



They said this was inclusive – but where are the women?

COVID response funding for WASH has arrived – but where is it?

Where does all that climate finance go on water?

Who can I complain to?

Donors never deliver what they promise! What can we do?

All the money for water is spent on fancy cars & big meetings!

Why am I paying more than my neighbour for water?

Flooding is on the rise – but we never get warned – there's no action!

The big farm is taking all the water from the river – how come?

Why should we comply when no-one else does?

How can we better listen to water users and their needs?

Those NGO's claim big impact – we don't see it?

The forest where our springs rise is being cut – what can we do?

Why don't those investors need SEIA?

How to strengthen accountability for water: stimulating & sustaining citizen voice, government responsiveness, & the enabling environment

Summary report of the Accountability for Water Programme 2020-2023



**Accountability
for Water**

ACTION & RESEARCH PROGRAMME

Executive Summary

The Accountability for Water Programme commenced in 2020. It was designed to accelerate progress on SDG6 and strengthen climate resilience, by supporting water sector professionals from government, civil society and development assistance agencies to improve sector performance for universal access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and sustainable water resource management (WRM.)

The Programme addressed a wide range of research questions to identify opportunities and approaches to strengthen accountability.

This report summarises the results of twenty investigations carried out between 2020 and 2023 into elements of accountability in the water sector in Africa (see p. 14 for full list of projects).

A series of questions (see Box 1) shaped the research under the themes of

- 1) community dynamics of accountability (what stimulates and sustains citizen action?);
- 2) duty bearer dynamics (what stimulates and sustains action by government/others?);
- 3) Enabling environments for accountability (how can legitimacy, sustainability and impact be ensured?).

The body of work includes:

- ④ 13 research reports produced by Professional Research Fellows (PRFs) working in the water sector or in water research institutions in Africa;
- ④ focused research in Kenya, Ethiopia and Tanzania including political economy analyses of water accountability and qualitative studies of government dynamics of accountability- drawing on over 50 interviews at multiple government levels and from key institutions;
- ④ a cluster-randomised multi-country survey of community dynamics of accountability across the three countries with over 2000 responses.

The findings and recommendations relating to each of the questions are presented in Table 1 below.

BOX 1: Guiding Research Questions

Community Dynamics

- ④ What factors stimulate or constrain citizen engagement and voice?
- ④ How inclusive are accountability interventions on water?
- ④ How do socio-cultural, religious and customary institutions interact with accountability processes?

Government Dynamics

- ④ What factors can stimulate or constrain government mechanisms for accountability and responsiveness to citizens?
- ④ What are the main barriers, and what are the best strategies and tactics for government to strengthen accountability?

Enabling Environment

- ④ How can accountability be supported and resourced in different contexts?
- ④ How can legitimacy be nurtured and sustained in different contexts?
- ④ How should INGOs and development partners respond to 'closing civic space'?
- ④ What metrics and measures can be used to support accountability?

The guiding questions relate to our theory of change (see [Hepworth et al. 2022](#)), which identifies four categories of social accountability: social accountability monitoring, budget analysis and tracking, evidence-based advocacy and statutory accountability mechanisms. Key findings and recommendations from Phase 1 of the Accountability for Water Programme include:

- ④ Strong evidence that across Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania there is a profound lack of trust in authorities responsible for water services, governance and regulation, measured by whether citizens would approach authorities to solve water-related problems, and their expectations that these problems will be successfully resolved. Notably, two out of three people experiencing water related problems did not report the problem to anybody. If users do not report water related problems, then holding those responsible to account is impossible. Our research therefore explores the reasons why citizen voice is subdued.
- ④ Non-reporting is shown to be well founded in many cases, as among those who reported problems such as lack of access, pollution, conflict, scarcity, only half received a response, and only 40% reported that positive action was taken to resolve the issue. The most common reason given for not reporting was the belief that the problem would not be solved (44%). The second most common reason was a lack of knowledge about who the issues should be reported to (38%). This lack of awareness

and limited capability of duty-bearers to respond, should be considered as critical barriers to system strengthening for WASH services and WRM governance.

- ④ Communities and individuals can be agents for change. Two out of three survey respondents were interested in joining local groups to manage water in both urban and rural areas, indicating that there is an opportunity for strengthening social accountability through citizen oversight in many contexts. There is a sense of responsibility for local water resources, with four out of ten respondents believing that water resource management in the community is the responsibility of the community.
- ④ Multiple case studies show strong community oversight and social accountability can yield positive outcomes. In Zimbabwe, residents' associations have successfully litigated to protect their water rights. In Tanzania persistent engagement by civil society organisation Shahidi wa Maji with citizens has leveraged enforcement action on industrial water pollution, secured water tenure for communities and triggered financing reforms. In Kenya, the work of Centre For Social Planning And Administrative Development (CESPAD) and Kenya Water for Health Organisation (KWAHO) is increasing social inclusion in decision making and service provision. Avenues for more effective mass communication between service providers and communities exist, with around 8 in 10 of survey respondents possessing mobile phones, and 4 in 10 having regular access to the internet (daily or weekly). Improving information flows between government, service providers, citizens and customers using text messaging and email is a potentially low cost and effective measure to activate rights and obligations, and strengthen feedback loops of reporting of complaints, action and institutional legitimacy. Poorer members of society are less likely to have access to these tools, so other approaches will be needed to ensure inclusiveness and equity, including visual aids, community meetings and radio - which remains the most widespread source of news and information.
- ④ Across the three countries, 1 in 3 survey respondents stated that women are not allowed to participate in water resource management locally, and half stated that women do not commonly take part in decision making. Responses were similar for both youth and elderly demographics. Marginalisation of people with disabilities is even clearer, with half the respondents stating that they think people with disabilities are not allowed to participate and 6 in 10 respondents stating that they do not commonly take part in decision making.
- ④ Drawing attention to water problems helps duty-bearers to take action. A challenge for community groups and individuals is to claim accountability in a positive/solutions- focused way. One option is to engage with pre-existing mechanisms, communication channels and local power structures. The survey found that while conflicts were between, and resolved by, neighbours. However, local officials, religious leaders and traditional local leaders, have also played important

roles in their successful resolution. This illustrates the potential of leveraging existing power dynamics within communities to resolve conflicts, but hints at the significant challenges for water justice where these existing power structures benefit from the status quo.

- Other case studies showed that it is possible for private organisations and civil society groups to effectively raise awareness of and engage with accountability structures. Sanivation, a sanitation and solid waste service provider, in Kenya found that civic education by the duty bearer is key to ensuring success in solid waste management (SWM). Enforcement of bylaws that prohibit unsanitary waste disposal is only effective when the public is aware of their responsibilities and have service options available to them. Youth are ready to engage in SWM activities, with programmes initiated and funded by the county government involving young people offering success, for example recycling activities. In Zimbabwe, the case study of Combined Harare Residents Association showed that most water and catchment management litigation cases were spearheaded by Residents Associations and CSOs, because the litigation process is expensive to an ordinary resident (Murambiwa and Akili, 2022).

The weight of evidence shows the potential for well-designed and supported accountability interventions to accelerate positive change in the water resource management and WASH sectors. However, the evidence also illustrates the criticality of tenacious and consistent technical and financial support for successful accountability interventions, alongside a conducive enabling environment. External support is often essential, but must avoid undermining the legitimacy of civic actors and distorting accountability relationships between duty-bearers and rights-holders. For example, creating dependency or over-reliance on external support and CSO ‘facilitators’ risks new forms of elite capture and restricts benefits to the few places where externally led interventions are operating, at the potential expense of the wider benefits of a well-functioning water sector within which institutions are responsive to the needs of all citizens. Practitioners and policy-makers must ensure that structural barriers to genuine inclusion – such as culture, language and literacy – are considered and addressed. Quotas, when implemented poorly, risk promoting tokenism rather than inclusion.

Informed by and in response to these findings, Phase II of the Accountability for Water Programme will focus on the design, development and launch of an SDG6 Accountability Facility, to channel financial, technical and legal support for high impact accountability interventions. The Facility will deploy the lessons learned to date and activate the community of practice and learning nurtured in Phase 1 to realise the full contribution of accountability monitoring to delivery of SDG6. The Facility will be overseen through an inclusive and transparent governance structure to and will accelerate cross-country learning, provide technical and legal advice, build on existing knowledge and explore unanswered questions, and implement the recommendations drawn from Phase 1.

Programme Questions, Findings, and Recommendations

Community Dynamics		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
<p>What factors stimulate or constrain citizen engagement and voice?</p>	<p>Awareness of citizen rights, of the responsibilities and service commitments of duty bearers, and of the existing opportunities to claim accountability, are necessary but not sufficient conditions for citizen engagement and voice. These are currently severely lacking. Across Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania only one in ten people are aware of any policies, laws or regulations on water resource management or drinking water and sanitation.</p> <p>Experience of failed attempts at engagement and raising voice, where duty-bearers have not responded, reduces people’s willingness to engage in the future. Experience of successful accountability claiming encourages greater engagement, which is likely attributable to both a greater anticipation of success, and a reduced fear of negative consequences such as reprisals from authorities.</p>	<p>Support CSOs to engage communities, both in raising awareness of existing policies and laws, and in claiming accountability. CSOs should allocate resource to publicise successful accountability claiming, to encourage others and spark a virtuous cycle of engagement more widely</p> <p>SDG 6 Accountability Facility: Social organizations such as the Centre For Social Planning And Administrative Development (CESPAD), Kenya Water for Health Organisation (KWAHO) and Combined Harare Residents Association (CHRA) have demonstrated the potential for CSOs to organise and mobilise people for social accountability (Kivuva 2022, Brian 2022, Murambiwa and Akili 2022). However, resourcing this work is essential to ensure its sustainability and impact.</p> <p>An SDG 6 Accountability Facility would enable delegated decision-making on the granting of funds and technical support. This facility would be mandated to support civil society accountability work and would be overseen by a board including civil society groups in the recipient countries. At present, most funding streams are unable to support the essential roles of social accountability in national water management. Development banks and aid agencies tend to work with government</p>

Community Dynamics		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>The case studies of Sanivation in Kenya and CHRA in Zimbabwe show that private organisations and civil society groups can raise awareness of, and engage with, accountability structures, producing significant impact for the local community.</p>	<p>clients or with service providers (e.g. Kpeh and Toe, 2022). Pooling funds with other donors can also prevent the dominance of a single agenda.</p> <p>Aid agencies and foundations struggle to identify promising social accountability approaches, and to manage the uncertainties and variation inherent in social accountability, as plans and programmes are continually influenced by, and adjusted to, wider political and economic forces (e.g. Kweka and Katomero 2022; Asnake et al. 2022). A dedicated facility would have the institutional knowledge and understanding to select and support effective accountability programmes, and the technical capacity to support programme development. With oversight from global civil society it could have legitimacy that directly granted funds may lack.</p>
<p>How inclusive are accountability interventions on water?</p>	<p>Women’s inclusion in formal accountability structures such as water user committees continues to be undermined by patriarchal norms – the cultural tradition that favours male domination and appreciates reservation or silence from women. Women either don’t attend, or don’t speak in decision-taking meetings, but are over-represented at the more arduous and risky parts of the water economy such as operating domestic water points.</p> <p>Quotas and similar policies of governments or development partners have increased participation in a tokenistic way that does not facilitate meaningful</p>	<p>Enhancing Participation of Marginalised Groups: Governments should establish mechanisms that promote meaningful participation of marginalized groups, such as women, youth, elderly, and persons with disabilities, in WRM decision-making processes. The challenge of tokenism must be confronted, which means finding ways to identify and foreground the concerns of marginalised groups, perhaps through dedicated forums, surveys and engagement with civil society groups that represent affected groups.</p> <p>Water resource management meetings that are expected to include voices from communities should, within their guiding policy, have more stringent accessibility requirements, including proactive outreach to communities</p>

Community Dynamics		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>participation or inclusive decision making, meaning that the water sectors are not answerable to women and they are excluded from opportunities to hold authorities to account.</p>	<p>earlier with enough time to arrange for attendance, and considering accessibility in deciding locations. The case of Kakamega demonstrated the importance of effective outreach by the water service provider, and more accessible information about processes, tools, policies and instruments that can be used to claim accountability (Simiyu 2022).</p>
<p>How do socio-cultural, religious and customary institutions interact with accountability processes?</p>	<p>Collective action is often critical to claiming accountability. Individual attempts to resolve issues through reporting problems can be successful, but this occurred in a minority of cases in the survey. However, mobilising influential collective action requires time and monetary resources and the right information and networks, which may not always be available for citizens especially for low-income communities.</p> <p>The disincentives to collective action often exceed the incentives due to skewed power dynamics between citizens and states, for example in Ethiopia key informants reported that citizens often perceive officials as ‘in charge’ of citizens, rather than in service to them. In some situations where communities were willing to organise to demand accountability there was fear of retaliation and reluctance of governments to respond to citizens’</p>	<p>Increasing popular knowledge of laws and regulations and expanding communication: Stakeholders should invest in increasing popular knowledge of existing laws and regulations related to WRM and WASH. This involves diversifying means of participation, considering the inaccessibility of rural areas and limited reach of social media.</p> <p>Making information available in audio, visual, and written formats suitable for people with low literacy levels and limited engagement with the state can improve accessibility, meeting the needs of blind and deaf people as well as making engagement easier for everyone.</p>

Community Dynamics

Question	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>concerns, which reduced people’s motivation to participate in collective action.</p> <p>The survey revealed some involvement of local cultural, religious and customary institutions in resolving water conflict, but there is not strong evidence of a productive interaction between these forces. Among the few cases of resolved water disputes, religious and traditional leaders were cited as involved more often than other local communities or groups, or even water companies, but less than water authorities and local officials.</p> <p>Users of WASH services are largely unaware of innovations such as customer service charters from service providers. Even in many cases providers at the local level are unaware of policy. Recognising that local power dynamics can exclude some parts of the community, recommendations focus on increasing inclusiveness and widening participation.</p>	<p>We propose exploring the use of radios, local barazas, and use of letters and petitions to ensure community ownership and collective responsibility in enhancing accountability. Simplifying complex policies into more manageable and targeted information would strengthen the accountability ecosystem.</p>

Government Dynamics		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
<p>What factors can stimulate or constrain government mechanisms for accountability and responsiveness to citizens?</p>	<p>Social accountability approaches that seek to form alliances between citizens to engage constructively with duty bearers have proven successful, such as water user's committees or residents' associations. Key to this is establishing accountability structures that emphasise the shared goal of improved service delivery, so that critique and raising of concerns can take place without this being interpreted as political or confrontational.</p> <p>The increasing government support for the Ethiopian Social Accountability Programme (ESAP) in Ethiopia over time has shown that the benefits of opening civic space in this way can be self-sustaining and lead to more openness between government and communities. This then allows joint analysis of problems, joint action planning, lobbying for budget allocation and implementation follow up. Similarly, the Liberia Parliamentary WASH Caucus has supported open communication between NGOs and government.</p>	<p>Create invited space: Governments should create invited space for civil society to share concerns and recommend improvements. This limits the politicisation of accountability claiming, making governments more likely to listen and citizens more likely to engage. The process is more likely to lead to improvements and therefore to help the government deliver their sector goals.</p>

Government Dynamics

Question	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>Often citizens need the support of civil society groups to represent individuals and communities. CSOs can buttress their efforts in pursuing legal avenues for redress and increase the political costs of inaction by duty bearers.</p> <p>The example of CHRA in Zimbabwe shows that this can be successful even in a context of limited civic space.</p> <p>Individuals and citizens' associations may also pursue this avenue without the support of a local organisation, but it requires the skills and confidence to negotiate the bureaucratic landscape.</p>	<p>Citizens need support: Civil society organisations should seek to organise communities to identify accountability failings and potential solutions, and to bring these to duty-bearers. External support should be available from international NGOs, foundations and aid agencies to fund this work, and to provide advice and guidance based on expertise and experience across the world.</p>
<p>What are the main barriers, and what are the best strategies and tactics for government to strengthen accountability?</p>	<p>Necessary conditions for improving accountability include clearly mandated roles for the key functions of WASH service delivery and WRM, without overlaps across government bodies and levels of government.</p> <p>A key element that is understated in the existing analyses is the need to coordinate the roles of the non-water ministries who have a large impact on water use and conditions, particularly land, agriculture, and industry.</p> <p>Achieving effective coordination of all stakeholders is likely to require the active engagement of the heads of states, raising expectations and demanding progress. While the overall legacy of President Magufuli in Tanzania is</p>	<p>Leadership must ensure coordination: Heads of state and other senior leaders must recognise that sustainable water resource management is an essential prerequisite of economic growth and human development.</p> <p>Ministries of agriculture and industry should be made part of WASH and WRM coalitions. These can be asked to raise the budget they assign to WASH and WRM as part of their mainstream activities. And they must be held to account for their impact on the goals of the water policies. Without this, conflicting policy and legal frameworks can lead to the goals of the water ministries being undermined, as industrial or agricultural development takes priority. This is likely to need the active support of senior politicians and heads of state.</p>

Government Dynamics

Question	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>contested, sector respondents were clear that he created pressure for greater accountability through the system and this proved effective at least in that he established a separate organisation for rural WASH. What was missing was building the accountability cycle and engagement with the public through invited civic space, to enable this pressure to turn into long-term accountability.</p>	

Enabling Environment		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
How can accountability be resourced in different contexts?	Both Tanzania and Ethiopia have experienced fluctuations in development partner contributions to the sector in recent years. While projects can be delayed or cancelled, accountability structures take time to establish and build effectiveness. The lack of awareness of formal routes of accountability identified in the survey demonstrates that familiarity and consistency will be needed to build awareness over time. These considerations suggest that external, project funding for accountability bodies and processes puts their long-term effectiveness at risk.	System strengthening and sustainability: Horizontal and structural accountability, the formal structures that enable different government agencies to hold one another to account, must be resourced through government revenue, to ensure that the systems that are built are maintained and improved over time and do not fail due to the ending of external partner support. External support must be carefully designed so that the overall ecosystem of accountability will not fail if this support is withdrawn.
	There is a key role for development partners and INGOs in promoting accountability. Firstly, their influence in the WASH sector of many countries is significant, with the WASH sector in many countries receiving the majority of funding needs from overseas assistance.	External supporters can lead by example: Development partner-influence should be used to ensure that there is invited space for civil society to report on the quality of services and management, and identify priority issues. These partners should lead by example, welcoming civil society input and engaging actively in multi-stakeholder monitoring initiatives, and demonstrating accountability against their own commitments. Civil society must be resourced to play their role. Raising awareness of laws, rights and obligations, attending stakeholder consultations, collecting information from disparate communities are all costly activities that the sector depends upon to identify challenges.

Enabling Environment		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
		Foundations and other large donors should invest in a common fund to support civil society. This fund should be mandated to provide long-term support to civil society groups to undertake social accountability interventions.
How can legitimacy be nurtured and sustained in different contexts?	The research has confirmed that external sector funding can undermine the legitimate accountability relationships between sector agencies and between government and citizens. For example the Zambia and Liberia cases involved externally funded sectors with lack of government ownership, and therefore weak accountability for the sector. It is essential that this is recognised by development partners and reflected in their interactions.	Aid effectiveness: The fundamental principles of aid-effectiveness call for the use of country systems, which would significantly shift the dynamic, supporting rather than undermining national accountability structures. Ensuring that lending or granting due-diligence processes include a detailed analysis of the existing national accountability structures, and making the adequacy of these a condition of support, would help to incentivise the generation and use of government revenue to build effective systems.
	When it comes to community level, external funds to support accountability claiming are often needed, but do come with the risk of perceived illegitimacy, of 'sock-puppet' (pretending to speak as someone else) or astroturfing (fake grassroots movements). For example the 'professional workshop attendees' identified in Kenya.	Legitimate financing for CSOs: These risks may be alleviated by supporting networks of organisations, maintaining support over a long period with organisations that are well known, and by pooling funds, so that allocation decisions are not influenced by one funder's priorities. Ideally such pooled funds would be allocated by an oversight committee of representatives from civil society.
How should INGOs and development	Both Ethiopia and Tanzania have shown in recent years the benefit of invited civic space for accountability and service delivery. Relying exclusively on top-down	Supporting invited space: External partners can support citizens by supporting the creation of such spaces within mutual accountability

Enabling Environment		
Question	Findings	Recommendations
partners respond to 'closing civic space'?	pressure was not enough for Magufuli's approach to sustain after his regime ended, and ESAP demonstrated the advantages to service providers of engaging with communities.	structures, and invite civil society to critique and review their own effectiveness, as USAID did in Liberia.
	In Zimbabwe, the use of courts to pursue rights was shown to be effective, where social pressure or 'unruly' accountability claiming such as protests might have been shut down.	Support for statutory accountability: INGOs and partners can and should allocate resources to support legal accountability in contexts where civic space is limited.
What metrics and measures can be used to support accountability?	At the national level, the accountability cycle provides a useful guide to measuring accountability. The publication of performance reports, public response to poor performance, and updating and refining laws, policies and institutional mandates on a regular basis, all point towards an accountability cycle that is functioning. Policies that are years out of date, and lack of transparency on sector performance, show a lack of attention to sector accountability that is likely to indicate poor functioning of the overall water governance system.	<p>Report, review react: Governments should ensure that progress on plans and goals are reported against and these reports published, and joint sector reviews or similar occasions should be used to analyse these reports and identify changes to the overall accountability ecosystem, such as reassigning roles or responsibilities or updating policies.</p> <p>Measuring local engagement: At the community level, the questions in the cross-country survey can be used to measure awareness of accountability structures, trust and legitimacy, and community power dynamics. The survey is available to all on the mWater.org platform.</p>

Accountability for Water Papers:

Kenya:

- 🔵 Brian, Barasa, Kones; 2022; Rural Women and water decisions in Kwale and Kilifi Counties, Kenya
- 🔵 Kivuva, Barasa, Kones; 2022; Enhancing Coordination For Accountability And Sustainability In Water Resources; Management; A Case Of Kerio Sub-Catchment In Baringo Rift Valley Basin
- 🔵 Simuyu, Barasa, Kones; 2022; Community Awareness for Better Service and Accountability: A Case of Low-Income Areas of Mumias Sub-County Kenya
- 🔵 Korir, Naomi; Barasa, Kones; 2022; Strengthening accountability in solid waste management through incentives and penalties in Naivasha, Kenya.
- 🔵 Barasa and Kones 2022a; Political Economy Analysis of the Kenya Water Sector
- 🔵 Barasa and Kones; 2022b; What Influences Accountability Practices In The WASH Sector In Kenya? A Qualitative Analysis Of WASH Stakeholders

Tanzania,

- 🔵 Ndyeshumba, Pitio; 2022; Assessment of Gender Power Relations and Accountability in Community-Based Water Supply Organizations in Wami-Ruvu, Pangani and Lake Victoria Basins of Tanzania
- 🔵 Salum, Mwajuma; 2022; Regulatory And Legal Accountability For Water Pollution In Tanzania: The Case Study Of Msimbazi River In Dar Es Salaam City
- 🔵 Parestico, Pastory; 2022; Opportunities and Challenges of Water Accountability Claiming in Tanzania
- 🔵 Kweka; 2022; What Influences Accountability Practices In The WASH Sector In Tanzania? A Qualitative Analysis Of WASH Stakeholders
- 🔵 Kweka and Katomero; 2022; The Changing Political Context In Tanzania And Its Implications On Wash Accountability

Ethiopia

- 🔵 Firehiwot Sinteyahu, Asnake Kefale, Mulugeta Gashaw and Timothy Brewer 2022; Water Licencing And Stakeholder Relationships Over Alwero Dam Governance: Accountability Gaps, Effects And Prospects

- ④ Michael Negash, Mulugeta Gashaw, Asnake Kefale and Timothy Brewer; Accountability in the One WASH National Programme of Ethiopia: The Cases of Selected Rural Woredas and Towns
- ④ Yosef Abere, Mulugeta Gashaw, Asnake Kefale and Timothy Brewer;; 2022; Wastewater Governance In Upstream Catchment of Awash Basin, Ethiopia: Challenges, And Opportunities For Better Accountability
- ④ Asnake Kefale, Mulugeta Gashaw and Timothy Brewer Asnake; 2022; Political Economy Analysis of Water Sector in Ethiopia
- ④ Mulugeta Gashaw, Asnake Kefale and Timothy Brewer; 2022; What Influences Accountability Practices in The WASH Sector in Ethiopia? A Qualitative Analysis of WASH Stakeholders

Wider region and cross-country:

- ④ Kpeh and Toe; 2022; Accountability Challenges In The Liberia Water-Supply Sector: LWSC in Robertsport and Kakata
- ④ Chifunda et al. 2022; Exploring Accountability Mechanisms Of The WASH Budgeting Process At National And District Levels In Zambia
- ④ Murambiwa and Akili; 2022; Assessing The Effectiveness And Impact Of Statutory Accountability Mechanisms To Improve Water Service Provision And Catchment Management.
- ④ N. D. Hepworth, T. Brewer, B. D. Brown, M. Atela, J. Katomero, J. Kones, M. Mulugeta; Accountability and advocacy interventions in the water sector: a global evidence review. H2Open Journal 1 June 2022; 5 (2): 307–322 doi: <https://doi.org/10.2166/h2oj.2022.062>

To see more of the Accountability for Water Programme research and events, and to keep informed about new developments, please visit www.accountabilityforwater.org

This paper is an output of the Accountability for Water action and research programme funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and managed by the Partnership For African Social and Governance Research (PASGR), supported by Water Witness International, KEWASNET and Shahidi Wa Maji. The content of the paper is the sole responsibility of the author.

August 2023

