In 2019, 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 Behaviour indicators. 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 available data they provide an overall summary of how governments and development partners are working in the sector and a starting point for discussion on how to improve behaviors 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 determining how they may improve their efforts 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 catalyse 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 profiles in the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All development partners are asked to indicate how they work in all countries. Data on development partners’ responses from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey are otherwise stated for Afghanistan, these data were provided feedback specificity on the country (75% of 21 ESA that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey). Because not all partners responded to the country (seven each, and the top four countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESA’s to better show their work in countries.

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

These profiles have been produced by SWA partners, including representatives from countries, external support agencies (including donors and multi-brokered organizations), civil society, and research and learning institutions. A full list of partners can be found at swawater.org/behaviours/what-we-do/partners.

For additional information, please contact: glaas@who.int or informationandsanitationwater@who.int
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8a</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Donor results are incorporated into country monitoring systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Development partner that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1a</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1c</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3a</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3c</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**INDICATORS GOVERNMENT**

**ENHANCE GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP OF SECTOR PLANNING PROCESSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOUR 1</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3b</td>
<td>ODA allocated to strengthening/supporting or developing (in the absence of sector planning processes) as a proportion of ODA</td>
<td>ADB, BMZ, USAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDICATORS GOVERNMENT**

**STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOUR 2</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1b</td>
<td>Government have defined public financial management and procurement systems that adhere to broadly acceptable standards</td>
<td>ADB, BMZ, USAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISPLAYED SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON AFGHANISTAN**

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

| TOP 5 GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES/NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (in terms of WASH budget) | ADB, BMZ, USAID |

| RESPONSIBILITIES FOR WASH (e.g. health, education, environment, public works, etc.) | ADB, BMZ, USAID |

| INTEGRATION OF WATER AND SANITATION IN GOVERNMENT PLANS | ADB, BMZ, USAID |

| DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS THAT PROVIDE SUPPORT IN AFGHANISTAN | ADB, BMZ, USAID |

**DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDI CATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2a</td>
<td>A formal government-led multi-stakeholder review mechanism exists</td>
<td>ADB, BMZ, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2b</td>
<td>Insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3b</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Donor results are incorporated into country monitoring systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDI CATORS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2a</td>
<td>A formal government-led multi-stakeholder review mechanism exists</td>
<td>ADB, BMZ, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2b</td>
<td>Insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3b</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Donor results are incorporated into country monitoring systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICATORS                      GOVERNMENT                          DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS
1.7a  Completeness of annual financial reports
1.7b  A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon
2.2a  Data are timely, reliable and endorsed by a multi-stakeholder forum
2.2b  Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems
4.2a  A national assessment for drinking-water, sanitation, and hygiene is available (year of latest assessment)
5.1a  Policy and plan coverage targets for specific WASH areas
5.1b  Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups
6.6b  Development partners adhere to country planning processes and policies
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
6.6c  Development partners using country public financial management systems
   a. Germany
   b. Japan
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
7.1a  Government has defined public financial management and procurement systems that adhere to broadly
   recognized best practices
7.1b  Government national WASH plan through a mutual agreement (e.g. MoU, SWAp)
7.2b  Amount of ODA allocated to strengthening country systems compared to WASH infrastructure projects
   a. Germany
   b. Japan
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
8.1b  Data collected through target programs reflect timely country monitoring systems
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
8.2b  Data collected is used to inform decision-making (i.e. results are incorporated into country monitoring systems
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
8.8a  Donors have signed an agreement (i.e. MoU, compact) with the government that cites support to government-
   led national plan
9.2a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
9.3b  Supreme Audit Institution independence
9.3c  Supreme Audit Institution publishes reports on WASH
9.4b  National audit reports are publicly available
9.4c  Development partners are part of the development audit institutional platform
9.5a  Development partners adhere to country planning processes and policies
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
9.5b  Development partners using country public financial management systems
   a. Germany
   b. Japan
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
9.6b  Development partners providing ODA support to country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
9.6c  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
9.7b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
9.8a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
9.8b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.1a  Donors have signed an agreement (i.e. MoU, compact) with the government that cites support to government-
   led national plan
10.1b  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.1c  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.2a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.2b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.3a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.3b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.4a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.4b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.5a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.5b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.6a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.6b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.7a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.7b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.8a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.8b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.9a  Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.9b  Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
10.10a Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise
10.10b Development partners that indicate being part of a country-level planning, monitoring, and learning
   a. USAID
   b. Ministry of Urban Development
   c. International Development Association (World Bank)
BAEHVEI1
ENHANCE GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP OF SECTOR PLANNING PROCESSES

INDICATORS

GOVERNMENT

DEVOLPMENT PARTNERS

1. Proportionally reviewed, government institutional plan (HIP) is in place and implemented

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

2. Drinking water

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

3. Hygiene promotion

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

4. Institutional WASH (e.g. schools and health facility)

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

5. Public financial management

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

6. Disease control

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

7. Development partners that are an active member of Tanzania institutional coordination platform

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

8. Percentage of ODA allocated to water and sanitation in the most recent ODA plan that is aligned with a national government plan as part of a broader institutional reform (e.g., HIP, HIPs)

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

9. Ministry of Urban Development

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

10. ODA ALIGNED WITH INSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES (in terms of ODA allocation)

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

11. ODA STAFF SUPPORT ARGUING FOR WATER AND SANITATION

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

12. Government leadership in the sector (for example, a government official appointed as chief water and sanitation enforcement officer)

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

13. Government leaders are bound by a legally binding agreement (i.e. ODA, MoU, IFC, IFIs)

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

14. Insufficient data

15. Inadequate institutional framework

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

16. Data not available

17. Data not available

18. Other external support agencies that provided data on Tanzania

a. Tanzania

b. Low

c. Limited

d. Discontinued

BAEHVEI2
STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

INDICATORS

GOVERNMENT

DEVOLPMENT PARTNERS

1. Government has defined public financial management and procurement systems that allow for timely and reliable disbursement of ODA

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

2. Insufficient data

3. Insufficient data

4. Percentage of ODA spending using country procurement system (%)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

5. ODA ALIGNED WITH INSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES (in terms of ODA allocation)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

6. ODA STAFF SUPPORT ARGUING FOR WATER AND SANITATION

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

7. Government leadership in the sector (for example, a government official appointed as chief water and sanitation enforcement officer)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

8. Government leaders are bound by a legally binding agreement (i.e. ODA, MoU, IFC, IFIs)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

9. Insufficient data

10. Inadequate institutional framework

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

11. Data not available

12. Data not available

13. Other external support agencies that provided data on Tanzania

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

BAEHVEI3
USE ONE INFORMATION AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY PLATFORM BUILT AROUND A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER, GOVERNMENT-LEAD CYCLE OF PLANNING, MONITORING, AND LEARNING

INDICATORS

GOVERNMENT

DEVOLPMENT PARTNERS

1. A formal government led multi stakeholder review mechanism exists

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

2. Insufficient data

3. Percentage of ODA spending using country procurement system (%)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

4. ODA ALIGNED WITH INSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES (in terms of ODA allocation)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

5. ODA STAFF SUPPORT ARGUING FOR WATER AND SANITATION

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

6. Government leadership in the sector (for example, a government official appointed as chief water and sanitation enforcement officer)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

7. Government leaders are bound by a legally binding agreement (i.e. ODA, MoU, IFC, IFIs)

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

8. Insufficient data

9. Inadequate institutional framework

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

10. Data not available

11. Data not available

12. Other external support agencies that provided data on Tanzania

a. Tanzania

b. Medium

c. Significant

d. Significant

13. Data not available for ADB

14. Data not available for USAID

15. Data not available for other partners

16. Data not available
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http://sanitationforall.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 (GLAAS), is leading the monitoring of the Behaviours. In order to avoid the burden on countries, the 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, CEI, CPA and EFA. While these sources provide a significant amount of data on any of the indicators, some information is not available for all countries or development partners.

Three 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 institutes. A full list of partners can be found at http://sawaterwashesan.org/behaviours/regional-partners/

### 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 development partners are encouraged to participate in the profile surveys. The GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey asked mission representatives for Afghanistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan to report on their activities in the country. Additional information is available at http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaa
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SWA COLLABORATIVE BEHAVIOURS: COUNTRY PROFILES 2017

An introduction to the profiles

In 2014, the Sanitation and Water for All (SWaW) 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. SWaW 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 available data they provide an overview of how governments and development partners are working in the sector and are a starting point for discussion 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 gaps that may require 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 profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All development partners were invited to complete the GLAAS 2016/2017 survey, but only those development partners that responded to the survey were included in this publication. However, the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESA partners to better show their work in these countries.

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 the Behaviours. In order to avoid 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, CSOs and partners. While these sources provide a significant amount of data and all the indicators, some information is not available for all countries or development partners.

Three 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 institutes. A full list of partners can be found at: swacooperationsdatawaterforall.org.

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