## Summary of Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Report to be circulated to the SC as soon as possible ahead of the next SC meeting.</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once SDGs are agreed (September 2015), the SC will review the positioning of SWA to reflect the SDGs. In the meantime, SWA partners should look for opportunities for SWA to be engaged in the post-2015 discussion.</td>
<td>Steering Committee /All Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In advance of the December SC meeting, the Country Processes Task Team has been asked to digest and analyze the current state of development effectiveness agenda and implications for WASH and SWA Vision.</td>
<td>CPTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In advance of the December SC meeting, the consultants who undertook the Review will further develop partnership typologies and will provide examples of existing partnerships comparable to SWA.</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In advance of the December SC meeting, the Secretariat, in consultation with the SC, will articulate the Theory of Change underlying SWA’s current Vision and Strategy (and in particular clarifying the role of the HLCD).</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SWA Secretariat to develop possible options for new framing of the Strategy (aligned with development of Theory of Change and partnership typology).</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the December meeting, the SC will adopt a re-framed Strategy.</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants and Secretariat to explore the option of SWA having a formal UN status.</td>
<td>Secretariat /Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants to provide options for simplifying the SWA membership constituencies, related to the typologies provided. Countries and Development partners is one particular option that was discussed for consideration.</td>
<td>Review consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Committee to begin its work as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Consultants and Secretariat to work together to provide options to simplify existing membership categories, SC size and composition to be tabled at December meeting.</td>
<td>Secretariat /Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secretariat to explore mechanisms for private sector involvement.</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator to follow up with SDC to inquire about continued funding for 2015.</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator to follow up with USAID regarding new funding.</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction and welcome

Darren Saywell, SWA Vice-Chair

The Vice-Chair (VC) welcomed the Steering Committee (SC) and underlined that the main objective of the day would be to discuss the preliminary findings of the SWA Review. He outlined the three main objectives of the day: take some important decisions related to the results of the review, agree on decisions to be taken later, at the upcoming December SC meeting, and define further information that may be needed to be able to make decisions in December.

The VC then explained the status of the Review Report, in particular the Oversight Commission’s (OC) decision not to share the full report with the SC ahead of this meeting but instead ask the consultants to give a presentation with key findings. The main reason was the further work needed to be done, in particular regarding organization of information and structure. The full Report will be circulated to the SC and the Partnership ahead of the December SC meeting.

Sanjay Wijesekera reiterated to the SC that UNICEF is proud of its role as host of the SWA Secretariat and convenor of the HLM. He stated that UNICEF is willing to continue to host the Secretariat but asked for a clear mandate if the SC would like UNICEF to continue hosting.
The VC reminded the SC about the discussion and points of consensus achieved at the SC Visioning meeting held in London in 2013 and that the Review continued many themes addressed at that meeting.

- **Action**: Review Report to be circulated to the SC as soon as possible ahead of the next SC meeting

2. **SWA Review Part 1**

2.2. **Presentation of SWA Review Findings**

   *Ken Caplan, Consultant and Leda Stott, Consultant (on phone)*

The consultants responsible for developing the Report presented the main findings of their work, including the Review’s objectives, focus, key caveats and limitations, methodology findings and conclusions. Ken Caplan framed his conclusions around three main themes: vision, strategy and governance. See Annex B for the presentation.

SC asked several questions on methodology, in particular about how many people the consultants talked to and from where. There was also some debate on the list of partnership typologies presented and in particular around the “learning and innovation” typology. In terms of defining the type of partnership SWA is, the group felt that it needed more information to be able to make a decision and many suggested that SWA has characteristics from more than one typology and that this should be taken into consideration. It was generally agreed that there was a typology missing from the presentation, which would be best described as “collective action”.

2.3. **Comments from the Oversight Committee**

   *Darren Saywell, SWA Vice-Chair and Chair of the SC meeting*

The VC gave the group a quick overview of the feedback of the OC to the initial findings of the Report. The consultants will address the feedback provided and the report will be published shortly.

2.4. **Initial clarifications**

   *Moderated by Amanda Marlin, WSSCC*

The group then had the opportunity to ask some clarifications ahead of the break-up session. The discussion focused mainly on the importance of involving partners in the upcoming changes to SWA and the need for further development of the typology list presented by the consultant.

2.5. **Group Work / Discussion**

   *Facilitator Vision: Leonard Todd, DFID*

   *Facilitator Strategy: Heather Skilling, USAID*
Facilitator Governance: Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF

The SC divided into three sub-groups to discuss: Vision, Strategy and Governance. Each group was tasked with proposing to the wider group:

i. Urgent decisions on Vision/Strategy/Governance to be taken at the present SC meeting
ii. List of inquiries that need to be developed further
iii. Decision to be taken at the upcoming December SC meeting

3. SWA Review Part 2

For a more detailed overview of the discussions held at each group, see Annex B.

Spokesperson for Vision group: Evariste Kouassi Komlan, UNICEF

The Vision group reported that the breakout discussion touched on important points for the future of SWA. When looking at SWA’s Vision, the SC should take into consideration the original vision, but also consider evolving in an ever-changing political landscape - especially at this crucial time of post-2015 agenda negotiations. There was also debate around “development effectiveness” – what it means, if it is effectively at the core of SWA, and if so, how.

After the presentation by the sub-group, there was an exchange of ideas among the full group, including the need to consider reviewing the Vision once the post-2015 agenda and SDGs are defined.

The SC made the following decisions related to Vision:

→ Decision: SWA’s SC reiterated existing endorsements that:

- SWA aims for universal WASH access and that WASH is the focus of SWA
- Development effectiveness is at the core of SWA
- SWA serves to connects WASH with other sectors and systems
- SWA aims to engage a broad, inclusive set of actors committed to achieve universal access

- Action: Once SDGs are agreed (September 2015), the SC will review the positioning of SWA to reflect the SDGs. In the meantime, SWA partners should look for opportunities for SWA to be engaged in the post-2015 discussion

- Action: In advance of the December SC meeting, the Country Processes Task Team has been asked to digest and analyze the current state of development effectiveness agenda and implications for WASH and SWA Vision

- Action: In advance of the December SC meeting, the consultants who undertook the Review will further develop partnership typologies and will provide examples of existing partnerships comparable to SWA
• Action: In advance of the December SC meeting, the Secretariat, in consultation with the SC, will articulate the Theory of Change underlying SWA’s current Vision and Strategy (and in particular clarifying the role of the HLCD)

→ Decision: at the next meeting, the SC will consider the following decisions:
  • Endorse a Theory of Change
  • Endorse an option to strengthen how SWA can improve development effectiveness
  • Define the type of partnership that SWA is that best fits SWA’s vision and objectives

  **Spokesperson for Strategy group: Peter Mahal Dhieu Akat, South Sudan**

The Strategy group challenged the SC to articulate SWA’s strategy such that country processes are at the center and that what are now the “three pillars” are better interlinked. The group felt that the current pillars are silo-ed and that negatively affects people’s understanding of and engagement in SWA; the SC agreed.

After the discussion, the SC decided the following on Strategy:

→ Decision: SC agreed that SWA needs a reframing of its Strategy, with the following principles:
  • Country processes should be at the centre of SWA’s Strategy
  • Integration of “pillars” is essential
  • Alignment of different activities needs to be more explicit
  • Strategy should reflect Paris, Accra and Busan principles

• Action: The SWA Secretariat to develop possible options for new framing of the Strategy (aligned with development of Theory of Change and partnership typology)

• Action: at the December meeting, the SC will adopt a re-framed Strategy

  **Spokesperson for Governance group: Mr. Thilo Panzerbieter, EWP**

The Governance group divided its recommendations into five areas:

Membership/Constituency, Steering Committee, Chair and Vice-Chair, Secretariat Host and Secretariat. As a principle, the SC agreed that Governance decisions should reflect the new direction that SWA takes, both in terms of Vision and Strategy. However, the group proposed some topics for debate, most to be decided at the upcoming SC meeting and made some important decisions.

The discussion focused mainly on the role of the VC and whether it should be a paid role (and if so, paid by whom), the role of the VC vs. that of the Coordinator (options: Vice-Chair and Coordinator to lead Secretariat, Vice-Chair as head of Secretariat or Secretariat as Executive plus Vice-Chair with more limited role) and the possibility of strengthening private sector engagement in SWA.

At the end of the discussion, the SC made the following decisions:
→ Decision: The following SC members to form recruitment Committee for new Chair and Vice Chair: Dick van Ginhoven (DGIS), Chris Williams (WSSCC), Sanjay Wijesekera (UNICEF), with Darren Saywell (Vice-Chair)

→ Decision: The SC overwhelmingly expressed support for the current Secretariat hosting arrangement within UNICEF and WSSCC

→ Decision: The SC will recruit a Vice Chair who has dedicated paid time, and recruit a new Chair, with the possibility of additional high level honorary chairs. The first focus should be on the VC with the intention of having a new VC in place by the December SC meeting

→ Decision: The Search Committee established at this meeting has the responsibility to deciding the profile of the VC and Chair and honorary chairs, develop TOR (when needed), identify a long list of candidates, short-listing and extend invitations to the top candidate to take up the relevant position. The Search committee should start its work as soon as possible to have the work towards having the New VC in place by December

• Action: Consultants and Secretariat to explore the option of SWA having a formal UN status

• Action: Consultants to provide options for simplifying the SWA membership constituencies, related to the typologies provided. Countries and Development partners is one particular option that was discussed for consideration

→ Decision: The December SC meeting Governance decisions include:

  • SC size and composition
  • Simplified membership categories
  • Mechanism to address gender (in)balance in the SC
  • The Secretariat mandate and TOR

• Action: Search Committee to begin its work as soon as possible

• Action: The Consultants and Secretariat to work together to provide options to simplify existing membership categories, SC size and composition to be tabled at December meeting

• Action: The Secretariat to explore mechanisms for private sector involvement


The Secretariat Coordinator reminded the SC of the budget approved at the SC meeting in London in mid-2013 and presented the updated budget which the Secretariat is currently working with. The Coordinator explained the two reasons that led to a budget revision:

  • UN Standard Staff Costs increased - these are the costs the Secretariat is required to use by the UN for budgeting purposes.
Donor schedules are not aligned and requests for proposals come at different times in the year. At those times the Secretariat adjusts the budget according to forecast at that time, which is more accurate than the one done many months or often years before. The Coordinator pointed out that this does not mean a change in activities, mandate or scope. In fact, often budgets – which are based on actual expenditures to date - are reduced.

The Coordinator informed the SC that the result of revisions is that the Secretariat reduced the budget for 2014 and increased the 2015 budget.

The Coordinator also signalled that WSSCC will need more funds for its activities by the end of 2014. There is a call for donors to fund this shortfall sooner than later. It is possible to transfer funds from UNICEF to WSSCC however, it is costly and therefore undesirable and avoided if at all possible.

USAID stated they have USD 200,000 to contribute to the SWA Secretariat at UNICEF.

In response to feedback that the reporting was not always consistent, the Coordinator requested comment on the level of detail presented in order to guide future financial reporting.

→ Decision: SC approved the approach to budget reporting

• Action: Coordinator to follow up with SDC to inquire about continued funding for 2015
• Action: Coordinator to follow up with USAID regarding new funding

5. Vice Chair Summary

The VC thanked the SC for a very productive meeting and the extensive number of decisions that were agreed on. Before closing the session, he highlighted the importance of the December SC meeting to the future of SWA.
ANNEX B

Notes from break-out session on Vision

Moderator: Leonard Tedd, DFID

The Vision group kicked-off the discussion on the origins of SWA and the reasons behind its current format. Many felt that those original objectives were still valid but questioned whether SWA remains focused on them and whether “aid effectiveness” was still a valid central piece of the partnership.

The group also acknowledged that SWA needs to adapt (and perhaps shape) the post-2015 reality in the sector by, for instance, make the objectives of SWA as concrete as those of the SDGs. The debate also focused on SWA’s benefits for its partners and stakeholders, and the best way to have an impact on countries’ political agenda.

There was a general agreement that the typology options presented by the consultants should not be silos, but that SWA should likely be a mix of “advocacy” and “collective action”. The group agreed that, although some called for SWA to broaden its remit beyond WASH to bigger water issues, it was an advantage to continue to focus on sanitation and water.

Clarity – of focus, of strategy – was a large part of the discussion, with the group acknowledging that it is a challenge to work as a partnership, with partners wanting different things. Hence, partners will not always be able to define everything together as much as some would like to see.

One major role for SWA is to coordinate its partners in a way that allows them to achieve consensus on key issues for the sector. If SWA can reach that stage, it can be the “place” where the sector defines its “asks” of others and also some critical pathways/benchmarks for successfully achieving universal sustainable access to WASH.

Another hot topic of the discussion was SWA’s membership and constituencies: should the partnership be all inclusive (and if so, how to engage these new constituencies?) or restrictive to those organizations whose purpose is universal access to WASH (“if universal access we try to close the gaps via membership”). There was no consensus among the group that they required more development on the topic by the consultants.

Notes from break-out session on Strategy

Moderator: Heather Skilling, USAID

The group agreed that the overall Vision and the three pillars of the SWA are suitable, but it was felt that the detail in the three pillars and the balance between them needs to be reviewed. The need for a strategy to deliver the Vision was raised and that the Vision must include details regarding the partners, role and responsibilities, timeframes, action plan and long and short term objectives.

The group felt that a Theory of Change (ToC) is very important for SWA, as the ToC which was developed when SWA was first set up was to find a way to bring donors and off-track countries into dialogue. As the partnership has grown we now have countries that are not off-track and not donor-dependent, so the ToC has to expand to include this: it’s now about collective action. SWA needs to
be an engine for making national processes work more effectively. China and India are interested in SWA for two reasons: (1) to learn from others (2) for collective action.

Global political prioritization gives a “hook” for changes at the national level in the short term but more needs to be done to link the global advocacy to the ongoing national processes.

The group agreed that there are two things within the SWA that need better alignment: (1) alignment between countries and support – sometimes the wrong countries get the wrong support. (2) The global monitoring landscape is fragmented and needs to be effectively coordinated.

SWA is unique for its engagement and access to finance Ministers, this needs to be retained going forward.

Then a discussion followed around the three pillars and the group agreed that most of the work of the SWA is under the national processes pillar, so it was felt that national processes should be at the centre of the SWA. The group quickly drafted a circular diagram – rather than pillars. This new framing should enable more effective coordination across global and national processes (which is not always carried out effectively through the current structure of SWA).

The circular model also ensures that all the pillars are included, but that they are cross cutting, and gives a new lens for looking at SWA activities. It is also important to see it as a feedback loop – evidence and global advocacy creates stronger sector which then feeds into stronger evidence. This framework is similar to CAADP and IHP – we need to go back to them and see if there are any lessons to be learnt.

The group also commented that mutual accountability needs to fit into the framework. There is also a role for SWA in target-setting – the SDGs will set broad targets, SWA could play a role in setting and monitoring more specific targets. Finally, there was a suggestion that the Global Monitoring Task Team change its name to Global Alignment.

**Notes from break-out session on Governance**

*Moderator: Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF*

The Governance group started discussions with the issue of membership and constituencies, in particular how they are classified vs. how to increase them if wanted/necessary. Arguments put to the group by different participants included: changing terminology (away from “developing country”), categorization based on capacity and resources, whether partners should decide their own category and whether CSO should be part of the “countries” category.

The group decided to discuss with the wider SC to propose only two categories instead of the current seven: governments and development partners. Also, that there should be a distinction between partners who operate at a policy and global influencing level and partners who engage at the working level.

The conversation then turned to possible the role of the private sector within SWA. Suggestions were made that SWA should be more a forum and hence inclusive, which raised questions about how SWA can become more “formal” and “established”, for example via a closer tie to the UN.
When it came to the composition and role of the SC, the group felt that a smaller group (reducing from 24 to 17) seemed sensible. The idea of having some appointed and some elected members would give an opportunity to have a SC membership fit for purpose for a decision-making body, as well address the fact that elections between countries have not been effective. Further, the mix of appointed and elected members gives an opportunity to address the gender balance. It was agreed that the VC position should be a paid one, but not full-time, although the question of who funds it remained opened. More input is needed for the SC to be able to make decisions on increasing the Secretariat’s mandate. The idea of regional HLMs was also put on the table.