To our knowledge, little attention has been paid to date to the attitudes of female decision-makers to sanitation and hygiene programming and investment in developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.¹⁰

3.1.2 Gender representation and agency in decision-maker roles in Kenya

In Kenya, gender representation in the political sphere is now enshrined in law: the 2010 Constitution states that at least one-third of Kenya’s elected and public bodies should be women (the ‘Gender Principle’¹¹). Additionally, Departments of Gender, Children and Social Services exist at national and county levels, and the National Gender and Equality Commission aims to reduce gender inequality and discrimination.¹² Gender-responsive budgeting is included in the Public Finance Management Act of 2012, which stipulates that equity must be mainstreamed in the budget-making process (i.e. revenue raising, resource allocation and budget preparation).

Despite the nominal mainstreaming of gender in public policy, Kenya ranked lowest of the East African Community members on the UNDP’s Gender Inequality Index in 2015 (measuring reproductive health,

² SHARE (undated) Violence, Gender & WASH: Making water, sanitation safer through improved programming and services <http://violence-wash.lboro.ac.uk/>

³ IWA (2014) An avoidable crisis: WASH human resource capacity gaps in 15 developing economies.

⁴ Pande & Ford (2012) Gender quotas and female leadership. World Bank <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/9120>

⁵ O’Brien (2015) Rising to the top: Gender, political performance and party leadership in parliamentary democracies. *AJPS* 59:4 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12173>

⁶ Meier & Funk (2017) Women and public administration in a comparative perspective: the case of representation in Brazilian local governments. *Administration and Society* 49:1 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0095399715626201>; Chen (2013) Do female politicians influence public spending? Evidence from Taiwan. *Intl Jnl Applied Economics* 13:2 <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/205f/c1e0da8fda525ce6ea7264ab6d4dd66f9f09.pdf>

⁷ O’Neil & Domingo (Sept 2015) The power to decide: Women, decision-making and gender equality. ODI <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9848.pdf>

⁸ Chattopadhyay & Duflo (2003) The Impact of Reservation in the Panchayati Raj: Evidence from a Nationwide Randomized Experiment <https://economics.mit.edu/files/769>; Jha & Sarangi (July 2015) Women and Corruption: What Positions Must They Hold to Make a Difference? <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2434912>; Hyde & Hawkins (2017) The role of women’s leadership in health system strengthening; Svaleryd (2009) Women’s representation and public spending. *Euro Jnl of Pol Economy* 25:2 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0176268009000020#!>

⁹ E.g. Ban & Rao (2008) Tokenism or Agency? The Impact of Women’s Reservations on Village Democracies in South India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 56:3 <https://doi.org/10.1086/533551>

¹⁰ Trivedi A (October 2018) ‘Women Are the Secret Weapon for Better Water Management’ <https://www.wri.org/blog/2018/10/women-are-secret-weapon-better-water-management>. WRI blog

¹¹ Bouke et al (August 2017) Strengthening the leadership and influence of women in politics in Kenya. Rift Valley Institute

¹² <http://www.ngeckenya.org/>

empowerment, and inclusion in the labour market). In terms of gender representation in leadership roles, while the Gender Principle and legal framework guiding women's participation in government are strong, compliance is relatively weak – the Kenyan parliament itself has been non-compliant since 2013.¹³ Following the 2017 elections, only 3 (of 47) County Governors and 9.2% of individuals elected to national and county legislatures are women, although a nominations process at the county level means that female representation ranges from 32-41%.¹⁴ In terms of gender-responsive WASH budgeting, it is not yet clear whether these gender representation guidelines have been realised on the ground; county budgets are not detailed enough to definitively demonstrate gender-sensitive planning.¹⁵

Beyond the national/county executives and legislatives, leadership within water and sewerage utilities are crucial drivers of WASH service provision in Kenya. The Water Services Trust Fund is also a key stakeholder, providing financial support to areas and communities where water supply is inadequate. WASREB, the national utility regulator, is also a key national stakeholder, and (along with other partners including Ministry of Water and Irrigation) produced a draft gender mainstreaming toolkit in 2011 on institutionalising gender mainstreaming (e.g. ensuring that men and women participate equally in the organisation, and improving the participation of women and men in governance, decision-making and operational processes).¹⁶

While achieving national goals on representation of women in key decision-making roles is important, how those women act once they are in those roles is equally significant. Are they constrained by expectations of how women are 'supposed' to act? Do they consider that taking on a leadership role requires a gender-blind approach? If they do plan to implement programmes that take gender into account, how do they think this will be received by colleagues/beneficiaries, and does this affect their willingness to promote those programmes?

3.2 Aims, approach and design

We are seeking research that 1) quantifies the gender balance of executive/managerial decision-makers and higher-level technical specialists in sanitation-relevant public bodies in Kenya, 2) assesses the key barriers to women's inclusion and participation in those roles, 3) analyses how attitudes of decision-makers to urban sanitation vary between men and women in those roles, and 4) assesses how existing barriers to women's leadership inclusion and pro-woman decision-making might be overcome.

Over and above these core aims, bidders might also choose to deliver some sort of assessment of whether women's representation in Kenya's sanitation-focused public bodies has any impact on sanitation outcomes for women in urban low-income areas (if available data allows for such disaggregation); however, we recognise that this may not be possible within the timeframe and budget of this particular project, and this is certainly not a requirement. Such outcomes could include: increased budget for gender-specific WASH requirements (e.g. MHM equipment included in community toilet designs); evidence of programme or budget design that differentiates between the needs of men and women living in low-income areas and responds accordingly; and/or internal processes that promote gender equity (in utilities, for example).

We anticipate that this project will be divided into two phases: a document review and stakeholder consultation phase generating an outline map of gender balance in relevant institutions and identifying

¹³ Bouke et al 2017

¹⁴ NDI & FIDA Kenya (2018) A gender analysis of the 2017 Kenya General Elections

https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/Gender%20Analysis%20of%202017%20GeneralElections%20FINAL%20High%20Res%20for%20Printer%20-%20NEW%20COVER_small.pdf

¹⁵ The National Treasury (2017) Public Expenditure Review: Health, Water and Sanitation

<http://daogewe.org/index.php/publications/reports/162-public-expenditure-review-health-water-and-sanitation>

¹⁶ WASREB (August 2011) Water utility gender mainstreaming toolkit

[http://www.waterfund.go.ke/toolkit/Downloads/3.%20Gender%20&%20Water%20Toolkit%20\(MWI,%20WB,%20WSP,%20GWA\).pdf](http://www.waterfund.go.ke/toolkit/Downloads/3.%20Gender%20&%20Water%20Toolkit%20(MWI,%20WB,%20WSP,%20GWA).pdf)

key questions to be explored further; followed by an in-depth survey of those institutions, probably supported by semi-structured key informant interviews. This is a very brief outline of the central questions to be answered by this research and of the suggested methodology by which they could be answered. We would expect a more detailed understanding and outline methodology to be developed by bidders at proposal stage, and a detailed methodology to then be developed by the selected research team (in consultation with WSUP and other key stakeholders in Kenya e.g. WASREB) over the first few months of this project.

The exact methodology to be used is open to bidders. We anticipate that a significant methodological challenge will be the (assumed) low number of women in leadership roles in government ministries, utilities and regulators, meaning that available sample size may be much smaller than desired. However, we anticipate that there are likely ways of usefully exploring this question even if sample size of women currently in decision-making roles is small. For example, the study could maximise the available sample size by more or less exhaustively including as respondents all women at high and mid levels of responsibility. Alternatively or additionally, the study could include women at lower professional levels (on the view that they may progress to higher levels at some point, or on the view that their attitudes may be indicative even if they remain at lower levels). Another approach would be to include consideration of women in identified low-income communities: what decisions would they like those in power to make, what issues do they think are otherwise overlooked? It is also certainly possible that the study may include men as respondents: this is likely to be necessary and appropriate during the initial consultation phase, but men might also be included as key respondents for in-depth interviews, for example to provide a comparator to women's attitudes around pro-woman action, and/or to assess men's views around how women in decision-making roles should act.

Finally, we note that the research questions outlined above, and associated methodology proposals, reflect our own understanding of the most appropriate approach to meet the over-arching aims described above. 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

The following deliverables are required:

- a) an inception report for WSUP (about 5 pages) detailing the methodology to be followed, within 6 weeks of contract signature (this must include a specific short section indicating how the Core Requirements (Appendix A) will be met);
- b) Policy briefing note (probably a 2-page publication) on the leadership gender balance in Kenyan public sanitation institutions;
- c) a short (3-5 pages) report at the halfway point of the project;
- d) a full final report **and** 2 policy briefing notes for Kenyan institutional stakeholders, detailing:
 - i) findings on decision-maker attitudes to urban sanitation
 - ii) the barriers to female inclusion in leadership roles and recommendations for policymakers on how to overcome those barriers;
- e) a full research paper of project findings written as a journal article in the format of a named peer-reviewed journal;
- f) a brief progress update shared with the Task Manager each month (bulletpoints in an email is sufficient).

The above listing of deliverables does not include minor deliverables, potentially including preparatory documents and/or presentations for workshops, subsequent workshop reports, blog posts for the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative website, or early reports of findings that can be made available for in-country or international communication. All deliverables (including draft-stage submissions) 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.

Deliverable **e** is a research paper, to be written as a journal article in the format of a named journal, not as a report for WSUP or country-level stakeholders. 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 Kenya) 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.¹⁷

¹⁷ 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. One approach which bidders may find useful is to commit to delivery of a 1-3 page summary report on findings for free use by WSUP and partners: this approach will ensure that the researcher maintains control over precisely what elements are made public and precisely which should be considered embargoed until journal publication (though this does not rule out the possibility of WSUP requesting additional information be made public if the summary omits detail necessary for headline understanding).

3.5 Schedule

Date	Milestone/deliverable
<i>Before UK 1700, 15th February 2019</i>	<i>Bid submission</i>
<i>4th March 2019</i>	<i>Start date</i>
<i>12th April 2019</i>	<i>Deliverable a: inception report</i>
<i>[To be agreed between WSUP and contracted researcher]</i>	<i>Deliverable b: policy briefing note</i>
<i>2nd September 2019</i>	<i>Deliverable c: halfway point report</i>
<i>7th February 2020</i>	<i>Deliverable d: final report and 2 policy briefing notes</i>
<i>7th February 2020</i>	<i>Draft deliverable e: journal article</i>
<i>6th March 2020</i>	<i>Final deliverable e: journal article</i>

We stress that this is a 12-month project with no possibility of costed or no-cost extension, and research design will need to take this into account. Final deliverable **e** will be the trigger for final payment: because this is non-critical we have allowed generous time, but bidders are welcome to bring this forward if they prefer.

4 Team profile

We are happy to consider any proposed team structure that provides the required skills and capacity. The research team should have **a)** a strong understanding of political economy and gender, particularly in Kenya; **b)** a strong understanding of the urban WASH sector (particularly sanitation and hygiene) in Kenya; and **c)** strong capacity for cross-sectoral policy analysis. It may not be necessary for the research lead to be expert in all these areas, but strong conceptual understanding across all areas will be essential. The lead researcher does not have to be a Kenyan national or based in Kenya, but this is not designed to be a desk-based study and so bidders with very strong links to Kenya will be viewed more favourably. We do not require bidders to be based in the UK or to have a UK-based partner.

We are happy to respond to queries about team structure during the bid preparation period.

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. 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 (Research Officer). Close liaison will also be expected with Kariuki Mugo (Country Programme Manager Kenya) and Emanuel Owako (Research & Policy Lead Kenya); and with the Urban Sanitation Research Initiative team in London (Guy Norman, Director of Research & Evaluation; Sam Drabble, Head of Research & Learning).

7 Contract terms

A standard WSUP Research Agreement format will be used. 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. We can share a template Research Agreement with bidders on request.

8 Payments

8.1 Payment schedule

Payment will be 30% on contract signature, 30% on acceptance by WSUP of final version of Deliverable C, and 40% on acceptance by WSUP of final deliverable E. All payments will require prior invoicing.

8.2 Budget

Up to GBP 100,000 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).

9 Bidding procedure

9.1 Bid format

Bids should be submitted to erl@wsup.com before UK 1700 hours (5 pm) of 15th February 2019. 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 400 words*)
- 5) Statement of the approach and methodology to be used (*max 2000 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 in GBP.** Clearly indicate total budget (maximum GBP 100,000 inclusive of VAT).

9) Indication of first-choice named open-access journal/s 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 five 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 1-5 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
f) Value for money within available budget	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 no later than one week before the submission date. 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: 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 3.3.

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 your bid.