Whose Public Action?
Analysing Inter-sectoral Collaboration for Service Delivery

Identification of Programmes for Study in Pakistan: Initial Notes and Methodology

Dr Masooda Bano

Islamabad, Pakistan
February, 2007

Published: February 2007
© International Development Department (IDD) / Masooda Bano
ISBN: 0704425513
9780704425514

This research is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council under the ESRC Non-Governmental Public Action Programme. The ESRC is the UK’s leading research and training agency addressing economic and social concerns. ESRC aims to provide high-quality research on issues of importance to business, the public sector and Government.
Table of Contents

Section-1: Objective of the paper

Section-2: Methodology

Section-3: Education
Concessions to private schools
Adopt a School Programme
Permission to mobilize government school buildings
Non-Formal Basic Schools Programme
Programme Selection
Programme details: NFE
READ
Mohallah schools
Mosque Schools
Nai Roshini Schools
Iqra Pilot project

Section-4: Health
National TB Control Programme
HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment
Management of Basic Health Units
Selecting a health programme
Case selection

Section-5: Water and Sanitation
Orangi Pilot Project and its replications
Citizen Community Boards
Rural Support Programmes
PPP projects run by NGOs working in Water & Sanitation
Programme selection
Selected programme: Orangi & its replications
Lodhran Pilot Project
Case selection

Section-6: Cross Sector Selection Issues

References
List of people interviewed
Identification of Programmes for Study in Pakistan: Initial Notes and Methodology

Section-1: Objective of the paper

This paper attempts to identify and categorise the types of relations that exist between state and non-state providers in Pakistan within the three service sectors under study. As highlighted in the paper analysing the evolution of state and NSP relations in Pakistan, these relations could be formal (contractual) as well as informal (loosely structured). The attempt here is to categorise the various forms of relations witnessed in the field into programmes rather than recording them as independent projects. A programme here is defined to mean a collection of various forms of relations, which exist between state and non-state providers within a similar framework focusing on some core functions. For instance, Adopt a School is a programme that provides one broad framework for state and NSPs to interact but within its ambit different types of contracts and interactions between the state and NSPs come about.

The report serves three objectives: one, it identifies the dominant forms of programmes that exist within the three sectors in Pakistan with a brief account of their origin; two, it then compares the two most relevant programmes for this research within each sector, in some details, to help decide on one programme for further investigation; three, it further elaborates on selected programmes to help identify the most suitable case to investigate the research questions. Finally, the report also highlights some cross-sector issues, which have implications for selection of the cases. Before, moving to these details, below is a word on methodology.

Section-2: Methodology

The paper draws upon documentary evidence as well as extensive interviews with prominent actors within each of the three service sectors under study. At the first stage of the fieldwork, the obvious players within each sector were identified. These in particular included the government, the leading NGOs working within education, health, and water and sanitation, and international donor community. Interviews were initially conducted with the main focal point/ministry spokesmen within each ministry to help identify those government programmes within which there are some obvious relationships with the NSPs. These exploratory interviews were followed up with in-depth interviews with the heads or senior officials of the relevant programmes. Interviews were also conducted with many NSP providers in all the three sectors especially those, which are involved in some form of relationship with the state in service provision.

Some big NSPs, with a national or regional presence, which were not involved in a relationship with the state, were also interviewed to get a critical perspective on the partnership programmes. At the same time, interviews were conducted with sector specialists in leading development agencies, including the multilateral and bilateral organizations like the World Bank and DFID. This was in recognition of the fact that the government development plans and sector strategy papers, as well as initial
interviews with the government and non-profit providers, made it clear very early on that the international donor agencies were often key players behind initiation of many of these partnerships. The international literature on partnerships had also suggested the likelihood of finding a strong donor influence on the—‘partnerships’ being a key objective of the millennium development goals. Reports of independent research think-tanks on each of the three sectors were also consulted.

Finally, where possible, a few seminars and conferences on the related subjects were attended. For example, the Second South Asian Conference on Sanitation (SACOSAN) provided a valuable opportunity to identify the programmes within water and sanitation and to verify the information gathered from different sources. Similarly, a workshop organised by an INGO in Islamabad with leading education NGOs from across the country was utilised to help identify the various types of relationships/programmes that exist among them and the state in the provision of education services. The country strategy plans of the bigger donors were also consulted.

The report is structured around the three service sectors: education, health and water and sanitation. As will be seen there are some sector differences, which have affected the types and number of programmes that have evolved within each sector. To begin with, education has a much larger number of NSPs than health or water and sanitation, although this is in the context of a relatively low level of NGO and voluntary activity in Pakistan. Even the Pakistan Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) notes: “Unlike other developing countries, there is a limited presence of NGOs in the (health) sector and reluctance on the part of government agencies to collaborate with NGOs,” (p. 77, PRSP). Water and Sanitation have even fewer NSPs. At the same time, government budgetary allocations for the three sectors vary: within Social Action Programme (SAP), 64 per cent of the budget was allocated for primary education, 19 per cent for primary health care, and 14 per cent for rural water supply and sanitation, and 3 per cent for population welfare (SPDC 1997; 2000). These differences have been highlighted right at the beginning to help understand some of the differences that can be seen in the number and types of programmes that have evolved across the three sectors.

Section-3: Education

As discussed in my paper on the history of state-NSP relations in Pakistan (Bano 2007), apart from the Bhutto socialist era when a large number of NSP schools were nationalized, the state has generally encouraged the involvement of the private sector in the provision of education. However, as discussed in that paper, the current emphasis on PPP is a new push, and international development agencies have played a role in this. From the beginning, there has been a provision for the state to give land to NSPs to set up schools and madrasas. A closer analysis of the country’s five year development plans, however, shows that it is really in the late 1970s and early 1980s that more conscious efforts were made to involve NSPs within education provision and much of this was done under the banner of literacy programmes. The attempts to formally engage NGOs/CBOs in implementation of state education programmes did not start till 1980s, and was put into practice in a noticeable way only under the Social Action Programme (SAP) in the 1990s. Since then the emphasis on participation has continued to grow and under the current government which was installed in 1999 after a military coup, ‘public-private partnership’ has become a critical component of the reform agenda (GoP 2002).
Government documents and interviews within the Ministry of Education show that, within the Ministry, public-private partnership is being interpreted to mean the three PPP programmes documented within the Education Sector Reform Paper.

1) **Concessions to private schools**: The first programme that all the government officials refer to in the context of PPP is the concessions announced to private schools under the current government. These concessions include allocating free land to schools, charging domestic rather than commercial rates for electricity and gas bills, tax exemptions on imports, and exemptions from income tax. There are no restrictions in terms of which type of private schools can access these facilities; even the elite private schools can access these facilities though in terms of electricity and other bills, there is a limit to the units allowed at concessional rates. All government officials interviewed, however, acknowledge that this programme is not being applied in a systematic manner: it is up to the negotiating capacity of the individual school to win these concessions from the relevant authorities.

2) **Adopt a School Programme**: The second prominent programme is Adopt a School. In this model, an NSP takes over the management of the government schools. The number of such cases is still limited. One reason for this is that most NGOs are donor dependent and cannot take on the responsibility of running state schools unless they get a donor-funded project to support this. In this regard, a significant push is coming from USAID, which so far is the only big donor that is supporting NGOs to take over schools under the Adopt a School Programme. USAID has engaged the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy, a national level NGO, to administer a programme of three-way partnership to adopt government schools. In this programme, a business concern is asked to provide financial support to take over the government school, and make investment in developing its infrastructure. USAID in turn finances PCP administrative costs and those of the NGO which is selected to mobilize the community to contribute to the running of the school. Thus, the partnership is between the corporate sector, a local NGO, and the government school. However, this is not necessarily a naturally developed alliance but is especially brought together by PCP, with support from funds from USAID. In this approach the state doesn’t give up the management of the school or staff; the private sector puts in resources, and the community contributes.

The National Education Foundation and its provincial counterparts are also approaching prominent corporate entities to take part in this programme. However, the number of such initiatives is relatively limited and none of the bigger NGOs interviewed, expect a few exceptions discussed below, appeared enthused about the idea. Some big NGOs are also concerned that under this programme the better run state schools rather than the poorly performing ones are being taken out of the state system as the private sector is not interested in taking over the worst cases. This allegedly is further weakening the state schooling system.

3) **Permission to mobilize government school buildings** for running evening shift schools by the private sector is the third main PPP programme being promoted by the state. But, there is little evidence of many interesting cases coming up within it. Also, in terms of partnership, it is not necessarily a very complex relationship as it is largely about sharing the bills for the monthly utilities. Though there are reportedly disputes about the bills, this programme is less likely to
generate rivalry over the notion of public action between state and non-state providers, as the interaction is relatively limited.

4) Finally, there is the government-run Non-Formal Basic Schools Programme, which involves active participation of the NSPs but interestingly it is not mentioned as a PPP in government documents. A possible explanation for this could be that the non-formal schooling programme started in 1980s so has a much older history of ‘Public-Private Partnership’ than the current PPP programmes, and thus was viewed differently. The first serious debates within the Ministry of Education around setting up non-formal schools through community involvement go back to 1979 (Khawaja & Brennan 1990). As will be elaborated later, in the eighties the government introduced ‘Nai Roshini’ schools and some other projects, which aimed to increase literacy through non-formal methods. Since then the government non-formal schools programmes has continued to evolve.

Under the present government, the programme has been renamed as the Non-Formal Basic Schools Programme and is being expanded dramatically. Currently, the federal government is running 10,000 such schools across the country; in addition, the Punjab government runs another 7,000 such schools (MoE 2005). The government has announced a plan to establish 82,000 such schools across the country. The exact time-frame for this is not available, but the August issues of the Non-Formal Basic Education newsletter produced by the Ministry of Education and UNESCO noted that in the last five months, 1,397 new non-formal schools had been opened employing 1,397 female teachers and enrolling 41,910 students. At the end of this non-formal schooling programme, the children are made to take the government administered five grade exam after which they can enter a government or private school. Generally, smaller rather than bigger educational NGOs in Pakistan have been interested in running these schools.

The bigger educational NGOs on the other hand all run non-formal schools of their own with funding from international donor agencies. These schools are largely independent of the government. The NGO is responsible for mobilizing the community to donate the school building, and to identify a local teacher. The NGOs on the other hand provide teacher training and monitoring. The difference of this model from the government run non-formal basic education school programme is that in this case the government does not monitor the NGO schools. It is up to the donor agency to evaluate these schools. Therefore, there is not much formal interaction between government and NGO run non-formal schools. The main interaction between the two sides is at the end of the non-formal school cycle when it comes to mainstreaming these children into government schools.

Under the current government many NGO representatives were appointed as advisors and ministers at federal as well as provincial level. Also, due to the active involvement of many donor agencies in the development of the current Education Sector Reform Plan, it seems there is a greater acceptance of NGO run non-formal schools within the Ministry of Education than before. In general, the current situation seems to be that the government requires these children from NGO schools to take a government run five grade exam after which they can enter the government schools. Most NGOs interviewed seemed happy with this arrangement. However, it is not clear, how many actually make their children undertake this exam and how the interaction between the state and NSPs at the time of mainstreaming takes place. There are signs that the influential NSPs are more likely to successfully mainstream their children into government schools.
The third institutional model of running non-formal schools is under the Rural Support Programmes which run their own community non-formal schools. Their method of community mobilization is very similar to the NGO model. The only difference is that because of RSPs’ special institutional connections with the government compared with an ordinary NGO, there is a possibility that they might have better institutional arrangements for mainstreaming their children into government schools. The Punjab Rural Support Programme has very recently also launched a specific programme for mainstreaming of children completing their non-formal schools. The national as well as the provincial Education Foundations also run non-formal schools. The model is the same as discussed above. The Foundations are institutionally like RSPs, i.e., they are NGOs set up by the government so have different institutional links with the government compared with ordinary NGOs.

Given the above details, it is clear that the two main programmes within education which entail substantial relations between state and NSPs at multiple levels are Adopt a School and the NFE programme. The next section, compares the two programmes on multiple factors to see which one merits further investigation for the purpose of this study.

Programme Selection

Interviews with multiple stakeholders suggest pros and cons in selection of either one of the two programmes. NFE is the older programme in terms of government and NGO interaction but it was never really conceptualised as a public-private partnership and even today for most NSPs (apart from those involved in government NFE schools), the formal interaction is often only at the mainstreaming stage. The Adopt a School programme, on the other hand, became popular mainly under the current government but here the tensions between the state and non-state providers are more obvious. There are other layers to the analysis which need to be taken into count but before that it is important to be clear about terminology.

Terminology

NFE has come to have quite a specific meaning in Pakistan; it represents a process involving certain fixed steps rather than a very adaptive or responsive model. These steps normally include:
- mobilisation of the community by an NGO, the Rural Support Programme or an Education Foundation to set up a school in the community;
- provision of a local teacher from the community who is normally just an eighth grade pass;
- the community donates the land and the building for the school;
- the NGO provides teacher training and undertakes constant monitoring;
- the school is multi-grade where in one class the teacher simultaneously teaches students from first to the fifth grade;
- the course is normally 3 years long but sometime is stretched to 4 years;
- and the teaching methods attempt to be more child focused. However, the curriculum is overwhelmingly based on the government curriculum to facilitate mainstreaming of their students in the government schools.

There is little evidence of innovative or community responsive curriculum being designed by the NGO non-formal schools. So, in using the term NFE in Pakistan, the emphasis is on community participation, a local teacher and a one room school; the term has little to do with actual syllabus. Also, it is important to remember that often other terms like Community Schools/Home Schools are used to represent the same model. For example, in the case of Sindh Education Foundation, its Fellowship
Programme, Community Schools, and Non-formal Schools share most of these characteristics. In general, the rise of this model/programme is embedded in debates over universal access to primary education.

Similarly, for the Adopt a School model, other terms are also being used. For example, many call it School Improvement Programme or School Upgradation Programme. The main defining feature of this programme is that the NSP is given the right to support the school either through improving the infrastructure facilities or getting involved in school management. How exactly the private sector engages in management, however, varies. The rise of this model/programme is embedded in debates over improving quality of schooling in state schools.

**Number of actors / Non-State providers**

Within the two programmes, Adopt a School involves a more diverse range of non-state providers. There have been examples of individual philanthropists taking over a school; philanthropic organizations like CARE\(^1\) taking over hundreds of schools; there are corporate philanthropists involved in sponsoring schools; and finally there are Rural Support Programmes taking over hundred of schools. Education Foundations, especially Sindh Education Foundation, have played a key role in introducing this model. Anita Ghulam Ali the head of Sindh Education Foundation (SEF) is regarded as the initiator of this programme in her tenure as Minister of Education for Sindh. Very few NGOs, i.e. those reliant on donor aid, are actively involved in this programme. Apart from ITA (Baela Jammel’s NGO) it is difficult to identify any big education NGO which is involved in this programme.

This information was also verified in a workshop in which 13 prominent education NGOs from across Pakistan were participating. All participants were very clear that they were not very interested in this model as they argue it is taking responsibility away from the state. One obvious reason for their non-involvement (which they are unlikely to mention) is that not many donors are currently funding NGOs to take over government schools so NGOs are unlikely to be attracted by the idea.

As compared to this, within NFE the situation is reversed. Here one only finds NGOs as non-state providers. It is difficult to indentify any prominent case of a corporate philanthropist or a traditional voluntary organisation being involved in NFE in Pakistan. The NFE debate in Pakistan is closely linked to EFA and UPE campaigns. The ideas came through the UN/donor platforms along with funds; the majority of the big education NGOs run NFE programmes of their own with donor funds (see details below). As discussed before, it is very rare to find big NGOs involved in the government run non-formal schools programme. Based on the fieldwork, ITA and Bunyad appear to be the only two exceptions (see below). So, in terms of number of actors, we have more diversity in the Adopt a School model than within NFE. In addition, in case of the Adopt a School programme, another non-state actor with a public agenda is the teacher unions as when NSPs take over management of government schools they have to deal with the government teachers who are already in place.

**Continuum of cases**

Both Adopt a School and NFE have a continuum of cases. Within Adopt a School, we can find three different categories in terms of the extent of reforms they are undertaking. At one extreme is the RSP model which has recently taken over 1600 government schools in Punjab. Here the contract is that the management is

\(^1\)This is a local philanthropic organization, not the international NGO
transferred just for two years to RSPs to improve the system before being returned back to the government. ITA’s approach seems the same. Baela Jameel emphasized that the approach of ITA is to improve the system within the given facilities, and maximum emphasis is on retaining the government teachers.

Then in the middle of the continuum, one can place corporate philanthropists motivated by intermediary bodies like the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy, who are taking over a select number of schools. In this model, often a local NGO is the one overtaking the management, while the corporate sector provides the funds. Often driven by the desire to gain goodwill for the corporation, such collaborations are more focused on improving the standards dramatically and investing in building repairs to gain a sense of pride in the school. Here considerations of how the government teachers react or how these standards will be maintained when the school returns to the government are less critical.

Finally at the other extreme are programmes like CARE, run by philanthropic organizations with a strong leader. They differ in their intensity of involvement and are more set on establishing high standards in their schools, rather than working within the existing system. CARE has continued to invest large sums of money in these schools, and is determined to stay engaged for at least 10 years.

In the RSP model the emphasis is more on making do with what is there within the given school resources. This is also reflected in the number of schools (up to 400), the RSPs have taken on in one district. The RSPs have taken them on with a clear aim to improve quality for two years and then return them to the government. On the other hand, the philanthropic organizations take on only a limited number. So, the scale is also representative of the kind of intervention planned. But, there are exceptions, like CARE, which has now taken on more than 260 schools and is still heavily investing new resources in them.

As for NFE, interviews suggest three types of NFE models, which can be placed on a continuum in terms of state/non-state interaction:

1) government sponsored non-formal schools, which are run by NSPs
2) NSP non-formal schools which engage with the government at the mainstreaming stage (Sudhaar, ABES, Sahee)
3) NSPs which work completely independently of government.

There is a clear government-NSP relationship to study in the case of the first category. There is also an argument for comparing the relationship of a bigger NSP with the state under this programme, as compared to a smaller NSP. In the second case, there is a relationship but given absence of any analysis on the the relations between NSPs involved in NFE and the state especially at the time of mainstreaming, more can be said only after the initial scoping studies.

It is also interesting to note that most of the bigger education NGOs are not involved in the government run non-formal school programme because of two reasons:

- The government monitoring team intervenes in their teaching methods
- The amount for monitoring each non-formal school given to NGOs is only Rs 200 (2 pounds) per month (recently raised to Rs 500) which amounts to little for a well-established NGO.

As Sadiqa Salludian (a very senior and well-respected development person who heads the Indus Resource Centre) said "this money provides no means to provide good teacher training or monitoring." This is understandably an issue for NGOs running large budgets. For a smaller NGO, which takes up 15 to 20 such schools
there is, on the other hand, a good explanation for their involvement: the monitoring cost collectively does provide a decent return for a small NGO and it becomes a source of patronage and clout within a small locality as the NGO gets to appoint the teacher and select school site.

Comparing the two programmes, it seems that the Adopt a School programme presents more clear challenges in terms of maintaining state-NSP relations. However, that is largely because more research (though more through policy reports) has already been done on it so that we are familiar with the tensions that arise. In the case of NFE, since it has not been conceptualised as a PPP, there is hardly any work analysing how the state and NGOs are engaging in this arena. So, focusing on NFE has the potential to contribute something new. Also, given that government and donors are investing large amount of resources in NFE, it is an important area to study. Focusing on NFE also helps focus on the detail of mainstreaming of children from NFE schools, which is of much interest to the international development debate. Therefore, there is a strong argument for selecting NFE programme as the focus. When seen across the sector, this selection also helps cover a different type of relationship, as this one is of a loose or informal nature, while within health and water and sanitation, the programmes selected are of a more formal and contractual nature. The next section provides some more details on the NFE programme in Pakistan.

Programme details: NFE

Pakistan developed its first development plan as early as 1951 and education featured prominently in it. From the beginning, universalisation of primary education remained a key policy objective of all Five Year Plans (Khawaja & Brennan 1990). However, the reference to non-formal education was rarely made and when referred to was tied to adult literacy programmes rather than targeting of school children. Despite high emphasis on universal literacy on paper, the commitment to it remained weak. It was only in the Fourth Five Year Plan (1970-1975) that the government allocated Rs 2.3 million to make 5 million adults literate. The real shift towards investment in literacy programmes and linking them to primary education and non-formal teaching methods only came in reality during the Fifth Five Year Plan (1978-1983) and the Sixth Five Year Plan (1983-1988). A Literacy and Mass Education Commission (LAMEC) was established in 1981, with the ‘explicit purpose to evolve strategies for eradicating illiteracy, to develop plans for the promotion of literacy and suggest ways and means to use non-formal education as mass approach for literacy programmes,’ (MoE 1978).

During this period, many pilot non-formal education projects were developed which, though failing in their individual capacity, acted as a prelude to the current government-run Basic Non-Formal School Programme. Among these the prominent projects included: READ, Mohallah Schools, Nai Roshini Schools, Mosque Schools, and Iqra Pilot Project.

**READ**

Rural Education and Development (READ) was started in 1977 in collaboration with UNESCO to integrate educational programmes with rural development and promote better economic opportunities for rural development. It involved Village Education Committees as an integral part of the programme and was open to formal as well as non-formal methods of teaching.

**Mohallah schools**
These schools were opened in those villages where there were no facilities for primary education or the school was not within walking distance for children. These schools focused on girls’ education and accommodation for the schools was provided by the Village Education Committee. By 1984, about 24 mohallah schools were established in the project area.

**Mosque Schools**

Mosque schools were an attempt to control the rising cost of building primary schools. In the project area 37 mosque schools were opened. Each school was provided a black board and an honorarium of Rs 150 per month and a teacher who got the salary of Rs 300 per month.

**Nai Roshini Schools**

The Nai Roshini (new light) schools were inspired by successful experiments in some countries of the region under the name of ‘drop in’ schools. They were started and operated within the existing primary school buildings in the afternoon. Full time teachers were employed to teach a condensed two-year primary education curriculum. They had no summer vacation; the schools were closed only during the sowing and the harvesting seasons and then only for short periods. The programme was launched in 1987. Though the projected aimed to attract children between 10-14 years of age, it also ended up having children of 15-19 or 20 years of age.

**Iqra Pilot project**

The Iqra Pilot project was launched in 1986. Unlike the project discussed above, this proposed a very informal method of educating an individual. A literate person, irrespective of his or her qualifications could volunteer and join the scheme to teach any number of illiterates in his or her own time, at times and places of mutual convenience and bring them to an acceptable level of literacy. In return s/he was promised a fixed monetary compensation.

All of the initial pilot projects of NFE within the state system had some level of support from international donor agencies. The fact that the development community and the UPE and EFA discourse had a role in initiating these programme is noticeable in the Plan documents, which state that these programmes will be developed in light of experiences in other developing countries. Also, it is noted that several lending and donor agencies had provided more than half a billion US dollars for basic education with a thrust on primary education during this period. These included: the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, USAID, and UNICEF (Khawaja & Brennan 1990).

The Literacy and Mass Education Commission (LAMEC), which managed all these projects, was reorganized on 1 December 1989, and renamed the National Education and Training Commission. In 1995, the Commission was one again renamed. This time it is was called the Prime Minister’s Literacy Commission. During the 1990s, based on the experience of these pilot projects, the Commission established a new pattern of setting up these non-formal schools. A significant difference was that the government started to implement this project entirely through NGOs rather than setting up the schools itself. The Project is based on the idea of home schools managed by a single teacher with multiple classes, being run through NGOs and CBOs.

Under the current government, the role of the Commission has been taken over by the Non-Formal Basic Education Project discussed above, under which a massive expansion of NFE schools is ongoing. In NFBE schools, the formal school curriculum is taught and children appear in primary examinations conducted by the District
Education Departments along with formal school children. The NFBE newsletter claims that during the last primary examination 75% of the children cleared their exams (NFBE: Dec 2005, Issue III, newsletter). Under the current Non-formal Basic Education Programme, community schools are preferably established in those villages or in clusters where government primary schools do not exist or where separate schools for girls are not available, or places where girls' participation rate at primary level is very low, or areas where the dropout rate is higher.

While the state NFE programme was evolving under guidance of donors and regional experiences, starting in the 1980s, a parallel tradition of NFE schools was also developing among NSPs again under the patronage of international donors. From the 1980s, there was a steady birth and rise of NGOs working with education that received funds from international donors to set up NFE schools. A DFID funded study of education NGOs in Punjab shows that out of the 233 education organizations surveyed in Punjab, the majority (84 per cent) were established in 1980s (Sahe 2006). In southern Punjab, around 60 per cent were established in the 1990s. All the main NGOs running NFE schools in Pakistan emerged from the 1980s onwards. Bunyad, Sahee, Sudhaar and Maula Baksh Trust are just some of the obvious examples. Apart from the funding, these organizations received training and technical support from the donors. UNICEF, in particular, played a key role in promoting these organizations and during the 1990s, published a series of newsletters and brochures documenting experiences citing these prominent NGOs involved in NFE as a role model. As discussed above, these bigger NGOs involved in NFE, however, have in general stayed disengaged from the government-run NFE programme. However, as discussed above, the methods and details of the government-run NFE schools and the independent NGO-run NFE schools are very similar on paper.

Based on this historical analysis and the issues discussed in the prior sections, the issues for case selection at the scoping stage are these:

The first option is that the research selects either ITA or Bunyad, and analyses why and how they have engaged with government NFE programmes and then to compares their experience with another big NGO (say Sudhaar or Sahee in Lahore) which has a long tradition of running NFE programmes with donor funds but which does not engage with the government. Sudhaar, in particular would be a good case for the scoping stage as it claims to successfully mainstream its children into government schools. The idea in making such a case selection would be to compare the nature of interaction/relations that the two maintain with the state with the idea of focusing on one, depending which raises more interesting issues.

The other option is that we choose either ITA or Bunyad, and compare it with a smaller NGO working with the government NFE programme. This way we are only focusing on the government-run NFE programme; what we are comparing then is how the size of the organization makes a difference in the type of relation that evolves.

Either one of the two options would be interesting but it might be more interesting to follow the first route given that majority of the big NGOs working within NEF in Pakistan stay outside the government programme so it is worth exploring why they do that and how they then resolve the issue of mainstreaming their children into government schools. It is also worth remembering that one benefit of including either ITA or Bunyad is that both these organizations are involved in NFE as well as Adopt a School so having them in the in-depth analysis will also provide an opportunity to compare what kind of relations the same organization needs to maintain vis-à-vis these two different programmes.
Section-4: Health

Along with education, primary health has been a priority area in all of Pakistan's Five Year Development Plans. However, as discussed above, the share of the government's budgetary allocation to health is much lower than to education, but more than to water and sanitation. At the same time, the number of non-profit NSPs within health is lower (4.5 per cent of the total non-profit organizations in Pakistan, compared with 8.5 per cent working within primary education) (Ghaus-Pasha et. Al 2002). The health sector in Pakistan currently provides many interesting cases of public-private partnership. The currently prominent programmes are three: Transferring Management of Basic Health Units to Rural Support Programmes, National AIDS Programme, and National TB Control Programme (MoH 2004).

In terms of tracing the history of state and NSP relations within health, all documents and interviews suggest that within the health sector, an active effort towards engaging NSPs in health services really developed only under the SAP, which made community participation a central component of state service delivery across all three sectors. Prior to that there were interactions and collaborations between state and some NSP providers working within health, but it is difficult to identify a programme as most were ad hoc developments. The most prominent example of NSP and state relations within the health sector is focused on the Family Planning Association of Pakistan (FPAP). FPAP is a relatively unique kind of NGO, which historically had a close link with government programmes and was involved in their implementation prior to the SAP period. Therefore, FPAP cannot be taken to represent a typical programme of NSP-State collaboration. It is more an independent case. Other examples of loose and independent state and NSP relations also exist prior to the introduction of SAP, i.e., before the 1990s. However, a conscious effort to enter into relations with NSPs in health service delivery only started under SAP; since then it has become more formalized under the current push towards 'public-private partnership' which is one of the core components of the reform strategy of the current government.

National TB Control Programme

Developed with the support of the Global Fund Initiative to control TB, the National TB Control Programme of the Government of Pakistan was launched in its current expanded form in 2002 (MoH 2006b). The programme has developed with the active partnership of the NGO sector at all levels. For example, the Association for Social Development, an NGO that has worked with the Ministry of Health since the late 1980s, has been involved in designing the national strategy framework for the current programme. It has also been responsible for conducting operational research, and it is now also helping improve the government TB control and prevention services. In addition, there are also many other NGOs, which take grants under this programme from the government to run their own TB prevention and control programmes. The NGOs, in particular, are being engaged by the government to run community awareness programmes to help identify patients and to encourage the public to use government TB control facilities. Given that Pakistan is the 6th highest TB burden country globally, it is an important programme: 1.5 million Pakistan are estimated to be TB patients.

There is a possibility of finding cases of interest in this programme. However, initial interviews with the concerned government officials and NSPs involved in the
programme seem to suggest that their relationship involves few interesting issues about policy and public action between state and non-state players. Dr Amir Khan, head of the Association for Social Development, was of the view that in their experience frictions and tensions have been more on technical issues related to the programme than due to some other factors. To resolve these differing technical views, negotiations were required and these could be studied. However, as the next section will highlight, the BHUs or HIV/AIDS form stronger candidates for this research than the National TB Control Programme.

**HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment**

Since the late 1980s, the Government of Pakistan has run a National AIDS Control Programme. This programme was given a push in 2003, when the government took a loan from the World Bank to expand it (PNAC 2006a). The programme has developed entirely on the basis of public-private partnership; all the implementation is being done by NGOs. At the same time, the EU and DFID have helped establish a Pakistan National AIDS Consortium, which has brought together a coalition of 23 NGOs working on HIV/AIDS (PNAC 2006a). This Consortium has its own office and conducts trainings for NGOs on technical issues. The Consortium also works very closely with the government in developing the National Strategy for HIV/AIDS Prevention and Treatment.

The programme history goes back to 1987 when shortly after the diagnosis of the first HIV/AIDS cases in the country, the Ministry of Health of the Government of Pakistan established the Federal Committee on AIDS. The following year, it launched the National AIDS Control Program (PNAC 2006a). In 1994, the AIDS programme along with three preventive health programmes was brought under the SAP. In 1999 the NACP, with support from USAID, initiated a strategic planning process, hiring a team of experts to investigate the AIDS situation in the country (PNAC 2006a). This resulted in a report, which contributed to the development of a National HIV/AIDS Strategic Framework for the next five years. The Enhanced HIV/AIDS Program was launched in October 2003 with recognition from the World Bank. In addition, DFID, CIDA, UN system organizations, USAID, EU, the Global Fund, and ILO are also partners. Currently around 200 NGOs are involved in HIV/AIDS related activities.

Accordingly to Mr Qadeer Baig, Director of the Consortium, the main reason why government has given NGOs such a big role in the programme is that the target populations for these programmes are not recognized by the government. The Pakistani Government does not formally recognize either female or male sex workers nor the drug users who are the main high-risk groups. Therefore, it has to operate through NGOs to access them. Secondly, HIV/AIDS programmes raise issues related to sexual matters, which is a taboo subject in Pakistani society. The government is thus reluctant to raise these issues from its own platform. Again according to Mr Baig, government officials rely on the NGOs to highlight the need to undertake these programmes when dealing with Islamic religion parties as, otherwise, they feel they will be criticized by the parties for promoting corrupt practices in society.

NGOs are therefore involved in research, prevention through awareness building, as well as curative services for HIV/AIDS patients. The government is mainly involved in developing the projects, disbursing the money and monitoring the projects. The programme so far mainly involves federal and provincial governments. The programme in all likelihood will raise interesting issues about tensions between state and non-state providers over handling of a taboo issue. Also, PPPs within HIV/AIDS programmes are internationally of interest. The LSHTM has been involved in
undertaking some background research for the Pakistan National AIDS Programme and is also currently undertaking research on the programme from the PPP angle.

HIV/AIDS could be an interesting programme to focus on. There are different types of NGO-government contracts being implemented under this programme to choose from. Also, these programme involve some well-known health NGOs. Finally, though the current programme was initiated only in 2003 with the arrival of World Bank money, even before that, NGOs were key players in HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in Pakistan as most donors had been working through them on this issue since the mid 1990s. The Enhanced HIV/AIDS Control Programme (2003-2008) is being implemented with assistance from the World Bank at a cost of Rs. 2.85 billion (PNAC 2006a). The broad area has probably been largely donor driven from the very beginning but interviews suggest that there has been a process of internal negotiations among the government, donors, and NGOs since 1996, which has led to the existing programme. If we select HIV/AIDS as the focus programme, then part of the emphasis should be on tracing this process of loose interaction/relations between the state, NSPs, and international donors, which have led to the current formalized partnership under the National AIDS/HIV programme.

**Management of Basic Health Units**

The other dominant partnership within the health sector in Pakistan now is the taking over of government Basic Health Units by the Pakistan Rural Support Program (PRSP). The programme is the focus of much attention of the donors and the government. Recently, the government has in principal agreed to hand over all the BHUs to RSPs under the President's Initiative. The model has already been replicated in 11 districts of Punjab and is now being expanded to other provinces (PRSP 2006). Recently, an external evaluation of the programme sponsored by the World Bank has taken place (World Bank 2006b).

There are 4685 Basic Health Units in Pakistan. Each BHU has a staff of 8 including a doctor (PNAC 2006a). PRSP initiated the idea of taking over BHU management because in its community mobilization meetings its staff realized that the communities rarely used the BHUs. According to a PRSP briefing paper, this happened because the doctor is either not present or intermittently available and due to the supply of poor quality medicines at the BHUs. According to the PRSP model, one doctor is sufficient to operate three BHUs provided he is local, adequately paid, and mobile. The model argues that people are willing to pay for quality medicines if made available at a BHU. A revolving drug fund of $1725 was created to give patients the options to buy quality medicines or to use government provided drugs (World Bank 2006b). The profits from the drug fund are utilized to cater for the needs of the poorest of the poor.

Existing evaluations of this experiment in Rahim Yar Khan, the first district to implement this model, suggest that the utilisation of BHU facilities has increased substantially since the handing of the BHUs in Rahim Yar Khan to PRSP. They show that numbers of outpatients increased by 200 percent; and about 83 percent of those who had visited for treatment both before and after the recent reorganization of the BHUs responded that they now found a significant improvement in their health services (World Bank 2006b). The World Bank has also started to quote the Rahim Yar Khan experience as a model of success in its international briefs (World Bank 2006a).
It is well documented that Jahangir Khan Tareen - at that time Chairman of the Task Force of the Punjab Government for the Agriculture sector, and later (2003), the MNA for Rahim Yar Khan and an Advisor to the Chief Minister of the Punjab on ‘New Initiatives in the Social Sectors’— has played a critical role in the success of the Rahim Yar Khan project. Now the Federal Minister for Industries, Production and Special Initiatives, it was Mr Tareen who asked PRSP to undertake this pilot in RYK. After a presentation to the Chief Minister of the Punjab in January 2003, PRSP made a proposal to take over the management of all the 104 BHUs in that District. The details of initial replications in 11 districts of Punjab are as follows:

2003: Chakwal, Vehari,
2004: Lahore, Faisalabad, Sahiwal,

From discussions within the Ministry as well as with PRSP staff, it is clear that there have been serious challenges to making this partnership work. The main issue has been around getting work done by the staff that remain on the government payroll. The Lady Health Workers in particular have had many problems adjusting to the demands of the new management.

The issue to note, however, is that within this programme, the diversity of NSPs is limited as all BHUs are being handed over to RSPs, which as discussed in Bano (2007) are not like ordinary NGOs. The programme is not going to involve other NGOs in the replication process so it is questionable to what extent this partnership model will work if BHUs were to be handed over to ordinary NGOs. On the other hand, given that the model is being declared a success case and is likely to be replicated across Pakistan, while the World Bank is projecting it favorably at the international level, it is arguably a good time to study this programme in detail. International development agencies, donors, as well as NGOs will be interested in such a study.

Selecting a health programme

Both the HIV/AIDS and BHU programmes have potential to form interesting cases for our study; the issue is really to determine which one of the two would yield the more interesting analysis for this study.

From meetings with NSPs involved in the HIV/AIDS programme and discussions with RSP staff, it seems that HIV/AIDS might have a longer history as a programme of partnership. However, since donors have a big role in it, the contracts are very clear cut, and the NGOs act as contractors so that there is little difference of opinion. Seen this way, BHUs offer a more challenging relationship, where an NGO has to get work done through government staff.

In terms of its longer history, however, the BHU programme is less exciting than the HIV/AIDS programme which, if seen as a loose relationship, has existed since early 1990s and thus has a much longer history than BHUs. Interviews with PRSP staff highlight that talk around privatizing BHUs really started around 1999, when three BHUs in Lodhran were handed over to NRSP. The experience inspired PRSP to do the same in Rahim Yar Khan two years later where the model really took off. Thus, the BHU programme has a shorter history. Also, in this case there is little evidence of a lot of negotiations between NSPs, state and the donors leading to this decision. In case of HIV/AIDS, on the other hand, the current programme (though largely a result of big World Bank money) has been based on experiences of NGOs and government since early 1990s and NGOs have been key players in this sector from the start. So
there is a relatively longer history of NGO/donor/state engagement in HIV/AIDS. Finally, there is a diverse range of NGOs involved in the HIV/AIDS programme as opposed to BHUs where now RSPs are the only key players. In the beginning, one or two NGOs got the BHUs but now, as a policy, government is only handing over to RSPs and not to other NGOs.

As opposed to these attractive features of studying the HIV/AIDS programme, the strong argument for focusing on BHUs is that this programme promises to highlight more serious tensions between state and non-state providers than in the HIV/AIDS model, as the former involves management of government staff and is not as clearly defined as the HIV/AIDS contracts. Also, BHUs affect a much larger segment of the population than the HIV/AIDS programme which is focused primarily on high-risk groups. Another argument for focusing on BHUs is that, given that the World Bank is promoting this model as a success case internationally, its independent analysis will be of interest to a broader audience. Also, given that the model is being replicated across the country now, the report findings might be useful in the replication process itself. And finally, focusing on BHUs helps maintain a common programme across the three focus countries, given that Bangladesh does not seem to have much happening within HIV/AIDS prevention work.

Case selection

The BHU model has been replicated within Punjab since 2003 and starting from 2006 is now being replicated in other provinces. There is an argument for focusing on Rahim Yar Khan, the original model and another replication (Faisalabad or Vehari) for the initial scoping studies. The other option is to focus on RYK and replication in one of the other provinces, as then there will be a slight diversity of player as in other provinces the replication will be carried out by the RSP of that province and not PRSP. But, given that the replication process in the other provinces only started a few months ago, the first option seems more feasible and realistic.

Section-5: Water and Sanitation

The Water and Sanitation sector in Pakistan presents relatively less diversity of relationships between the state and non-state providers. The most quoted nationwide survey of Pakistani NGOs conducted by SPDC under a non-profit sector research project supervised by John Hopkins University does not even provide a category of NGOs working within water and sanitation, while it maintains a distinct category for education and health (Ghaus-Pasha et al. 2002). Therefore, it is difficult to come up even with vague estimates of the number of NSPs working in water and sanitation. However, the signs are that there is a growing emphasis of the government and donors on this sector since the 1990s. With the allocation of more funds to be spent through NSPs, more NGOs are coming into this sector, the Tareeq Foundation and WESS in Balochistan being just two examples.

Even on the government side, water and sanitation have traditionally not had a clear focus. Unlike the other two sectors, there is no one ministry devoted to this sector, though increasingly the Ministry of Environment is being given a bigger role. According to the Local Government Ordinance of 2001, planning and implementation of sanitation and related development programme is a responsibility of the
Tluka/Tehsil/Town Municipal Administrations (TMAs), or city government in the case of larger cities. At the federal level, the Ministry of Environment is the lead agency in the sanitation sector. Other ministries, which deal with sanitation related matters include Health, Planning and Development, Local Government and Rural Development, and Housing and Works. At the provincial level, water and sanitation are dealt with by a number of departments including Local Government and Rural Development, Works and Services, and the Public Health Engineering Department.

According to the Pakistan country brief presented at the SACOSAN-2 conference held in Islamabad during September 2006, the first policy statement of the government for the comprehensive combined water and sanitation initiative did not come about till 1988. This also took place after a donor-supported sanitation sector review and follow-up conference that supported the preparation of a strategic investment plan and project preparation for rural water supply and sanitation. This new-found emphasis was actually put into practice under SAP, where sanitation received high funding throughout the 1990s (MoEn 2006). One of the key objectives of SAP within the water and sanitation sector was to involve communities in the operation and management of small water and sanitation facilities. Rural sanitation was especially emphasised.

Since 1999, under the present government, the language of PPP is equally emphasised within the water and sanitation sector. The World Bank and the government officials are actively talking about PPPs within water and sanitation. At the SACOSAN conference in Islamabad, a whole session was devoted to the Community Led Total Sanitation Programme in Bangladesh, and the World Bank specialist for Water and Sanitation present at the occasion highlighted how the Bank is helping encourage the Pakistani government to adopt this model. It was also highlighted that the Government of NWFP had already initiated this model and a relatively successful replication had started in Mardan.

Also, it is stated in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper that “The government is encouraging the local communities and NGOs to actively participate in planning, designing, implementing, operating and maintaining water supply and sanitation schemes,” (p. 80, GoP 2003). Grants for NGOs and communities to establish community managed water and sanitation schemes are also available through the federally administered Khushali Bank and the Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF). The beneficiary communities are required to contribute 20 per cent of the capital cost of such projects.

In the earlier study of relations between NSPs and the state in water and sanitation in Pakistan, the following four models were identified as examples of public-private partnership in Pakistan.

1. Evolution of the Rural Support Programmes (RSPs) in Water and Sanitation
2. Municipal Collaboration with Non-State Providers in Jaranwala
3. Replication of Orangi Pilot Project Approaches

Based on current interviews and documentary evidence, the conclusion is that the choice of programmes is still more or less the same as were identified in this study.

**Orangi Pilot Project and its replications**

In terms of an explicit public-private partnership within water and sanitation, the Orangi Pilot Project remains the most prominent example in Pakistan. At the same
time its replications, especially in Lodhran district, are the focus of much attention within the PPP debate about water and sanitation in Pakistan. The project is now being replicated in a few more districts within Punjab. It is one project that most people within the sector quote when asked to identify important PPPs within W&S (details are given below).

Citizen Community Boards
Details of the current status of CCBs have already been discussed in the report on state and NSP relations in Pakistan. There is little evidence so far that CCBs have become active forums for public-private partnerships in water and sanitation. There is only a handful of CCBs, which have become noticeable, the Jawaranwal case being one of them. Given this limited number of CCB cases which are actually active, it is difficult to argue that CCBs can be taken as a programme to be explored seriously in terms of understanding state and NSP relations within water and sanitation. Interviews and existing reviews of CCBs suggest that elected Nazims rather than the community are putting together CCBs just to secure funds. No-one has been able to quote an example of a CCB that has done so well that is has become noticeable. However, at the same time, RSPs as well as many bigger NGOs claim that they are in the process of converting their local village organizations into CCBs (see example of Tareeqi Foundation below).

The Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment, which was established at part of the Devolution Ordinance 2001 to promote CCBs, has established a large number of CCBs but its officials agree that so far it is difficult to identify any cases which have become noticable for their projects in water and sanitation. The Trust funds infrastructure development projects through CCBs but these projects are only for 1 to 10 months duration; after that the Trust withdraws and it is between the community and the government to maintain that project. In many ways, RSPs are claiming to do the same as are NGOs like the Taraqee Foundation. So, it seems that, if we are interested in CCBs, then the best way to look at them is as part of projects like the one run by the Taraqee Foundation where CCBs are being established as part of a bigger programme of water and sanitation rather than focusing on a CCB per se as there are so far not many dynamic examples of them. It is possible to develop a typology of the kind of organizations that are establishing CCBs as part of their water and sanitation programmes to help determine which one might form the more interesting case if we are interested in further exploring this option.

Rural Support Programmes
The RSPs are still very dominant in Pakistan and supply of drinking water and provision of sanitation facilities remain an integral part of their work. Community involvement in rural W&S started through the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme in 1982. Since the mid-1990s, decentralised, community-based schemes were taken up in national water-related policies. Later, the National Rural Support Programme and the provincial Rural Support Programmes adopted this approach. Key to the approach was the involvement of the beneficiary communities themselves through contributions in cash and kind.

Interviews with PRSP, and SRSP, reveal that both these RSPs are currently involved in the small water supply and rural sanitation projects. However, most of these projects are funded through small grants of the Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund and last only for a duration of six months to one year. After that the community is supposed to manage the project on its own with occasional collaboration with the state officials. These six-month or a year-long projects are unlikely to highlight any dense relations between state and RSPs.
PPP projects run by NGOs working in Water & Sanitation

Finally, there are some big NGOs working in water and sanitation that are currently operating in partnership with the government to establish water supply and sanitation facilities in rural as well as urban areas. Tareeqi Foundation, a big NGO in Balochistan, is currently implementing an integrated programme for water supply and sanitation in collaboration with the district government in selected provinces of Pakistan. This particular project has been ongoing since 2004, and will continue till 2008. The project involves creating drinking water supply schemes and building sanitation facilities in collaboration with the district government and through community mobilization. According to a senior official of the Tareeqi Foundation, the project is also working to create CCBs through community mobilization to help manage the Water and Sanitation facilities. There are few other NGOs that are undertaking similar projects.

To provide some idea of the scale of the Tareeqi Foundation and other organizations involved in similar projects in water and sanitation, some details on the Foundation are provided here. Taraqee Foundation is one of the biggest NGOs in Balochistan. It started its operations in the field of low cost sanitation in 1994 and credit operations were started in 1996. The activities undertaken are capacity development, community physical infrastructure, micro credit and education. Within water and sanitation, TF re-initiated and completed a previously abandoned project that involved the installation of low cost sewerage lines in a squatter settlement in Quetta. Following the success of this project a UNICEF funded Water and Sanitation project was initiated in Naseerabad in 1998 that included sanitation schemes and awareness-raising. In 2001, the Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF) established a partnership with TF for a trial implementation of 34 schemes in one year. On the successful completion of the trial, the partnership was extended for a second phase in which 305 schemes were planned for implementation in a period of 2 years (ending October 2004). Initially three districts were targeted; however now the area of operations has expanded to six and these include Naseerabad, Jafferabad, Bolan, Jhal Magi, Pashin and Qillah Saifullah.

The identification of Community Infrastructure Projects (CIP) is demand driven. The selection process is based on sustainability as determined by the willingness of the communities to make arrangements for operations and maintenance (including recovery of operation and maintenance costs). Taraqee assists communities in organising themselves, preparing, implementing and managing these projects. The average cost of one CPI scheme varies from Rs.100, 000/- to Rs. 500,000.

The most commonly needed types of CIP projects are: Earthen Roads, Drinking Water Supply Schemes (DWSS), Water Reservoirs, Small Scale Water Treatment Plants; Low Cost Sanitation (LCS); Karez Extension and Rehabilitation; Delay Action Dams and Recharge Dams.

Programme selection

The two programmes which are strong candidates for further investigation are: the Orangi Pilot Project and its replications especially in Lodhran; and the PPP projects of some of the bigger NGOs like Tareeqi Foundation as described above.

Of the two, there is no doubt that OPP is the stronger candidate: it is a much older programme, presents multiple levels of interaction with the state, and is also being replicated. The only concern is that the programme has already been studied a lot.
But, it is also true that it has not been analysed so far from the angle of this study – the focus on government-NSP relations. It is true that it has received more attention than any other sanitation programme in Pakistan but, as for proper analysis, the model has been studied mainly as an effective tool for mobilising community participation for effective sanitation services. There is still scope to study how it has (succesfully) managed to involve the government.

Focusing on OPP has the advantage that this programme has had a large impact and is constantly in negotiation with the government about extending its programmes as well as its core project. OPP-RTI is now the Karachi City Government’s team member for developing the cities main sewage disposal and drainage channels. Karachi Water and Sewerage Board too has lately accepted OPP-RTI proposals. They are currently also advising the Karachi government on how to deal with floods caused by recent rains. So, the collaboration is on-going at multiple levels.

As opposed to Orangi, the only main advantage of focusing on an organization like Orangi is that it also allows us to study the processes through which these NGOs are developing CCBs. Since, currently there is a lot of interest in CCBs among donors and the government, this aspect of the study could get much attention. But, this is a much weaker justification for selecting a programme than the arguments in favour of OPP.

**Selected programme: Orangi & its replications**

Orangi is the largest katchi abadi or unplanned settlement in Karachi. People began living in the area in 1965 and after 1972, it grew rapidly. This was the situation when the Bank for Credit and Commerce International (BCCI) first invited Dr. Akhter Hammed Khan to work in Orangi in 1980. The first focus was on sanitation and sewerage problems. Without sanitary latrines and underground sewerage lines, both the health and property of the residents were being endangered. However, the households could not afford the current cost of conventional sanitation systems. The first OPP researchers rejected solutions based on foreign aid because the local residents could not afford to repay the large costs involved, given the necessary scale of the operation.

More recently, there has been further interest from a range of other agencies including local NGOs, bilateral and multilateral development assistance agencies, and state institutions. Since 1983, community organizations, activists and NGOs from other katchi abadis and informal settlements in Karachi and other cities of Pakistan have applied to the OPP for help in replicating its Low-Cost Sanitation Programme. Since 1986, government and international agencies have also tried to replicate the OPP experience by integrating it into the planning processes they are sponsoring. To respond to this demand, OPP converted these programmes into a Research and Training Institute (RTI) for the development of katchi abadi. The Institute is currently assisting initiatives in a number of other areas in Pakistan that are seeking to replicate the Orangi sanitation programme.

OPP-RTI provides social and technical guidance to both community and government facilitating partnerships. The model that has evolved from the programme is the component-sharing concept of development with people and government as partners. The programme has extended to all of Orangi, to 279 settlements of Karachi and to 13 cities covering a population of more than 2 million.
Since 1994, the OPP-RTI partner NGOs/CBOs that started replication are now expanding work beyond their towns and cities. They are constantly negotiating project and policy changes in partnership with the people and government. The replication partners are: Anjuman-e-Samaji Behbood (ASB) in Faisalabad and Jaranwala; Lodhran Pilot Project (LPP) in Lodhran, Khanpur and surrounding villages; Conservation and Rehabilitation Centre (CRC) in Uch Sharif, Ahmedpur Shariqa and Alipur; Akhtar Hameed Khan Memorial Trust (AKHMT) in Rawalpindi; Organization Pan environment (OPE) and Al-Watan Forum (AWF) in Gujrawala; Muawin in Lahore and Shahpur Chakar Welfare Society (SCWS) in Sanghar. ASB, LPP, CRC, AKHMT and Muawin are now mature partners replicating work at city level and partnering with government agencies.

Work in Karachi itself is expanding rapidly and OPP-RTI is supporting the city government with all technical mapping, design work, costing and on-site supervision. The government agency responsible for sewerage infrastructure development in Karachi, the Karachi Water and Sewerage Board (KWSB) is now in agreement with the OPP-RTI proposals for sewage disposal. KWSB agree that developing the existing drainage channels provides a realistic and cost effective plan of action towards developing sanitation facilities in Karachi. The KWSB has also requested OPP-RTI support for the provision of water supply and sewage disposal for Karachi’s katchi abadis. OPP-RTI was involved in preparing the National Sanitation Policy (NSP).

OPP is also an interesting case as the funding for the core administration costs of the organization are met by a Pakistani Foundation, with additional funds provided for additional training and education projects provided by international donors.

**Lodhran Pilot Project**

Among Orangi’s replications, the Lodhran Pilot Project in Lodhran Tehsil of Punjab’s Bahawalpur District has attracted much attention. The project has been assisted by the World Bank, Water and Sanitation Programme-assisted Project.

The Lodhran Pilot Project started in response to a request made to OPP by the Chief Minister of Punjab to replicate the project in his province. Lodhran, a small market town of 140,000 in the southern Punjab with little in the way of basic services, was selected in February 1999, for this replication. This place also happened to be the home town of the adviser to the chief minister, Jahangir Khan Tareen (interestingly, the same individual who has been instrumental in the success of the BHU model in Rahim Yar Khan). A senior social mobiliser from OPP was sent there for six months to talk to people from communities and government and train people. The process started with mapping out the settlement, its existing infrastructure and problems, using hired surveyors. The city’s municipal engineer, his staff, local councillors and the social organizer chosen from Lodhran were all brought to OPP for orientation. A project office was also opened, run jointly by the municipality and LPP, where the municipal engineer (who was appointed technical adviser to the communities) and LPP’s social organizer, have offices. The project is continuing to perform well and is now being expanded beyond Lodhran.

**Case selection**

Based on the above information, it is argued that, in the scoping stage, it is best to focus on OPP (Karachi office) taking into account the Karachi citywide replication and the Lodhran experience. As recommended by Perween Rahman, Director of OPP, the issues coming out of state and NSP relations in a big city (Karachi) are different.
than those of a small town (Lodhran), so covering the two in the scoping stage will help capture some of these differences and select the final case.

**Secton-6: Cross Sector Selection Issues**

The programme and cases, as proposed, also help balance out other relevant selection criteria which were not the primary criteria for programme selection but which, if covered, would help add other analytical dimensions to the study:

1) As documented above, in the three sectors, Rural Support Networks are important players in PPPs. In W&S, they are the most experienced non-state providers apart from a few selected NGOs like Orangi. In health, with the BHU model, they have become the key players. Based on the experience of PRSP’s take-over of BHUs in Rahim Yar Khan District, the programme is now to be replicated across the country under the Presidents’ Initiative. This replication will only happen through PRSPs and not through other NGOs. In education, all PRSPs run non-formal community schools. PRSP has now even initiated a programme aimed at mainstreaming its children from non-formal to formal schools. According to NRSP officials, the Punjab government is now contracting PRSP for a provincial level education reform programme. Therefore, some of the most obvious PPPs in Pakistan now are between government and RSPs (and through them the community). But, at the same time, it has to be remembered that RSPs are not an ordinary non-state provider. Institutionally they have very strong links with the state. Therefore, they cannot be compared with an ordinary NGO, so what works in their case in terms of PPP would not necessarily be applicable to an ordinary NGO which has no institutional links with the state. However, given that they are leading some of the most prominent models of PPP in Pakistan across the three sectors, there is an argument for selecting one case from RSPs yet at the same time being mindful not to select all cases from this category. Therefore, it is positive that within health BHUs have been selected as this helps cover the RSP model.

2) In selecting the programmes, another general issue that demanded attention was that, within education and health, the programmes can be divided into two broad categories: one, in which the government facilities and staff are being brought under the management of the private sector; and the second, in which the state is contracting an NGO or the private sector to deliver the service through its own institutional arrangement. The two models have different consequences for PPP and it seems that the model in which the NGO has to manage government staff is more tension prone and requires more negotiation than the model in which the NGO is delivering a service through its own institutional structure. Within health, the AIDS/HIV PPPs are examples of the latter, and the BHUs an example of the former. Within education, the Adopt a School programme is an example of the former, and the non-formal schools programme is an example of the latter. There was an argument for studying both types of partnerships, as the issues coming out will differ and add to the complexity of the analysis of state and NSP relations. Since this research project is designed to study just one programme in each sector, it excluded the possibility of including both types of models within the same sector. Therefore, in order to include both models, the only option was that either the BHUs and NFE combination, or the HIV/AIDS and Adopt a School combination be chosen. Any other combination would have excluded one model or the other. As it has turned out, by choosing BHUs and NFE, the research has been able to cover both models.
3) Finally, as discussed in the state-NSP paper, we can see three types of dominant NSPs in Pakistan: first there are NGOs, a post 1980s phenomenon closely linked to development aid and sharing similar concerns of commitment and motivations as documented in other parts of the world within the development literature; second, the traditional voluntary organizations, which do not engage with development institutions but are engaged in service delivery across the three sectors; third, GONGOS, including RSPs and Foundations which operate as NGOs, and today present the biggest development network within Pakistan, but have formal connections with the state.

Given that the focus of this research is on relations between state and non-state providers, it might be suspected that the nature of the relationship would vary depending on which of these three types of NSPs is engaged in the partnership. Though the programmes and the possible case studies have been selected on different criteria, nevertheless it might be worth noting that the cases selected for in-depth study in Pakistan do cover each one of these types of organizations in Pakistan.

- Within education, due to the focus on NFE, the case selected is bound to be an ‘NGO,’ i.e. an NSP reliant on development aid. As NFE is practised in Pakistan, it is a very donor aid linked phenomenon.
- Within health the focus is on BHUs, where RSPs are the only NSPs being allowed to enter the partnership.
- Within water and sanitation, the focus is on Orangi, which does engage with development aid, but is known to be very independent of the donors, and has an endowment established through a grant by a Pakistani Bank in early 1980s, thus making it less vulnerable to shifting donor priorities. This provides an opportunity to analyse whether for-profit as opposed to non-for profit motives of an NSP may lead to different types of relations. Also, the comparison across the three types of cases will help compare where the relation has evolved in response to the interventions of development institutions and where it is a more natural evolution.
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List of people interviewed

Education sector key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sabina Ahmed</td>
<td>Education contact at Action Aid</td>
<td>Has worked mainly on advocacy initiatives within education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudry Akram</td>
<td>In charge, Non-formal Education Programme Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Supervises the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sageer Alam</td>
<td>President Punjab Teachers Union</td>
<td>Has been involved with the Union for over 20 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Saqib Ali</td>
<td>Planing Wing Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Has been involved in the evolution of non-formal education programme of the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sadaf Zulfiqar Ali</td>
<td>Save the Children UK</td>
<td>Regularly evaluates NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Shahjahan Baloch</td>
<td>CEF, Save the Children UK</td>
<td>Regularly evaluates NGO education projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Edwin</td>
<td>ABES</td>
<td>A well respected medium level education NGO. Has a long history in non-formal education. Does not engage with government non-formal school programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Fayyaz</td>
<td>Planning Wing, Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Very senior government official within the planning wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Muhammad Afzal Haque</td>
<td>Managing Director National Education Foundation Government of Pakistan</td>
<td>Has been involved with the NEF from a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesha Ijaz</td>
<td>Oxfam, CEF Management Committee</td>
<td>Regularly evaluates NGOs education projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Baele Raza Jamil</td>
<td>Chairperson ITA</td>
<td>Has been advisor to the Federal Minister for Education under the current government. Currently runs a very big NGO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Haroona Jatoi</td>
<td>Planning Wing, Ministry of Education</td>
<td>A very senior official within the Ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kaneez Fatima Kassim</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)</td>
<td>Has evaluated and funded education projects for over 15 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Steve Passingham</td>
<td>Senior Regional Education Advisor, DFID</td>
<td>Has been in Pakistan for slightly over six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Khalid Pervaz</td>
<td>Sudhaar</td>
<td>A very prominent education NGO in Punjab. It has been involved in NFE for a long time. Claims to successfully mainstream some of its children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Khurran Riaz</td>
<td>Assistant Programme Officer Institutional Strengthening Aga Khan Foundation</td>
<td>Over view of AKF operations within education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Shaheen Attiqr Rehman</td>
<td>Bunyad</td>
<td>Has held advisory positions at Punjab government level. Is a very prominent personality with the education NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Saleem</td>
<td>Project wing Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Has been involved in the evolution of government non-formal school programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sofia Shakil</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist The World Bank</td>
<td>Has worked with AKRSP for many years; has a long standing interest in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Shami</td>
<td>Senior official, Planning Wing, Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Is currently supervising a large government survey on types of schools (including NFE schools) across Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Farhat Sheikh</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer</td>
<td>Has been with the Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender, Education
The Asia Foundation
for almost a decade. Has evaluated numerous education projects.

Fawad Usman
Chief Executive
Sudhaar
As explained above.

Dr Sissel Volan
Minister Counsellor
Deputy Head of Mission
Royal Norwegian Embassy
Funds education projects.

Mr Abbas & Dr Fareeha Zafar
Sahee
A very prominent education NGO. It runs non-formal schools. But, its main distinctive feature is relatively strong research skills as compared to other NGOs.

Water & Sanitation sector key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afsar Ali</td>
<td>Surhard Rural Support Programme (SRSP)</td>
<td>A key player within community led water and sanitation programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehbood Allahi</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation falls within environment ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Amjad</td>
<td>Taraqee Foundation</td>
<td>One of the most prominent NGOs in Balochistan. Is currently implementing a water supply project in collaboration with the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Waseem Ashraf</td>
<td>Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment</td>
<td>Has been set up to promote formation of CCBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiza Haider</td>
<td>NRSP</td>
<td>As discussed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Rifat Hayat</td>
<td>Project Planning Officer</td>
<td>As discussed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perween Rehman</td>
<td>Orangi Pilot Project</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saira Kareem</td>
<td>Safe Drinking Water for All</td>
<td>It is a government initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javaid Ali Khan</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Farhan Sami</td>
<td>Country Team Leader Water and Sanitation Programme</td>
<td>Is very well-informed about water and sanitation sector and any PPP projects within the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahibzada Shoaib</td>
<td>Surhard Rural Support Programme</td>
<td>As discussed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ahmed</td>
<td>Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund</td>
<td>Is currently funding many small-scale water and sanitation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Waraich</td>
<td>Lodhran Pilot Project</td>
<td>Currently, one of the most prominent replications of OPP. Initiated on request of the government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Health sector key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ali Akbar</td>
<td>Assistant Coordinator</td>
<td>Heads the national TB Control Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Qadeer Baig</td>
<td>National Manage Pakistan National AIDS Consortium</td>
<td>Heads the national consortium and has a long experience in the development sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Tania Khan</td>
<td>In charge Social Sector, Rural Support Network</td>
<td>Leads the NRSP research network so is very well-informed about activities on the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Raja Mansur</td>
<td>Punjab Rural Support Programme</td>
<td>Is involved in supervision of BHUs taken over by PRSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Malik M Safi</td>
<td>Deputy National Coordinator Ministry of Health Government of Pakistan</td>
<td>Involved in BHUs programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syed Hameeduddin Shah</td>
<td>Assistant to Joint Secretary Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Overall review of health policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imran Rizvi</td>
<td>Amal</td>
<td>Oldest NGO working in HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Suleman</td>
<td>Nai Zindagi</td>
<td>One of the well-know NGOs working with drug addicts and HIV/AIDS programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>