Sanitation

UNDP

Drinking-water

Access for vulnerable groups: specific measures exist for “poor populations” (GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey).

100% of UNDP funding is stated in the national budget. Source: GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey.

Data not available for

Germany

Data not available for

Japan

The four donors are: EU Institutions, France, Norway and the United Arab Emirates.

GLAAS 2013/2014 ESA survey. Donors indicated using pooled funding mechanisms: European Commission and Sida. Donors did not provide country specific information.

France

Percentage and total amount shown is based on annual average disbursement from 2013 to 2015; Source: OECD-CRS, 2016.

Source: West Bank and Gaza Strip GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey. The 80-90% refers to German Government / KFW / GIZ.

France

Quality of budgetary and financial management assesses the extent to which there is a comprehensive and credible budget linked to policy priorities, effective financial management systems, and timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts. (1=low to 6=high) Source: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=country-policy-and-

Dimensions 1-4 are PEFA (Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability) scores, based on an A to D scale (https://pefa.org/content/pefa-framework).

Rural sanitation

A plan sets out targets to achieve and provides details on implementation (based on policies where these exist). It indicates how the responsible entity will respond to organizational requirements, type of

Urban drinking-water

Data for this indicator are not currently collected at the global level.

France

WASH budgets are available from government ministries and institutions

WASH budgets are predictable

Donors committed to multi-year funding (three or more years) under a multi-year investment plan or strategy

Data not available for

Insufficient data

Partly

Fully

Rural drinking-water

Data not available

Household expenditure data

Non-tariff household expenditure data (self-supply) on WASH are available

Revenue estimates from tariffs are available from utilities or other service providers

Background on the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles

The World Health Organization (WHO), through the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking Water (GLAAS), is leading the monitoring of these behaviours.

In order to avoid placing a burden on countries, WHO has leveraged existing monitoring initiatives and data sources for the country profiles: information for the profiles is drawn from the most recently available data (from GLAAS, OECD, CIA, CPA and IFAD). While these sources provide a significant amount of data on the indicators, some information is not available for all countries or development partners.

These country profiles have been produced by SWA partners, including representatives from countries, external support agencies (including donors and multi-beneficiary organizations), civil society, and research and learning institutions. A full list of partners can be found at: http://sanitationandwaterforall.org/about/partners/

For additional information, please contact: glaas@who.int or info@sanitationandwaterforall.org

An introduction to the profiles

In 2014, the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) global partnership identified four Collaborative Behaviours that, if jointly adopted by governments and development partners, would improve long-term performance and sustainability in the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector. SWA has also developed a monitoring strategy with a set of indicators to assess progress on the Four Collaborative Behaviours.

Based on publicly available data, the country profiles provide an overview of how both the government and development partners are applying the Behaviours. Information regarding the government and development partners is presented side-by-side to highlight areas of success and to encourage mutual accountability. The 2017 country profiles are the first round of profiles for the Collaborative Behaviours and they may be further refined moving forward.

Using the profiles

These profiles are intended as a resource for countries and development partners. While the profiles are not completely exhaustive, by bringing together relevant data they provide an overall summary of how governments and development partners are working in the sector and are a starting point for discussions on how to improve behaviours to strengthen long-term performance. For example, both countries and development partners can use the profiles to see how well they and others are applying the Collaborative Behaviours and identify areas that may need more effort and/or resources.

Because of limitations in the availability of data, many of the profiles contain considerable data gaps. However, it is hoped that they will still serve to catalyze discussions, and trigger action to ensure these gaps are addressed in future monitoring rounds.

About development partners’ responses

A main data source for development partners in the country profile is the GLAAS 2016/17 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. Development partner contributions to the profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/17 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza, USAID provided feedback specifically on the country (but on 13 ESA’s that responded to the GLAAS 2016/17 ESA survey). Because countries did not answer the GLAAS ESA survey for every country (they were asked to select for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.
Government has defined public financial management and procurement systems that adhere to broadly:

3.1a Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

2. Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders (i.e. data are reported in a usable format)
3. The mechanism applies evidence-based decision-making, including consideration of agreed indicators (e.g. access, outcome, health outcomes, etc.)
4. Data are timely, reliable and endorsed by a multi-stakeholder forum
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3b Multiple donors are supporting a national M&E system

3.1b Partnerships have defined strategic public financial management goals and action plans that are widely accepted

1. Degree of integration and reconciliation between present records and past data
2. Timeliness of changes in program and project designs
3. Internal controls of budgetary and financial processes
4. External oversight of entities to identify systemic weaknesses and in cash flows
5. Calendar for M&E activities is publicly available
6. Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups

4. Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers

7. There is an external review of the system

1. National system for the collection of data
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

6. Partners have designed and implemented a system for internal and external auditing

1. A government level multi-stakeholder mechanism exists for setting up of different regulations related to responsibilities for WASH, health, education, environment, public works, etc.
2. Multi-sector coordination mechanisms have been set up on national or sub-national level
3. Mechanisms of institutionalization and empowerment of actors who have salary influence on service delivery
4. Mechanism includes donors that contribute to WASH in the country
5. Mechanism includes non-governmental stakeholders (i.e. NGOs, civil society organizations, advocacy groups)
6. Mechanisms incorporated in documented and publicly available
7. Development partners that are active in selecting partners and international coordination platforms

5. Mechanism includes all ministries and government agencies that directly or indirectly influence service delivery
6. Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups
7. Number of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements)

- UNICEF
- USAID
- BMZ, EC, UNDP
- Switzerland

2.1b Partnership agreements to improve country planning processes and policies

1. A government level multi-stakeholder mechanism exists for setting up of different regulations related to responsibilities for WASH, health, education, environment, public works, etc.
2. Multi-sector coordination mechanisms have been set up on national or sub-national level
3. Mechanisms of institutionalization and empowerment of actors who have salary influence on service delivery
4. Mechanism includes donors that contribute to WASH in the country
5. Mechanism includes non-governmental stakeholders (i.e. NGOs, civil society organizations, advocacy groups)
6. Mechanisms incorporated in documented and publicly available
7. Development partners that are active in selecting partners and international coordination platforms

STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

1. National system for the collection of data
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

SDG related to strengthening or developing (or both) the above mentioned evaluation and monitoring systems

3.2c Insufficient data

16% No

Arsenio Alcaraz

WASH STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

1. National system for the collection of data
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3.1b Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

1. Degree of integration and reconciliation between present records and past data
2. Timeliness of changes in program and project designs
3. Internal controls of budgetary and financial processes
4. External oversight of entities to identify systemic weaknesses and in cash flows
5. Calendar for M&E activities is publicly available
6. Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups
7. Number of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

4. Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers

7. There is an external review of the system

1. A government level multi-stakeholder mechanism exists for setting up of different regulations related to responsibilities for WASH, health, education, environment, public works, etc.
2. Multi-sector coordination mechanisms have been set up on national or sub-national level
3. Mechanisms of institutionalization and empowerment of actors who have salary influence on service delivery
4. Mechanism includes donors that contribute to WASH in the country
5. Mechanism includes non-governmental stakeholders (i.e. NGOs, civil society organizations, advocacy groups)
6. Mechanisms incorporated in documented and publicly available
7. Development partners that are active in selecting partners and international coordination platforms

STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

1. National system for the collection of data
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3.1b Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

2. Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders (i.e. data are reported in a usable format)
3. The mechanism applies evidence-based decision-making, including consideration of agreed indicators (e.g. access, outcome, health outcomes, etc.)
4. Data are timely, reliable and endorsed by a multi-stakeholder forum
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3.1b Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

1. Degree of integration and reconciliation between present records and past data
2. Timeliness of changes in program and project designs
3. Internal controls of budgetary and financial processes
4. External oversight of entities to identify systemic weaknesses and in cash flows
5. Calendar for M&E activities is publicly available
6. Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups
7. Number of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

4. Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers

7. There is an external review of the system

1. A government level multi-stakeholder mechanism exists for setting up of different regulations related to responsibilities for WASH, health, education, environment, public works, etc.
2. Multi-sector coordination mechanisms have been set up on national or sub-national level
3. Mechanisms of institutionalization and empowerment of actors who have salary influence on service delivery
4. Mechanism includes donors that contribute to WASH in the country
5. Mechanism includes non-governmental stakeholders (i.e. NGOs, civil society organizations, advocacy groups)
6. Mechanisms incorporated in documented and publicly available
7. Development partners that are active in selecting partners and international coordination platforms

STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

1. National system for the collection of data
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3.1b Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

2. Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders (i.e. data are reported in a usable format)
3. The mechanism applies evidence-based decision-making, including consideration of agreed indicators (e.g. access, outcome, health outcomes, etc.)
4. Data are timely, reliable and endorsed by a multi-stakeholder forum
2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
3. Partners have set up processes to share information and evidence-based lessons
4. All stakeholders are engaged in the development and review of indicators
5. The process for developing and reviewing indicators is transparent
6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services

3.1b Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems
**BEHAVIOUR 1**

**ENHANCE GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP OF SECTOR PLANNING PROCESSES**

- **Governance and policy frameworks**
  - Government has defined and adhered to public financial management and procurement systems that adhere to broadly accepted international standards. 

- **Public sector budget and expenditure reporting**
  - Public sector budget and expenditure reporting enables the number and cost of civil servants working at any point in time to be quantified.

- **Procurement and contract implementation**
  - Development partners using country procurement systems.

- **Reform and institutional change**
  - A formal government-led multi-stakeholder review mechanism exists.

- **Data collection**
  - Data collected through partner programs feed into country monitoring systems.

**BEHAVIOUR 2**

**STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS**

- **Participation and collaboration**
  - Development partners adhere to country planning processes and policies.

- **Public sector budget and expenditure reporting**
  - Insufficient data for this indicator.

- **Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups**
  - Insufficient data for this indicator.

- **Development partners working across institutional boundaries**
  - Data not available for other partners.

**BEHAVIOUR 3**

**USE ONE INFORMATION AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY PLATFORM BUILT AROUND A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER, GOVERNMENT-LED CYCLE OF PLANNING, MONITORING, AND LEARNING**

- **Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders**
  - Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders.

- **Data used in evidence-based decision-making**
  - Data collected are used to inform decision-making (i.e. results are incorporated into country monitoring systems or decisions are informed by data).

- **Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services**
  - Data not available for other partners.
Background on the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles

The World Health Organization (WHO), through the UN-Water Global Alliance and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking Water (GLAAS) is leading the monitoring of the behaviours.

In order to avoid placing a burden on countries, SWA has leveraged existing monitoring initiatives and data sources for the country profiles. Information for the profiles is drawn from the most recently available data from GLAAS, OECD, CIA, OECD and other. These sources provide a significant amount of data on the indicators, some information is not available for all countries or development partners.

These country profiles have been produced by SWA partners, including representatives from countries, external support agencies (including donors and multi-biateral organizations), civil society, and research and learning institutions. A full list of partners can be found at: http://swa.org/about/swa-partners/

For additional information, please contact: glaas@who.int or info@sanitationandwaterforall.org
Background on the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles

The World Health Organization (WHO), through the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking Water (SWA) is leading the monitoring of the behaviours.

In order to avoid placing a burden on countries, SWA has leveraged existing monitoring initiatives and data sources for the country profiles. Information for the profiles is drawn from the most recently available data from GLAAS, OECD, CPIA and PEFA. While these sources provide a significant amount of data on the indicators, some information is not available for all countries or development partners.

These country profiles have been produced by SWA partners, including representatives from countries, external support agencies (including donors and multi-bced organizations), civil society, and research and learning institutes. A full list of partners can be found at http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/swa_behaviours

For additional information, please contact: glaas@who.int or info@sanitationandwaterforall.org

Behind the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles

An introduction to the profiles

In 2014, the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) global partnership identified four Collaborative Behaviours that, if jointly adopted by governments and development partners, would improve long-term performance and sustainability in the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector. SWA has also developed a monitoring strategy with a set of indicators to assess progress on the four Collaborative Behaviours. Based on publicly available data, the country profiles provide an overview of how both the government and development partners are applying the Behaviours. Information regarding the government and development partners is presented side-by-side to highlight areas of strength and where gaps are evident.

Using the profiles

These profiles are intended as a resource for countries and development partners. While the profiles are not completely exhaustive, by bringing together relevant available data they provide an overall overview of how governments and development partners are working in the sector and can be a starting point for discussions on how to improve behaviors to strengthen long-term sector performance. For example, both countries and development partners can use the profiles to see how well they and others are applying the Collaborative Behaviours and identify areas that may need more effort and/or resources.

Because limitations in the availability of data, many of the profiles contain considerable data gaps. However, it is hoped that they will still serve to catalyze discussions, and trigger action to lessen these gaps are addressed in future monitoring rounds.

About development partners’ responses

A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All data from external support agencies in the country profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza Strip, GLAAS ESA did not provide feedback specifically on the country but list 12 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA Survey. Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.

The four Collaborative Behaviours are:

1. High level support for sector funding
2. Targeting for sector funding
3. Strengthening and integration of institutional assessment
4. Strengthening ability to deliver predictable support

A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All data from external support agencies in the country profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza Strip, GLAAS ESA did not provide feedback specifically on the country but list 12 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA Survey. Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.

The four Collaborative Behaviours are:

1. High level support for sector funding
2. Targeting for sector funding
3. Strengthening and integration of institutional assessment
4. Strengthening ability to deliver predictable support

A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All data from external support agencies in the country profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza Strip, GLAAS ESA did not provide feedback specifically on the country but list 12 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA Survey. Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.

The four Collaborative Behaviours are:

1. High level support for sector funding
2. Targeting for sector funding
3. Strengthening and integration of institutional assessment
4. Strengthening ability to deliver predictable support

A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All data from external support agencies in the country profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza Strip, GLAAS ESA did not provide feedback specifically on the country but list 12 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA Survey. Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.

The four Collaborative Behaviours are:

1. High level support for sector funding
2. Targeting for sector funding
3. Strengthening and integration of institutional assessment
4. Strengthening ability to deliver predictable support

A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All data from external support agencies in the country profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For the West Bank and Gaza Strip, GLAAS ESA did not provide feedback specifically on the country but list 12 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA Survey. Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.