Attendees

Steering Committee Members:

1. Mr. Yaw Sarkodie, Ghana
2. Mr. Jawed Ali Khan, Pakistan
3. Ms. Anita Gaju, Rwanda
4. Mr. Salisu Abdulmumin, AMCW
5. Mr. Kepha Ombacho, Kenya
6. Mr. Johan Gely, SDC
7. Mr. Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS
8. Ms. Lily Ryan-Collins, DFID
9. Mr. Jon Lane, WSSCC
10. Mr. Mohamed Elrawady, CEDARE
11. Mr. Rudy Amenga-Etego, ANEW
12. Ms. Rolien Sasse, EWP
13. Mr. Yakub Hossain, FANSA
14. Mr. Ger Bergkamp, IWA
15. Mr. Henry Northover, WaterAid
16. Ms. Erma Uytewaal, IRC
18. Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF

Observers

19. Mr. Robert Bos, WHO
20. Mr. Frank Agyeikum, Spokesman for SWA Chair John Kufuor
21. Mr. Christoph Merdes, BMZ
22. Mr. Peregrine Swann, WHO/GLAAS
24. Ms. Merri Weinger, USAID
25. Ms. Nina Odenwälder, GIZ
26. Mr. Thomas Walder, IADB (SDC)

Secretariat

27. Ms. Cindy Kushner, Coordinator
28. Mr. Piers Cross, Senior Advisor

Regrets

1. Mr. Darren Saywell, Vice-Chair
2. Mr. Disan Ssozi, Uganda
3. Ms. Lindiwe Lusunga, South Africa
4. Mr. Oswald Chanda, AfDB
5. Mr. Dominick de Waal, WSP

Summary of Next Steps:

1. GLAAS:
   a. Launch on 12 April 2012

2. HLM:
   a. Ensure clear messages and a well-structured meeting that delivers tangible outcomes and garner media coverage.

3. NPR:
   a. CPTT to develop clarity of concept and clear high-level messaging for the HLM.
   b. CPTT to meet in Washington after the HLM to further develop the mechanism.
   c. Henry will review the current TT TOR and provide bullet points on qualities of desirable candidate.
   d. Nominations for a new CPTT Chair should be sent to Piers Cross.

4. Annual Partnership Meeting:
   a. Secretariat to define a date and location by May SC meeting, carry out evaluations and consult on the meeting design, tabling initial design at July SC meeting.

Revised 2012 Schedule of Steering Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 23, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, July 9, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 3, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Oct/Nov – TBA  | Full Day        | In Person at APM  |
**Draft Minutes**

**Introductions, Welcome and Update from Meeting Chair (Sanjay Wijesekera, for SWA Vice-Chair)**

We now have 81 Partners, including the newest Partner, South Sudan. We are building up to the second High Level Meeting. We have the 2012 WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme Report (JMP). The 2012 UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment on Sanitation and Drinking Water (GLAAS) will be launched on 12 April. And we now have a high-profile SWA Chair – former Ghanaian President John Kufuor. We are in a strong position now to catalyze change.

**Statement by SWA Chair John Kufuor’s Spokesman, Frank Agyekum**

The Chair sends his regrets for not being able to attend due to a recent surgery. He is committed to doing what he can to support this group. He recognizes that good work has been done on water, noting the recent achievement of the MDG water target, but that we need to do more. For sanitation, he wants to work with us to bring a greater focus to this important issue. He sends his greetings and looks forward to seeing everyone in April.

**GLAAS (Robert Bos and Peregrine Swann, WHO)**

The 2012 UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment on Sanitation and Drinking Water (GLAAS), led by WHO, will be released on April 12, 2012.

Following the release of the first GLAAS in April 2010, there was an evaluation meeting in June 2010, where the attendance was dominated by donors. There were no clear evaluation criteria and rather, the discussion focused on explaining the GLAAS process and its limitations. The evaluation stressed the importance of ensuring that:

- the GLAAS data are ‘credible’;
- close links to country processes are established;
- there is a balance between the breadth and the depth of analysis;
- GLAAS links to other sectors;
- GLAAS reports emphasize positive messages wherever the data support information on real progress.

Important outcomes:

- Reporting moves from annual to biennial
- Report combines broad analysis with in-depth studies
- GLAAS strategy 2011-2016 developed
- Need to step up resource mobilization

Preparing the 2012 GLAAS, WHO has had some constraints:

- Lingering staff transition
- Cash flow problems
- WHO’s financial crisis – staffing shortage and reduced motivation
- No CSOs in Africa this time
- Personal tragedy in WHO team
The first half of 2011 was spent re-designing, testing and reviewing questionnaires; developing protocols for the in-depth studies; initiating arrangements for the country analysis and assessment; and there was involvement in post-2015 work.

With increased donor support, WHO was able to spend the second half of 2011 establishing the structures, different approaches for different WHO regions: Western Pacific (WPR) and South East Asia (SEAR) straightforward and effective business as usual; Africa (AFR) – a mix of CREPA (now WSA) Collaborating Centre assignment, WHO country offices, existing CSO contacts and SWA links; in Eastern Mediterranean (EMR) through the WHO Regional Centre for Environmental Health Activities (CEHA) in Amman; in Europe (EUR) with questionnaires in Russian; in the Americas (AMR/PAHO) through Regional Office efforts, and counterpart institutions. Efforts have also been ongoing at country level. Furthermore, distinct questionnaires were sent to bilateral and multilateral donors.

Activities for the first half of 2012 included: data validations; reception of questionnaires, analysis and synthesis; review of ancillary studies; report writing; clearances; production.

74 country survey responses and 24 donor responses have been received so GLAAS is now truly global. (Only four countries from 2010 report, did not participate again.) There is room for further improvement but tremendous overall progress. An evaluation will be undertaken by September 2012, most likely hosted by Switzerland (SDC Bern).

**Key messages from the 2012 GLAAS Report**

Two consistent themes in the report: 1) the importance of sustaining services to avoid slippage against the water target and faster progress on sanitation; and 2) the importance of enhancing the accountability agenda, where SWA plays an important role.

- Most countries are making strong commitments on increasing coverage but many are falling short of meeting these commitments
- Only five countries were able to provide complete financial data
- Expenditure is often around 50% of allocations.
- Funding allocations are frequently unbalanced - it is overwhelmingly going to water and to urban areas, rather than sanitation and rural areas, where the greater needs are.
- Insufficient staff for O&M and hygiene promotion.
- Very low numbers of women employed.
- Inadequate budgets to recruit and retain staff.
- A methodology is being developed to measure human resource capacity gaps and to enable countries to report on their in-country financial flows more easily which will hopefully provide better data for 2014.
- The right to water and sanitation is increasingly recognised by countries but few have established equity criteria for allocating resources to the poor and un-served in either rural or urban areas.
- Donor aid is increasing, mainly due to Japan, by 3.5% since 2010 report.
- Increase is reported in aid to basic services, from 16 to 26%. But it appears that coding in the OECD database may not be consistent and that needs to be addressed.
- Aid to fragile and conflict affected states for all sectors is around 30% of total aid but for WASH, it is 10%.
- Sector budget support is relatively low at around 5% but is in fact slightly greater than other sectors. Opportunities to support system-wide strengthening through greater emphasis on sector budget support exist.
In other sectors, O&M is funded by donors but not particularly in WASH and this could be discussed and addressed by the sector.

Discussion
- The issue of non-traditional donors being reported in GLAAS was raised. This is being looked into but for now, many are not reporting to OECD, which is where much of the data comes from on donor aid.
- We need more detail on budgeting and expenditure constraints. Budgets arrive late and then timeframes are difficult to expend on capital. This issue is not necessarily just a capacity-to-spend issue.
- Developing sector capacity remains a priority sector issue: SWA should think about what we are doing on this.
- It was reiterated that keeping the HLM on a biennial cycle with GLAAS is preferable.
- The GLAAS findings show that the WASH sector is doing better than other sectors in some dimensions; we often consider ourselves behind other sectors but this is not always the case. Also, a reason that health and education spend so much is because much expenditure is on recurrent expenditure, compared with WASH sector which is characterized by “lumpy” infrastructure expenditure.
- GLAAS will look at developing tools (powerpoint slides, interim reports, regional reports) and communicating them. People would like to use GLAAS data regularly and need access to the information for presentations.
- SWA should look to influence decision-makers beyond Ministers of Finance.

High Level Meeting (Sanjay Wijesekera, Chair of HLM TT)
See attached presentation for slides presented.

Discussion:
The SC discussed the importance of a structured meeting and Ministerial discussion and that it is important to have clear key messages to communicate after the meeting. It was suggested to limit the number of topics and ensure the speakers are aware so that the Moderator and Chair can ensure a good flow. The ongoing strong preparatory process will help to facilitate a focused meeting.

It is important to use the Partner’s communication resources to have good media coverage. The communications messages and materials should be coordinated for each partner to use to reach out to the media.

SC Members from Ghana, Rwanda, Pakistan and Nigeria each spoke to the preparatory process occurring in their countries, highlighting the engagement of both Ministers and stakeholders.

After the HLM, the prep process will be documented to facilitate learning for countries. The Sector Ministers meeting is a major opportunity to engage a large number of sector Ministers and will be a substantively strong meeting.

National Planning for Results Initiative (NPRI) (Henry Northover, Chair, CPTT)
See attached presentation for slides presented.
NPRI focuses on countries without a comprehensive sector strategy and plan in place and/or where there is no coordinated donor presence. Countries identify and prioritize a planning need and a coordinated set of partners support the country-led planning. There are several challenges which need to be addressed as NPRI develops:

- Need vs. Demand: how do countries articulate demand if they are not aware of NPRI. Who initiates the conversation?
- Avoiding vertical-ism: Rather than mobilizing a different set of partners and resources, the SWA Partners work with ‘what is there’ to the extent possible.
- Agencies: The ‘headquarters’ level interactions on SWA and NPRI at the global level are not always aligned with in-country partners. Organizations are often decentralized and so implementation of decisions made at HQ level can be challenging.
- Addressing donor isolation: How can SWA Partners collectively address the countries which do not have a strong donor presence and therefore have very limited opportunities to mobilize resources in-country.
- Larger resource requirement: Once planning is stronger, there is a need to mobilize larger resources. NPRI does not respond to this need in a direct manner.

Next Steps: CPTT will meet to discuss a work program, just after the HLM in Washington DC.

Discussion:

- So far we are only working with dedicated funding of under $2 million for NPRI. There is a small budget of about $1 million for UNICEF and WSP each.
- Although this is the core business of WSP, many Partners are engaging on these activities and this is an effort to coordinate inputs and focus efforts where there is demand and also need.
- We should always recognize that every country is having a dialogue on where the sector should go. The dialogue may be weak, but there is always something there that can be developed.
- We need to be careful about “Launching” NPRI at the HLM and managing the expectation that there is large scale funding to follow; when we know that is not the case.
- Development Partner ‘leads’ were discussed and concerns were raised. What this term means needs to be clarified as the leadership should be from the country. What does the development partner ‘lead’ mean for the other partners who are acting in the country? This should be clear so there is not the expectation NPRI comes with new staff and offices, etc.
- There are important challenges. Defining eligibility criteria is a good start to define the niche of NPRI. However, this could also limit us to a small set of countries and then there are questions about other countries which could benefit.
- The main message from the development partners is “We support country planning, capacity building and development of service delivery mechanisms.
- There is an outstanding issue of which set of countries NPRI is meant for: Is it only in countries with weak donor coordination and limited access to resources in-country. Then, other countries who do have resources and better coordinate but still have planning needs then more broadly use the SWA framework to bring partners together around a focused agenda – i.e. SWA’s partnership mechanism. Otherwise, if NPRI is the full set of countries with planning needs, there is a different framing of the mechanism. This is important in our messaging as it may define different ways to operate in and with different countries.
- If NPRI is narrowly defined, we need to be clear: NPRI is not the only way SWA engages in a country. This is how it engages when there is not a mechanism.
• There are examples, such as Ghana, South Sudan, Kenya, etc where DGIS is putting in large amounts of funds and is very open to having these funds be used to strengthen planning. Whether this is NPRI or rather the basic SWA Framework, is a point requiring clarity.

• We need to keep sight of the fact that basic information on NPRI has already been circulated widely and there is an expectation from countries that there is a defined SWA mechanism to strengthen country-led planning. Also, donors are interested in NPRI and this is bringing new donors to the SWA discussions.

• The fundamental questions of ‘what is NPRI designed to do’ and ‘which countries is NPRI meant for’ do not yet have the clarity needed for the HLM.

• The Global Sanitation Fund (WSSCC) is finding countries are reporting huge value in the pre-planning around figuring out how to spend the larger funding coming in. This is very much in line with NPRI and WSSCC will become more engaged on NPRI.

• Everyone agrees:
  • Demand needs to remain at the top of the eligibility criteria. The Government needs to be leading. It doesn’t matter how much money there is. If there are no plans, countries cannot spend what is needed to achieve universal access.
  • We are supporting this activity. SWA promotes a common agenda and links the global to local and then goes forward with south-south exchange.
  • We have a communications problem. We need clear high-level messaging prior to the HLM and further development shortly after the HLM so that we can quickly provide information to all Partners.

To roll out NPRI, we need to:
1. Develop clear, specific eligibility criteria and clearly define the concept and bounds of NPRI.
2. Communicate what assistance is available to countries.
3. Enable countries to articulate demand based on knowledge of what NPRI is and is not.

Governance Issues

New Chair of CPTT

Henry is stepping down as CPTT Chair after the CPTT meeting to be held in Washington in April. Henry will review the current TT TOR and provide bullet points on qualities of desirable candidate. Nominations go to Piers. Candidates can be self-nominated.

SC Elections (Piers Cross, Secretariat)

On February the 8th the SC approved the re-election of 9 positions on the SC in line with the SWA governance rules. The Secretariat (Piers) presented an update on this process making the following points:

There had been no voluntary resignations following the call for resignations.

• The SC decided that they would not ask Rwanda and Nepal to reappoint the representatives who had left government, preferring to ask all eligible countries (including Rwanda and Nepal to propose staff at the time of the 2012 elections).

• Taking into account attendance records is was agreed that the following 9 positions representing the following constituencies would be up for re-election:
  o Dev Country Governments: 1 x Francophone Africa (Rwanda), 1 x Asia (Nepal), 2 positions for Anglophone Africa (replacing Uganda, South Africa and Kenya)
  o Donors: One position recommended to be refreshed (donors to decide).
Multilaterals: CEDARE
Civil Society Networks: ANEW and FANSA to elect new representatives.
Sector Partners: IWA

• All partners (including existing agencies represented on the SC) are eligible to propose candidates for election.
• Preference should be given to women candidates
• The election will only begin after the HLM.

Proposal endorsed

Partner Satisfaction Survey (Piers Cross, Secretariat)
An on-line survey went out to all partners in French and English a few days ago to evaluate SC representation, the SWA Partnership and the Secretariat. As of March 9, we have 31 responses. A preliminary analysis was presented from these early results which made the following points:

On SC Representation
• Majority of partners expressed satisfaction with SC
• The constituencies that need to improve representation are:
  o Research and Learning
  o Sector Partners
  o Developing country governments

On Effectiveness
• HLM is perceived to be SWA’s best product thus far
• The greatest potential impact is in Country level support, but much to be done to realize this.
• Constituencies expressing most satisfaction on effectiveness are:
  o Developing country governments,
  o Donors and
  o Civil society.
• Constituencies getting less out of SWA are:
  o Research and Learning
  o Sector Partners

SWA Secretariat
• High level of satisfaction on performance
• Increased communications needed

A complete analysis will be presented once the response period has expired.

Annual Partnership Meeting (Sanjay Wijesekera)
The Governance Document dictates that there will be an Annual Partnership Meeting (APM). In 2011, we held regional meetings with partners on the margins of other major events. However, it was agreed by the SC that SWA has come a long way and it at a critical point of requiring: greater definition of how we go forward and 2) enhanced engagement by all Partners, rather than just a few leading Partners.

It was agreed that a stand-alone, two-three day, substantive, results-oriented meeting – not a conference - is required late in the year. The APM should be held approximately 6-7 months after the
HLM to ensure adequate evaluation of the 2012 HLM and related preparatory process as well as to
learn from the roll out of NPRI in a few more countries.

The Secretariat will identify dates and a venue in early May, after the HLM.

Topics for and ideas about the APM:
- What’s in GLAAS and how as a partnership are we responding?
- The APM can be an opportunity to discuss what we have done, what we are trying to do, how we
  are going to reach it.
- We should see where there is good alignment with the discussion WSP is having now as they
  develop a 5yr plan, which includes a significant focus on monitoring and verification.
- This should be a substantive discussion.
- Rio will raise Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which will reinforce or replace the MDGs.
  It appears that SDGs will take longer to develop: W&S will appear in or as one of the SDG goals.
  While the formulation of WASH targets and indicators is led by WHO and UNICEF using the
  JMP, SWA needs to think more about the issue.
- We need a broader review and setting out a roadmap will be the crux of this forum.
- We can use the APM to promote South-south exchanges as well as to develop mechanisms for
  this.
- How do we better relate non-government action to government action? What can the partnership
  contribute to improve that coordination? How does this link to country level? How do we better
  link to the private sector? How do we make SME and larger companies a part of this discussion?
- We need to link in industry so that their products can be aligned to what we need.
- How do we ensure countries have ownership of the Partnership processes to ensure the
  Partnership is most useful at country level.
- How can we use the Partnership to hold NGOs to account?
- SC has to present what we’ve been doing, and seek an endorsement.
- External assessment needs to happen before the APM.
- We should be linking to other sectors – use the opportunity to engage health, education, etc.
  (decentralization, agriculture, finance)
- The location should reflect where partners are (i.e. largely Africa).
- We could piggyback this meeting with the AMCO/EXCO, which will likely be held at the end
  of the year.
- The early concept of SWA was that of being a marketplace: each Partner is a seller and a buyer.
  This concept can also underlie the APM.
- Engaging Partners and consulting on long-term planning – which the SC is responsible for – are
  key concepts for the 2-3 day meeting.

Secretariat: Update and issues
Management of the Chair: (Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF)
As partners, we all have calls on the Chair. However, we need to respect the role of the Secretariat in
managing the Chair in order to have a central contact for President Kufuor’s office.

Revised 2012 Schedule of Steering Committee Meetings (Cindy Kushner, Secretariat)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 23, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, July 9, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 3, 2012</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late Oct/Nov – TBA       Full Day       In Person at APM

Communications: (Cindy Kushner, Secretariat)
SWA Communications will be focused on the HLM for the short term. Ceridwen Johnson will join the Secretariat, based with WSSCC in Geneva, on April 16. In the future, we will fully review our materials and approach and take things forward with our full capacity.

Funding and Staff: (Cindy Kushner, Secretariat)
The Secretariat is fully funded through the end of 2013. There is no funding beyond 2013. This issue will be raised at the end of 2012 with the donor partners.

The Monitoring and Outreach Advisor will join the team at UNICEF in mid-May.