

### Attendees:

#### Steering Committee Members:

- |                                            |                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, DFID, Vice-Chair | 12. Ms. Tamie Mpotulo, South Africa        |
| 2. Mr. Yaw Sarkodie, Ghana                 | 13. Mr. Khaled Abu Zeid, CEDARE            |
| 3. Mr. Jawed Ali Khan, Pakistan            | 14. Mr. Peregrine Swann, WHO (Observer)    |
| 4. Mr. Johan Gely, SDC                     | <u>Secretariat</u>                         |
| 5. Mr. Jon Lane, WSSCC                     | 15. Mr. Piers Cross, Senior Advisor        |
| 6. Ms. Clarissa Brocklehurst, UNICEF       | 16. Ms. Cindy Kushner, Interim Coordinator |
| 7. Mr. Rudy Amenga-Etego, ANEW             | <u>Regrets</u>                             |
| 8. Mr. Yakub Hossain, FANSA                | Mr. Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS                |
| 9. Ms. Fleur Anderson, EWP                 | Mr. Disan Ssozi, Uganda                    |
| 10. Mr. Darren Saywell, IWA                | Mr. Bai-Mass Taal, AMCOW                   |
| 11. Mr. Henry Northover, WaterAid          | Mr. Oswald Chanda, AfDB                    |
|                                            | Mr. Kepha Ombacho, Kenya                   |

### SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS:

- A revised Country Processes Task Team TOR will be circulated by Henry shortly.
- There are issues of accountability within SWA more broadly as well as within NPRI. The Governance Standing Committee will review and develop a note for the SC on these issues, detailed in the NPRI section of the April 3 SC Minutes.
- The CP TT will take the SC comments and revise the NPRI Concept Note.
- SWA Partners which attend the WSP Meeting in Switzerland in June will raise the issue of joining SWA with Jose Luis Irigoyen, Director of Water, Transport and ICT, World Bank.
- The Secretariat will draft one page on: what is the outcome of 2012 HLM? What is the focus? What are the commitments anticipated?
- The SC and Secretariat will provide better options for engagement and SC Members will reach out to their constituencies. The Secretariat will draft key messages such as “The HLM unlocks access to Ministers of Finance” and get lessons learned documented. Also the Vice-Chair and Secretariat will draw up the list of specific things that specific Partners can do and the SC Members will take that to their constituency. If SC Members have suggestions, please send these to Cindy.
- All SC Members kindly comment on the proposal regarding Sector Partners and the creation of a new ‘Academic and Learning Institution’ constituency or otherwise, silence will be taken as a ‘no-objection’ and the Secretariat will undertake the actions laid out herein for a final decision in June.

### MINUTES

#### Update from Chair

No major developments since previous telcon.

HLM Strategy and Workplan have been circulated widely.

#### Standing Committees and Task Teams: Work Progress Update

### **Governance Standing Committee - Rudy Amenga-Etago, Chair**

The Governance Standing Committee requires another 1-2 members and seeks volunteers from the Steering Committee.

### **Country Processes Task Team (CP TT) - Henry Northover, Chair**

Task Team TOR: There was some ambiguity over the term ‘global recourse mechanism’. CPTT chair suggests the following rewording: “The Country Processes Task Team will monitor the gaps in policy, planning, financing, information and TA. It will bring larger strategic challenges that arise from SWA’s support for planning processes and which cannot be satisfactorily resolved at an in-country level to global level SWA mechanisms such as the HLM, regional consultations and partners’ meetings.”

**→ A revised CPTT TOR will be circulated by Henry shortly.**

Countries to focus on: The CP TT has decided to engage more thoroughly with countries which requested support following the 2010 HLM. After the upcoming joint mission to Liberia and take stock of the lessons learned, the CPTT with help from the Secretariat will return to those countries originally inquiring about further SWA support.

### Main points from discussion on the National Planning for Results Initiative (NPRI)

The SC discussed the NPRI concept note. It was felt that the NPRI addresses one of SWA’s central functions. It was a very encouraging concrete step to meet a central objective of SWA. There were however some questions raised, aiming to get clarity and to strengthen the purpose and function of NPRI.

- a. Is the NPRI a body or a looser voluntarist initiative?
  - b. Is there an overall coordinating or monitoring body for NPRI? (ie what/where is the line of accountability?) The CPTT can help support and facilitate, but it hasn’t the mandate or resources to coordinate.
  - c. The term ‘implementing agencies’ risks the exclusion of other agencies supporting the work of NPRI (WaterAid and Ghanaian Govt in Liberia are a case in point). Restricting a comprehensive vision to the work of 2 ‘Implementing agencies’ risks excluding other sources of support and narrowing the resource pool available from other agencies. This may risk shifting NPRI into a narrow technocratic and top-down initiative. Would terms such as ‘lead’ or ‘facilitating agencies’ be a way of keeping open more inclusive forms of engagement?
  - d. Are there suggestions over how other agencies offering intellectual and other resources in support of NPRI’s objective can coordinate? Is there a potential risk of confusion with each agency intervening unilaterally?
- Emphasize that monitoring at country level is part of the planning process
  - It was noted that although WSP and UNICEF are specifically mentioned as implementing agencies there could be room for contributions from a broader set of actors within the

overall scope and purpose of the NPRI. Further, UNICEF and WSP, as the two currently identified facilitators, set out clearly how they will coordinate their work related to NPRI.

- The question of who is going to provide coordination and what that coordination entails needs to be clarified. It is clear that the SWA Partnership cannot be directive in its oversight of NPRI, hence a high level of transparency and coordination is required.

Broader issue: SWA is a partnership between sovereign organisations, each with their own accountability mechanisms and management structures. There is no provision for directive management by the SC. This introduces two key questions:

- o What happens if SWA members or non-SWA members engaging in SWA activities do not adhere to SC guidance and oversight?
- o What is the added value of being a member if non-members can directly engage in SWA activities e.g. NPRI?
- o What are the “powers” of the SC? Without powers, does it have any accountability?

**→ ACTION: Governance Committee to review and develop short note on how to address above.**

It was also noted that the US, WSP and WB are not currently SWA Partners. SWA welcomes coordination, but would prefer that stakeholders which are significant contributors to SWA Activities join the Partnership.

It was acknowledged that US was in the process of considering membership. There has been no response to initial invitation from the chair of the Interim Core Group (Jon Lane) for WB to join.

**→ SWA Partners attending the WSP Council Meeting in Switzerland in June to seek discussion with WSP leadership to clarify both WSP’s and WB position on SWA membership.**

- The paper currently references that ‘NPRI’ will accomplish goals but it isn’t clear who ‘NPRI’ is. This language needs to be clarified to reflect the fact that NPRI is not an entity in itself.
- The NPRI concept note references both water and sanitation but there are concerns that water and sanitation are very different and that sanitation may get lost. Partners will maintain vigilance that there is a focus on sanitation.

**→ The CP TT will take the SC comments and revise the NPRI Concept Note.**

### Liberia Mission

At the request of the Liberia Government, several SWA donors and development partners will join a joint mission to Liberia in April 2011 to undertake four goals:

- o generate commitment to Liberia’s sector objectives
- o Pilot NPRI within SWA and identify the priority actions required
- o Identify a process and timeline to deliver a Compact
- o Develop a concept paper for how a Compact will be implemented

The four main mission areas are institutional arrangements, service provision equity (eg urban-rural split), addressing data gaps and identifying financing mechanisms and aid effectiveness issues around alignment and harmonisation.

This Mission arises out of SWA processes. Liberia is learning from Ghana. This is a country-led process (Government with strong civil society input). There is a concern over how the strong momentum generated by the Liberia Mission can be maintained. The mission will map NPRI questions to Liberia: how do we manage accountability? Address the issue that a number of parties to the mission are not members? Accountability for the Mission is through the Task Team to the Steering Committee.

This mission is an outcome of the HLM and we need to communicate that. Also, Ghana is providing a great deal of input, which is an interesting example of South-South cooperation. The Interim Coordinator of the Secretariat will participate in the Mission to document these types of issues precisely.

### **2011-2012 HLM Task Team- Clarissa Brocklehurst, Chair**

Key Messages and materials to support Partner participation in high level and sectoral meetings are coming shortly from the Secretariat (briefing materials, talking points, etc).

#### Update on 2011 Meetings:

- LDC-IV: We are working to get WASH into the Outcome document and UNICEF (as a Partner and the Secretariat), UN-Water, UNSGAB, WSP and Sierra Leone were involved in the preparatory meeting which was held in New York. We are working with Partners to get a speaker on the agenda in Istanbul to talk about WASH.
- ESCAP Commission Meeting: We are discussions about potentially contributing to a Side Event on MDGs.
- Africa: AMCOW will be holding country level dialogues and SWA will support those.
- OECD High Level Forum 4 (Busan)
  - o This is an important meeting as it convenes Ministers of Development Cooperation and Ministers of Finance from developing countries.
  - o There are 3 ways to influence:
    - Progress since Paris: the Secretariat is working to provide evidence.
    - Outcome Document: the Secretariat will coordinate inputs but also Partners should work to include messages on sanitation and water in their formal interactions with OECD.
    - Side Events: The Secretariat will coordinate this, but it is likely more effective if a Side Event is sponsored by States. One idea is to focus on the Liberia Mission, Ghana Compact and the connection of the two. One suggestion is that Germany, the US, Ghana and Liberia could host or possibly South Africa as Chair of AMCOW. A key SWA message is targeting resources for results.
    - Messaging: We have to have something to say in terms of how we are building country capacity – the Secretariat will send out messaging. Also,

as the HLM4 is not sectorally focused, we will include a message that aid is delivered through sectors to ensure the relevance of mechanisms such as SWA is clear

It is important that all Partners are active and engaged. The Secretariat will work to provide common messaging and arrange for opportunities on the agenda, such as Side Events. However, in order to fully ensure sanitation and water are on the agenda at meetings, Ministers from Partner countries will also need to bring the messages to the meetings/events.

#### HLM Process and Strategy:

The HLM is only a year away and we must work on the preparation strategy. The current strategy focuses on 2011 as a bridge year in terms of maintaining momentum. We will build a narrative in 2011 and table it at 2012. This is a more purposeful way to looking at events rather than repeating same messaging at events and lay out stepping stones to the HLM: we must demonstrate evidence of impact (Finance info from GLAAS, WaterAid's research on absorptive capacity in fragile states).

**→ The Secretariat will draft one page on the ideal outcome of the 2012 HLM – with the headline achievements we would be seeking. This will form the basis for developing messaging for the HLM.**

We need to continue to engage the World Bank so we can move to ensure the HLM is on the official agenda. Again, Partners need to be actively engaging to prepare for the HLM and the Secretariat will provide support.

#### HLM Monitoring

The Secretariat has provided inputs to monitor the HLM in GLAAS which GLAAS will integrate into their survey (highlighted existing questions and added questions and hope to pilot a scorecard on a few issues).

#### **GLAAS, Peregrine Swann, WHO**

Update: GLAAS held the first GLAAS Global Team Meeting (29/31 March) with Regional WHO Advisers and Facilitating Centres. Comments included: make questionnaire relevant to MICs as well as LICs, sustainability issues need to be covered more. The questionnaires will be finalized by end of May and be sent out for completion June – September.

In-country financial flows draft working paper finalized and can be shared with SWA participants if they wish. Financial Flows study will be carried out in 6-10 countries and be completed by October 2011

Facilitating Centres are being established: CEHA (Centre for Environmental Health Activities) for Eastern Mediterranean region, CEPT (Center for Environmental Planning and Technology University) for South East Asia region, Cinara for Pan American region, CREPA and possibly Medical Research Council for Africa region.

Asia Highlights were prepared for SACOSAN and an updated Africa Highlights will be prepared for AfricaSan.

Main Recommendations from the GLAAS Technical Consultation Meeting in December 2010 were:

- The GLAAS team to consider splitting up the planned in-depth study on the reporting of in-country financial flows, to include an initial scoping study.
- GLAAS to link the data gathering with existing national multi-stakeholder processes where appropriate
- GLAAS to continue and to deepen its collaboration with the WSP Country Status Overview process
- Limit the number of additional questions when designing the new survey forms while recognising that some extra areas of information will be needed
- GLAAS team to establish a Working Group to advise on developing the survey questionnaire
- GLAAS 2012 to begin to capture data from non-traditional donors
- Consider including sections in GLAAS 2012 that provide audiences with different regional focuses
- Actively link with other initiatives where the benefit can be expected to be mutual such as the Sanitation and Water for All and the EU Water Initiative and monitoring programmes of the international development banks and donors.

At the IATI Meeting in Paris, GLAAS was presented as an example of improving aid effectiveness in a sector. In country MIS could be useful for SWA

GLAAS will convene a Side Event on measuring results at Stockholm World Water Week, jointly with WaterAid, WHO and AfD: Improving Mutual Accountability: New Tools and Trends

## **GENERAL DISCUSSIONS**

### **Discussing how to engage Partners more actively**

The SC discussed how to have Partners more actively engaged. Partners join because they want to be part of the movement but there is a sense that Partners are waiting for guidance.

**→ The SC and Secretariat will provide better options for engagement and SC Members will reach out to their constituencies. The Secretariat will draft key messages such as “The HLM unlocks access to Ministers of Finance” and get lessons learned documented. Also the Vice-Chair and Secretariat will draw up the list of specific things that specific Partners can do and the SC Members will take that to their constituencies. If SC Members have suggestions, please send these to Cindy.**

### **Compacts as a Tool**

A compact is tool where each sets out a set of commitments for which they can hold each other to account. It is a political framework not a legalistic contractual one. Looking at IHP and CAADP: CAADP has shifted away from Compacts and looking at impact and outcomes.

With CAADP, there is no global HLM but rather related only to country processes. The lesson from IHP+ is that when its donor led, Compacts tend to be weak. Compacts need to have country leadership. For example, in Liberia, the Government is driving the development of their Compact and learning a great deal from Ghana.

Government leadership/ownership is important but also ownership across a broad range of in-country actors. It is clear that the approach needs flexibility and local context. The compact exists within a framework of mutual accountability and attempts to set out clarity of commitments and predictability from both sides.

#### Ghana Example from SWA:

The Government decided to do a Compact to articulate its objectives and commitments when they reviewed budgetary allocations and found that water and sanitation had a low priority within social services. The Government was saying sanitation and water were priorities but that was not reflected in the budget. Civil servants and civil society worked together to engage resulting in a strong working relationship between technocrats and politicians. Sector technocrats found that the Finance technocrats did not know about the impacts of water and sanitation and the development of the Compact. In the context of the preparation for the 2010 HLM, the sector was able to make facts and figures known to Finance colleagues. One of the limitations of the Ghana Compact is that the development partners were less engaged. There is a strong dialogue with development partners around SWAPs in Ghana, but the Compact did not represent development partners commitments alongside the Government's as it was focused on the Government. Having the document is important as it is a key monitoring tool and it has increased the interaction between sector technocrats and finance technocrats.

#### Discussion:

There was a question of the relationship between SWAPs and Compacts. One is a data source and working process and the other takes that information into the political arena. A parallel was drawn: The GLAAS/JMP provide data and SWA 'lobbies' using that data. SWAPs provide data and the Compact brings it to a political level and allows for accountability. SWAP is a working process where as the Compact facilitates accountability for actions identified.

A Compact should be seen as one possible road to achieve goals: there needs to be mutual accountability in order to have predictability of resources and a longer-term and goal-driven vision.

**It was agreed that Compacts should not be prescriptive but the utility should be recognized.** Looking ahead to the development of guidelines and documentation to assist in stronger national planning, the SC will look at a category or indicator of whether a country has been through the process of having a political dialogue (addressing sector harmonization, predictability, etc). The SC can also look at this as an indicator of what SWA is contributing to results. By defining the types of issues to be addressed and what could be achieved with a

Compact or similar tool, it will give SWA a target to measure and achieve in a certain number of countries.

It was agreed that the SC does not want to 'brand' Compacts as SWA as that would undermine country leadership, but WA should try to measure the contribution the partnership makes to achieving the above outputs and outcomes.

### **Secretariat Update: Piers Cross**

#### **Result of the Election of 3 new SC Members:**

1. Leading Spokeswoman Seat: Eng. Ebele Okeke, former head of Nigerian civil service (5 nominees confirmed, election held)
2. Asia Seat: Dr Sudha Sharma, Secretary for Health, Government of Nepal (2 nominees, 1 confirmation)
3. Francophone/Lusophone Africa Seat: Elections close April 8 (2 nominations confirmed)

#### **New Partners:**

We have received applications from the Arab Water Forum and Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP). Both have been reviewed and the Applications approved by the Vice-Chair. Both will be in the Sector Partner Constituency.

**Sector Partner Constituency:** The addition of the two new Partners brings the Sector Partner constituency to 18 partners. The intention of the Constituency was to be a place for Partners which could not be easily categorized but make important contributions to the sector. However, it has become a significantly large Constituency, though it generally lacks cohesion as a Constituency. Upon review, there are several academic and learning institutions and therefore it is proposed that a seventh constituency be developed and appropriate Partners shift to the newly created Constituency.

The Secretariat will discuss with all current Sector Partners to determine where each Partner feels it is best suited and the Secretariat will return to the SC at the next Meeting with a recommendation of the split. At quick review, it appears that 7-9 of the 18 partners would fit in an 'Academic and Learning Institution' Constituency. The Secretariat proposes that an SC seat would then be created to represent the Constituency as an exceptional case. The Governance Document would then need to be revised to reflect the new Constituency and SC Seat.

→ **The Secretariat proposes a decision on the creation of a new constituency and placement of current Sector Partners be taken at the June SC Meeting and the (s)election for the SC seat would be facilitated amongst partners in July – in time for the person to attend the SC Meeting in Stockholm in August.**

→ **All SC Members kindly comment on the proposal above or otherwise, silence will be taken as a 'no-objection' and the Secretariat will undertake the actions laid out herein for a final decision in June.**

**Website:**

There are significant updates to the website coming soon. In May, all the documents from the HLM country preparatory process will be posted (Econ Case, Profiles) as well as the addition of a page to post SC minutes and documents. In the next few months, we will develop and post key messages and materials to support advocacy around the SWA priorities.

**UN Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation Catarina de Albuquerque:**

Cindy attended a consultation for Catarina just prior to SACOSAN. She previously prepared and submitted a report to the UN on private sector participation and water and sanitation and is currently preparing a paper on ‘financing the realisation of the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation.’ Much of the work of SWA is pertinent to the report currently being prepared and will be shared. Cindy will ensure there is a linkage amongst SWA Partners and Catarina’s team.

The consultation was primarily attended by human rights specialists and the discussions centred around: Use of Maximum Available Resources and Progressive Realization; Expenditure; Non-Discrimination, prioritization and targeting; Tariffs and Subsidies; International Obligations; Borrowing: Deficits and Spending; Non-State Funding