Summary of Action Points

HLM Work
1. HLM TT and also Donors SC Members will work to address donor engagement for the 2012 HLM.
2. SWA Secretariat to draft a concise report summarizing the self-reporting from countries on 2010 HLM Commitments, taking into account the guidance of the Steering Committee.
3. SWA Secretariat will integrate a robust validation process of commitments reporting into the 2012 HLM preparatory process.
4. The SWA Secretariat and HLM TT will integrate SC inputs to the HLM Concept Note and move forward.
5. The SWA Secretariat to develop a template for the HLM country preparatory process and work with the HLM Task Team and Partners to address the delegation of supporting country preparatory processes across countries amongst Partners.

Country Processes Work
6. The CPTT will clarify the relationship of the CPTT and NPRI in writing to the Steering Committee in the form of the Telecon minutes.
7. CPTT to review and fully align the CPTT TOR and NPRI Concept Note.
8. SWA Secretariat and CPTT to review the SWA Workplan country-level outputs and indicators to align more realistically to an appropriate monitoring role of the Secretariat/Task Team.

Governance/Communications
10. Governance Standing Committee with the Secretariat will develop a Conflict of Interest Policy.
11. One-two more people are required for the Governance Standing Committee.
12. Secretariat will review timing and cost implications of an Annual Partnership Meeting and propose a solution to the SC.
13. Secretariat to publish a revised simple brochure on SWA.
14. Secretariat can proactively engage with partners on other political processes and events. The Secretariat will post more on the SWA website on these events/processes in the coming months.
15. Secretariat to reach out to Francophone and Lusaphone African countries to identify a suitable candidate for the SC.
16. Secretariat to lead the nomination/voting process for a new Vice-Chair.
Draft Minutes

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

Welcome to new SC members: Dr. Sudha Sharma, Secretary, Ministry of Health, Nepal for Developing Country constituency; Eng. Ebele Okeke, former Head of Civil Service, Nigeria as Leading Spokeswoman for WASH; Ms. Erma Uytewaal, Program Manager, IRC for Research and Learning Constituency have joined the Steering Committee.

From Dr. Sudha Sharma, Nepal: Dr. Sharma welcomes the opportunity to serve on the Steering Committee representing South Asian countries. The brunt of poor WASH is on health and if we must focus some resources for prevention into WASH. Nepal very committed to the WASH sector and has increased national funding by over 150% over the past couple of years. The thinking in Nepal is changing to look at strengthening systems.

From Mr. Jawed Ali Khan: Mr. Khan, previously Director General in the Ministry of Environment is now part of the Planning Commission as Environment has been moved to a provincial responsibility.

New SWA Partners: Mozambique, Timor Leste, Water and Sanitation Program (WSP), Millennium Water Challenge, CEWAS. We now have 75 Partners

Update on SWA from the Vice-Chair: This is an important and big and growing partnership. SWA is borne from a realization that there is a structural deficit in the global architecture for WASH and that is stopping us from achieving transformational, change. We have recognized that we’ll not be able to mobilise the political commitment necessary to make transformational change without addressing this structural deficit.

Other sectors have shown how they can deploy political will to achieve results. A clear example is the abolishment of user fees in health. This decision took real financial resources and leadership from the highest level – not technical people. We are now looking, in the WASH sector, how to gain the necessary political buy-in and resources to make progress.

The first High Level Meeting (HLM), held in 2010 was successful – Finance Ministers attended but more importantly they engaged. The HLM is about resource allocation and economics rather than focusing on water and sanitation.

The Partnership is aiming for two broad outcomes: increasing impact of resources (not just more money but how we use money to achieve results) and mutual accountability. We don’t just say we’ll do big things – we monitor and hold ourselves accountable. We haven’t done this well in the sector thus far.

There are three ways SWA will achieve outcomes: political prioritization, deploying evidence (having better evidence and bringing it to the right people’s attention and achieving results on the ground (strengthening country planning).
We have the right partners – countries, donors, multilaterals, etc. Without SWA, we’ll do good work but without SWA the work we do will not have the transformational impact.

The challenge now for the Steering Committee is to use the potential that we have in our great partners. SWA is not an organization. It is about what Partners do. Whether the Partnership gets stronger or seizes to exist depends on Partners. We need high level engagement from countries. We also need to maintain our focus on the three priority areas and build on this niche. We must be careful of fragmentation and focus on the outcomes we want to achieve. We’ve had big success over the last year but also have a big challenge ahead of us.

**Technical Issues**

**Report on 2010 High Level Meeting Commitments**

Cindy Kushner of the SWA Secretariat presented preliminary findings from the monitoring exercise carried out with attendees of the 2010 High Level Meeting for comment from the Steering Committee.

*Comments on the presentation of preliminary findings*

- Clarify how the information was collected
- Tone and rigor are fine: clear.
- Involvement of Civil Society is important. We should clarify the role in this exercise. As the exercise was very basic, efforts to engage civil society in a more robust review are needed (linked to 2012 HLM preparation)
  - Important role of civil society was also a preliminary finding and will be added to the report.
- Attribution is very difficult and not likely possible. That does not need to be a problem. Look at how much attribution we can give in the future but also look at contribution as it is very important.
- We should report where there is no or less progress as well as where there is progress. Further, we should report on all findings in order to ensure transparency.
- The reporting thus far has not been validated by Ministers/committee in-country and should be a consideration in the future. Bias is important. We should recognize the bias in the report.

*Comments on Implications of findings*

- We need to be careful to present information in a way that engages Ministers of Finance but also ensure accountability.
- The findings on the influence of the HLM on donor decision making are striking.
- The apparently low influence of the HLM on donor decision-making is interesting. What are circumstances that led donors to this point? This donor point requires more reflection as we need to address it for the 2012 HLM. The HLM was initially a donor initiative and had strong political drive from donors. The World Bank agreed to host the meeting because two donor ministers wrote to the World Bank President of WB.
There is a distinction between support for SWA/the HLM and influence of the HLM on decision-making. Donors are supportive of SWA and the HLM (ie providing funding to the SWA Secretariat, GLAAS, CSOs, etc).

Advocacy: We need materials which focus on each country. SWA is in fine print. (Suggestion: one leaflet per country)

What the preliminary findings are telling us about the interaction with Ministries of Finance is very important.

*Action Points*

1. *HLM TT and also Donors SC Members will work to address donor engagement for the 2012 HLM.*
2. *SWA Secretariat to draft a concise report summarizing the self-reporting from countries on 2010 HLM Commitments, taking into account the guidance of the Steering Committee.*
3. *A robust validation process of commitments reporting will be integrated into the 2012 HLM preparatory process.*

**2012 High Level Meeting**

The HLM Task Team is developing a Concept Note to articulate and explain the 2012 High Level Meeting. Issues discussed:

- **Donors:** The initial monitoring of the influence of the first HLM in 2010 shows that donor decision-making was not notably influenced by the HLM. We need to further explore how to increase the influence of the HLM on donor decision-making.

- **Opportunity:** It is understood that the 2010 HLM was successful as a first meeting but also that we will only get one more chance with Ministers of Finance to demonstrate that the HLM is a mechanism which adds value and contributes to impact.

- **Attendees:** The HLM is a meeting of Finance Ministers from developing countries and Development Cooperation Ministers from donors (or equivalent from non-country donors). While we need to maintain a focus we also need to ensure the HLM speaks to the audience of Finance Ministers from countries which have large numbers of unserved.

- **Theme:** We will develop a theme which draws in Finance Ministers and donors. This should be informed by GLAAS and knowledge of what still isn’t moving/why we are still underperforming as a sector. We should be opportunistic: what is most interesting to Ministers of Finance? Economics and Equity as a theme has support from the SC. MDGs is another possible theme – linking achievement of the MDGs to accountability and economic impact.

- **Political Drivers:** In 2010, we had two donors which were key political drivers. We need to identify where this push will come from for the 2012 HLM.

- **Country preparatory process** – This needs to be inclusiveness and bring civil society on board. For Africa, this needs to be linked to AMCOW. In South and East Asia, look for opportunity to link to SACOSAN and EASAN.

- **GLAAS:** WHO is aiming for production of GLAAS by end of March. Bruce Gordon is now responsible for GLAAS as Federico Properzi is moving to UN-Water. GLAAS will hold workshops and provide support to countries to respond to the survey. The SWA Secretariat and GLAAS team will work together to see how the workshops can introduce the country preparatory process.
- **Venue:** While other venues were discussed, the SC agreed that the HLM should stay linked to the World Bank Spring Meetings.
- **Donor preparatory process:** The SC requests a degree of openness.
- **Changing nature of Aid:** While we work to engage traditional donors, we also need to be aware of and looking to bring in non-traditional donors as aid is transforming. India, Brazil, China and Russia as well as Foundations are now key actors.
- **Critical factors for success:**
  - The HLM Needs to be at the World Bank and not across the street.
  - We need a high level chair to draw people in
  - We need a political driver to ‘get there’.
  - Donors need to engage at a high political level.
- **Partner Engagement:** The HLM is an opportunity to engage partners. Only with Partners engagement will the HLM be a success.
- **Why is the HLM different from existing processes**
  o SWA provides a structured process where clear commitments and decisions are tabled by decision-makers and monitored. This concept needs to remain clear: This is what makes it distinctive. There is a specificity of the HLM that is unique and not replicated in other meetings.

**Action Point**
1. The SWA Secretariat and HLM TT will integrate SC inputs to the HLM Concept Note and move forward.
2. The SWA Secretariat to develop a template for the HLM country preparatory process and work with the HLM Task Team and Partners to address the delegation of supporting country preparatory processes across countries amongst Partners.

**Other Political Issues**
- Agenda-setting is key. We need to do more to get WASH on the global agenda. Upcoming opportunities include Busan (OECD), Rio (UN), Bonn (Green Economy), Sustainable Sanitation: Five Year Drive, UN General Assembly
- Everyone needs the vision to guide what we’re doing. The Secretary General plans to put sanitation and water at the top of his agenda in his second term. We should be aligning to that. We as Partners have the energy
- There are lessons to be learned from the Health sector. There is a strong partnership for maternal and child health (MCH). It was at the top of the General Assembly agenda and health issues have been prioritized. There was an active lobby for Nutrition and it was effective. We need more evidence on the WASH impact on nutrition and health as well to utilize the momentum on those issues. It is partners which much be proactive on these fronts. Another example is the recent GAVI replenishment: Prime Ministers themselves met and over-achieved the initial target.
- Addressing the Rights to Sanitation and Drinking Water in the future: The focus of the HLM is finance/economics. If countries adopt the Right to Sanitation and Water, SWA should take it up and put it in the Framework, especially from a financing point of view. Is there something we should think about aligning with country processes in terms of aligning to the right?
- Communications is essential that we are all saying the same thing
The Five Year Drive is awareness raising. SWA offers instruments for higher quality implementation. SWA is mechanism for global accountability

**Action Point**

1. Secretariat can proactively engage with partners on other political processes and events. The Secretariat will post more on the SWA website on these events/processes in the coming months.

**National Planning for Results Initiative**

The Liberia Joint Mission was a success. A Compact was developed which sets out milestones, accountability framework and is awaiting the President’s signature. The Country Processes Task Team and Secretariat will work to disseminate lessons learned from the experience in Liberia from both Liberia’s point of view as well as other Partners.

Dominick of WSP presented briefly on NPRI. NPRI is in the Action-Learning phase. Several partners are engaged including: Liberia, Ghana, UNICEF, WSP, WaterAid, IRC, and UNDP.

There are four key objectives of NPRI:

1. Sustain political will to own and drive national plans and planning processes: it is critical to link the HLM to country planning within this objective.
2. Support a consultative and sustainable planning process: We need to pay attention to the capacity of the planning process and ensure there is capacity to instill confidence – in countries as well as partners.
3. Develop clear, actionable, and accountable plans: We want every country to have a strong multi-component plan in place.
4. Strengthen linkages between plans and large scale finance: This remains a challenge as the bulk of investment nor technical assistance will not come through NPRI. The small pots of money and pool of resources should catalyse the process.

Why is there an NPRI? A mechanism is something we can understand. The HLM is an event around political prioritisation. GLAAS is a report within improving evidence-base. NPRI is a mechanism to frame the support to robust planning. These are our instruments to address SWA’s priority areas - Real ways to achieve results.

**Comments/Questions:**

- The Concept Note should refer to ‘SWA’ rather than ‘NPRI’ countries, implementers, etc.
- Who’s making the decisions about NPRI? The management of NPRI is still a question.
- The model is a good instrument that can help off-track countries move forward in a structured manner. How can we scale it up? It should be more open and non-restrictive. Countries should show interest, SWA would develop a process to assess strengths and gaps and how to address shortcomings.
- This is not a fully-donor backed assistance – governments contribute resources.

The main point is to have national actionable plans with in a context of robust planning processes – we are still structuring how the SWA Partnership can facilitate the identification
of and support to address gaps. As national planning processes are on-going and not ‘one-off’ paper plans, SWA’s challenge is to sustain on-going inputs to national planning processes.

There was a discussion about the relationship between the Country Processes Task Team (CPTT) and NPRI. It was agreed that NPRI sits in the CPTT and guides much of the work done in the TT.

Action Point:
1. The CPTT will clarify the relationship of the CPTT and NPRI in writing to the Steering Committee in the form of the Telecon minutes.
2. CPTT to review and fully align the CPTT TOR and NPRI Concept Note

Review of Workplan
A status of where we are at on the implementation of the SWA Workplan was presented. It was noted that monitoring of the Workplan should not become a large separate process as much of this begins to get into sector monitoring which is being done, and best done, elsewhere. However, the Workplan can continue to serve as a management tool to keep our efforts focused and give an indicative path.

GLAAS monitors the sector and SWA has to make a judgement on what it contributes. At some stage in the future (a year or two down the line after we’ve had time to contribute to more significant change, we’d need an external evaluation. Generally, the efforts made within the SWA Framework are on track and focused where the SC intends.

Action Point:
1. SWA Secretariat and CPTT to review the SWA Workplan country-level outputs and indicators to align more realistically to an appropriate monitoring role of the Secretariat/Task Team.

Governance Issues
Vice-Chair
Vice-Chair Sanjay Wijesekera will take up the position of UNICEF’s Chief of WASH in November. Sanjay, with the support of the SC, feel that the host of the Secretariat should not serve as Vice-Chair and therefore will be stepping down. A call for candidates from the Steering Committee was made and the Secretariat will oversee the following process in the coming months?

1. Secretariat send out reminder on call for nominees from existing SC members 1 – Aug 31
2. Closing date for SC nominees – Sept 7
3. Secretariat check all nominees against selection criteria and check that nominees are willing to stand – Sept 16
4. Selection process:
   a. If only one eligible candidate, current Vice-Chair sends out call for no-objection to all SC members (say 2 weeks)

1 SC members can nominate themselves, or other SC members can nominate any other SC member. Nominees need to express their willingness to stand prior to election.
b. If more than one eligible candidate, each nominee prepares short bio and the Secretariat manage internal voting process against the candidates (say 4 weeks).

5. In the event that there are no nominees, the Vice-Chair and Secretariat will lead the identification of alternative external candidates, reviewing their suitability and availability, aiming to make a recommendation by at the next SC meeting.

Action Point

1. Secretariat to lead the nomination/voting process for a new Vice-Chair.

Constituency Engagement:
SC members are doing a great deal to reach out and consult with Constituency Partners around the agendas of the SC meeting. We will continue to look at how to involve other Members. AMCOW could be useful to engage African countries. In South Asia: SC members are looking at other existing processes in the region and interact through those on SWA.

SC Performance
The performance criteria and attendance at SC meetings over the past year was noted.

Governance Standing Committee (Rudy Amenga-Etego, Chair)
Governance Document revision: We have added the R&L Constituency to the Governance document.
Outstanding Governance Issues: The Governance document references a ‘conflict of interest policy’ and that is needed and should be developed by the Standing Committee.

Currently the Governance Standing Committee has one member and there is a call for 1-2 more members.

Action Point

1. Secretariat to revise the French version of the Governance Document and post both English and French on the website.
2. Governance Standing Committee with the Secretariat will develop a Conflict of Interest Policy.
3. One-two more people are required for the Governance Standing Committee.

LAC Region
A small group (led by SDC and IRC) will work on a strategy to engage in LAC, with special attention to clarity of expectations and role/added value of SWA. Partners are interested in generating the platform in the region to respond to the urgent issues, especially sanitation and will start working small to see how it works in the region. There is a particular interest in the opportunity for cross-regional sharing.

Non-Anglophone Africa SC Seat
Voting was held and inconclusive several months ago. It was agreed that this is an important constituency and that the Secretariat should proactively search for candidates. AMCOW will assist.
**Action Point**

1. Secretariat to reach out to Francophone and Lusaphone African countries to identify a suitable candidate for the SC.

**Chair Search Committee Update: (Henry Northover, Chair):**

The Committee has a shortlist and continue to reach out for a Chair. We remain committed to get a high level person, while recognizing that there is a trade-off on going for a high profile chair versus taking too much time. The time pressure is well understood.

**Secretariat: Update and issues**

**Funding:** There is a current shortfall of $1.6 million for the two-year Secretariat budget. DGIS intends to contribute $1 million soon. DFID intends to support GLAAS and SWA Secretariat and will work on this.

**Staff recruitment status:** When funds are received, recruitment for remaining staff will commence.

**Secretariat Workplan:** The current draft Workplan is indicative as the Secretariat is not yet well-staffed.

**Communications:** The Partnership Newsletter was published in time for Stockholm. A revised brochure on SWA will be published following Stockholm.

**Annual Partnership Meeting:** A full Annual Partnership Meeting would be costly. In the past year, we’ve held regional Partnership meetings around other large conferences. This issue will be reviewed by the Secretariat

**2011-2012 Schedule of Meetings:** Approved. Meeting schedule for October 2011-September 2012 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 5, 2011</td>
<td>12:00-14:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 7, 2011</td>
<td>13:00-15:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 8, 2012</td>
<td>13:00-15:00GMT</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012 (~day before WWF)</td>
<td>Full Day</td>
<td>Marseilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 2, 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>August (Sunday before SWWW)</td>
<td>Full Day</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Points**

1. Secretariat will review timing and cost implications of an Annual Partnership Meeting and propose a solution to the SC.

2. Secretariat to publish a revised simple brochure on SWA.

**AOB**

DGIS is going to commission the updating of review of international water events and agencies and proposes to do this within the SWA context. The SC agreed that this is desirable.
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