Sanitation and Water for All Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 7, 2010 15:30-17:30 Stockholm

Steering Committee Members

Attending

AMCOW – Mr. Bai-Mass Taal, Executive Secretary
Ghana- Mr. Yaw Asante Sarkodie, Team Leader, Water and Sanitation Monitoring Platform
DGIS – Mr. Dick van Ginthoven, Senior Advisor
SDC – Mr. Johan Gely, Program Manager
DFID – Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, Team Leader
UNICEF – Ms. Clarissa Brocklehurst, Chief of WASH
WSSCC – Mr. Jon Lane, Executive Director
ANEW – Mr. Rudy Amenga-Etego, CEO, Foundation for Grassroots Initiatives in Africa
End Water Poverty – Ms. Rolien Sasse, CEO, SIMAVI
FANSA – Mr. Yakub Hossain, Deputy Executive Director of Village Education Resource Center
IWA – Mr. Darren Saywell, Development Director
WaterAid – Mr. Henry Northover, Head of Policy
AfDB - Mr. Peter Akari, Africa Water Facility

Regrets

Kenya – Mr. Kepha Ombacho, Chief PH Officer, Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation
Pakistan - Mr. Jawed Ali Khan, Director General, Ministry of Environment
Uganda – Mr. Disani Ssozi, Director
South Africa – Ms. Lindiwe Lusunga, Deputy Director General, Dept of Water Affairs

Secretariat - Attending

Piers Cross, Secretariat (Interim Vice-Chair)
Cindy Kushner, Secretariat

Annexes:
Intro Slides
Governance Document
Secretariat TOR
Financing Options Review (Working Group paper)
Country Processes Review (Working Group paper)

Minutes

Opening (Piers Cross in the chair)

- Introductions and apologies for absence
- History: Sanjay

Summary of points:

- 2006 was a defining moment – early definition of concept
- 2008 Side Event at the UN General Assembly where the UK and the Netherlands announced $100 million Euro and support for the ‘Global Framework for Action’ which is officially created.
- 2009: the ICG was formed and worked to develop a common vision.
- 2010: The first HLM was held, where Finance Ministers sat down and talked about WASH with water/sanitation Ministers and donors. The clear outcomes are documented in the Chairs summary and high level statements of intent from people who control resources (finance ministers). There was an agreement to focus resource on poorest countries and poorest people, if the specific calls to action are met (GLAAS is helping to monitor), about $1billion in aid will be available per year for poorest people in poorest countries (realigned
rather than new money). Many Finance ministers have stories from their own countries as well. All these results have been partially or largely triggered by this meeting, the HLM.
- September 2010: The ‘Global Framework for Action’ becomes The “Sanitation and Water for All” partnership
- As we go forward, we need tangible results on the ground.

• The vision and mission of SWA were summarized in the slides presented by Clarissa Brocklehurst.
• Report to the Steering Committee by the Chair of the former Interim Core Group:

Congratulations to the elected leaders of Sanitation and Water for All. This report is to explain how we’ve reached this stage.

1. Internal Arrangements
   Thus far, SWA has been governed by an interim governance document, dated 2 June 2009. The organization comprised the Interim Core Group (ICG – which took decisions), four working groups (which carried out substantive work and reported to the ICG) and the Secretariat (which supported all). The ICG came out of a meeting in London in May 2009 of interested partners. The first ICG meeting was in June 2009 and subsequently met 14 more times (6 in person, 8 by phone) with up to 20 members. The main decisions have been:
   - Establishing clarity and unity of purpose of SWA (see standard documents to describe)
   - Created robust system of governance according to good practices
   - Attracted 60 partners, including 600+ CSO organizations through networks and a mailing list of over 300
   - Fitted SWA into the global architecture of our sector
   - Started various activities (see below)

   a. Working Groups: There was a lot of work done through the Working Groups. All working groups have completed their work and ended.
     Aid-Effectiveness and Finance Modalities: This working group reviewed options for financing mechanism and produced recommendations. Current discussion is about setting up a ‘TA Mechanism’ – a small fund to catalyze and strengthen national planning and capacity building. Final report: SWA AEFM options review. (ANNEX)
     Political-Communications Strategy: This working group provided guidance and coordination for the High Level Meeting and also looked at broader communications and political outreach for the partnership.
     Governance: This working group drafted the Governance Document.
     Country Processes: This working group looked at how SWA could support and add value to national processes to ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved. Final report: synthesis and emerging issues.
     It was recommended that the Country Processes (country level up) and AEFM (global down) working groups combine as these concepts develop into action.

   b. Secretariat: UNICEF has hosted a small under-funded and understaffed Secretariat. It was initially envisioned that UNICEF would only host the HLM, but in fact also served as a ‘secretariat’ for the ICG as well. UNICEF has done an excellent job. The Secretariat also has a good website up and running.

   c. Chair: The ICG elected a Chair who oversaw the secretariat support of the ICG and chaired the group.

   ➔ The Steering Committee upholds previous decisions taken by the ICG that have current implications.
2. Activities
   a. High Level Meeting: this was the major activity of SWA in the past year. Ministers of Finance along with their sector ministers met with donor representatives on the outskirts of the World Bank Spring Meetings. Thank you to UNICEF and the World Bank for a successful meeting.
   b. GLAAS: SWA appreciated that UN-Water/WHO brought this report to the ICG for consultation. The first report was published in April and is well-received.
   c. Advocacy: SWA worked to raise the profile of the partnership’s key objectives (increased political prioritization, targeting of resources, improved evidence-base, support to countries) at global and regional meetings such as Stockholm, AWW3, etc. and maintained a website (www.sanitationandwaterforall.org).
   d. TA Support: Several options were discussed: a large pooled fund, a small pooled fund to specifically support off-track countries to prepare for and be ready to receive investments. Both were decided against. However, ‘pooled action’ is currently being discussed (currently referred to as a ‘TA Mechanism’). This could evolve.

There has always been an emphasis on volunteerism. Donors come forward with funding, others with human and other resources. The tone the ICG set was one of working for the common cause. It is possible to put extensive resources into but not through SWA.

3. Five Key Issues for the Steering Committee
   a. Governance: Governance for the partnership is basically done. There are small details remaining but all agree the Steering Committee shouldn’t get bogged down in this and can focus on visionary leadership.
      The Secretariat will propose edits, drafted in consultation with previous Governance Working Group members and work to resolve the Governance Document issues before the next Steering Committee meeting in November.
   b. Finance and Funding: Thus far, the partnership has been informal and evolving. It has never had a workplan with a budget as it was a constantly moving plan. Thanks very much to DGIS and DFID for financing the past year and thanks to UN-Water and UNICEF for fund management and enabling work to be done rapidly. Going forward, UNOPS is ready to provide trust-fund management if needed. Finance is still a big worry. Lots of global organizations are looking for money and times are tight.
   c. High Level Meetings
      It has been agreed that Global HLMs will be every two years with interim regional interim meetings.
   d. GLAAS
      Regarding GLAAS (of which SWA isn’t a decision-maker) will be every 2 yrs to coincide with Global HLM and JMP.
   e. Pooled action:
      A ‘TA Mechanism’ (possibly with a different title) is an ongoing discussion and a work in progress.

Comments:
The ICG was informal and open. We have now moved to elected representative members and should still be inclusive. The Governance Document allows flexibility and it is up to the Steering Committee.

**Informal Donor meeting report:**
There was significant turnout with 12 bilateral representatives (11 present plus Austria represented through SDC). Key points discussed

1. The relationship between the Steering Committee and other partners needs to be managed.
2. There is still not a resolution or consensus around the positioning of SWA with respect to the global architecture. Some think SWA is duplicating other partnerships. Some are questioning the need for the TA Mechanism. There are essentially three groups right now: members and financial contributors; those who are happy to be part of it and to strengthen it, and those who are ‘waiting and seeing’ who might contribute but are not fully convinced. The Critical group is those who are still concerned.

A message was sent from the Scandinavians: DANIDA/SIDA/Norway:
They have followed the development of SWA and have reached a position:

1. Support the principle and objectives of SWA, which are viewed as generic and match most organizations
2. Not convinced another global mechanism is needed at this point of time
3. Not considering SWA membership at this point.
4. Will follow development and when see added value, will reconsider our position.

In terms of the partnership drive, the Secretariat was in contact with about 70 countries and 28 joined. While everyone would like to see as broad support and engagement as possible, we will continue working with those who haven’t joined in all constituencies and will continue to communicate with others to engage as they’d like.

The issue of our communication gap was raised as well though and some of the scepticism may be from this. We should also be reaching out to emerging donors. However, the scepticism may also have to do with internal politics and is not only our communications. We can always communicate better but need to look at how much effort we look at making to convince those not yet engaged. It is in the end about outcomes – when we can show that progress, maybe they will change their minds.

Everyone extended a very big Thank You to Jon for his hard work and dedication over the past year.

**Governance and management of SWA (Piers Cross starts in the chair)**
The role of a Steering Committee member was reviewed (from the Governance Document.
Governance Document (pg 2) - Representative sub-group of the Sanitation and Water for All Partnership (14-32 person), with an allocation of seats for each constituency; drives forward the initiative; holds decision-making authority and oversees all Sanitation and Water for All activities; meets regularly through the year; may set up and oversee sub-committees to carry out key tasks and functions.

The issue of composition was discussed, based on the criteria laid out in the Governance Document (Pg 5):

- Balanced regional representation – **not achieved**
- Balanced representation of sanitation and water sectors - probably
- A range of necessary technical competences and institutional perspectives - probably
- Avoidance of conflict of interest and/or capture of the Sanitation and Water for All agenda by vested interests (a detailed Conflict of Interest Policy will also be developed) – unsure, but likely
- Gender balance: at least 1/3 of the representatives should be women and at least 1/3 of the representatives should be men – not achieved
- Balance between governmental and non-governmental – achieved

Nepal sent in a point: Nepal sees a bright future for SWA and feels the election was fair, but results are not balanced. Several important constituencies are not appropriately represented: Francophone, those representing off-track countries, variety of religions (such as Buddhist and Hindu).

Ghana will raise the issue of balanced representation and appropriate constituency consultation, to ensure SC members are able to represent the constituency, with AMCOW take up the issue of composition with AMCOW.

\[\text{FUTURE DECISION: Composition.}\]

The Secretariat will work with the SC to address the issue of composition before the next SC meeting.

The Governance Document states that half of the Steering Committee is open for election each year. Therefore half of the current members would only have a one year term. This is not an urgent matter, but who to split the group needs to be decided within the year.

It is decided this will be taken up in the next meeting.

\[\text{FUTURE DECISION: Initial SC Member Terms}\]

**Chair TOR, selection criteria, budget, timetable, process**

There is a basic TOR in Governance Doc but it was written with the presumption of a SC member.

The Secretariat will revise the Governance Document to address the external, high-level Chair decision.

A Search Committee volunteered to find a high-level Chair: Henry/WaterAid, Jon/WSSCC, Dick/DGIS, Sarkodie/Ghana, Clarissa/UNICEF-Secretariat. Also, AfDB can contribute. Henry will lead.

We should also consider asking UNSGAB for support. The Search Committee should clarify how UNSGAB can help.

The Secretariat will speak to UNSGAB Secretariat

Note: WSSCC is currently going through a similar process and is very happy to provide info on their process.

There is a request to the Search Committee to include consideration of 2 co-chairs (North/South) including pros and cons.

**Election of Vice-Chair:**

It was agreed that as not all the members are present, this is not a decision that should be taken today. As we will have a high-profile Chair, this means the Vice-Chair is more important than the Governance Document reflects. There is a preference for Interim Vice-Chair and it was decided that the Secretariat will take on this function until the next SC meeting. Piers Cross from the Secretariat will serve as the interim temporary Vice-Chair.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would propose a process for election/appointment of a Vice-Chair to be undertaken if at all possible before the next meeting, so as to resolve the issue in a clear and professional manner.
**Working Groups**

All previous Working Groups have completed their work and disbanded. It was agreed a Standing Committee on the ‘TA mechanism’/country processes should be formed as soon as possible. Work is already underway in Liberia with several partners working to develop what they hope will serve as a pilot. Dick/DGIS agreed to temporarily lead the group. Carl Mitchell from USAID could lead in the future if the US joins SWA.

There should also be a Standing Committee on Governance. The Secretariat will reach out to partners about this, including a notice in the next Newsletter.

As many SC members are new, the Secretariat will write a history of the previous four working groups and layout plans to form 2 new Standing Committee.

**Secretariat arrangements and TOR (ANNEX)**

The Secretariat has 3 main responsibilities:
- Steering Committee support
- Communications
- HLM and Preparatory process

There may be other activities which would be taken on by other partners with dedicated funding. UNICEF will host the Secretariat and will have partners which will provide services as well. Partners will be accountable to UNICEF and UNICEF will be accountable to the Steering Committee.

**Financial structure and funding prospects**

All donors stressed that these are difficult times for funding and we must emphasis value for money. DFID has some funding for Secretariat and GLAAS this year. DFID money will go through UN-Water Trust Fund. DGIS hopes to fund a Secretariat/GLAAS/TA Mechanism package early next year.

**Date and place of next meeting and main agenda points**

Large numbers of partners going to Addis Ababa for AWW3 and therefore it was decided that the next SC meeting will be a two day meeting, with an emphasis on substance on November 20-21 in Addis Ababa.

**AOB**

It was agreed that a clear work plan/log frame is needed for the Steering Committee and for the Secretariat (2 products). The Secretariat will develop this in consultation with the Steering Committee.

The 5-Year Drive of Sustainable Sanitation is a proposal by UNSGAB to International community. This doesn’t interfere with any existing or future activities. Current status: UNSGAB is discussing with some countries.