### Action points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit suggestions of major events in the first half of 2013 where it might be appropriate for the SC to meet at.</td>
<td>All SC members</td>
<td>10 December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback SC minutes to Constituencies after each SC meeting</td>
<td>All SC members</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each SC Member will more actively engage and consult with Partners in his/her constituency</td>
<td>All SC members</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the Governance Document</td>
<td>Darren Saywell (Vice-Chair), Thilo Panzerbeiter (Northern CSO Rep), TBA (FANSA), TBA (WaterAid); Support: Secretariat</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a rapid review of the executive function within management/governance models in other partnerships and networks and offer recommendations for improved decision-making.</td>
<td>USAID will provide a junior consultant and coordinate with the Secretariat</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a background paper to present options for timing/scope of an independent evaluation of SWA.</td>
<td>Lily Ryan Collins (DFID)</td>
<td>In advance of the next SC meeting (~March 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose a plan for 2013 Partnership Meeting</td>
<td>Johan Gely (SDC)</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategic plan for the Chair’s activities in 2013, including a process for making decisions on additional requests by SWA Partners.</td>
<td>Yaw Sarkodie (Ghana), Johan Gely (SDC) and Henry Northover (WaterAid); Support: Secretariat</td>
<td>21 December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure the agenda of the four annual SC meetings (two in-person and 2 calls) around clear decision points.</td>
<td>Darren Saywell (Vice-Chair); Support: Secretariat</td>
<td>for Future SC meetings (starting in 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Dialogue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a strategy for the next HLM and also activities and opportunities leading up to a next HLM. A decision on the next HLM is needed by end January 2013.</td>
<td>Sanjay Wijesekera/UNICEF (lead), Henry Northover/WaterAid, Salisu Abdulmumin/AMCOW, Chris Williams/WSSCC and Dibalok Singha/FANSA</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a terms of reference for a working group on harmonizing sector monitoring tools.</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretariat Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Meeting Report</td>
<td>December 6, but aiming for November 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Secretariat financial report shared, including the cost of the 2012 HLM.</td>
<td>December 6, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Secretariat tasks from 2012</td>
<td>December 6, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of HLM commitments monitoring</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual narrative report</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Secretariat Workplan</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability of tracking SWA Partner contributions to SWA activities and changes in Partner behaviour will be raised at a future SC meeting in 2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes

1. Introduction
1.1 Review of Partnership Meeting
Following the 2012 SWA Partnership Meeting - attended by over 100 Partners and potential partners - the SWA Steering Committee met to review the Partners feedback and discussions held in the previous days and, as the Partnership’s decision-making body, to set a course for the future.

The Steering Committee agreed that the Partnership Meeting (PM) was held at a critical point in the development of the SWA Partnership. The success of the second High Level Meeting (HLM) and the growth in its membership has opened up new options for the SWA partnership and the meeting was an opportunity to celebrate achievements, take stock of lessons learnt and test out potential paths for the future.

A key message from partners was to consolidate gains. This is a major global partnership; it is in the early stages of its development and whilst some responded positively to the new ideas put on the table, others were more cautious. This first PM showed that it is a partnership with a diverse range of views: getting consensus between partners was not always easy. As a result, a great many decisions were left to the Steering Committee (SC) to make. The model SWA is following is to have strong and active partners taking the lead with support from a small secretariat. Clear identification of roles (Partners, SC Members, Secretariat) was a critical message.

Key comments from SC members included:
- All SC members commit to bring more leadership and inputs to the SWA partnership
- Many people did not have clarity on roles of Partners vs. Partnership and also roles of Secretariat and the SC. Communicating these roles needs to be clear going forward.
- New ideas were put on the table at the beginning of the PM and it became clear that the focus from the start should have been on achieving common knowledge, before moving to decisions.
- Preparation for the PM is welcome (background papers, consultation, etc.) however, the substance needs to come from Partners and the Steering Committee rather than the Secretariat in the future.
- The constituency breakout groups were very effective and should be central to future PMs.
- The PM should be framed to reach consensus on key issues to inform the SC.
- A clear take-home message(s) would have been useful.
- The SC is the decision-making body of SWA. The SC should be putting options before informed partners to gather views of partners but the decisions belong to the SC.

2. Vision and SWA Framework
New ideas for the SWA Framework were put on the table at the PM, however, the message from the Partners and the decision from the SC is that the Partnership will maintain its existing Vision and Framework and will work to consolidate efforts so that as a Partnership we can ‘do what we are already doing, better.’ There is scope for changes to the Partnership’s strategies within the current framework but the SC agreed that, for now, the Partnership will focus on the existing three priority areas and two outcomes and review its actions and strategies to see what is needed to improve impact. The majority of participants agreed that SWA needs to make progress on its initial framework and achieve greater impact before looking at broadening the scope of the Partnership.

➤ DECISION: The Partnership will maintain its current Vision and Framework (three priority areas and two outcomes)
3. Governance
A number of issues around how the Partnership works were raised, including issues of governance and how we can work better together. Several issues were discussed, decisions made and short-term actions set out, as summarized below.

⇒ Decision: The SC agreed to fully review the Governance Document in light of what has been learned since it was first drafted two years ago.
  o Action: Darren Saywell (Vice-Chair), Thilo Panzerbeiter (Northern CSO Rep), FANSA (TBA) and WaterAid (TBA) will lead a review of the full Governance Document, with Secretariat support, by January 2013.

3.1 Improving Steering Committee Functionality
SC Members agreed that as a governance body it needs to be more proactive and a stronger driving force for the Partnership. All SC Members agreed to increase engagement and leadership. It was further agreed that the SC should have better focused, but less frequent, meetings where members attend better prepared, having consulted with and thereby representing their constituencies.

⇒ Decision point: in the future, the SC will have two in-person meetings a year, preceded by a preparatory (virtual) discussion approximately two months prior to the in-person meetings (hence, a total of four meetings per year).
  o Future SC Meeting Agendas should be structured around a series of decision points, supported by comprehensive preparation of background materials and constituency consultations.

⇒ Decision: Roles and responsibilities for SC members should be clearly articulated and known by all Partners.
  o A revised Governance Document should set out a terms of reference, roles, responsibilities and performance criteria for SC members
  o Each SC Member will more actively engage and consult with Partners in his/her constituency

⇒ Decision: The SC will explore the role of an executive function to improve its functioning.
  o USAID will provide a junior consultant to undertake a rapid review of executive functions in governance/management models in other partnerships and networks, in coordination with the Secretariat by January 2013. Recommendations will be offered for improved decision-making in the SC.

3.2 Independent Evaluation
The SC discussed the idea of an independent evaluation so that it can make better evidence-based decisions on how to proceed, both on substantive as well as governance issues.

⇒ Decision: The SC agreed that an independent evaluation would be valuable but the timing and scope is not yet clear. The SC noted that, during the Partnership Meeting, constituency groups provided many good points on what SWA should be doing and that these could usefully be drawn on in the shorter term to direct the Partnership’s focus.
  o Action: Lily Ryan Collins from DFID will draft a background paper to present options for timing and scope of an independent evaluation, on which to base decisions on future strategic changes. To present in advance of the next SC meeting (~March 2013)

3.3 Next Partnership Meeting
The periodicity of Partnership Meetings was discussed.
Decision: The SC agreed that a Partnership Meeting should be held once every two years, alternating with the High Level Meeting. However, as we are in such a critical period, the next Partnership meeting will be held in November 2013 (an offer to host was proposed by Switzerland).

- Action: SDC to come up with a proposal for tabling at the next Steering Committee meeting.

3.4 SWA Chair

The SC agrees that the SWA Chair John Kufuor offers great political capital. Thus far, President Kufuor has sent several letters and chaired the 2012 HLM. Further, he carries WASH messages to other meetings he attends. In the future, we need to selectively identify strategic opportunities which the Chair can engage on. The SC reviewed and agreed that the role for the Chair is as a global spokesperson for SWA in political, and possibly media events, and that we should consider not only letter writing actions but other forms of media engagement (video addresses, etc).

Decision: A year-long strategy will be set to engage the SWA Chair on.

- Johan Gely (SDC), Yaw Sarkodie (Ghana) and a representative from WaterAid will work with the Secretariat to develop a strategic engagement plan for the Chair by 21 December, 2012 including a process for making decisions on additional requests for the Chair’s time by SWA Partners.

3.5 Steering Committee Elections

New members of the SC were introduced and the election process for each constituency was explained.

- Most constituencies carried out elections and others conducted a consultation process to select members. It was noted that elections are challenging in the developing country constituency as there are limited nominations and limited voting. Ten new SC members have joined following the last elections. In October 2013, 11 SC slots would be under consideration for re-election (see attached table).
- It was noted that the aim of 1/3 of representatives being women remain a target still to be reached. (currently 21%)
- A question was raised about who decides which organizations are in the ‘Sector Partners’ constituency. The current practice of accepting Partners into this constituency is guided by the Governance Document criteria, which some people find too vague, and then the Secretariat advising the SC per application. The SC then accepts or declines applications. It was requested that this be a key issue for review when the Governance Document is reviewed/revised.

4. Political Dialogue

The SC agreed that SWA’s political dialogue activities, including the keystone HLM, requires further thought and strategy following the inputs from the Partnership Meeting.

- Action: a small group (led by Sanjay Wijesekera/UNICEF, including Henry Northover/WaterAid, Salisu Abdulmumin/AMCOW, Chris Williams/WSSCC and Dibalok Singha/FANSA) will be convened to set out a strategy for the next HLM, including activities and opportunities leading up to the next HLM. A recommendation on the next HLM to be presented to the SC by January 2013.

Key points from the SC discussion, to guide the small group’s work, include:

- More analysis is needed on the implications of options under consideration.
• Clarity around HLM’s objectives and success indicators - what is it that, concretely, only an HLM can successful resolve/answer/deliver?
• Particular modalities on how to track commitments/alignment with GLAAS should be developed
• A few options for the next HLM were offered: keep same successful formula, introduce regional HLMs and/or another venue or a smaller more strategic high level meeting
• Preparations for a 2014 HLM need to start by early 2013
• Base decisions on analysis / feedback from countries at political level
• Address how to leverage the commitments made
• Articulate and disseminate a detailed plan on what needs to happen before, during and after the HLM
• Work out timing in relation to GLAAS, reporting, commitments. We need to ensure strategic sequencing in order to be effective
• Improve outreach and engagement of a broader set of Partners at country level far in advance.
• The HLM should be designed as a part of an on-going political dialogue, a process more than a meeting.
• SWA should think more about how to link the on-going HLM Dialogue with the Country Processes discussions, especially around setting and implementing commitments.

5. Global Monitoring
During the Partnership Meeting, Partners discussed and overwhelmingly supported the idea of SWA being used as a platform for rationalizing the global monitoring landscape. While there is general consensus that the JMP is the global monitoring tool to monitor ‘outcome’ (coverage), monitoring inputs and processes is a cluttered field. The SC agreed to set up a working group to harmonize/coordinate/rationalize the various input/process monitoring tools and look at ‘standardizing’ a small number of parameters to enable harmonization. Everyone agrees that SWA is a platform for agreement and not an enforcement body – any standards or norms developed will be voluntarily adopted by governments and development partners.

➔ Decision: SC members agreed that SWA has an important role to play in streamlining the global monitoring landscape.
  ○ Action: A group will be formed to develop a strategy proposing how the many input/process monitoring tools can be harmonized. The Secretariat will draft a terms of reference for this group by January 2013. While this group may form the core group to also address ‘standardizing’ parameters, this latter task should be sure to be widely consultative.

6. Country Processes
The Country Processes Task Team has developed a vision paper and frequently asked questions about the National Planning for Results Initiative (NPRI) and these are on the SWA website in French and English. The Task Team will meet on Friday, November 16, 2012 to propose how to address requests for NPRI support and how to operationalize the feedback from the Partnership Meeting. Further, at the November 16 2012 meeting, Henry Northover will hand over the chair of the CPTT to Dominick Revell de Waal. The Vice-Chair sincerely thanked Henry for his dedication, efforts and success of getting NPRI off the ground.

The CPTT will report back to the SC within 10 days of the meeting, specifically on:
  - TOR and workplan for the coming year
- Minutes and proposed decision points

7. Secretariat Report

The Secretariat reviewed its reporting procedures to the SC. The Secretariat is tasked by the SC and reports in each SC meeting on the activities of the Secretariat. Further, in terms of financial reporting:

- Background: It was clarified that as per the Governance Document: “The governance structures of Sanitation and Water for All do not hold any financial authority. Any funding provided by Partners for Sanitation and Water for All operations or activities will have its own dedicated financial oversight and governance mechanisms. Funding Partners may allocate the Steering Committee a specific advice or guidance role, for which decision-making will be in accordance with this document.”

- In 2010, the Secretariat proposed a budget for 2011-2013 and reports annually against that budget.
  - Action: The 2012 Secretariat financial report will be shared with the SC within three weeks. The cost of the 2012 HLM will also be included.
  - Action: A narrative annual report will be submitted to the SC in January 2013.
  - Action: Following the synthesis of the Partnership Meeting and SC meeting, the Secretariat will draft a proposed Workplan for 2013, by January 2013.
  - Action: The Secretariat will synthesize the Partnership Meeting and circulate the report within three weeks, aiming for two weeks.

The issue of tracking all Partners’ contributions to SWA was discussed. While many agreed this would be useful in principle, the reality of discerning ‘SWA activities’ from an organization’s normal operations would be challenging. It also raises the questions of ‘doing business differently’ suggesting that reporting should not be limited to leveraging funds, but also changes in behaviour. If SWA is about doing things differently, many agencies would find that most of their resources are used for activities which would fall under the SWA framework.

- Action: Viability of tracking SWA Partner contributions to SWA activities and changes in Partner behaviour will be raised at a future SC meeting in 2013.

7.1 Monitoring Commitments of the HLM

The SC requested an explanation of how HLM commitments would be monitored. It was noted by all that the success of the HLM is measured by the impact of the HLM commitments being implemented. Developing countries and donors/banks each make specific commitments at the biannual HLMs and agree to report progress against the commitments. It is the responsibility of the Secretariat to coordinate the collection of this reporting, and to analyse, synthesise and disseminate the reporting on the progress of implementing commitments. In January 2013, the Secretariat will widely circulate information to Partners that, in April 2013, the Secretariat will be requesting a status update for both 2010 and 2012 sets of HLM commitments from those who made commitments at the two HLMs. In the long-term, the development and monitoring of the commitments needs to be more comprehensively addressed in the on-going HLM Dialogue (preparatory process, meeting, follow-up).

- Action: The Secretariat will draft a correspondence on monitoring HLM commitments and share with the SC by end of December 2012. Following approval by the SC, the correspondence will be widely circulated to ensure all stakeholders are aware of the request for monitoring that will go to the governments so that the HLM commitment monitoring can be a more central part of transparency and accountability amongst stakeholders at country level – a responsibility held by Partners.
8. Closing

- **Action:** Generally, it is the responsibility of the SC to feedback the minutes to constituencies / partners. However, these SC minutes will be circulated by the Secretariat as part of the Partnership Meeting reporting.

- **Action:** Next SC Meeting: All SC members are requested to submit suggestions of major events in the first half of 2013 where it might be appropriate for the SC to meet at.
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