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Executive Summary

Background to the Review

This report describes the process and presents the findings of the External Review of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), which was carried out between April 2010 and January 2011. The review covers the period of 2005 to 2010. The review was conducted on behalf of the joint donors and funded by the Netherlands Government and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The first phase of the review in April 2010 was co-funded by the Norwegian government. The external review team consisted of three independent consultants.

Objectives

The overall objectives of the review were to: (i) Provide WSSCC’s donors, partners and members with a comprehensive assessment of the progress, contributions, achievements and impact of WSSCC at the global and national levels; (ii) Assess the appropriateness of governance and institutional arrangements; (iii) Assess the appropriateness of WSSCC’s mission, goals and strategies; (iv) Determine how well WSSCC is meeting the requirements of its donors in terms of having impact and justifying further future funding; (v) Assess the extent to which the recommendations of the last External Review have been implemented, and provide a basis and recommendations for enhancement and improvement of the performance of WSSCC and; (vi) Identify ways in which WSSCC’s donors and other partners can support WSSCC’s success in the next five years.

Report Structure

The report consists of 5 Chapters: Chapter 1 includes the objectives of the review as well as the main lines of the approach. Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of WSSCC’s objectives, organisation, budgets as well as some trends in the sanitation sector. Chapter 3 provides an assessment of the three pillars of WSSCC, the Networking and Knowledge Management, Advocacy and Communications, the Global Sanitation Fund (GSF) and the assessment of the interrelations between the three pillars. Chapter 4 provides an assessment of the governance and management performance. Chapter 5 contains general conclusions as well as conclusions related to the fields of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, outcome and impact. The chapter ends with suggestions for the way forward.

General conclusions

- WSSCC has played an important advocacy role in sanitation at a global level and a clear contribution with some of its regional activity. Through its national network WSSCC has played a substantial role in the improvement of the legislative and institutional frameworks in a number of countries.

- WSSCC’s new pillar, the Global Sanitation Fund, offers a significant opportunity at country level at an opportune time. At the same time the Global Sanitation Fund is also a calculated risk for WSSCC, as it is a new, complex and time consuming activity to be incorporated with the existing knowledge and advocacy activities.

- Until recently the GSF preparatory process has been too slow, the concept has not been explained well enough and the system is too complex (transparency and collaboration has probably gone too far). Consequently, no money has been spent yet on the implementation of GSF activities. This means that at present the GSF is a higher risk than it should have been.
During the period 2005-2006 WSSCC activities came to a near standstill. The underlying reason for the slowdown was the unsuccessful process of change of institutional host. The WSSCC revival from early 2007 onwards is spectacular with new ideas, new strategies, clear strategic decisions, a new host organisation and an increased number of staff in the secretariat; however, as yet, there is limited evidence of this resurgence in terms of development results.

The development of the GSF has bought the WSSCC’s work ‘closer’ to its mission of achieving water supply and sanitation for all however, it would be helpful if the Council could be more explicit and coherent about their model of improved sanitation and how they contribute to it.

WSSCC’s global advocacy has concentrated on sanitation and hygiene. The materials WSSCC provides are ‘market leaders’ and world class. The WASH brand has been internalised by all major players in the sector. An independent evaluation recognised IYS and the Global WASH Campaign as the most effective advocacy campaigns in global sanitation efforts and WSSCC as being a main player in both. The assessment in particular identified the strong brand, consistency and collaboration involved in IYS as being its major strength; areas where WSSCC played a key role.

The evaluation also assessed advocacy organisations and despite their role in ‘good’ campaigns WSSCC was not mentioned amongst the ‘most effective advocacy organisations’. WSSCC’s role in IYS is often not overtly attributed to its success; only UN-Water and others in some UN HQ departments were explicit about WSSCC’s contribution.

Despite being extremely effective in its advocacy work the Council had no real model of what success would look like (benchmarks etc.) or a clear chain of outcomes or milestones through which advocacy activity would lead or contribute to the Council’s overall goals.

In the sanitation arena awareness has been raised and in many cases global and national institutional frameworks are in place. There is increased coordination and the major gap now in the sector is to increase resources to allow for practical action and change towards global sanitation targets. The review team strongly agrees that the focus of the new advocacy strategy on economic outcomes or other non-sanitation indicators such as health or education is an important step forward for WSSCC, if they are to remain at the cutting edge of sanitation advocacy.

The Council’s Knowledge Management Role is not clear to stakeholders although knowledge outputs are well regarded and add value, in particular if they are practical, accessible and seen as coming from a neutral player. The Council’s role in organizing and co-hosting learning events and training is appreciated if it involves the sharing of experience but again is not something they are widely recognised for.

Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, outcomes and impact

**Relevance:** The mission and outcomes of WSSCC are highly relevant to the global debate and represent concrete activities to achieve the sanitation MDGs. The establishment of the GSF is highly relevant and has been started at the appropriate moment in time. That is, a moment when legislative and institutional frameworks are improving but the implementation of sanitation activities to achieve sustainable improved sanitation still needs to get off the ground.

**Effectiveness:** The strategic decision to dedicate most efforts to sanitation and hygiene, in view of the limited progress on sanitation, was an excellent choice as it provided WSSCC with a clear focus on an important but heavily neglected sub-sector and a clear niche. In the view of the review team this decision has been central to the survival as well as to the growth of WSSCC.
Although WSSCC has a global mandate, it concentrates its efforts on Africa and Asia because most of the people in the world who lack water and sanitation live in these regions. The review team strongly agrees with this approach but feels that this focus isn’t matched as well as it could be in its governance mechanisms in particular representation at the steering committee level.

Discussions about the role, effectiveness and make-up of the Steering Committee revealed deep concerns among a number of parties. Moreover, the effectiveness of the GSF Advisory Committee has been limited.

Networking and Knowledge Management, Advocacy and Communications together with the Global Sanitation Fund form the three strategic ‘pillars’ of WSSCC. It is the review teams understanding that the aim is for WSSCC’s value added in the sector to relate to its ability to ensure the three pillars make up a coherent whole, whose impact and effectiveness will be greater than the sum of its parts. The review team feels that though some progress has been made in integrating the three areas they are still not as closely strategically aligned as they could be.

The national coordinators are all very committed volunteers. Their effectiveness depends to a large extent on their role and place within the sector in the countries concerned. The effectiveness of the 35 national WASH coalitions differs from one country to the other depending on their role and place within the sanitation arena and the credibility of the national coordinator. The effectiveness of some of the national WASH coalitions in the eight countries visited increased while that of other coalitions substantially decreased for various reasons.

Efficiency: Overall WSSCC’s advocacy and networking as well as its advocacy and communications represent good value for money. The efficiency of the GSF still needs to be proven. Data regarding the value addition of the GSF provides evidence that economies of scale need to be generated for the GSF to ensure that value for money is achieved. Moreover, the assumptions behind the GSF (number of people reached and unit costs involved) still need to be proven in reality.

Sustainability: The governmental institutions and multi-stakeholder forums related to sanitation and hygiene are more sustainable as compared to six years ago although major improvements in institutional frameworks are still required. The establishment of National Multi-Stakeholder Task Forces chaired by national government officials provides a (fragile) first step towards and basis for institutional sustainability at government level. The main impact areas of Coalition activities and engagement at a national level appear to be their ability to influence national programmes, advocate for specific policy change and raise awareness and build commitment to the sector. This seems to be a reasonable foundation for sustainable change at a national level but it needs to be supported by continued pressure to ensure that increased prioritisation by government is matched by transfer of funds and resources.

The GSF will contribute to sustainable improvements in sanitation at a household and community level if its strategy of encouraging behavioural change and the construction of toilets without subsidies are effectively implemented.

The institutional and financial sustainability of the National WASH coalitions may be limited in many cases. These mechanisms could and often are now being replaced by other locally resourced and driven mechanisms. This may be viewed as a natural progression and evidence of successful institutionalisation if embedded in nationally owned systems.

In the view of the review team, WSSCC’s financial sustainability is always going to rely on its ability to generate donor funds. Other models such as charging members or the provision of ‘consulting services’ may provide additional ways of generating income but these are unlikely to be significant given WSSCC’s mandate and cost.
Outcomes: (i) WSSCC’s contribution has been substantial and could be verified during the field visits in the following major fields: a) governments have acknowledged the importance of sanitation and hygiene and changed policies, departmental structures and responsibilities and strategies accordingly; b) the national level coordination in sanitation and hygiene improved and budgets for sanitation are being made available; (ii) WSSCC’s contribution to awareness raising and from media coverage is demonstrably substantial; (iii) WSSCC’s contribution to increasing the skills and knowledge of professionals and organisations is significant and is most easily evidenced in the uptake of practical guidelines and overviews of current practice that have been produced. The material on CLTS is perhaps the best example of this; (iv) WSSCC’s contribution to improved global and regional leadership for sanitation and hygiene is valuable, while WSSCC’s contribution is recognised by other main players with special reference to its role in advocacy and; (v) WSSCC’s contribution to the following outcomes remains limited (or cannot be assessed) at present as GSF still has to start implementation; i) people achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours; ii) WSSCC activities become more effective and benefits become more sustainable

WSSCC should consider reducing the number of outcomes, make the indicators more explicit and synchronise the result frameworks including the outcomes and indicators of the three pillars.

Impact: Impact in terms of large number of poor people attaining sustainable access to basic sanitation and adopting good hygiene practices cannot be easily assessed in quantitative terms. Nevertheless, the Country Programme Proposals for the GSF in nine countries are very explicit in their quantitative statements. Altogether these nine CPPs aim to change the lives of more than 28 million people. Out of these 28 million people more than 11 million people will have started to use improved toilets during the five year GSF programme period. This number of 11 million people can be attributed to the GSF.

The intended impact of WSSCC’s work is expressed differently in different documents. In GSF material and in the latest draft advocacy strategy, impact looks at the benefits of improved sanitation on for example improved health and quality of life. That impact is in turn linked with improved child survival, reduced population growth, improved education opportunities, improved economic productivity, improved living environment and reduced poverty. The review team thinks assessing impact beyond the level of improved sanitation is very important in particular to increase and sustain resources that are committed to both the WSSCC and to the sanitation sector in general.

Suggested Ways Forward

WSSCC’s focus on sanitation and hygiene should be maintained, in view of the limited progress on sanitation, it provides WSSCC a clear focus on an important but heavily neglected sub-sector and a clear niche; however the relation between broader water supply and water resources issues should be made more explicit.

The GSF has major potential to become a major Global Sanitation Fund with a substantial financial envelop. WSSCC’s present organisational set-up will fit a financial envelop of approximately USD 100 million per year. Such a fund needs to be flexible and demand driven based upon feasible requests/proposals made by individual countries.

The major challenges for WSSCC will be to deliver on outcomes. The most crucial issue for WSSCC in the coming years is to deliver and deliver quickly enough on GSF outputs and outcomes in 17 countries (all round 1 and round 2 countries) and not prepare GSF in new countries.

To increase WSSCC’s value add and market niche, WSSCC needs to ensure an explicit and balanced symbiosis between the three WSSCC pillars. This should revolve around a strategy which targets resource holders and those that can influence future funding to sanitation. Arguments and performance indicators that focus on the link between sanitation and economic, health and other
poverty measures should form the basis of future activities. There is a need to elaborate a clear integrated framework for all three pillars which focuses on a clear results chain towards non-sanitation specific indicators (like health, absenteeism at school etc).

The direction in which WSSCC has developed implies that the Council will be a long term player in the sector. This requires an up to date staffing and organisational structure and governance, therefore the Council should consider: (1) reviewing their current functional structure; (2) looking at whether NC's and national coalitions can sustainably work on a voluntary basis in particular if they have a greater role in co-ordinating membership; and (3) review the role and membership of the steering committee.

WSSCC should better interact with other players (NGO's, CBO's, Governments, INGO's, UNICEF, WSP and Private sector) and closely monitor the development of the interaction, especially in view of the GSF and reflect on the implications of the interactions on WSSCC's perceived neutral broker role and their ability to convene. India and China require a different approach. The direct and indirect contribution of the GSF to achieving the sanitation MDG needs to be reassessed. Inclusion of China in the WSSCC network has a high priority.

Future Strategic options for WSSCC

Build on new mechanisms
In view of the changing role of the National WASH Coalitions, the new players in the sector, the competition, as well as the GSF with its new mechanisms, the relationship between WSSCC and the national level needs to be carefully reviewed and reassessed based upon the specific situation in each individual country.

Make better use of the Membership potential
A reflection on the meaning of membership, the expectations of WSSCC as well as its individual members, the responsibilities of WSSCC as well as its members including the real value added of membership is needed and is being undertaken by WSSCC at present. Effective WSSCC Membership management requires more effort for joint planning of membership activities and sufficient resourcing at all WSSCC levels: Geneva and Coalition countries.

Review relations with the national level
The WSSCC Secretariat needs to review its relations with the national level. Options to be considered: i) strengthen the role of national coalitions and the decentralisation process of coalitions wherever possible; ii) support Programme Coordinating Mechanisms; iii) Play a pro-active role in the National Stakeholders Forums/Committees; iv) focus on the Executing Agency; v) the appointment of national coordinators as the official WSSCC representative and as national membership co-coordinators. The efficiency and limits of the WSSCC's voluntary mechanism needs to be reviewed in the light of future relations with and role/responsibilities of the WSSCC National representatives/coordinators and to safeguard WSSCC's "neutral broker" role.

Balancing the three Pillar strategy
WSSCC's GSF will impact on its organisation and management as well as on its priority setting. WSSCC faces 2 challenges: (1) How to balance the interrelations between the three pillars and the specific requirements of each of the pillars (e.g. advocacy also has its own dimension independent of the GSF); and (2) How to balance the global and regional level interventions and the implementation of the GSF in a number of specific countries.

Reorient Advocacy
Awareness has been raised and knowledge levels increased, advocacy work is gradually changing from awareness to action and the climate in which advocacy is conducted has changed with special reference to access to internet and the social media. Therefore the top-down model of lobbying
governments needs to be complemented with grassroots advocacy. At national level the improvements of legislative and (partly) institutional framework are gradually being achieved. Future advocacy needs to play a role in explaining and monitoring the sanitation policy implementation process at provincial and district level.

Focus on impact the GSF
The collection of relevant impact related data (such as: health data/indicators, educational data, indicators on measuring behavioural change) during the baseline survey process is very important because this enables WSSCC and any other party to compare the baseline data with the same type of data at the end of the programme period. Even without suggesting a direct link between the GSF interventions at a local level and findings on health and education (impact), the relevant impact related data will be extremely valuable as simultaneously activities are being conducted in a large number of countries/specific situations.

Accelerate and simplify the GSF preparatory and implementation process
WSSCC needs to review the GSF preparatory process, concentrate on monitoring main issues and accelerate the implementation process. There is a need for: i) focus on GSF outcome one; ii) clarification of responsibilities of the PCM in the GSF; iii) review of the sector and gap analysis and; iv) simplification of the M&E process.
1 Introduction

Context

The Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) is a global multi-stakeholder partnership organisation that works to improve the lives of poor people. WSSCC enhances collaboration among sector agencies and professionals around sanitation and water supply and contributes to the broader goals of poverty eradication, health and environmental improvement, gender equality and long-term social and economic development. The activities undertaken by WSSCC were recognised in the United Nations General Assembly resolution A/RES/45/181 of 21 December 1990.

Traditionally having worked on Networking & Knowledge Management, Advocacy & Communications, the WSSCC in 2008 launched its Global Sanitation Fund (GSF), which is a pooled fund, from which competent organisations in eligible countries would receive grants for sanitation activities. It is anticipated that the three types of activities (networking & knowledge management, advocacy & communications and the Global Sanitation Fund) will complement each other and make a coherent whole for advances in sanitation. The Global Sanitation Fund (GSF) provided the basis for a considerable growth both in membership and budgets.

WSSCC has more than 4,000 individual members in more than 150 countries and a network of National WASH Coalitions in 33 countries. It carries out its work programme by working collaboratively, with partner organisations and its members, through Networking & Knowledge Management, Advocacy & Communications and grants management via the Global Sanitation Fund.

WSSCC’s mission is to achieve sustainable water supply and sanitation for all people.

Until August 2009, WSSCC was part of the World Health Organisation. In 2006 an attempt was made to change hosts from WHO to UNICEF. This attempt failed, contributing to an institutional slowdown. The WSSCC revival from early 2007 onwards did lead to new ideas and strategies with special reference to the establishment of the Global Sanitation Fund. In August 2009, WSSCC’s operations began to be transferred to a new host, the United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS). This transfer was complete as of 1 January 2010.

The last external evaluation of WSSCC’s activities was carried out in 2004. As stipulated by its donor agreements, an external review of WSSCC was planned for mid-2010. The review covers the period of 2005 to 2010. Further, the timing of the review represents the midpoint of the implementation of the 2008-2012 Medium Term Work Plan (MTWP) approved by the Steering Committee in 2007. The donor agreements further state that WSSCC will give the donors the opportunity to participate in review, monitoring and evaluation missions with regard to the MTWP.

The overall objectives of the review are to: (i) Provide WSSCC’s donors, partners and members with a comprehensive assessment of the progress, contributions, achievements and impact of WSSCC at the global and national levels; (ii) Assess the appropriateness of governance and institutional arrangements; (iii) Assess the appropriateness of WSSCC’s mission, goals and strategies; (iv) Determine how well WSSCC is meeting the requirements of its donors in terms of having impact and justifying further future funding; (v) Assess the extent to which the recommendations of the last External Review have been implemented, and provide a basis and recommendations for enhancement

---

1 Final Report: External Review of WSSCC. The Performance Assessment Resource Centre, 2005; Executive Summary is appended to this document. For assessment of the results of the 2004 WSSCC review see annex 8.
and improvement of the performance of WSSCC and; (vi) Identify ways in which WSSCC’s donors and other partners can support WSSCC’s success in the next five years (for terms of reference see annex 1).

Approach

A balanced consideration has been given to the full scope of WSSCC activities undertaken in carrying out its mandate (mission): the global agenda and stimulating the “sanitation” thinking within international institutions, national governments and other stakeholders including the work at national level by coordinators and members.

Above all the review will reflect the change within WSSCC from an organisation focused on networking and knowledge management as well as advocacy and communication towards an organisation based upon growth and a focus on stimulating “down-to-earth” implementation at national and sub-national levels through the establishment of the Global Sanitation Fund.

The review did gather evidence through country visits, meetings with WSSCC governance, management and technical advisory structures, questionnaires, consultations with international partner and global initiatives, representatives of donor agencies and other key informants.

The approach during the first phase of the review included a desk study of documents as well as a preliminary discussion with the WSSCC Secretariat in Geneva in April 2010. An Inception report was presented in May 2010 (see also annex 2 on methodology). This inception report did lead to substantial discussions amongst donors and with the WSSCC Secretariat.

A questionnaire for the National Coordinators was presented to (and filled in by) the coordinators during the annual meeting in Geneva in April 2010 (for details see annex 3 findings questionnaire national coordinators). The analysis of this questionnaire was part and parcel of the second phase of the review.

The second phase of the review, in fact the review itself, took place from September 2010 to January 2011. During this period field visits were paid to Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, the Philippines and Tanzania (for itinerary see annex 4). The choice of countries for field visits was based on various criteria and discussed both with the WSSCC Secretariat in Geneva and the funding donors.

To ensure an effective field visit, preparatory notes were prepared for each of the countries visited. These notes contained a preliminary assessment of the sanitation sector, the WSSCC activities as well as key questions to be discussed with each of the major stakeholders in the countries concerned. These notes were sent to the national coordinators two weeks prior to the field visit itself. After each field visit a summary note was produced for each of the countries visited assessing major relevant issues of the WSSCC review. These summary notes were sent to the national coordinators for their comments. These notes are included as annex 7 of this draft report.

A field visit to Washington and New York was included in November 2010 to meet with the WSSCC Chair, representatives of the World Bank, the Water and Sanitation Program, UNICEF and UN-WATER. During this visit discussions were held with relevant NGOs in both cities. Additional discussions were also held in UK, the Netherlands and Geneva. During the review process meetings were held with the WSSCC Secretariat in Geneva in May, October, December 2010 and January 2011.

The review team provides an expert opinion on an extensive and multi-faceted programme of WSSCC, based on an extensive consultation of files, field visits and a large number of interviews with parties and partners involved at global, regional and national levels. It should be emphasised that the term review mission should not be understood as a mission that really thoroughly evaluated the whole programme and all its components at all levels. This was not realistic for the following reasons: (i) the
Global Sanitation Fund activities have only recently started and (ii) many of the WSSCC activities consist of a large number of sub-activities in many countries and at various levels.

Our overall assessment of the outcomes will be based upon the outcomes as formulated in the WSSCC M&E Protocol and as agreed upon in the WSSCC External review Inception report (May 2010)².

Table 1: Assessment Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of WSSCC’s outcomes in M&amp;E Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing country governments and support agencies acknowledge the importance of sanitation and hygiene and change their policies and strategies in accordance with the WSSCC principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More countries improve national-level coordination in sanitation, hygiene and water, with Ministerial responsibility for sanitation clearly allocated. Sanitation budgets are created and funded or increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Water and sanitation activities around the world (programmes, projects) become more effective and their benefits become more sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisations and professionals in the field are better equipped to identify successful approaches and to share, adopt and apply tacit knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sector professionals and organisations in developing countries increase their skills and knowledge through accessible, timely and relevant web-based and electronic knowledge; and awareness raising and media coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Global and regional leadership for sanitation and hygiene improves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WSSCC’s contribution to collective global leadership is recognised by its peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC M&E Protocol 2008-2015

The overall assessment of the outcomes is summarised in chapter five of the draft report.

The review team consisted of the following persons: Bert van Woersem (Team leader, BVW), Mark Keen (IOD PARC) and Edwin van Someren (EdwiseConsult). The review was conducted on behalf of the joint donors. The review was funded by the Netherlands Government and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

The report

Before summarizing the main contents of the draft report the following two remarks need to be made: (i) The GSF process has been described and assessed in chapter three of this draft report in a fairly comprehensive manner. The main reason is that the review team learned from many discussions that the knowledge regarding the GSF remained limited contributing to misunderstandings regarding the GSF concept, purpose, contents and processes and; (ii) Membership, National WASH Coalition and Strategic Partnership issues will be dealt with in chapter three under the heading of Networking as these represent the main activities of a network organisation. WSSCC itself describes these issues partly under the heading of communications.

Chapter one includes the objectives of the review as well as the main lines of the approach. Chapter two provides a brief overview of WSSCC’s objectives, organisation, budgets as well as some trends in

the sanitation sector. Chapter three is the backbone of the report as it provides an assessment of the three pillars of WSSCC, the Networking and Knowledge Management, Advocacy and Communications and the Global Sanitation Fund. The chapter concludes with the assessment of the interrelations between the three pillars. Chapter four provides an assessment of the governance and management performance although major issues like the national coalitions already have been dealt with under the heading of networking. Chapter five contains general conclusions as well as conclusions related to the fields of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, outcome and impact. The chapter ends with a number of suggestions of the review team for the way forward.
2 Overview of WSSCC

2.1 Purpose and Strategy

1990-2004

WSSCC founded in 1990 and mandated by name in United Nations General Assembly (UN Resolution No.A/RES/45/181) to continue the work of the International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade 1981-1990, focused on networking and knowledge management in the 1990s and expanded its work to include advocacy and communications at global as well as at national level during the period 2000-2005. WSSCC’s mission statement was originally formulated at its first global forum in Oslo in 1991:

“To enhance collaboration among developing countries and external support agencies, so as to accelerate the achievement of sustainable water, sanitation and waste management services for all people, with emphasis on the poor”.

The VISION 21 report produced by WSSCC in 2000 indicated as a target that “by the year 2025 every person in the world will enjoy good hygiene, sanitation and water supply”. For 2015 intermediate targets were set to halve the percentage of people un-served with water and sanitation. The Iguacu Action Programme (IAP) indicates how the VISION 21 principles can be put into practice.

The objectives of WSSCC were clearly defined in the WSSCC Progress Report 2000-2003. These are:

(i) to provide a framework for advocacy in, and for the sector;
(ii) to facilitate networking and information exchange between members and more widely in the sector;
(iii) to disseminate information to internal and external audiences and;
(iv) to communicate with greater clarity WSSCC's role, activities and outputs.

Activities in addressing these objectives as set out in the Progress report 2000-2003 were formulated in the following three fields; (i) advocacy, communication and mobilisation; (ii) thematic activities; and (iii) regional and national activities. In 2004 an independent review was undertaken which looked at WSSCC’s performance. Figure 1 outlines the main findings of this review.
Figure 1 Overview of 2004 Evaluation Findings

- WSSCC was seen to be relevant, effective and efficient and there are some signs of impact in terms of the mobilisation of governments to meet international water and sanitation goals.
- WSSCC has built an enthusiastic network of largely voluntary professionals in many countries and regions in particular in Southern and Eastern Africa and South and South East Asia.
- WSSCC is credited with achieving the adoption of sanitation as a Millennium Development Goal and with the WASH advocacy campaign at World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002.
- WSSCC was seen as largely successful in providing a forum and voice for the general public, ‘poor communities’, sector professionals and local NGOs who are not aligned with the major international institutions. It is seen as independent and credible with its main constituencies
- The WASH brand is well established and provides a good platform for promotion and advocacy.
- The Council has also been seen to play an important contributing role in key conferences and workshops.
- There is some debate over the WSSCC’s future focus, strategy and direction and the required size and form of the Secretariat to fulfil a central function.

2004 – 2006
This period marked a low point for the organisation and activities came to a near standstill due to the inconclusiveness of discussions around the start of a sanitation grant programme as well as the discussions around the need to find a new host organisation.

2007 – to 2010
2007 saw the beginning of a ‘re-energising’ of WSSCC and major growth and organisational transformation in particular at the Secretariat in Geneva. A Medium Term Work Plan for 2008-2012 (August 2009) provided for the first time a comprehensive results framework for WSSCC including mission, impact, outcomes, outputs, indicators and activities. This framework was also supported by a monitoring and evaluation protocol (August 2009).

In 2008 WSSCC’s mission was stated as follows: “to achieve sustainable water supply and sanitation for all people in the world”. To achieve this mission, WSSCC is to follow five core principles:

1. Water and sanitation are essential for social and economic development.
2. People themselves are at the centre of planning and action for achieving sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene.
3. WSSCC serves poor people and communities who currently lack water and sanitation.

---

3 These five core principles have been mentioned in the Medium Term Work Plan 2008-2012, while the website mentions as a sixth core principle: The number of people without sanitation is much greater than the number without water, while the agencies working in the sanitation are fewer; so WSSCC dedicates most of its efforts to sanitation and hygiene.
4. WSSCC works by enhancing collaboration among sector agencies and professionals.

5. WSSCC aims to be at the forefront of global knowledge, debate and influence in its fields.

WSSCC intends to focus its efforts on Africa and Asia as most people who lack water and sanitation live in these continents. WSSCC’s mandate remains global. WSSCC made in its 2008-2012 Work Plan the strategic decision to concentrate its efforts on sanitation as this sub-sector is lagging far behind in comparison to other development subjects (for details see chapter 4.5).

The main purpose of WSSCC’s work is formulated in the 2008-2012 Work Plan as follows:

“To accelerate provision of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene to poor communities”.

The Medium Term Work Plan 2008-2012 focuses on the description of the approach and does not explicitly outline a strategy. A key shift though in strategic direction was to focus primarily on sanitation and hygiene and for water supply to be a secondary area of engagement. WSSCC was to contribute to sanitation development through its strong membership ethos, close links to grass-root level work, long experience of community management and of sanitation and hygiene and a durable institutional home in the United Nations - under a new host UNOPS.

These features were to form the basis to support the scale up of proven approaches for sustainable improvements in sanitation and hygiene through three complementary work areas (pillars) of WSSCC:

1. Networking and Knowledge Management.
2. Advocacy and Communications.
3. The Global Sanitation Fund (GSF).

The third of these – the GSF – was a new addition to WSSCC’s work and aims to take a programmatic approach to helping millions of people to improve their sanitation and hygiene and has the following three dimensions: (i) identifying and studying innovative and successful ideas and programmes; (ii) generating more commitment by other organisations and; (iii) replicating the innovative and successful ideas at a larger scale.

The 2008-2012 Work Plan describes eleven common principles that apply to all three work areas (“pillars”):

(i) target un-served and poor communities;
(ii) be people centred and demand-driven;
(iii) concentrate on sanitation and hygiene, while being aware of their relation to broader water supply and water resources management issues;
(iv) create demand by raising people’s awareness not by offering subsidies;
(v) promote simple, affordable and appropriate solutions;
(vi) be sensitive to gender issues and aim for gender equality;
(vii) encourage the development of innovative financing strategies;

---

4 The definition of purpose and outcome as well as the contents/description of the terms is not always uniform within WSSCC documents. The definition and description in the WSSCC M& E Protocol were used as the leading document by the review team.
5 In this report these work areas will be referred to as “pillars”.
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(viii) take into account operation, maintenance and sustainability of the services;
(ix) be part of well-coordinated strategies owned by the people and their governments;
(x) promote good governance including zero-corruption, accountability and quality control and;
(xi) respect and collaborate with people and agencies of all backgrounds such as public sector, private sector and civil society.

In this review we will be assessing the outcomes and impact of WSSCC’s work but will also be reviewing their adherence to these principles and the value this adds to what WSSCC does and their ‘niche’ within a more crowded sanitation arena.

WSSCC is already planning beyond the timeframe of its 2008-2012 workplan and while this period is out of the remit of this review, the team will be looking at future suggested strategies within the context of making suggestions for the way forward.

2.2 Organisational Structure

The Steering Committee

The Steering Committee (SC) forms the governing body of WSSCC and members are able to stand for and elect the governing SC. The SC consists of the Chair, one active UN partner agency, two members associated with active non-Un partner agencies, seven members of countries from countries with Human Development Index less than 0.8 subdivided in regional constituencies and two members from any countries. In addition, three ex-officio members (UNOPS, WHO and the WSSCC Executive Director) as well as permanent non-voting members at the SC meetings from donors contributing more than $ 100,000 per year. Up to four non-voting invitees can be invited for the SC meetings.

The governing body has the responsibility to: (i) decide on policies and strategies; (ii) ensure the financial viability; (iii) monitor the performance (iv) appoint the Chair; (v) play an active role in selecting the Executive Director; (vi) manage the governance process; (vii) represent the interests of WSSCC’s members and stakeholders; (viii) to be morally accountable to the donors and; (ix) to set rules for their own meetings.

The Secretariat

The Secretariat in Geneva is headed by the Executive Director who is a staff member of the Host Agency and works in accordance with the duties specified in the job description made by the Host Agency. The Secretariat changed host agency from WHO to UNOPS in 2009 and moved office within Geneva. It has also dramatically increased in size with currently 21 staff members up from 2 in late 2006.

Regional representatives

WSSCC has designated seven regional constituencies and representatives from these seven regional constituencies sit on the SC. These regional representatives don’t however have an explicit regional role any more.

National coordinators and National WASH Coalitions

The National Coordinators work under the leadership of the Executive Director in line with the role, selection and appointment procedures as elaborated by the Executive Director. The National

---

6 Eastern and Southern Africa, Middle, Northern and West Africa, Southern Asia, South-Eastern and Eastern Asia, Eastern and Central Europe, Western and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Small Islands Developing States.
Coordinators have no formal governance role. As of 31 December 2010 the following 33 national WASH coalitions were established (see table 2.).

Table 2: National WASH coalitions in WSSCC Regional Constituencies as per 31 December 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional constituency</th>
<th>Country with National WASH coalition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle, Northern and West Africa</td>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern and Eastern Asia</td>
<td>Cambodia, Myanmar, Philippines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>Brazil, Guyana, Jamaica</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Central Europe &amp; Western and Central Asia</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Island developing Countries</td>
<td>Pacific (Tonga, Tuvalu and Fiji)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC 2009 Narrative Report updated by WSSCC

The total number of national coalitions hardly changed from 2004 to 2010 (from 34 to 33). However, since 2004 six countries were dropped (Trinidad & Tobago, Mauritius, Maldives, Thailand, Colombia and Morocco), while five countries established national coalitions (Liberia, Benin, Cameroon, Niger, and Cambodia).

In 2009 the WSSCC Secretariat visited China as China has a great potential for networking and knowledge management in view of its huge sanitation backlog. WSSCC’s overtures in China did not as of yet lead to a major step forward in the WSSCC-China relations.

2.3 Strategic partnerships

WSSCC’s partners are defined in the Governance document section 2.1 as “an agency (including, but not limited to, UN bodies) that, in the opinion of the Chair, is currently undertaking a substantial work programme in partnership with WSSCC”. The organisations currently designated by the Chair in this manner are: Centre Régional pour L’Eau Potable et L’Assainissement à faible coup (CREPA), EAWAG/Sandec, Gender and Water Alliance, Global Water Partnership, International Scientific Forum for Home Hygiene (IFH), International Water and Sanitation Centre (IRC), International Water Association (IWA), London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Streams of Knowledge Global Coalition of Water and Sanitation Resources Centres, Swiss Resource Centre and Consultancies for Development (SKAT), The International Secretariat for Water (ISW), UN-Habitat, UNICEF, Water Engineering and Development Centre (WEDC), Water Integrity Network (WIN), WaterAid, World Health Organisation, World Water Council.

Since 2004 WSSCC has moved from memorandum of understandings that outline information sharing activities and cooperation to developing strategic partnerships which outline shared visions and commitment to joint collaboration on activities from design to implementation (e.g. the partnership with WaterAid West Africa regarding a strategic partnership under which the first key aspect is a regional media network). WSSCC works with a broader set of partners than the above mentioned ones.

2.4 Membership

The WSSCC website describes WSSCC as a:
people-centred organisation and therefore gathers individuals who, collectively, are part of a great WASH movement. It is the people – rather than the organisation – who makes the real difference. Being a WSSCC member means being a part of a global peer network committed to improve sanitation, hygiene and water worldwide.

It has not as yet been made completely clear as to the roles and responsibilities of being a member and their formal relationship to the secretariat. Rights and opportunities though do include voting in Steering Committee elections, access to multi-purpose members only section of the website and membership in National WASH coalitions.

According to the website members can contribute to the WSSCC in the following ways; (i) share research and case studies; (ii) engage with others through discussion board on members only section; (iii) participate in National WASH coalitions work; (iv) engage with thematic working groups and events such as regional workshops; (v) support global and national advocacy campaigns; (vi) contribute advocacy campaign successes; (vii) participate in on-line advocacy campaigns organised by the Secretariat and; (viii) raise awareness of sanitation demand creation.

During the period 2004-2010 the WSSCC membership has more than doubled from 1780 in 2004 (external review) to 4178 members in Nov. 2010 (at launch of new WSSCC website) members.

WSSCC used 3 different database systems to register membership between 2004 and 2010:

- Until 2007 membership data was maintained in a central offline database which was very complicated for updating membership data and resulted in less accurate membership data. Moreover membership data for 2005 was lost and for 2006 only the total membership figure could be retrieved. In 2006 a thorough cleanup exercise of the offline membership database resulted in more accurate membership data.
- In 2007, WSSCC launched online membership subscription and started a new database, resulting in a complete new start of membership registration.
- In November 2010 the launch of the new WSSCC website started the new re-registration exercise of membership, which is in line with the new membership strategy.

Figures 2 to 4 show the developments and trends in WSSCC membership during the period 2004-2010. Figure 2 illustrates an initial lull and then sharp increase; figure 3 shows how the profile of membership has changed to include a much higher proportion of members coming from an NGO background; figure 4 shows how membership has grown sharply in Asia and Africa.
2.5 Budget and expenditures

The total WSSCC expenditure from 2005 to 2009 amounts to USD 13,720,042 as specified in table 3. The expenditure in 2006 was low due to a slow down of WSSCC activities during that period. The expenditure increased substantially from 2007 onwards. The idea of four separate Trust Funds was introduced and agreed upon in 2007.
### Table 3: WSSCC Expenditure for the years 2005-2009 (in USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking and Knowledge Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National networking</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>519,694</td>
<td>606,991</td>
<td>777,303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global networking</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,243</td>
<td>26,615</td>
<td>70,857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic networking</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>66,072</td>
<td>88,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>148,718</td>
<td>179,904</td>
<td>123,458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and meetings</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>70,627</td>
<td>84,626</td>
<td>64,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>194,074</td>
<td>182,740</td>
<td>591,418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% PSC to WHO</td>
<td>49,270</td>
<td>128,402</td>
<td>143,435</td>
<td>147,297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for this Trust Fund</strong></td>
<td>428,270</td>
<td>1,116,102</td>
<td>1,290,383</td>
<td>1,988,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy and Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific advocacy activities</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>323,523</td>
<td>163,311</td>
<td>347,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and conferences</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>96,544</td>
<td>155,189</td>
<td>90,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy materials</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>231,047</td>
<td>62,654</td>
<td>188,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,608</td>
<td>157,619</td>
<td>140,206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>291,494</td>
<td>362,382</td>
<td>722,117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% PSC to WHO</td>
<td>31,850</td>
<td>136,918</td>
<td>109,298</td>
<td>129,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for this Trust Fund</strong></td>
<td>276,850</td>
<td>1,190,134</td>
<td>1,010,453</td>
<td>1,742,717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Global Sanitation Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up the GSF</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>101,090</td>
<td>113,009</td>
<td>299,034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the GSF:</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 countries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,184</td>
<td>93,885</td>
<td>3,289,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 countries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,068,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluation, audit and learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,244</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>73,308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>99,493</td>
<td>477,654</td>
<td>813,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% PSC to WHO</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>46,728</td>
<td>104,034</td>
<td>453,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for this Trust Fund</strong></td>
<td>63,280</td>
<td>406,180</td>
<td>936,961</td>
<td>6,121,735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 All PSC figures in this table will be reduced from 2009 due to the transition from WHO to UNOPS. UNOPS fee is 8% plus 0.5% allocable.
The indicative expenditure budgets as presented in the Medium-Term Work Plan 2008-2012 are substantially higher than the expenditures for 2008 and 2009 as presented in table 3. By and large the main reason for this under-spend is the slow progress made with the Global Sanitation Fund. Activities under the GSF slowly got off the ground partly due to staff recruitment problems, an underestimation of the complexity of the start-up of such a Fund and the lack of clarity in the GSF preparatory process (for details see chapter 3.4). The GSF preparatory process did gain speed in 2010 ensuring an implementation of GSF activities in individual countries from 2011 onwards.

The contributions from a number of bilateral donors remained the backbone of WSSCC (see table 4). The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is a new funding donor.

Table 4: WSSCC Donor contributions 2005-2010 (x 1,000 USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>14,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>6,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>5,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>7,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulabh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,745</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data provided by WSSCC Secretariat

8 In 2005 and 2006, the separate trust funds did not exist. They were created along with the three separate departments in 2007.
The financing strategy as defined in the 2008-2012 Work Plan is based upon multi-year multi-donor pooled funding in accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (for details see chapter 4.3 and 4.6).

2.6 Trends in sector development

Major challenges

There is a greater understanding and acceptance of the major benefits of sustainable improved sanitation for human development; however, insufficient resources are still being allocated to meet the MDG target for sanitation. It is in general a low priority for ODA as well as from domestic allocation; and aid resources that are provided are not always well targeted. Political will though improving remains limited. Moreover, the sanitation sector remains confronted with a weak, although improving legislative structure, a fragmented institutional framework as well as a lack of absorption capacity in a number of countries. Based upon discussions held the review team noticed a lack of collaboration between major players at national level as well as a lack of uniformity of the sanitation approach at national level, which does not facilitate the policy implementation of the national governments.

Figure 5 summarises how, despite some progress, Sanitation for all remains a major if not the greatest human development challenge.

**Figure 5:**
**Striking facts, food for thought and what about no evidence?**

The global crisis:

- 2.6 billion people in the world do not have access to adequate sanitation, this is almost 40% of the world’s population (WHO/UNICEF).
- 1.4 million children under 5 year of age die every year from diarrhoea caused by unclean water and poor sanitation. This means 4,000 child deaths a day or one child every 20 seconds (WHO-WaterAid).

Sanitation:

- 7 out of 10 people without sanitation live in rural areas (WHO/UNICEF).
- Diarrhoea kills more children every year than AIDS, malaria and measles combined (WHO).
- Children living in households with no toilet are twice as likely to get diarrhoea as those with a toilet (WEDC).
- Every year, around 60 million children in the developing world are born into households without access to sanitation (UN Water).
- At any one time half the hospital beds in developing countries are filled with people suffering from diarrhoea (UNDP).

Hygiene:

- Hand-washing at critical times can reduce the incidence of diarrhoea by up to 47% (UN Water).
- The integrated approach of providing water, sanitation and hygiene reduces the number of deaths caused by diarrheal diseases by an average of 65% (WHO).
Education and livelihoods:

- For every $1 invested in water and sanitation, $8 is returned in increased productivity (UNDP).
- Improved access to sanitation and water produces economic benefits that range from $3 to $34 per $1 invested increasing a country’s GDP by an estimated 2% to 7% (UN Water).
- Lack of safe water and sanitation costs Sub-Saharan Africa around 5% of its GDP every year (UNDP).
- 443 million school days are lost each year due to water-related diseases.
- 11% more girls attend school when sanitation is available (UK DFID).

Millennium Development Goals:

- The world is seriously off-track to meet the sanitation MDG target – to halve the proportion of people without access to sanitation by 2015. If current rates of progress continue, the global sanitation goal will be met 30 years too late (WHO/UNICEF).
- In Sub-Saharan Africa, the sanitation MDG target in that region is not due to be met for another 200 years (WHO/UNICEF).

Financing the sector:

- Over the past 10 years, aid to health and HIV/AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa has increased by nearly 500%, while aid to water and sanitation has increased by only 79% (OECD).

Source: WaterAid 2010 Report and other data.

At the current rate of progress, the world will miss the sanitation MDG target (JMP report 2010). Progress made in the eight countries visited in the review has been summarised in table 5.

Table 5: Trend in sanitation coverage in eight countries visited (in % of total population) JMP data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Improved Urban</th>
<th>Improved Rural</th>
<th>Shared Urban</th>
<th>Shared Rural</th>
<th>Unimproved Urban</th>
<th>Unimproved Rural</th>
<th>Open defecation Urban</th>
<th>Open defecation Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estimates for the use of Improved Sanitation Facilities, Updated March 2010, wssinfo, JMP

9 JMP definitions: Improved sanitation: Connection to public sewer/septic system, pour-flush latrine. Pit latrine and ventilated improved pit latrine. Not considered as “improved”: public or shared latrine, open pit latrine and bucket latrine.
Table 5 does not provide a positive trend in the improved sanitation coverage over the period 2005-2008 except in rural areas in Bangladesh, Nepal and the Philippines. The trends in sanitation coverage in African countries are hardly positive. The changes regarding coverage in shared, unimproved and open defecation are minimal over the period 2005-2008. There is no improvement in trends in comparison with the trend in sanitation coverage over the period 2000-2005.
3 Performance and Output

3.1 Context

Performance assessment for organisations like WSSCC has been considered complicated, often due to outputs, outcomes and indicators not being properly defined.

WSSCC has made progress in measuring performance through its Monitoring and Evaluation protocol. This is based upon a results framework (WSSCC 2007 and officially approved in August 2009) with indicators for outputs, outcomes and impact. The recent WSSCC annual reporting (e.g. 2009 Annual report) is output oriented based upon outputs, indicators and means of verification as defined in the M&E protocol.

The WSSCC programme is conceptualised as three major interrelated pillars: (i) networking and knowledge management; (ii) advocacy and communications and; (iii) the Global Sanitation Fund. The performance and outputs of these pillars as well as the interrelations between them will be assessed in this chapter. The M&E protocol also includes activities, outputs and indicators in the field of governance and management. This issue will be dealt with in chapter 4.

3.2 Review of activities; Networking and Knowledge Management

WSSCC has over two decades of experience in the areas of networking and knowledge management. The basic building blocks of WSSCC as a ‘network’ organisation are its membership, the national coalitions and relationships both formal and informal with other partners within the sector.

Progress and direction in this area from 2005-2010 reflects the organisational transformation and renewal that has taken place during this period. At the beginning of this period there was no clearly articulated strategy but areas of work focused around ‘4 P’s’ – Partnerships (networking and coalition building); Progress (monitoring and evaluation); Promotion (advocacy) and Profile (communication). In 2007 WSSCC reorganised to form two separate departments one focusing on Knowledge Management and Networking and the other on Advocacy and Communications. A formal strategy for knowledge management was developed in 2008 and the expected outputs and outcomes for networking are articulated in the M and E protocol.

Social Change Networks have been a growing phenomena as the ‘world has become smaller’ through better communications and a greater realisation that concerted action across national borders can achieve more and encourage learning. Annex 4 provides a brief overview of the role of networks and in particular the role of central coordinating bodies such as secretariats. Key components and qualities that are seen to facilitate effective networking are:

- Vibrancy – so the level and combination of shared purpose, enthusiasm, trust and need shaped around structures which facilitate action
- Connectivity – the ability for frequent and convenient interactions between a large group or population who feel membership is useful
- Diversity – a wide range of network members who bring different experiences, contacts and views of the central purpose to ensure a broad and balanced outlook
- Democracy – all network members need to feel able to contribute and to have a meaningful say in how things get done. This democracy needs to be balanced with a need for networks to be nimble and responsive so not overly long in making decisions
• Impact – networks need to achieve outcomes which are valued. This might mean that when one set of goals are achieved a network should stop and not look to exist for ever.

Networks do appear to need an effective co-ordinating mechanism which should:

• Have a clear formal mandate accepted by all members
• Clear and transparent decision-making structures
• Processes which allow for joint agenda setting
• Include a clear monitoring and evaluation role including perhaps standard setting, public communications and learning
• Have credible and dynamic leadership which can manage without relying on positional power or authority
• Be able to manage financial and human resources quickly yet transparently and effectively
• Be able to both plan strategically (give a clear vision for the future) and generate capacity and resources incrementally.

This review will not attempt to directly assess WSSCC against these criteria but they will assist us in our judgements as to the future direction the Council might take and the reasons for its current performance.

3.2.1 Membership

WSSCC is a membership network and the members are often cited as a major asset and crucial to the success of the Council as they provide a link to local levels and provide organisational legitimacy as they elect the steering committee. The membership has doubled over the last five years to over 4000, however it hasn’t been clear what membership means; or what the expectations/responsibilities of members are, or the real added value in practice is of different groups of members. This issue is now being addressed and membership is being reviewed and more clearly defined. At present though it is unclear now how many ‘active’ members WSSCC really has.

It is expected that the implementation of the new membership strategy (with a focus on quality rather than quantity of membership), the newly developed membership activities and especially the information gained from the recently started re-registration exercise (through the new website) and the Global Forum (planned for October 2011), will yield the much needed information to further definition and planning of WSSCC membership. At present these new membership initiatives are strongly Geneva led.

In the new membership strategy national coordinators have an important role and responsibility in membership management: (1) to ensure that all WASH Coalition members are also WSSCC members; and (2) to encourage new membership. During the 8 country visits the review team established that: (1) In all 8 countries visited, the membership has grown substantially between 2007 and 2010; (2) In-country management of growing membership was perceived as complicated by the National coordinators in term of building and maintaining contacts with new members, involving new membership in WSSCC activities and strengthening National WASH Coalitions; and (3) NC’s have limited time and resources for membership management, especially when new members are living far away from centralised National WASH Coalition activities (with decentralisation of Coalitions the opportunity arises to activate membership at local level).

The review team assesses the recent membership developments as follows:

• Effective WSSCC Membership management requires more effort for joint planning of membership activities and sufficient resourcing at all WSSCC levels. If National
Coordinators are to play a more active role in developing and engaging with members within their country then more resources are required for them to do so. The Council needs to consider how reasonable this expectation is given NC’s are volunteers.

- The implementation of the new membership strategy is seen as a major step toward better definition and activation of WSSCC membership; especially through the focus on the formation of a group of active members of manageable size (group of sector professionals, with allowance for a group of "up and comers" and students with potential for the future, whilst seeking a gender balance in membership).

- There is need to closely monitor and analyze the results of the implementation of the Membership strategy and especially the re-registration process. The online re-registration has started but the registration of members without Internet access/Email accounts has not started yet. (Members in this group are not to be lost, since they are expected to be the WSSCC’s closest link to the local level).

- The Global Forum (October 2011) should be utilised for further strategic membership planning: Grouping of active member practitioners, recruitment of new members and construction of sustainable collaboration mechanisms based on expressed and formulated mutual interests/benefits and clear working agenda for the future.

3.2.2 National Coalitions

WASH coalitions have been formed for a variety of purposes. Whatever, the purpose, it should be expected to develop and change over time - depending on both internal factors (the internal dynamics of the coalition and its ability to draw in key players) and external factors (the status of the sector).

The purpose of the WASH coalitions may be straightforward or more ambitious. An example of the former might be building a coalition for the purpose of information exchange or to fill knowledge gaps. These activities are relatively low risk; participation in such a forum carries neither high resource requirements nor imposes high levels of responsibility on the part of individuals to the work of the coalition.

At a more ambitious level, a coalition may be formed with the purpose of influencing national programmes and/or carrying out joint advocacy on controversial or challenging topics. In that case the responsibility of members of the coalition towards each other will be significantly higher, with corresponding higher resource requirements and risks. The WASH coalition building guidelines outline a range of purpose and Figure 6 summarizes the findings of the review team in eight countries visited regarding the range of purpose, with increasing risks and resource inputs associated with higher levels of impact.

The following remarks can be made regarding figure 6:
**Figure 6: Assessment of the dynamic purposes of eight national WASH coalitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Burkina</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Madagascar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold key actors to account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Outcomes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill gaps – design new activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence national programs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate specific policy changes</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor outputs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise public awareness</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence national programs</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain attention for the sector</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build wider commitment</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor inputs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align individual activities with nat. programs</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify complementary activities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify sector gaps</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to sector planning</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** - = no activity/purpose; * = limited activity/purpose; ** = medium activity/purpose; *** = major activity/purpose

**General trend WASH coalition in country concerned 2005-2010**

- Downward Trend: 
- Upward Trend: 
- Stable trend: 

**Lower Risks, Resources Higher**
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There are major differences in the performance of the national WASH coalitions between the countries visited.

The majority of the coalitions played a substantial role in enhancing the legislative and institutional framework for sanitation. This may in some cases be attributed to the efforts of the national coordinator rather than to the whole coalition.

Since neither the internal dynamics of a coalition nor the status of the WASH sector remained static, most coalitions will move up and down the range of purposes over time. The National WASH coalitions have had a cyclical nature with periods of enthusiasm, joint action and clearly defined activities interspersed with periods of relative inactivity and lower group cohesion. Figure 6 shows that the general trend over the period 2005-2010 is upward for two coalitions and downward for five coalitions. The trend of one of the coalitions remained stable over the last five years.

The 35 National WASH Coalitions are at the ‘coal face’ of WSSCC’s work. The Secretariat in Geneva has recently taken a more pro-active role in stimulating WASH coalitions by encouraging new coalitions through exploring existing multi-stakeholders groupings/coordinating mechanisms with similar agendas to play the role of WASH coalitions. This strategy shift is valid as more and more groupings are getting off the ground in the crowded sanitation arena and therefore linking up with existing groupings is realistic and also prevents unnecessary overlap and duplication.

National Coalitions are made up of volunteers, although may apply for small grants from the Secretariat (under the Networking and Knowledge Management pillar) to support an agreed programme of work. Between 15 and 21 coalitions have been supported each year from 2007.

National WASH coalition trends

The National WASH coalitions aim to provide a neutral platform for all actors to contribute to increased momentum in sanitation and hygiene in order to achieve the MDG targets. A successful national coalition appears to have the following common characteristics; (i) an active and respected coordinator with a relevant and credible background, or host organisation; (ii) a less crowded sanitation landscape in the country concerned; (iii) an active and committed host organisation and; (iv) a good relationship with the government.

There is a general tendency that the role and importance of the national WASH coalition as a neutral platform for all actors is being reduced (e.g. major actors like WSP and UNICEF hardly participate in a number of the WASH coalitions any more). This is mainly due to other mechanisms like National Task Forces on sanitation or other multi-stakeholder platforms being established (in a number of instances with the assistance of the WASH coalition). External stakeholders are often unaware of the role the WSSCC coalition may have played in either morphing into a nationally owned body or in instigating its development. Other ‘competing” networks have also been established (e.g. the Fresh Water Action Network and the End Water Poverty Network). The National Coalitions are also less prominent within the WSSCC due to the increased size of the secretariat and with the addition of the GSF. The proportion (if not the total amount) of funds being used to support non GSF activities at a national level has dropped and this appears to have reduced the level of focus on coalitions in comparison with other elements of the Council’s activities and governance.

There is a tendency that the National WASH Coalitions gain strength in their relations with NGOs and CBOs and loose strength as multi-stakeholders platforms.

The National Coordinators

National Coordinators (NCs) are seen as effective when they are credible actors in the sanitation arena within their national context. This credibility can either be based on their own personal knowledge and experience or that of their host organisation.
• Although NCs are ‘volunteers’ their effectiveness seems to be enhanced because they are paid by their host agency to work in the sanitation arena.

• Financial and technical support received from Geneva is highly valued though more is felt to be required. The NCs also feel that the release of funds when agreed is too slow and that compensation for their role should be considered.

3.2.3 WSSCC and other water and sanitation sector organisations

The collaboration of WSSCC with other major international agencies in the field of sanitation can be sub-divided into three categories; (i) multi-lateral agencies who share common interests (e.g. WHO and UNICEF); (ii) Agencies with clearly defined areas for collaboration on specific themes (FAN, EWP, Rainwater Harvesting) and; (iii) International agencies with similar objectives on advocacy, attitude, policy change (e.g. WSP, WaterAid, GWP).

The major organisations in the field of sanitation are UNICEF, WSP, WSSCC and WaterAid. These organisations are all seeking to find and communicate solutions to sanitation obstacles, to mobilize political will and funding and to engage stakeholders in achieving policy change and to implement better practices. Collaboration and coordination will increase the effectiveness of the individual efforts.

The relationship between the WSSCC and these organisations differs considerably at country and headquarters levels. This primarily relates to the levels of decentralisation and organisational structures of these ‘partners’. UNICEF is a particularly prominent example as at a senior level the Council’s work within the UN system as a member of UN-Water and also in supporting the International Year of Sanitation, is well known and highly regarded; at country level this contribution is far less known or appreciated; conversely Water Aid country offices, often because of their coordinating role, work closely with the Council, yet at headquarters their understanding and appreciation of Council activities is far lower.

WSP strives to be a valued, high level source of impartial advice and experience, based on comparative knowledge of what works. WSP’s strategy is to make an impact in three critical entry points: (i) Promoting sector reform, improved governance, and the development of country owned roadmaps; (ii) Assisting countries in developing sustainable financing strategies to implement large-scale programmes and; (iii) Providing capacity building support to both regional and national policy makers and service providers.

The bulk of WSP’s national support is focused on 25 selected countries. Country level support generally follows the sequence of assisting clients in planning reforms, developing strategies, and implementing investment programmes. Increasingly, country plans also include helping clients develop effective sector communication strategies. WSP puts much emphasis on sanitation and hygiene education and formulated in 2008 a Medium Term Strategic Framework on Sanitation as well as a global strategy for scaling up sustainable services. The relationship between WSP and WSSCC at country level differs from one country to the other, but the general trend is downward.

The mission and objectives of WSP and WSSCC are similar. Moreover, they both: (i) advise on the adoption of solutions to obstacles faced by poor people in obtaining sustainable access to sanitation, (ii) generate, validate and communicate innovative sanitation solutions and (iii) communicate lessons from experience to target audience. WSP and WSSCC both play a role in providing advice to help countries adopt improved policies and strategies and undertake institutional reform. WSP’s approach is more direct to government, while WSSCC’s approach as a network organisation is mainly channelled through the national WASH coalitions and their coordinators. Both approaches contribute to the improvement of the legislative and institutional framework. WSP’s role in advising on the strengthening of investment programmes and projects is different from WSSCC’s role although the Global Sanitation Fund recently opens up this area for WSSCC as well.
Figure 7: Examples of collaboration with other major players

1. The establishment of Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) which brings together all major sector players and developing and developed governments in collaboration to achieve universal sanitation and water. The WSSCC Executive Director was a major driver through his role as Chair of the Interim Core Group which culminated in the formalisation of SWA. The major activity for 2010 was the first High Level Meeting in April in Washington.

2. Development of key messages and UN Water Advocacy Kit on behalf of the sanitation sector for the International Year of Sanitation 2008 in which the WSSCC’s Executive Director and Advocacy and Communications department played a key leading role. This collaboration resulted in one clear, consistent set of key messages which were adopted and promulgated by the whole sector.

3. Collaboration with FAN and WaterAid to strengthen the position and input of civil society into the SACOSAN political process from 2008 onwards leading to uptake of many CSO issues and recommendations in the 2008 Delhi Declaration and much increased space for civil society and grassroots participation and attention for key issues such as equity and inclusion in the 2010 SACOSAN conference (collaboration around this last theme also includes UNICEF and WSP).

4. Collaboration with WSP and AMCOW to support the Africasan process 2008-2010 especially with regards to the Africasan Awards as a mechanism to increase political will, highlight positive change, and raise general awareness on sanitation and the importance of the Africasan political process.

5. Collaboration with IRC and WaterAid in a series of regional practitioner workshops on sanitation and/or hygiene between 2008-2010 repositioning WSSCC as a key player in facilitating especially tacit knowledge exchange and management and practitioner learning and sharing.

6. Collaboration on the theme of CTLS to support its rise as the dominant sanitation demand creation approach while at the same time ensuring quality control and exploring key issues around sustainability, CLTS + etc. Partners include IDS, WaterAid and UNICEF.

7. By collaborative work with the International Scientific Forum on Home Hygiene and as a Steering Committee member of the Public Private Partnership on Handwashing with Soap, strengthening WSSCC’s position as a key player in the field of hygiene promotion and hygiene behaviour change, through which WSSCC (has) contributes (d) to a shift in the WASH sector towards more systematic inclusion of more strategic hygiene behaviour change programmes and approaches. This is also supported by the guidance provided in the development of national GSF programmes.

On paper the liaisons with WSP and UNICEF\textsuperscript{10} are close as these organisations are represented at the SC meetings. However, the linkages in the field are more diverse and in a number of instances more limited. Table 6 summarises the trends in linkages of WSSCC with some selected major other players in the eight countries visited.

\textsuperscript{10} However, this was no formal link. The manager of WSP is a permanent observer invitee to the SC for mutual information, while Clarissa Brocklehurst from UNICEF was elected as a WSSCC member.
Table 6: Trends in Linkages WSSCC through National WASH Coalitions with UNICEF, WaterAid, WSP and others in eight countries visited (2005-2010)

Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>WaterAid</th>
<th>WSP</th>
<th>NGOs and CBOs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A: WSP is not in Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field visit discussions review team, 2010

The relationship between WSP, UNICEF and WSSCC at country level differs from one country to the other and collaboration at a national level has had a tendency to decrease in a number of the eight countries visited. These major parties do not meet within the National WASH coalitions in as many countries anymore however there are exceptions to this. In Nigeria UNICEF plays a central role within the National Coalition and in Burkina Faso WSP is keen to support and engage with the Coalition. In these countries the key factor is the distinctiveness and clarity of the WASH Coalitions role and how it relates to that of either UNICEF or WSP in country. In both these examples engagement with the WASH coalition was dependent on the coalition being a ‘bridge’ between Civil Society and Government and a clear sense of the coalition adding value which other actors couldn’t. As GSF begins to move into its operational phase and primary learning and knowledge is generated, this will bring them closer to WSP’s role in some countries, so working with them to ensure there is clarity about ‘space’ and relationship to government will be important.

The collaboration between WSSCC and WaterAid does appear to have intensified at national level as national coalitions are hosted and/or supported by WaterAid in a number of countries. WSSCC may need to reflect on what this might mean to their perceived ‘neutral broker’ role and their ability to convene.

WSSCC played an important role in the establishment of the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) initiative. However, with the establishment of this SWA initiative the strategic positioning of WSSCC as a global lead agency might change. SWA is a global partnership aimed at achieving universal and sustained access to sanitation and drinking water for all, by firmly placing sanitation and water on the global agenda with an immediate focus on achieving the MDGs in the most off-track countries.

A key partner explicitly identified by WSSCC is UN-Water whose mandate is to coordinate the activities of the UN family in the Water Sector with the aim of getting coherence and minimizing duplication amongst the 26 agencies and organisations that are in the sector. Their role is a difficult one as there are many overlapping mandates and a huge disparity in the resources available to different UN bodies. UNICEF and the World Bank (including WSP) clearly have greater prominence in sanitation than other agencies though UNDP, WHO and FAO also make significant contribution.
WSSCC in this period has played a clear and appreciated role in supporting UN-Water’s secretariat and the UN-Water task force on sanitation; in particular in the provision of materials for the International Year of Sanitation and their contribution to UN reports such as the GLAAS report. Given the similarity of their co-ordinating role WSSCC has also been seen as being a positive force in assisting the secretariat in its management of the politics of the UN and the often implicit rivalries of different agencies. In particular the present Executive Director is a respected figure and his support and commitment to greater coordination plus the Council’s ability to bridge the gap between the UN and non-UN members has been greatly appreciated in managing these tensions. This work has improved and re-invigorated the Council’s link with the UN though as stated earlier this hasn’t necessarily filtered through to country level activities and engagement.

WSSCC set out during this period to build greater linkages with private and financial sector actors and to increase their involvement and engagement with other development partners in the sanitation sector. At present there has been little progress in this area. Initiatives have been started with Ashoka, a social entrepreneurship network, Rentokil and a group of banks interested in the sector but these as yet have not led to meaningful levels of activity. Given WSSCC’s desire to shift their advocacy work from awareness raising to increased resource allocation and firm activity this area of networking should be something they continue to build and pursue.

3.2.4 Knowledge Management

Up until 2008 WSSC had no explicit articulation of their role and niche within knowledge management. To some degree activities which focused on capturing and disseminating learning and improving awareness and understanding were folded into and complementary to other key Council activities. Comparing WSSCC to other Knowledge Management Centres or ‘Hubs’ the functional configuration of the three pillars is quite unusual. It is possible to argue that up until the instigation of the GSF that WSSCC was an organisation with knowledge management goals which used processes and tools of networking and advocacy to try and achieve those objectives. The 2008 Knowledge Management strategy aimed to clarify WSSCC’s knowledge management activities initially by distinguishing between tacit and explicit knowledge. It outlines the following set of aims:

- The availability of and access to quality controlled explicit knowledge and information within WSSCC
- Sector professionals directed to high quality relevant sector knowledge and information
- Existing knowledge gaps identified and closed
- Easy uptake and adoption of knowledge and information facilitated
- Experience and lessons learnt from GSF shared and applied.

The strategy is quite brief and does not identify a clear set of activities which are planned to meet these objectives. There is only a hazy definition given of Knowledge Management as a concept and the Council’s specific niche as a KM actor.

Annex 5 provides a brief overview of the role of Knowledge Management hubs. It outlines a model by which ‘hubs’ can be differentiated by their remit (the need, demand, problem or knowledge gap being addressed); their institutional model or structure; its processes and outcomes (means) and the audience it aims to service.

WSSCC has a complex and changing remit, in particular because WASH is a large sector with a multitude of actors; in particular the shift of knowledge need, from one of awareness raising to what works and how do you resource it, requires a quite dramatic shift in terms of the type and vehicle/producer of knowledge. It is also working at a number of different institutional levels so
trying to appeal to both policy practitioners and actors working on the ground. This diversity provides strength but makes identifying a niche quite challenging.

The WSSCC’s relationship with the UN and its aim to link up UN to non UN actors also further complicates the identification of a clear set of agreed knowledge tools and processes. The informal relationship building and networking to get ‘rivals’ to work together are quite different to direct capacity building and knowledge product generation. It is unlikely that many of WSSCC’s ‘knowledge customers’ are likely to receive, value or recognise all of the services that it aims to provide.

The Council is not a primary knowledge ‘producer’ or research institute and strategy suggests a focus on facilitating learning for improved practice. It may be argued that with the instigation of the GSF this will change and that using GSF initiatives as action learning ‘laboratories’ and therefore drawing out primary learning from them will be a considerable shift in the Council’s KM remit.

‘Knowledge’ activities in the 2008-2012 workplan are grouped with networking but could be mainly seen as:

- Organising learning events/meetings at different WSSCC levels – so including at a national, regional and global level
- Input into and co-organizing/hosting formal conferences and sector wide events such as World Water Week
- Production of ‘knowledge’ outputs – in this area the Council does have a clear sense that its role is to provide practical documents which are ‘useful’ to practitioners and ‘neutral’.

There are a number of activities covered elsewhere within this document which also contribute to WSSCC’s desired knowledge outcomes; in particular the use and development of the website as both a tool to disseminate WSSCC learning and products but also as a ‘signpost’ to other latest thinking and research within the sector. The management of ‘members’ or interested partners and stakeholders is also a role commonly associated with knowledge management; as could be the contributions made to major reports mentioned in the networking section.

The team suggest that reviewing the Secretariat’s structure and functional definitions should be considered to get a clear fit between department purpose and outcomes (rather than maybe outputs).

The review team assesses WSSCC’s Knowledge management contribution as follows:

- National Coordinator meetings are highly valued and the absence of them in early years in this period has been seen as contributing to a dip in members and national coalitions view of WSSCC’s usefulness.
- Workshops and training sessions are highly valued if they clearly focus on ‘tacit’ knowledge – so experience sharing and reviewing – and then matching it to more explicit knowledge provided in reports and manuals. Sessions which focus on information provision or ‘teaching’ should not be undertaken by WSSCC. Some stakeholders have also commented that WSSCC has not run enough learning sessions in this period.
- Contributions to sector wide events are hugely valued by those who are organizing them but are often not seen or recognised by other stakeholders. To some degree this is a good sign as it illustrates WSSCC’s ‘collaborative’ ethos; however this lack of attribution may undermine perceptions of WSSCC’s added value.
- Knowledge ‘outputs’ are highly valued, seen as distinctive and fitting a particular knowledge gap. Those outputs most often cited are: Facilitating ‘hands on’ training: workshops for CLTS; Compendium of Sanitation Systems and Technologies; Guide to
Hygiene and Sanitation Software; Public funding for Sanitation: the many faces of sanitation subsidies. The WASH case study series have also been seen as a useful addition though it is unclear as yet how they will progress, though linking these to GSF activities would seem most logical. There has been little comment on the utility of source bulletin produced in collaboration with IRC.

Table 7: Summary assessment Networking and Knowledge management outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New National WASH Coalitions established.</td>
<td>Number stable. Pro-active strategy WSSCC for new coalitions still to reap fruits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National WASH Coalitions carrying out planned and part-funded annual work programmes.</td>
<td>Being undertaken – high number of coalitions receiving funding (15-20), though impact and credibility varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National Coordinators attending annual meeting and participating in sharing, learning, planning exercises.</td>
<td>Effectively done and highly appreciated by participants. The 2011 meeting to include wider membership much anticipated. Has high profile facilitator and seen as potential stepping stone for greater influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Priority themes identified and strategies to address them developed and implemented.</td>
<td>Seems a plethora of themes – requires clarification and rationalisation to have clear benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work programmes carried out by Thematic Working Groups/Coordinators with full stakeholder inclusion.</td>
<td>Appears to be limited activity on thematic working areas. Maybe in need of rationalisation given other thematic working groups in the sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Explicit knowledge and information made available to sector professionals in easy accessible format.</td>
<td>Focus to move from providing access to explicit knowledge towards tacit knowledge sharing and learning. Explicit knowledge outputs when meeting need perceived as high quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. National WASH Coalition members, sector professionals, people benefiting from trainings, meetings, workshops and knowledge tools.</td>
<td>On site learning and capacity development appreciated. More and more knowledge products and tools ready for dissemination/training/Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GSF learning and sharing exercises organised and materials produced and spread.</td>
<td>GSF not implemented as of yet. Need to elaborate how three WSSCC pillars to be interrelated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Collaboration between representatives of UN agencies and non-UN agencies supported and facilitated.</td>
<td>Senior level strong relations at global level. Major role in Sanitation and Water for All initiative. Links at national level less strong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M&E Protocol, August 2009

3.3 Review of Activities; Advocacy and Communications

As reflected in the 2004 External Review, advocacy has been seen as a major strength of the Council and an area where they can clearly be seen to have had an impact. This contribution has continued during this period in particular through WSSCC’s involvement and inputs into the International Year of Sanitation and through the continued Global WASH campaign. WASH advocacy consists of the following campaigns and events; the Global WASH campaign, Women’s Leaders for WASH, WASH radio campaign, World Water Day, Global Hand washing Day, World Toilet Day.

WSSCC’s advocacy strategy has remained consistent over the last 10 years, although it is in the process of undergoing a fairly major change. The first explicit strategy written in 2009 outlines the following overarching aims:

- Support to and scaling up efforts in reaching the MDG target for sanitation
- Increasing awareness on sanitation, hygiene and water supply
• Improving the context for generating political priority for sanitation.

It also identifies a number of ‘subject’ and contextual objectives. This split is a little confusing, and the review team has summarised these objectives as follows:

• To contribute to global, regional and national leadership on sanitation and hygiene
• To influence and contribute to increased global coherence and coordination of actions in hygiene and sanitation
• To influence governments to increase funding and to adopt a single national plan and ministry for sanitation
• To influence the climate change debate and to stress the importance of water services
• To increase private sector involvement in hygiene for poor people
• To increase the focus on preventative health within the medical profession.

A recent evaluation\textsuperscript{11} of advocacy in sanitation provides perhaps the best neutral assessment of WSSCC’s contribution through its advocacy work. This report looked at a number of campaigns that had been undertaken within the sector and looked at ranking them based on the impact they have had.

The main findings were that overall advocacy in the sanitation sector has been effective and that the International Year of Sanitation and the Global WASH Campaign were identified as the most powerful. WSSCC was a main player in both and the assessment in particular identified the strong brand, consistency and collaboration involved in IYS as being its major strength; areas where WSSCC played a if not the key role.

The report also assessed advocacy organisations and despite their role in ‘good’ campaigns WSSCC was not mentioned amongst the ‘most effective advocacy organisations’. In our inquiry it was clear that WSSCC’s role in IYS was often not overtly attributed to its success; only UN-Water and others in some UN HQ departments were explicit about WSSCC’s contribution.

The Global WASH campaign ‘went viral’ which is hugely unusual and all stakeholders commented strongly on the power and impact of WSSCC’s visual materials and their posters in particular. The review team feels that it is generally accepted that these are world class and that WSSCC is a ‘market leader’ in this area.

A key point though from the report and a criticism of the advocacy work in the sector as a whole was a lack of identification of expected impact. The Council had no real model of what success would look like (benchmarks etc) or a clear chain of outcomes or milestones through which advocacy activity would lead or contribute to the Council’s overall goals.

As recognised by the WSSCC in their latest draft Advocacy strategy it is now accepted that in the sanitation arena awareness has been raised and in many cases global and national institutional frameworks are in place. There is increased coordination and the major gap in the sector is to increase resources to allow for practical action and change towards global sanitation targets. As such the review team strongly agrees that the focus of the new advocacy strategy on economic outcomes or other non-sanitation indicators such as health or education is an important step forward for WSSCC if they are to remain at the cutting edge of Sanitation advocacy.

\textsuperscript{11} ‘Sanitation Advocacy Research Project’ undertaken by Data Harvest, commissioned by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, September 2009
The review team also agrees that the future target audiences should be those who have the capacity to invest in sanitation and hygiene, such as politicians in developing and donor countries and entrepreneurs. Advocacy should shift towards the national level and more concretely to the action and implementation level. This will be translated in more funds being spent for national/local level advocacy as compared to global level advocacy.

There also needs to be better information produced e.g. 3% of African GDP lost because of poor water and sanitation which clearly links sanitation to the achievement of other MDGs and development goals. It reinforces however the need for greater integration in strategy formulation processes between the pillars and also the need for the GSF to collect baseline data beyond sanitation outcome level.

The new Communication strategy clearly outlines objectives and processes but does not relate as directly to the objectives of the other two pillars as perhaps it could. There is a sense that effective communications underpins all of WSSCC’s activities in particular the link between members, the WASH coalitions and the Secretariat. The website falls under the communications unit and has recently undergone a major overhaul which was much needed. Changes in internet technology now mean that access has greatly improved in the developing world and the new website aims to be a much more collaborative and two-way communication interface rather than a depository of documents, contacts and signposts to other knowledge providers. The new site should also provide a lot more information about the need, profile and usage of visitors. The impact of the new site is hard to assess as it only went live in November 2010, however first indications are positive although a couple of NCs remarked that the increase in interactivity meant that further demands have been placed on them to reply/answer queries.

The WASH Media Award is another element of the communications strategy and reflects the fact that the media is seen as a target for WSSCC advocacy. In the team interviews and discussions there was little mention of this activity though there is recognition that coverage has been given to it on the BBC, Reuters and other news outlets.

Outputs

Advocacy and communications is a major pillar of WSSCC. WSSCC plays a major role at global level as well as a role through the national WASH coalitions at national level. The main outputs of WSSCC have been summarised in table 8.

Table 8: Summary assessment of the Advocacy and Communications outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive advocacy strategies devised by National WASH coalitions</td>
<td>Focus on advocacy at national level for awareness raising and changes in institutional frameworks largely successful. In future refocus needed (new challenges).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advocacy support to National WASH Coalitions</td>
<td>Specific WASH radio campaigns effective, IYS campaign also reinforced brand and message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WASH branded advocacy materials produced and distributed globally</td>
<td>Materials remain in high demand and ‘world class’. Advocacy strategy under review to meet new challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advocacy meetings in many contexts</td>
<td>Active in many sector events though contribution sometimes not recognised. Pro-active prioritisation required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSSCC, departmental reports, knowledge products, newsletters, brochures, press releases, articles and profile products produced.</td>
<td>Profiling WSSCC as a leading sanitation actor and advocate achieved. Need for message to be refined and intensified with GSF and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Website visitors, downloads, e-mail requests,</td>
<td>Hugh membership increase, though clarity over level of active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 The Global Sanitation Fund

3.4.1 Objective, principles and outcomes of the Global Sanitation Fund

WSSCC’s objective is to accelerate the achievement of sustainable water, sanitation and waste management services to all people in the world. To help meet the goal of ensuring improved sanitation and hygiene for all, WSSCC has created the Global Sanitation Fund. By doing so, it contributes to progress towards the MDGs, especially those to reduce child mortality, eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality and empowerment of women, and ensure environmental sustainability.

The purpose of the GSF is to support national efforts to help large numbers of poor people to attain sustainable access to sanitation and adopt good hygiene practices (WSSCC Medium Term Work Plan 2008-2012).

During the Review most commentators were broadly supportive of the launch of this new sphere of activity but some specific comments raised are included in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Specific comments made on launch of GSF:

- The existence of the GSF and its launching in individual countries has created a momentum for sanitation and triggered engagement from governments and sector players.
- GSF was valued as an excellent and strategic initiative and its model could offer a good opportunity to attract more funding.
- The core function of the GSF as a financing mechanism to help large number of poor people improve their sanitation and adopt good hygiene practices has not sufficiently been emphasised or communicated.
- GSF means less attention for other pillars
- You should combine grant funding (GSF) with loan funding; far more effective
- GSF should remain a small grant fund, learn from experience, impact in terms of innovation, not in terms of scale
- WSSCC is becoming too much of an implementer
- GSF introduces an extra layer in the sanitation implementation; not needed + expensive.
- GSF should focus on the 40% poorest people; now too general.
- GSF should be globally competitive system, now pampering each country with some money.
- GSF is much bigger than WSSCC and will fully dominate WSSCC in future.
- National WASH coalitions should have a say over the GSF otherwise national coalitions will be marginalised.
**GSF guiding principles**

The GSF has formulated nine guiding principles: (i) people-centred, community managed and demand driven; (ii) targets poor and un-served communities; (iii) expands coverage; (iv) respects national leadership; (v) promotes sustainable services; (vi) incorporates gender considerations; (vii) pools funds; (viii) uses results-based management and; (ix) works transparently.

**GSF expected outcomes**

The GSF Results Framework is clear, comprehensive and consists of a balanced number of outcomes, outputs and indicators. The role of the various parties involved in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the GSF has been elaborated. The GSF framework focused on sanitation and hygiene is probably the best existing sector framework. However, the GSF planning and monitoring framework is not yet fully fit for the purpose as it is too elaborate. In table 9 four outcomes for GSF and related outputs have been formulated:

**Table 9: GSF outcomes and outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours.</td>
<td>1.1 People (in project area) construct and use more effective sanitation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Communities (in project area) eliminate open defecation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 All members of project communities benefit from project interventions in an equitable manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Effective use and management of sanitation is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 People sustainably improve their hygiene behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity is created for the sustainable spread of improved sanitation and hygiene.</td>
<td>2.1 Provision of services to deliver effective sanitation and hygiene (small scale providers, micro finance providers, etc) improves to meet demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 People (in neighbouring communities) construct sanitation facilities where not directly attributed to sub grants or donor activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Local organisations improve capacity for future sanitation work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existing and new government and support agencies put more resources into sanitation and hygiene work.</td>
<td>3.1 Government’s policies &amp; strategies are applied, reviewed and improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 More finance and human resources dedicated to sanitation related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Successful and innovative approaches in sanitation and hygiene are identified, proved and spread.</td>
<td>4.1 All GSF activities incorporate capturing and sharing lessons learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 GSF funded activities are cost effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 GSF activities are considered good value and effective by donors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSF Results Framework, 2010

**Impact**

Impact has been formulated in line with the WSSCC impact as defined in the WSSCC M&E Protocol:

*Large numbers of poor people attain sustainable access to basic sanitation and adopt good hygiene practices.*

---

12 October 2010, these principles fit within the WSSCC core principles.
13 GSF outputs and outcomes not fully overlap with the outcomes and indicators as formulated in the WSSCC M&E protocol. The WSSCC Secretariat should pay more attention in synchronizing its frameworks.
14 This outcome and output schedule substantially differs from the one in the 2009 M&E Protocol.
The GSF results framework includes specific indicators for each of the outputs specified for project, sub-grantee and national programme level. The GSF results framework is the basis for the results framework for each of the GSF country programmes. The following findings can be observed regarding the GSF result framework:

- The framework is very comprehensive, consistent and really focused on sanitation. An important and successful effort in translating sanitation in a specific results framework.
- There is a hierarchy in outcomes with outcome one as the major outcome (people achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours). This could be better reflected in the framework (approximately 80% of the GSF funding will be used to achieve outcome 1.) Such a hierarchy would also have consequences for the number and type of indicators to be used.
- The number of indicators is substantial which does not automatically facilitate an effective and efficient monitoring process.
- The GSF logical framework as well as the Monitoring framework is comprehensive, but complex. At present the fund could be in danger of being ‘over managed’ in particular given its size and the need to be able to both generate and communicate a clear set of results quickly. A focus on a relatively limited number of key indicators is essential.
- The definition of Impact under GSF as well as under the whole WSSCC M&E protocol should be reconsidered. Impact should be formulated and monitored at a higher level including verifiable indicators at impact level (e.g. health, access to education). Moreover, indicators for behaviour change could be better specified.

Identification of countries

Country selection has been based upon a set of criteria: (i) large number of people and percentage of population without basic sanitation; (ii) high incidence of diseases related to poor water, sanitation and hygiene; (iii) low socio-economic development indicators; (iv) national sanitation policy and strategy; (v) existing activities of the National WASH coalitions and; (vi) government agreement on contribution of GSF to the solution of sanitation problems. These criteria are valid and imply a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia.

3.4.2 GSF Programme structure and organisation

The GSF is a Trust Fund under WSSCC established to boost expenditure on sanitation and hygiene in support of national policies. As part of the WSSCC Secretariat, the GSF is accountable to the WSSCC Steering Committee on issues of governance and directly linked to the GSF Advisory Committee for technical advice.

The GSF supports other organisations’ implementation work through grants to selected organisations in eligible countries. At the country level, the Executing Agency (EA) is programmatically and contractually accountable to GSF/WSSCC, while the Country Programme Monitor (CPM) monitors and evaluates the EAs contractual performance. The CPM is only accountable to the GSF in Geneva. The EA, as the sole direct recipient of the GSF grant, manages the GSF-funded country programme and selects the Sub-Grantees (SG) through and open and transparent process. The SG implements the sanitation and hygiene Country Programme work plan.

---

15 For details see the Guidelines for Preparation of Country Programme Proposal, WSSCC Global Sanitation Fund, November 2010. The Programme Coordinating Mechanism (PCM) in reality is often referred to as National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM). Both terms are used and have the same meaning.
The Programme Coordinating Mechanism (PCM) brings together governmental and non-governmental actors to plan and coordinate the GSF-funded work. The PCM’s main responsibilities include: (i) maximizing synergy between GSF and other actors and their policies; (ii) ensuring communication between GSF and other activities of the National WASH coalitions; (iii) participating in the development of the M&E plan of the EA; (iv) along with the CPM, advising in the monitoring and verification of programme implementation; (v) ensuring that monitoring results are communicated to government and other stakeholders; (vi) advising the EA on implementation issues and; (vii) facilitating EA’s access to technical resources in the national WASH coalitions and WSSCC’s network.

The selection of the EA as well as of the Sub-Grantees is based upon a competitive bidding process.

The organisational chart of the Global Sanitation Fund as understood by the review team is presented in figure 10. The figure indicates that the role and place of the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM) remains to be clearly defined. The NCM is supposed to have linkages with government, WSSCC Secretariat as well as with the National WASH Coalitions. These linkages as well as the responsibility chains still need to be further elaborated to prevent complications during the GSF implementation process.

The National WASH Coalitions are not a part and parcel of the GSF organisational chart. The role and place of the National WASH Coalitions in the GSF preparatory process in the eight countries visited largely differed from one country to the other. However, in most instances the role of the National WASH Coalitions is limited to a role in the National Coordinating Mechanism. It is unlikely that the GSF will strengthen the position of the National WASH Coalitions in future as these coalitions have no explicit role to play. However, the National Coordinators themselves in general are more positive about their roles (as indicated in the National Coordinators Questionnaire 2010).

16 The arrows in figure 6 indicate clear responsibility lines. Where no arrows are shown this implies unclear linkages in the opinion of the review team (e.g. unclear relations between the National Coordinating Mechanism and other parties).
Figure 10: The organisational chart of the Global Sanitation
3.4.3 The GSF Preparatory Process

Steps and timing of the GSF Preparatory Process

The GSF preparatory process has been summarised in six steps in figure 11. The figure indicates these steps as well as the average time needed to accomplish each step in the round 1 countries¹⁷.

Figure 11: Steps and timing of the GSF preparatory Process

The approval of all six steps is in the hands of WSSCC Secretariat in Geneva. The formal agreement of steps four and five are based upon a contract signed between the Executing Agency and the Country Programme Monitor with UNOPS.

¹⁷ The average time needed as indicated in the figure can and should be substantially reduced. There is some recent evidence that the preparatory process is being reduced.
The Country Programme Proposal (CPP)

The CPP is a crucial step in the GSF preparatory process (in figure 11 indicated as step 3). The GSF appoints a consultant to facilitate the development of the Country Programme Proposal. The consultant supports the PCM to develop and agree on a GSF programme and activities. The country programme is based upon the findings in the Country Sector Review and Gap Analysis report. Guidelines for drafting the proposal are made available by GSF. Based upon discussions with major sector actors the Country Programme Proposal will be submitted to WSSCC Secretariat by the PCM for approval.

The Country Programme Proposal includes a sanitation sector analysis (based upon earlier gap analysis) including the institutional setting, the programme rationale, objectives and the implementation strategy, the results framework, call for sub-grant proposal and an outline of the M&E strategy. The GSF Secretariat in Geneva has elaborated very comprehensive and clear guidance notes for each of the sections of the CPP.

Based upon discussions during the field visits the following findings can be formulated regarding the Country Programme Proposal development process:

- The GSF results framework is technically a very good starting point for discussions at country level.
- The consultant plays a very prominent role in the (too) long CPP process.
- The quality of the sector analysis and the CPP substantially differ from one country to the other. In general the following shortcomings have been observed: (i) the institutional analysis is merely a description of the various institutions and stakeholders and does not analyze possibilities and challenges regarding the GSF process and; (ii) the sector analysis does not clearly and logically lead to proposed GSF activities.

3.4.4 State of Affairs GSF preparatory process

The GSF preparatory process got off the ground in 17 countries starting with 7 countries in round 1 and an additional 10 countries in round 2. The state of affairs regarding the GSF preparatory process round 1 and round 2 countries is summarised in tables 10 and 11.
Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 10: Overall status Round 1 countries as per 31 December 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Madagascar</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>Burkina Faso</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector Review conducted and approved; Sanitation Sector Status and Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Part of CPP July 2010</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Feb 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and appointment Executing Agency (EA)</td>
<td>Govt</td>
<td>May to Oct 2010</td>
<td>July 2009 to Mar 2010</td>
<td>Dec 2009 to May 2010</td>
<td>1st one failed / second is scheduled</td>
<td>June to Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency Date signed</td>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>06 May 2010</td>
<td>Expected on 1st March 2011</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with Sub-Grantees signed</td>
<td>Expected Feb 2011</td>
<td>Expected in Feb 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF activities started in the field</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Round 2</strong></th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Togo</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Benin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on scope of work for GSF</td>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Put on hold</td>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Programme Monitor appointed</td>
<td>Selected as of Dec 2010</td>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selected / appointment put on hold</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed TOR forExecuting agency</td>
<td>Ongoing / EA will be FMOH</td>
<td>Sept 2010</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Subject to agreement with Gov</td>
<td>Aug 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and appointment EA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No acceptable bids</td>
<td>July to Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug to Nov 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Date signed</td>
<td>1 March 2011</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not prioritised</td>
<td>1st Feb 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with Sub-Grantees signed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled May / June 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF activities started</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC 2009 Narrative report updated by GSF Team as of December 31, 2010
As of 31 December 2010 the EA contracting process is being finalised in the following countries:

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Medical Care Development International (MCDI); An international US based NGO</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>AGETIP, local firm, originally set up by the government</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>UN HABITAT</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>NR Management Consultants India Pvt Ltd</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Plan International Malawi</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Government of Uganda, Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Negotiations ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Government of Ethiopia, Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Proposal preparation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC 2009 Narrative Report updated by GSF Team as of 31 December 2010

Regarding the GSF preparatory process the following general remarks can be made:

- The GSF preparatory process consists of a large number of steps and procedures. The process is comprehensive and transparent. However, the preparatory process takes too long and has not fully been understood in the countries concerned. In fact, there has been a lack of understanding from national governments and other national stakeholders regarding the key elements of the GSF as well as a lack of understanding within WSSCC regarding the (im) possibilities of the GSF within a specific national context. This is one of the reasons why the rate of expenditure under the GSF has been low. Another reason is the lack of staff during the period 2008-2009. The GSF preparatory process has accelerated over the last six months.
- The role of the GSF Programme Coordinating Mechanism (PCM) in the preparation and monitoring of the GSF has not been made clear to national stakeholders.
- The Executing Agencies so far selected (in Madagascar and Nepal) for the implementation of the GSF made a very strong impression during the field discussions in both countries. These agencies are very capable of “getting the job done”.
- The selection of the Executing Agency is based upon the UNOPS competitive bidding process. However, this selection process has also had to take into account political and strategic realities, so for example in Uganda the GSF had to fit into a Sector Wide Approach, while the Kenyan government is also reluctant to follow a competitive bidding process for the selection of the EA. This has slowed down the preparation process in some countries.
- None of the GSF outputs as formulated in the WSSCC M&E protocol have been achieved as of yet as these outputs refer to implementation. The GSF implementation process will start early 2011.

3.4.5 Funding eligibilities

Three major issues are relevant regarding the funding eligibilities; (i) no subsidies; (ii) one million USD/year/country and; (iii) contracts between UNOPS and the EA for a limited period of time. Regarding these issues the following remarks can be made:

- GSF will not allow the use of its funds to pay for sanitation hardware subsidies. Under specific circumstances GSF funds may be used to provide software support to sanitation programmes that have a hardware component.
• The contract between UNOPS and the EA only cover a two year period with the option for another three years. This might endanger the smooth implementation of the Country Programme by Sub-Grantees.

• The one million USD per year per country for the GSF programme is an arbitrary amount, but can be justified in a start-up process. The review team accepts that this provides a sense of equality of opportunity and uniformity in project planning. However, the team feels greater impact would result from linking resource allocation to country specific opportunities and capabilities.

3.4.6 Targets set by GSF

Table 13 summarizes targets and unit costs derived from the nine Country Programme Proposals (CPPs) that WSSCC Geneva received till 30 September 2010. Altogether these nine CPPs aim to change the lives of more than 28 million people. Out of these 28 million people more than 11 million people will have started to use improved toilets during the five year GSF programme period. This number of 11 million people can be attributed to the GSF and is referred to in the GSF reports as the preferred target18.

The unit costs vary between USD 3.7 per person in Madagascar to 9.4 in Nigeria. This is substantially below WSSCC’s indicative planning figure of USD 15 per person as assumed in the Medium Term Work Plan 2008-2012. The following reasons can be mentioned; i) none of the programmes includes a notional for seeding micro-finance and for specific targeted subsidies and; ii) expected economies of scale as a result of working across whole focal areas.

Table 13: Targets and unit costs as per CPP proposals received by GSF in nine countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Focal area</th>
<th>Total target population in focal areas</th>
<th>Population with improved toilet attributable to GSF</th>
<th>Unit costs in USD per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2 out of 13 regions</td>
<td>1,730,000</td>
<td>778,500</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>300 out of 1621 communes</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>8 out of 626 districts</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>2,560,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>8 out of 22 regions</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>6 out of 24 districts</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>796,500</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>203 out of 3900 local government areas</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>6 out of 774 local government areas</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>712,500</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4 out of 14 regions</td>
<td>2,330,000</td>
<td>1,048,500</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>10 out of 111 districts</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 9 countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28,330,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,146,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 The reasons are that unimproved toilets do not yield the full range of health benefits, that poor quality toilets may diminish people’s commitment to staying ODF, and that the MDG target definition (JMP) is also based on the use of improved toilets.

19 Assumption that all will be affected by the programme

20 Total programme cost divided by people start using improved toilet attributable to GSF
3.5 Interrelations between the three WSSCC pillars

*Sharing, Promoting, Enabling - The WSSCC ‘three pillars strategy’*

Networking and Knowledge Management, Advocacy and Communications together with the Global Sanitation Fund form the three strategic ‘pillars’ of WSSCC. It is the review team’s understanding that the aim is for WSSCC’s value added in the sector to relate to its ability to ensure that the three pillars make up a coherent whole, whose impact and effectiveness will be greater than the sum of its parts.

There has been a common view from interviewees that this is a positive and conceptually sound approach which outlines a clear way forward. The review team feels that while some progress has been made in integrating the three areas they are still not as closely strategically aligned as they could be. There needs to be greater consistency in the messaging and strap line and further reinforcement of efforts for the ‘pillars’ to develop strategies and action plans together rather than look at how different plans might overlap.

The GSF pillar does have real potential to bolster and drive other pillars through its enabling of increased sanitation to provide the basis for an “evidenced whole” where GSF evidence leads to advocacy based on learning, leading to increased resources and focus and consequently to scaled up activities to achieve the sanitation goals.

The WSSCC policies and strategies for each of the three pillars need to be better interrelated and integrated in operational terms. How to relate advocacy and communications as well as networking and knowledge management to the GSF and in which manner the three pillars will mutually influence each other should be translated in operational terms in “each pillar document”. The two ‘traditional’ pillars should become part and parcel of the GSF preparation, implementation and monitoring process without losing their own identity as individual pillars.
4 Governance and Management Performance

4.1 Governance and Accountability

The WSSCC approach is people-centred, which is also reflected in its governance structure. The members of WSSCC elect the Steering Committee (SC) from among themselves, which governs WSSCC and defines the mission, principles and strategy.

Shift from WHO to UNOPS

During the period 2005-2006 WSSCC activities came to a near standstill. The main reasons for the slowdown in 2005-2006 were the unsuccessful process of change of institutional host and the unscheduled retirement of the Executive Director at the end of March 2006. The termination of the hosting arrangement with WHO on 31 March 2006, and purported move to UNICEF, led to a reduction in staff that opted to stay in WHO. In addition, those staff who were to move to UNICEF terminated their staff contracts under WHO so that after a forced closure of three weeks in April 2006 only three staff remained.

In August 2009, WSSCC’s operations began to be transferred to a new host, the United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS). The transfer was completed on 1 January 2010. The shift from WHO to UNOPS as the host agency has been a positive move as it has created an enabling environment for the GSF although processes for employment within the UN in general are still quite cumbersome and this does still limit WSSCC’s ability to be as flexible and reactive as it would wish to be. The shift to UNOPS enabled WSSCC to elaborate and implement a comprehensive financial management system for the GSF.

The Steering Committee

The Steering Committee (SC) forms the Governing body of WSSCC and members are able to stand for and elect the governing SC. The SC is renewed through the election process each three years. Criteria for nomination to stand for elections have been tightened and now require two endorsements from other members. All SC meetings were held and the Governance document was followed. Based upon discussions held with various parties as well as based upon the results of the National Coordinators questionnaire in the opinion of the review team the effectiveness of the functioning of the SC was hampered by the following factors: (i) Major GSF issues were supposed to be dealt with by the GSF Advisory Committee although the relations between this Advisory Committee and the SC did not appear to be clearly elaborated; (ii) The conceptual issues related to the GSF as part and parcel of the WSSCC as well as the need to ensure a symbiosis between the three pillars have not been highlighted by the SC as a crucial issue; (iii) The consequences arising from the lack of progress of the GSF have not been clearly recognised as key issue for action by the SC and; (iv) According to the results of the National Coordinators questionnaire, the SC lacks feeling with the National Coordinators and members (see also annex 3 summary note – WSSCC National Coordinator’s questionnaire).

The GSF Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee for the GSF consists of highly experienced, well-known, well established members in the field of sanitation and hygiene. The Advisory Committee reports to the GSF section within the WSSCC Secretariat in Geneva.

Following further discussions, it became clear that the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee has been low. The following reasons have been mentioned: i) lack of discussions on the main concepts; ii) lack of transparency regarding the SC-Advisory Committee relations; iii) Lack of transparency about
what happened to the recommendations made and; iv) Highest WSSCC Secretariat management level did not participate in major discussions in Advisory Committee. These shortcomings have recently been recognised and action is being taken to address the issues.

**Governance and management outputs**

The governance and management outputs as formulated in the M&E protocol including remarks of the review team have been summarised in table 14.

**Table 14: Governance and management outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WSSCC membership increases</td>
<td>Very substantially, see also chapter 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WSSCC Steering Committee properly constituted</td>
<td>Yes, constituted according to rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WSSCC Steering Committee governs</td>
<td>SC does not always function properly according to interviews and NC remarks. Role and place of the GSF Advisory Committee unclear. Recent improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSSCC actively manages its members</td>
<td>Major efforts made, recent improvements, still membership issue (diversity, numbers, value addition still to be elaborated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WSSCC maintains good relations with donors</td>
<td>Yes, excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSSCC maintains good relations with Host Agency</td>
<td>Yes, excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Secretariat functions professionally</td>
<td>Yes, excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All of WSSCC’s operational teams are directed, supported, financed and work effectively.</td>
<td>Urgent need to increase/improve/elaborate the interrelations between three WSSCC pillars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M&E Protocol, August 2009

**Regional coordinators**

The Steering Committee decided in March 2008 to merge the roles of elected regional SC members and regional representatives in order to end confusion that had arisen about the roles and positions of the two types of regional representatives since the introduction of elected SC membership in 2004. The relationship between the Secretariat and the national coordinators evolved which meant less space for regional coordinators. However, the regional dimension of WSSCC remains important.

**National coordinators**

The national coordinators fulfil the following roles; (i) to develop and implement an annual national programme of action; (ii) to act as a focal point for coordination of a National WASH Coalition of WSSCC members to support the goals of WSSCC; (iii) to contribute to regional and inter-regional activities; (iv) to identify and mobilize national level resources to complement WSSCC’s core funding and; (v) to report to the Secretariat on well defined issues.

The position of National Coordinator is a voluntary appointment to which no rights of employment or automatic remuneration are accorded. Each coordinator is appointed by the Executive Director advised by the National WASH Coalition for an initial period of three years. After this, extension is possible. The WSSCC Secretariat supports the national coordinator through guidance, provides information on WSSCC’s work, coordinates and facilitates exchange of information. It also offers funding to support programmes of action; this funding is awarded through a process of formal proposal.
The national coordinators in 33 countries (for details see also chapter 2.2) are very committed volunteers often related to a well-known and appreciated national NGO. The effectiveness of a national coordinator depends to a large extent on its role and its place within the sector in the country concerned. The workload of the national coordinator increased through the introduction of the GSF as well as through the introduction of the new WSSCC website. WSSCC should reflect on the limits of the voluntary mechanism in terms of workloads of national coordinators.

4.2 Management

The Secretariat

The staffing situation of the WSSCC Secretariat from 2005-2010 saw dramatic changes related to the near standstill of WSSCC in 2005-2006 and the revival from 2007 onwards.

At the end of 2005 the WSSCC Secretariat consisted of seven staff members (Executive Director, two assistants, 2 programme officers and one finance assistant). The staffing situation of the Secretariat as per February 2007 was dramatic with three staff members (Interim executive Director, one programme officer and one team assistant).

WHO’s inability to recruit staff has been a major cause of work delays and under spending of WSSCC in the last two years. The recruitment of new posts was accelerated through an effective UNOPS recruitment process. By July 2010, the WSSCC Secretariat had a full complement of permanents staff (see table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Programme staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Partnership coordinator, Assistant and HR coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager Networking</td>
<td>Programme officer, team assistant, technical officer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager Advocacy and</td>
<td>2 programme officers, 1 Membership Services officer, 1 team</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>assistant, 1 junior consultant, 1 technical officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager Global</td>
<td>2 team assistants, 3 programme officers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration officer</td>
<td>1 Financial assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC staff structure July 2010

Issues concerning the roles of different departments within the WSSCC Secretariat are gradually being addressed. The priority appears to have been the GSF start up and this has taken considerable energy, developing the other pillars and more importantly integrating them to get the required synergy is now happening.

The relations of the WSSCC Secretariat with the national level are becoming more diversified with the start of the GSF in a number of countries and the changing role of National WASH coalitions in view of the changing sanitation arena.

National Coordinators have clearly perceived and been appreciative of increased levels of timely support and assistance from the secretariat.

4.3 Financial management

The WSSCC strategy is for financing the whole of WSSCC’s work for the period 2008-2012 as formulated in the Medium Term Work Plan including its Global Sanitation Fund. The concept is
based upon multi-year multi-donor pooled funding in accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

To balance income and expenditure two strategic points are relevant: (i) to prevent cash flow problems WSSCC will calculate cash flow requirements over a five-year period using UNOPS standard costs and asking donors to contribute over a five-year period and; (ii) to spend as much money as donors will give in a demand driven financing strategy (with high demand WSSCC will seek more income).

The Multi-Donor Trust Fund consists of four projects within UNOPS (see also table 16). WSSCC asks the donors to give its SC the freedom to allocate the incoming funds across the four projects as appropriate according to the 2008-2012 Work Plan. This also enables donors to specify that its funds should go in one or more projects.

Until 2007 WSSCC-donor relations have been complex, fragmented, and different for each of the donors, small restricted grants next to unrestricted funds leading to high transaction costs both for the donor as well as for WSSCC. In line with elements of the Paris Agenda WSSCC aimed at long term commitments of unrestricted funding entrusted to WSSCC to spend within the framework of the Medium Term Work Plan under the accountability of the Steering Committee.

WSSCC currently maintains good relations with its donors. All WSSCC donors subscribe to the pooled funding model, and do not earmark funds for specific activities or specific projects. This has been a significant change from the pre-2007 funding model. Pooled funding has been extensively debated and embraced by the donors particularly as they encourage developing countries to adopt this approach. In 2009, WSSCC held the first annual Donor Accountability Meeting whose principles are: WSSCC wants to be accountable to its donors, WSSCC wants donors to know each others' views, and WSSCC aims to be transparent in its all activities and relationships, WSSCC aims for common plans, agreements, reports and accounts. The meetings were successful with a good atmosphere and high level of intellectual rigour and review of WSSCC’s work and reports.

WSSCC benefits substantially from the progress made and support for common plans, agreements, reports and accounts. There are significantly lower costs via common proposals and common reports as previously WSSCC was required to handle a huge range of small amounts and report on specific items individually to each donor. Savings in time and resource have been experienced across WSSCC, UNOPS and donors. Six out of seven WSSCC donors provide long term commitment on average of three years which allows for effective programme planning. One donor, Norad, has made yearly commitments because of its funding approach and systems. They have maintained this annual support for many years and each year since 2007.

WSSCC maintains four trust funds and below is a table of current donor contributions to each.

Table 16: Donor Contributions to WSSCC trust funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking and Knowledge Management</th>
<th>Advocacy and Communications</th>
<th>Global Sanitation Fund</th>
<th>Governance and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGIS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three donors (AusAid, DFID, Norad) allow WSSCC to allocate between trust funds based on liquidity which is very helpful for financial management. The four others (DGIS, SDC, Sweden and Gates) specify the amounts and contributions per trust fund and state that if WSSCC wishes to vary the amounts between Trust Funds this must be requested in writing. Further simplification of the pooled funding with one GSF Trust Fund and one “Non-GSF” Trust Fund could be considered in future.

The Gates Foundation has supported WSSCC’s pooled funding and common reporting. This can be considered unusual for many foundations and private sector organisations have their own very specific proposal, budget and reporting requirements. Pooled funding is certainly operationally efficient for WSSCC. However, there is a tendency amongst donors to re-focus on “project financing,” particularly by foundations that often have specific geographic and programmatic criteria attached to funding, and on “national financing” where donors do not have funds to support global organisations. This is challenging for WSSCC’s fundraising efforts and WSSCC needs to at times re-evaluate whether it would be advantageous to accept earmarked funding. However, this would endanger the achievements of managing costs and remaining strategically flexible to respond to programmatic needs and realities.

4.4 Monitoring, evaluation and audit

WSSCC’s Secretariat is actually hosted by UNOPS. UNOPS has a well established system for programme management including M&E. The UNOPS programme management and monitoring system is not only concerned with activities but more importantly with the outputs (results in UNOPS terminology). The management system is results based. In the WSSCC 2008-2012 Work Plan as well as in the M&E Protocol (August 2009) WSSCC has made substantial efforts to clearly define activities, outputs, indicators as well as means of verification for the three pillars of the WSSCC programme as well as for governance and management. Moreover, outcomes as well as impact have been defined.

Monitoring of an organisation like WSSCC is complicated for the following reasons: (i) JMP indicators are questionable; (ii) outcomes are processes rather than concrete achievements; (iii) Much work is carried out alongside other organisations, which raises the problem of the attribution of WSSCC; (iv) it is difficult to set numerical targets for outcomes and impacts.

The assessment of the main lines of the WSSCC result framework is that major improvements have been achieved as compared to the past. Moreover, the annual reports correctly follow the M&E framework. However, the following remarks can be made: (i) there is too much inconsistency in definition and contents of the terminology used and; (iii) there is too much inconsistency between the results frameworks of the three individual pillars and general M&E protocol (for a detailed assessment of the GSF framework see also chapter 3.4).

4.5 Strategic positioning and direction

In the past many people have had difficulty in defining the objectives and goals of WSSCC (see also 2003 WSSCC Review Report). WSSCC has made major progress in better focusing and strategic positioning its activities.

Focus on sanitation

The strategic decision to dedicate most efforts to sanitation and hygiene, in view of the limited progress on sanitation, was an excellent choice as it provided WSSCC with a clear focus on an important but heavily neglected sub-sector and a clear niche. In the view of the review team this decision has been central to the survival as well as the growth of WSSCC.

The development of the GSF has bought the WSSCC’s work ‘closer’ to its mission of achieving water supply and sanitation for all though, it would be helpful if the Council could be more explicit and coherent about their model of improved sanitation and their contribution to it. For example, given
the main thrust of most GSF programmes whether ODF is seen as an interim outcome or an indicator of improved sanitation in itself. Figure 12 describes CLTS, the sanitation ladder and some of its critics.

Figure 12 – Community Led Total Sanitation

It is estimated that more than 2 billion people in the developing world practice open defecation (OD) and that every year the resulting diarrhoeal diseases kill around 1.8 million people, mainly children under the age of 5.

CLTS is widely known and recognised as a revolutionary and effective participatory approach to rural sanitation focusing on ending open defecation. It emerged in 1999 from the work and practice of Kamal Kar and from its early beginnings in Bangladesh it has spread to over 40 countries and is recognised and supported by local governments, bilateral and multilateral donors and NGOs.

CLTS is to a degree a response to failures in ‘top down’ rural sanitation programmes which often focus on providing ‘hardware’ and subsidises to communities as a means of changing their behaviour. It instead seeks to provoke communities through their own appraisal and analysis to decide to become OD free and to do so through their own efforts. Central to this is that communities are facilitated and not taught and that communities install their own latrines or toilets with their own resources. Participatory appraisal approaches are used with the community in real time to ‘trigger’ the community to see how they are ‘eating each others shit’. This ‘trigger’ leads to a resolution to end OD, a plan of how to do so and the emergence of ‘natural leaders’ to facilitate and lead the process. Results at a community level have been impressive and it is clear that huge numbers have had their lives improved because the communities they live in have become OD free.

CLTS is not without its critics. There are some who worry that it doesn’t focus on the poorest and that it creates demand but doesn’t address supply issues. Some see a group of CLTS ‘fundamentalists’ who hold on to a set of principles and processes that may or may not all be essential. There are also key challenges in particular, how the methodology can be effectively scaled up and what institutional structures/processes are required for scaling up in different contexts.

According to the handbook on CLTS, it is an integrated approach to achieving and sustaining ODF status. CLTS processes can precede, lead on to, or occur simultaneously with improved latrine design, adoption and improvement of hygiene practices. It includes a sequence of steps to be applied and tools in triggering CLTS.

The process from open defecation to sustainable improved sanitation is often referred to in terms of a “sanitation ladder”. However, there is no common understanding/definition how such a ladder looks like and the concrete steps to be taken to climb the ladder.

The road map towards sustained improved sanitation consists of the following main components:

- The road towards ODF status; this road is clearly defined, properly paved and leads to achieving ODF status at community level.
- The road to sustain ODF status is less clear. It is generally assumed that without follow-up actions, ODF status will not be sustained. These assumptions are not evidence based. Which actions to take to ensure sustainability of the ODF status remain largely unclear.
The road from ODF status towards sustainable improved sanitation (rising up the sanitation ladder) remains unclear although it is generally accepted that sanitation marketing is crucial in this respect.

Sanitation marketing takes further the local demand created in ODF villages and enhances development of local entrepreneurs and strengthens linkages with those and with external parties. Sanitation marketing gets into market research, product and business development and ensures that appropriate sanitation options are made available and that suppliers have the necessarily capacity to provide the desired services.

CLTS together with sanitation marketing generates sanitation demand and increases supply of the sanitation products and services at scale. Individual households will make the individual choice how fast to climb the sanitation ladder (or to follow the road) taking into consideration their individual needs and priorities. In this respect the price of the product to be bought possibly remains more important than anticipated in most of the literature.

The National Coordinators are supportive of the shift in strategic direction and also of the instigation of the GSF. There are some concerns as to how the GSF process has been implemented, how long it has taken and how it will be governed. A summary of feedback on this area provided by the Questionnaire is included in Figure 13.

*Figure 13: Findings from National Coordinators on Strategic Decisions*
NC’s opinion on Strategic Decision I; Focus on sanitation and hygiene:

- The large majority of NC’s agreed to concentrate most efforts on Sanitation and Hygiene, one NC disagrees (see below).
- Key comments made: (1) In the past Sanitation & Hygiene have been overshadowed by attention given to Water; (2) Sanitation is falling far behind Water supply; and (3) we need to shift the Paradigm to make it Sanitation, Hygiene & Water.
- The one disagreeing NC argued that: (1) Importance to ensure that Water does not fall off our (WSSCC) agenda - there is a direct link between the two (Water & Sanitation); (2) Water, sanitation and hygiene are not compartmental and should not be seen as one having priority over the other; and (3) The crisis of water availability is growing and WSSCC needs to review its focus and commitment to drinking water – both as a right as well as an advocacy priority for safe, assured quantity, adequate supply of drinking water and water for sanitation and other livelihood needs.

NC’s opinion on Strategic Decision II; Global Sanitation Fund and Growth Scenario

- The large majority of NC’s agreed to the development of GSF, no NC disagrees.
- Key comments on GSF: (1) GSF will act as catalytic initiative for Sanitation & Hygiene in respective countries; (2) GSF supports the software activities on Sanitation & Hygiene which can bring change; and (3) GSF bridges existing gaps.
- Critique expressed to the GSF Mechanism/modality: (1) The programme content and the management structure, leaves much to be desired; (2) GSF is a bit too small to make a real impact; (3) the operational modality is bureaucratic; and (4) some doubts were raised about the effectiveness of GSF.

Geographical Focus

WSSCC, although having a global mandate, concentrates its efforts on Africa and Asia as most of the people in the world who lack water and sanitation live in these regions. The review team strongly agrees with this approach but feels that this focus isn’t matched as well as it could be in its governance mechanisms in particular on the steering committee.

The WSSCC revival from early 2007 onwards is spectacular with new ideas, new strategies, clear strategic decisions, a new host organisation and an increased number of staff in the secretariat; however, as yet, there is limited evidence of this resurgence in terms of development results. In some areas the evolutionary process has not been as quick as might have been hoped and to a degree funders may well be in a position where they must make important funding decisions based on expectations of success rather than on any impact or return on investments already made.

WSSCC has found new directions and responded to new and more explicit needs regarding the achievements of the sanitation MDGs.

Growth scenario

The strategic decision of WSSCC to grow mainly through the establishment of the GSF is a timely and highly justified decision as there is major momentum for action. GSF fits into the WSSCC mission and relates to reality at ground level, where there is an urgent cry to accelerate the achievements of the sanitation MDG. This MDG is substantially lagging behind, which impacts on the achievement of other related MDGs as well.
4.6 Paris declaration

The international agreement towards enhanced aid effectiveness has been specified in the Paris Agenda in 2005. Countries and organisations committed themselves to continue to increase efforts in harmonisation, alignment and managing aid for results with a set of monitorable actions and indicators.

An assessment WSSCC’s contribution to the Paris Declaration on components relevant to sanitation in eight countries visited can be summarised as follows:

Alignment: WSSCC activities with special reference to the GSF are to a large extent aligned with the government policies. However, in some instances GSF principle of non-subsidizing is not in line with national policies.

Harmonisation: WSSCC Trust Funds contribute to donor harmonisation and coordination. However, at national level donor harmonisation in the sanitation and hygiene remains limited.

Ownership: National ownership of the concept, the preparation, implementation and monitoring of the Global Sanitation Fund is crucial for the success of this fund. The role and place of the national government in the GSF process is in principle ensured through its leading role the National Coordinating Mechanism (NCM). Its role in the selection and the monitoring of the Executing Agency needs to be reviewed to ensure full ownership at national level.

Modality: One of the central aspects of the sector-wide approach is that it attempts to improve the way aid is coordinated with the other donors (harmonisation) and to align it more closely with the recipient government’s policy and management rules and regulations (alignment). As regard the latter, one important instrument is the deployment of aid modalities that are less earmarked. The GSF supports NGOs, multilaterals and governments core operations and long-term operations and programmes. However, GSF funding is earmarked funding for clearly defined activities, which makes it “project funding” as compared to other funding/aid modalities. It remains off budget and consequently less aligned (e.g. as compared to pooled funds, co-financing sector programmes and general and sectoral budget support). It can be argued that the project approach is suitable for GSF, especially in its early stages of development.
5 Conclusions and the Way Forward

5.1 General conclusions

WSSCC has played an important advocacy role in sanitation at a global level and a clear contribution with some of its regional activity. Through its national network WSSCC has played a substantial role in the improvement of the legislative and institutional framework in a number of countries. WSSCC’s new pillar, the Global Sanitation Fund, offers a significant opportunity at country level at an opportune time. At the same time the Global Sanitation Fund is also a calculated risk for WSSCC, as it is a new, complex and time consuming activity to be incorporated with the existing knowledge and advocacy activities.

- During the period 2005-2006 WSSCC activities came to a near standstill. The underlying reason for the slowdown was the unsuccessful process of change of institutional host.
- The WSSCC revival from early 2007 onwards is spectacular with new ideas, new strategies, clear strategic decisions, a new host organisation and an increased number of staff in the secretariat; however, as yet, there is limited evidence of this resurgence in terms of development results. In some areas the evolutionary process has not been as quick as might have been hoped and to a degree funders may well be in a position where they must make important funding decisions based on expectations of success rather than on any impact or return on investments already made.
- The main reason given amongst interviews for this revival is passionate, credible and politically astute leadership. The WSSCC needs to ensure that this credibility successfully develops and not focused on individuals. The best way of doing this will be through effective performance and the delivery of results.
- The choices made to focus on sanitation and to geographically focus on Africa and Asia are valid and based upon a good analysis of the sector and its needs.
- The development of the GSF has bought the WSSCC’s work ‘closer’ to its mission of achieving water supply and sanitation for all though, it would be helpful if the Council could be more explicit and coherent about their model of improved sanitation and how they contribute to it.
- WSSCC’s global advocacy has been concentrated on sanitation and hygiene. The materials WSSCC provides are ‘market leaders’ and world class. The WASH brand has been internalised by all major players in the sector. An independent evaluation recognised IYS and the Global WASH Campaign as the most effective advocacy campaigns in global sanitation efforts and WSSCC as being a main player in both. The assessment in particular identified the strong brand, consistency and collaboration involved in IYS as being its major strength; areas where WSSCC played a key role.
- The evaluation also assessed advocacy organisations and despite their role in ‘good’ campaigns WSSCC was not mentioned amongst the ‘most effective advocacy organisations’. WSSCC’s role in IYS is often not overtly attributed to its success; only UN-Water and others in some UN HQ departments were explicit about WSSCC’s contribution.
- Despite being extremely effective in its advocacy work the Council had no real model of what success would look like (benchmarks etc) or a clear chain of outcomes or milestones through which advocacy activity would lead or contribute to the Council’s overall goals.
- In the sanitation arena awareness has been raised and in many cases global and national institutional frameworks are in place. There is increased coordination and the major gap in
the sector is to increase resources to allow for practical action and change towards global sanitation targets. The review team strongly agrees that the focus of the new advocacy strategy on economic outcomes or other non-sanitation indicators such as health or education is an important step forward for WSSCC if they are to remain at the cutting edge of Sanitation advocacy.

- While the Council’s Knowledge Management Role is not clear to stakeholders the knowledge outputs are well regarded and add value, in particular if they are practical, accessible and seen as coming from a neutral player. The Council’s role in organizing and co-hosting learning events and training is appreciated if it involves the sharing of experience but again is not something they are widely recognised for.

5.2 Relevance

The use of improved sanitation is particularly low in SS Africa at 31% overall, even so the disparity between urban and rural areas is striking. Seven out of ten people without improved sanitation live in rural areas. At the current rate of progress, the world will miss the MDG target by 13 percentage point. Unless huge efforts are made, the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation will not be halved by 2015. Even if we meet the MDG target, there will still be 1.7 billion people without access to basic sanitation. If the trend remains as currently projected, an additional billion people who should have benefited from the MDG progress will miss out and by 2015 there will be 2.7 billion people without access to basic sanitation (JMP, 2010 report).

The rationale to focus on sanitation is that progress on sanitation is lagging behind as compared to other development issues. Sanitation is off-track for achieving the MDGs. The main reasons for lagging behind are; (i) reticence to talk about the subject; (ii) lack of political leadership and commitment for sanitation; (iii) the inconsistencies in the ways the sanitation problem is being tackled and; (iv) inadequate financing.

The mission and outcomes of WSSCC are highly relevant to the global debate and concrete activities to achieve the sanitation MDGs. The establishment of the GSF is highly relevant and started at the appropriate moment in time as the legislative and institutional framework are improving while the implementation of sanitation activities to achieve sustainable improved sanitation still needs to get off the ground. The role, structure and mechanisms of WSSCC are highly relevant. However, there is an urgent need for additional resources to ensure that a viable and feasible GSF will get off the ground.

5.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

5.3.1 Effectiveness: Mission, goals and strategies

Focus on sanitation

The strategic decision to dedicate most efforts to sanitation and hygiene, in view of the limited progress on sanitation, was an excellent choice as it provided WSSCC with a clear focus on an important but heavily neglected sub-sector and a clear niche. In the view of the review team this decision has been central to the survival as well as to the growth of WSSCC

More attention for sanitation

Attention for sanitation has increased over the last five years leading to national sanitation policies and plans, specific budgets for sanitation as well as to some improvements in the institutional
framework. WSSCC, through its global level efforts as well as through its national WASH coalitions, has played a demonstrable role in improving legislative, financial and institutional frameworks.

More attention to sanitation has resulted in the “sanitation arena” becoming more crowded. This has led to the need for a more focused strategy and also for clearer demonstrable results closer to the MDGs as there is increased competition for funding. The WSSCC have in a number of countries rather lost their influence either because National coalitions haven’t evolved beyond their original advocacy agenda; or because others (including government) have taken their place. The ‘doldrums’ period of the WSSCC may well have been a contributing factor in a number of countries. The GSF will probably revitalize WSSCC’s role at national level.

Geographical focus
WSSCC, although having a global mandate, concentrates its efforts on Africa and Asia as most of the people in the world who lack water and sanitation live in these regions. The review team strongly agrees with this approach but feels that this focus isn’t matched as well as it could be in its governance mechanisms in particular on the steering committee.

Basic principles
The assessment of the application of the basic WSSCC principles in summarised in table 17

**Table 17: WSSCC basic principles and summary assessment review team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic principle</th>
<th>Summary assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Target unserved and poor communities</td>
<td>Prominent in advocacy and relevant in choice GSF focal areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be people-centred and demand-driven</td>
<td>People centred prominent in advocacy often well translated by coordinators at national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concentrate on sanitation and hygiene, while being aware of their relation to broader water supply and water resources management issues</td>
<td>Focus on sanitation good choice. Relations with broader issues should be made more explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create demand by raising people’s awareness not by offering subsidies</td>
<td>Focus of WSSCC’s message with special reference to the GSF. Much more explicit as compared to the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promote simple, affordable and appropriate solutions</td>
<td>Solutions for specific situations as well as the process from OD, through to ODF well advanced. Solutions towards higher levels of the sanitation ladder less clear in particular when focusing on supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be sensitive to gender issues and aim for gender equality</td>
<td>Not prominently reflected in main documents any more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encourage the development of innovative financing strategies</td>
<td>Limited role for WSSCC except in case of non-subsidizing principle for sanitation. An area which perhaps requires greater focus given current needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Take into account operation, maintenance and sustainability of the services</td>
<td>Incorporated in all WSSCC activities though need to look at sustainability of CLTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Be part of well-coordinated strategies owned by the people and their governments</td>
<td>Major efforts made in this field with special reference to the GSF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Promote good governance including zero-corruption, accountability and quality control</td>
<td>Contribution through financial management systems through UNOPS as well as through the principle of competitive bidding for GSF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing, Promoting, Enabling - The WSSCC ‘three pillars strategy’

Networking and Knowledge Management, Advocacy and Communications together with the Global Sanitation Fund form the three strategic ‘pillars’ of WSSCC. It is the review teams understanding that the aim is for WSSCC’s value added in the sector to relate to its ability to ensure the three pillars make up a coherent whole, whose impact and effectiveness will be greater than the sum of its parts. There has been a common view from interviewees that this is a positive and conceptually sound approach which outlines a clear way forward. The review team feels that though some progress has been made in integrating the three areas they are still not as closely strategically aligned as they could be. There needs to be greater consistency in the messaging and strap line and further reinforcement of efforts for the ‘pillars’ to develop strategies and action plans together rather than look at how different plans might overlap.

This GSF pillar does have real potential to bolster and drive other pillars - through its enabling of increased sanitation - to provide the basis for an “evidenced whole” where GSF evidence leads to advocacy based on learning, leading to increased resources and focus and consequently to scaled up activities to achieve the sanitation goals. WSSCC needs to be aware however that GSF and its role as a funded vehicle significantly changes the nature and dynamic of WSSCC/GSF as a ‘network’. It may lead to ‘volunteer’ elements (such as NC’s) to feel that given the increased expectations on them to engage with members that there should be some financial reward for their role.

Medium Term Work Plan 2008-2012

The present WSSCC Medium Term Work Plan does not fully reflect the dynamics in WSSCC’s thinking regarding new strategies, priorities, M&E and its role and place in the sector. This has been recognised and it is now being reformulated. A new interim workplan has been produced and a new advocacy direction formulated and presented for further discussion.

5.3.2 Governance

WSSCC’s revival has been spectacular. The Secretariat has been very effective in introducing new ideas, strategies, strategic decision making and in transferring its operations to a new host organisation.

Discussions about the role, effectiveness and make-up of the Steering Committee revealed deep concerns among a number of parties. Moreover, the effectiveness of the GSF Advisory Committee has been limited.

The national coordinators are all very committed volunteers. Their effectiveness depends to a large extent on their role and place within the sector in the countries concerned. The effectiveness of the 35 national WASH coalitions differs from one country to the other depending on their role and place within the sanitation arena and the credibility of the national coordinator. The effectiveness of some of the national WASH coalitions in the eight countries visited increased while that of other coalitions substantially decreased for various reasons. GSF and increased focus on engaging members may well affect NC’s effectiveness.
5.3.3 Efficiency

Overall WSSCC’s knowledge management and networking as well as its advocacy and communications represent good value for money. The efficiency of the GSF still needs to be proven. The table summarizing data regarding the value addition of the GSF provides evidence that economies of scale need to be generated for the GSF to ensure that you get value for money. Moreover, the assumptions behind the GSF (number of people reached and unit costs involved) still need to be proven in reality.

The proposed unit costs within these nine countries vary from USD 6 to USD 9. The proposed unit costs are well below the WSSCC’s indicative planning figure of USD 15 per person for the following reasons: i) none of the programmes includes a notional for seeding micro-finance and for specific targeted subsidies and; ii) expected economies of scale as a result of working across whole focal areas.

5.3.4 Value addition of GSF

The set-up costs of the GSF are, as per definition, a relatively high percentage in the early years of the GSF. The set-up/overhead costs of the GSF include six agencies at various levels, each with a defined value addition (UNOPS, WSSCC, Executing Agency, Programme Coordinating Mechanism, Country Programme Monitor and the Sub-Grantee). The set-up costs during the first year of the GSF amount to approx. 50% of the total fund. From the second year onwards these costs will be reduced to 30% and ultimately to 20% (see table 18). This percentage is high, but could be acceptable in view of the value addition of various agencies, the accountability and transparency and effective delivery for a bigger fund. Economies of scale need to be generated. In the view of the review team the ‘costings model is appropriate if the WSSCC can generate a substantially higher income for the GSF per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties involved in GSF process</th>
<th>Value addition</th>
<th>Cost description</th>
<th>Cost as % of 2011 expenditure24</th>
<th>Cost as % of 2012 expenditure25</th>
<th>Cost as % of aspirational performance expenditure26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>UN credibility and brand. Trust Fund management, fiduciary responsibility and audit; GSF contracts tender award and administration; HR, legal and administrative services to WSSCC</td>
<td>Fixed fee 8.5% of expenditure27</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSCC Secretariat</td>
<td>GSF core team: small group of professionals with combined sanitation, grants management and procurement expertise. GSF Trust Fund architecture development, programme design and management for all countries; monitoring and supervision, lessons learning and technical knowledge development; links to and from other WSSCC</td>
<td>Fixed costs approx. $ 2.8 million in 2011, $ 3.8 million in 201228</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Calculation of unit costs is based upon the following definition: Dividing the total programme costs by the number of people who start to use an improved toilet during the period of the programme (attributable to the GSF).
23 Under the assumption that the total amount availability per country will remain $ 1 million per year. In case of more substantial amounts per country per year the costs/overhead will decrease.
24 Costs as percentage of anticipated 2011 expenditure of USD 16.5 million
25 Costs as percentage of anticipated 2011 expenditure of USD 38.5 million
26 Costs as percentage of anticipated performance expenditure of USD 100 million/year
27 Amount will vary per year
28 Increasing slightly in future years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties involved in GSF process</th>
<th>Value addition</th>
<th>Cost description</th>
<th>Cost as % of 2011 expenditure&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Cost as % of 2012 expenditure&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Cost as % of aspirational performance expenditure&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executing Agency (EA)</strong></td>
<td>Locally based, national agent competitively selected and appointed to manage the GSF grant and implement the country programme. The cost of a local EA is much lower than the equivalent staff based in Geneva. EAs bring experience on grant management in the local context and knowledge of local sanitation scene. It shares experience through monitoring and evaluation of lessons learned. The GSF investment develops national capacity of the organisations acting as EA and with EAs coaching and supporting sub-grantees.</td>
<td>Fixed costs approx. $200,000 per EA per year</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Coordinating Mechanism</strong></td>
<td>Group of country sector stakeholders for increased ownership working together for GSF in a voluntary capacity. Programme design and TORs for EA; ensuring consistency and complementarity with other programmes in country; harmonizing, attracting and influencing other sector agencies. The PCM secures effective coordination and collaboration, sets the path for SWAP, strengthens government institution’s leadership and provides a collaborative platform for sector actors. It disseminates lessons learned, influences local policy and mobilizes additional resources.</td>
<td>Fixed costs approx. $20,000 per PCM per year</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Programme Monitor</strong></td>
<td>WSSCC Secretariat’s eyes and ears on the ground. Locally based, competitively selected and appointed to assess capacity, track and verify programme implementation against programme work plan and budget, reporting to the GSF Secretariat. The cost of a local CPM is much lower that the equivalent staff based in Geneva. It facilitates the learning process.</td>
<td>Fixed costs approx. $70,000 per CPM per year</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Grantee</strong></td>
<td>Field work in the country programme to increase the number of people with access to sanitation. They are selected for their local experience.</td>
<td>Fixed grant amount approx. $1,000,000 per year per country</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSSCC
5.4 Sustainability

5.4.1 General

The governmental institutions and multi-stakeholder forums related to sanitation and hygiene are more sustainable as compared to six years ago although major improvements to institutional frameworks are still required. The establishment of National Multi-Stakeholder Task Forces chaired by national government officials provides a (fragile) first step towards and basis for institutional sustainability at government level.

As illustrated in figure 6 the main impact areas of Coalition activities and engagement at a national level appear to be their ability to influence national programmes, advocate for specific policy change and raise awareness and build commitment to the sector. This seems to be a reasonable foundation for sustainable change at a national level which is in line with the principles of the Paris Declaration; though it needs to be supported by continued pressure to ensure that increased prioritisation by government is matched by transfers of funds and resources.

At a Global level sanitation is clearly a much higher priority and the WSSCC has played a key role in ensuring there is some clear sustainable harmonisation around identification of issues and messaging and working towards a set of agreed interventions. The International Year of Sanitation is a good example of this. An increased, robust evidence base as to what works and why and how lessons may be learnt across countries is the most pressing concern for global change and it is clear that the GSF is on line to address this.

The GSF will contribute to sustainable improvements in sanitation at a household and community level if its strategy of encouraging behavioural change and the construction of toilets without subsidies is effectively implemented.

Sustainable change beyond the community level will require effective scale up by local organisations and resources.

The institutional and financial sustainability of the National WASH coalitions may be limited in many cases. These mechanisms could and often are now being replaced by other locally resourced and driven mechanisms. This may be viewed as a natural progression and evidence of successful institutionalisation if embedded in nationally owned systems.

In the view of the review team the WSSCC’s financial sustainability is always going to rely on its ability to generate donor funds. Other models such as charging members or the provision of ‘consulting services’ may provide additional ways of generating income but these are unlikely to be significant given WSSCC’s mandate and cost.

WSSCC has made major strides forward given where it was in 2007 and it has created a ‘strategic storyline’ which has the potential to be attractive to major donors. The strategy though is not without risk and at present current income levels need to increase if it is to occupy the niche it has the potential for. There is a necessity for the GSF to delivering clear and timely results if the Council is to remain a credible and attractive player. If those results are not forthcoming then the sustainability of the Council itself, including its other activities is questionable.
5.5 Outcomes

The Review team has tried to make a summary assessment of the progress made towards the eight outcomes in the WSSCC M&E protocol. Table 19 outlines that progress and tries to highlight the contribution if any made by WSSCC.

Table 19: Outcomes according to M&E Protocol, progress towards outcomes and WSSCC’s contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description WSSCC’s outcomes in M&amp;E Protocol</th>
<th>Progress towards outcomes</th>
<th>Contribution of WSSCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing country governments and support agencies acknowledge the importance of sanitation and hygiene and change their policies and strategies in accordance with the WSSCC principles</td>
<td>• The importance of sanitation and hygiene is more widely recognised • Developing country governments and support agencies change their policies • Significant improvements in some countries particularly concerning legislative frameworks and national plans.</td>
<td>• Global WASH Campaign and IYS seen as central to global pressure in this area • Clear evidence of significant contribution in some countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More countries improve national-level coordination in sanitation, hygiene and water, with Ministerial responsibility for sanitation clearly allocated. Sanitation budgets are created and funded or increased.</td>
<td>• Existing and new support agencies put more resources into sanitation and hygiene work, although not enough. • Multi-stakeholders task forces established, but still major issues concerning ministerial responsibility in a number of countries • Budgets are somewhat increasing but these are not being kept to in terms of expenditure</td>
<td>• Some specific examples of where Coalition pressure/advocacy/engagement has made a difference but not universal • Advocacy still not effective enough with resource holders outside of the sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours</td>
<td>• Behaviour is changing. • However, limited evidence of scaled up sustainable behaviour change as of yet. • Overall progress to MDG’s slow</td>
<td>• Slow implementation of GSF means that WSSCC contribution not as direct as it could have been • Success of advocacy has can be seen as making an indirect contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Water and sanitation activities around the world (programmes, projects) become more effective and their benefits become more sustainable.</td>
<td>• The most common intervention tool being put forward within the GSF is CLTS – this is in line with other agencies and the approach does appear to lead to initial impact, however there is little if any rigorous evidence of sustainability and scale-up as yet of CLTS or other tools being considered.</td>
<td>• GSF not implemented as yet – thorough process which has taken time so must work otherwise effectiveness should be questioned • Support work, advocacy and communications does seem to be stressing effectively need for sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisations and professionals in the field are</td>
<td>• Innovative ideas in sanitation and hygiene are being spread and used</td>
<td>WSSCC gets mixed response – smaller NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 Our overall assessment is based upon the eight WSSCC outcomes as formulated in its M&E protocol and as agreed upon in the WSSCC External review Inception report, May 2010. For details see table 3 of this Inception report.
### Description WSSCC’s outcomes in M&E Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description WSSCC’s outcomes in M&amp;E Protocol</th>
<th>Progress towards outcomes</th>
<th>Contribution of WSSCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>better equipped to identify successful approaches and to share, adopt and apply tacit knowledge.</td>
<td>• Less certainty about success as of yet</td>
<td>and practitioners that engage very positive of WSSCC contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sector professionals and organisations in developing countries increase their skills and knowledge through accessible, timely and relevant web-based and electronic knowledge; and awareness raising and media coverage.</td>
<td>• Overall some evidence of this but still some way to go</td>
<td>• Delay in update of website means hard to attribute to much to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Global and regional leadership for sanitation and hygiene improves</td>
<td>• Increased attention but still a crowded arena with high levels of agency competition • Establishment of the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) initiative.</td>
<td>• WSSCC does have good partnerships and good strategic relationships and partnerships. Some concern that this is over reliant on credibility of Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WSSCC’s contribution to collective global leadership is recognised by its peers</td>
<td>• Patchy given role in IYS and Global Wash Campaign</td>
<td>• WSSCC has not messaged its own role highly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in M&amp;E Protocol</td>
<td>The use of output/outcome and impact indicators within WSSCC in order to suggest a more refined and systematic set of indicators.</td>
<td>• Need further work on this in particular illustrating the value WSSCC brings and how three pillars add up to a set of outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: dark green=major contribution; light green=substantial contribution; yellow=major opportunity but contribution is less than could be expected; red=hardly any or no contribution.

### Attention for sanitation

Attention for sanitation has increased over the last five years leading to national sanitation policies and plans, specific budgets for sanitation as well as to some improvements in the institutional framework. All major players in the water and sanitation sector have played a role in improving the legislative and institutional frameworks.

It should be emphasised that still a lot needs to be done with special reference to the institutional framework. WSSCC, through its global level efforts as well as through its national WASH coalitions, has played a demonstrable role in improving legislative, financial and institutional frameworks in a number of individual countries. A summary assessment of the progress made in eight countries visited is presented in table 20.
Table 20: Summary assessment progress made during 2005-2010 in sanitation legislative and institutional framework in eight selected countries (visited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country progress in sanitation and hygiene legislative framework</th>
<th>Country progress in sanitation and hygiene institutional framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Preparatory notes and discussions during countries field visits 2010

The assessment of the outcomes can be summarised as follows:

- WSSCC’s contribution has been substantial and could be verified during the field visits in the following major fields: i) governments have acknowledged the importance of sanitation and hygiene and changed policies, departmental structures and responsibilities and strategies accordingly; ii) the national level coordination in sanitation and hygiene improved and budgets for sanitation are being made available.

- WSSCC’s contribution to awareness raising and from media coverage is demonstrably substantial.

- WSSCC’s contribution to increasing the skills and knowledge of professionals and organisations is significant and is most easily evidenced in the uptake of practical guidelines and overviews of current practice that have been produced. The material on CLTS is perhaps the best example of this.

- WSSCC’s contribution to improved global and regional leadership for sanitation and hygiene is valuable, while WSSCC’s contribution is recognised by other main players with special reference to its role in advocacy.

- WSSCC’s contribution to the following outcomes remains limited (or cannot be assessed) at present as GSF still has to start implementation; i) people achieve better hygiene outcomes through changed sanitation behaviours; ii) WSSCC activities become more effective and benefits become more sustainable.

WSSCC should consider to reduce the number of outcomes, make the indicators more explicit and synchronize the result frameworks including the outcomes and indicators of the three pillars.

5.6 Impact

Impact in terms of large number of poor people attaining sustainable access to basic sanitation and adopt good hygiene practices cannot be easily assessed in quantitative terms.
Figure 14: The WSSCC Monitoring and Evaluation Protocol, August 2009 states the following

“At the end of each year, the outputs and outcomes are monitored and reported both to the Steering Committee meeting and to the Donor Accountability Meeting...Regarding indicators, in principle WSSCC monitors its work using standard indicators such as those developed by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme and using existing monitoring mechanisms, rather than inventing its own monitoring indicators or mechanisms. One problem with this approach is that many of WSSCC’s outcomes are processes rather than concrete achievements and so indicators tend to become subjective (e.g. governments change their policies – by how much, to do what). Another problem is attribution, because much of WSSCC's work is carried out alongside other organisations (e.g. an innovative idea is spread, how much of that spreading is attributed to WSSCC? Because of those problems, WSSCC does not set simplistic numerical targets for its outcomes or its impact. Of course it is important and interesting to know how many people have gained access to improved sanitation, but it would be foolish either to quantify the numbers or to claim the credit”.

Nevertheless, the Country Programme Proposals for the GSF in nine countries are very explicit in their quantitative statements. Altogether these nine CPPs aim to change the lives of more than 28 million people. Out of these 28 million people more than 11 million people will have started to use improved toilets during the five year GSF programme period. This number of 11 million people can be attributed to the GSF and is referred to in the GSF reports as the preferred target.

The intended impact of WSSCC’s work is expressed differently in different documents. In GSF material and in the latest draft advocacy strategy, impact looks at the benefits of improved sanitation on for example improved health and quality of life. That impact is in turn linked with improved child survival, reduced population growth, improved education opportunities, improved economic productivity, improved living environment and reduced poverty.

The review team thinks assessing impact beyond the level of improved sanitation is important in particular to increase and sustain resources that are committed to both the WSSCC and to the Sanitation sector in general. The set-up of the GSF provides major opportunities in the baseline survey and analysis to capture data relevant to assess this level of impact. This baseline data can be used in the GSF evaluation process and without suggesting a direct link between the GSF interventions at local level and health and education (impact), show what changes occur.

5.7 Harmonisation, alignment and ownership

WSSCC activities with special reference to the GSF are to a large extent aligned with the government policies. However, in some instances GSF principle of non-subsidizing is not in line with national policies. WSSCC Trust Funds contribute to donor harmonisation and coordination. However, at national level donor harmonisation in the sanitation and hygiene remains limited.

The approach followed by WSSCC through the GSF follows primarily a ‘project’ modality except in Uganda where GSF is part and parcel of a SWAP. This might be seen as a traditional approach. It can be argued that the project approach is suitable for GSF, especially in its early stages of development.

30 The reasons are that unimproved toilets do not yield the full range of health benefits, that poor quality toilets may diminish people’s commitment to staying ODF, and that the MDG target definition (JMP) is also based on the use of improved toilets.
5.8 The way forward

5.8.1 Overall direction

*Remain focused on sanitation*

The strategic decision to dedicate most efforts to sanitation and hygiene, in view of the limited progress on sanitation, was an excellent choice as it provided WSSCC with a clear focus on an important but heavily neglected sub-sector and a clear niche. In the view of the review team, this decision has been central to the survival as well as to the growth of WSSCC. This focus should be maintained; however, the relation between broader water supply and water resources issues should be made more explicit.

*Deliver GSF outputs and outcomes*

The GSF has major potential to become a real Global Sanitation Fund with a substantial financial envelop. The major challenges for WSSCC will be to deliver on outcomes. The most crucial issue for WSSCC in the coming years is to deliver and deliver quickly enough on GSF outputs and outcomes in 10 countries.

WSSCC should not aim at preparing GSF in new countries in round three but should focus on additional funding in existing GSF countries (round 1 and 2) with special reference to countries with a high potential for additional GSF funding through sufficient absorption capacity.

*Aim high*

WSSCC needs to consider GSF as a truly global fund aiming to accelerate the number of people with sustainable access to improved sanitation. A financial envelop of approx. USD 100 million per year will fit WSSCC present organisational set-up. Such a fund needs to be flexible and demand driven based upon feasible requests/proposals made by individual countries. WSSCC should consider creating an opportunity for donors to contribute to GSF in specific countries taking into consideration the national absorption capacity and lessons learnt from the GSF experiences.

*Clarification of niche and future strategic focus*

To increase WSSCC’s value added and niche by ensuring an explicit and balanced symbiosis between the three WSSCC’s pillars. This should revolve around a strategy which targets resource holders and those that can influence future funding to sanitation. Arguments and performance indicators that focus on the link between sanitation and economic, health and other poverty measures should form the basis of future activities. There is a need to elaborate a clear integrated framework for all three pillars which focuses on a clear results chain towards non-sanitation specific indicators.

*Be a long term player*

The direction in which WSSCC develops implies that the Council will be a long term player in the sector at least until the sanitation MDG has been achieved. The Council needs to continually review its staffing and organisational structure and governance to ensure it is meeting this purpose. The Council should consider:

- reviewing their current functional structure
- looking at whether NC’s and national coalitions can sustainably work on a voluntary basis in particular if they have a greater role in co-ordinating membership
- review the role and membership of the steering committee, some positive changes have been made but it may still not be as effective as it could be
How to better interact with other players

Interaction with other major players is in a dynamic process of change due to the changes in the sector itself. The interaction of WSSCC through its national WASH Coalitions with the NGOs and CBOs are good and tend to intensify. The interactions with the national governments are being intensified in countries with the GSF. The development of the interrelations of WSSCC with governments, NGOs and CBOs should be closely monitored in view of the GSF.

The interactions of WSSCC with UNICEF and WSP at national level tend to decrease as these parties play a less intensive role in the National WASH Coalitions. The relations with WaterAid have tended to increase over the last few years. WSSCC may need to reflect on what this might mean to their perceived neutral broker role and their ability to convene.

The development of these interactions should be closely monitored in view of the GSF.

Differentiate between “big two” and other countries

India and China require a different approach. The direct and indirect contribution of the GSF to achieving the sanitation MDG needs to be reassessed. Inclusion of China in the WSSCC network has a high priority.

5.8.2 Future strategy options for WSSCC

Build on new mechanisms

The “traditional” and well established WSSCC mechanisms to work at national level are through the National WASH Coalition in 35 countries. In view of the changing role of the National WASH Coalitions, the new players in the sector, the competition, as well as the GSF with its new mechanisms, the relationship between WSSCC and the national level needs to be carefully reviewed and reassessed based upon the specific situation in each individual country. The potential for effective and fruitful relationships between the National WASH Coalitions and the GSF mechanisms should be further explored.

Make better use of the Membership potential

A reflection on the meaning of membership, the expectations of WSSCC as well as its individual members, the responsibilities of WSSCC as well as its members including the real value added of membership is needed and is undertaken by WSSCC at present. Effective WSSCC Membership management requires more effort for joined planning of membership activities and sufficient resourcing at all WSSCC levels: Geneva and Coalition countries.

Review relations with the national level

The WSSCC Secretariat needs to review its relations with the national level. The following options could be considered: i) strengthen the role of national coalitions and the decentralisation process of coalitions wherever possible; ii) support Programme Coordinating Mechanisms; iii) Play a pro-active role in the National Stakeholders Forums/Committees established by national governments; iv) focus on the Executing Agency; v) the appointment of national coordinators as the official WSSCC representative and as national membership co-coordinators. The efficiency and limits of the WSSCC’s voluntary mechanism needs to be reviewed in the light of future relations with and role/responsibilities of the WSSCC National representatives/coordinators and to safeguard WSSCC’s "neutral broker" role.

Focus on the development world or be universal

WSSCC’s choice to establish a GSF will impact on its organisation and management as well as on its priority setting. WSSCC needs to find a proper balance in the following two ways:
• How to balance the interrelations between the three pillars and the specific requirements of each of the pillars (e.g. advocacy also has its own dimension independent of the GSF).

• How to balance the global and regional level interventions and the implementation of the GSF in a number of specific countries.

Reorient Advocacy

Awareness has been raised and knowledge levels increased. Therefore, the purpose of the advocacy work is gradually changing from awareness to action. Moreover, the climate in which advocacy is conducted has changed with special reference to access to internet and the social media. Within this context the top-down model of lobbying governments need to be complemented with grass root advocacy.

At national level the improvements of legislative and (partly) institutional framework are gradually being achieved. Now there is a need for advocacy to play a role in explaining and monitoring the sanitation policy implementation process at provincial and district level.

Focus on impact GSF

The collection of relevant impact related data during the baseline survey process is very important as this enables WSSCC and any other party to compare these baseline data with the same type of data at the end of the programme period. Even without suggesting a direct link between the GSF interventions at local level and findings on health and education (impact), the relevant impact related data will be extremely valuable as simultaneously activities are being conducted in a large number of countries/specific situations. WSSCC should take immediate action to incorporate relevant impact data in the baseline survey process.

These impact data include health data/indicators (prevalence of diarrhoea and other related diseases amongst children), educational data (school attendance especially from girls). Moreover, specific indicators measuring behavioural change could be included (e.g. washing hands with soap after using the toilet and at other critical times). The GSF result framework already includes some indicators for measuring behavioural change.

Accelerate and simplify the GSF preparatory and implementation process

WSSCC needs to review the GSF preparatory process (Guidelines for the preparation of the Country Programme Proposals) with special reference to the following: i) focus on outcome one with other three outcomes to be placed at a lower level; ii) clarification of responsibilities of the PCM in the GSF implementation and monitoring process; iii) Sector and gap analysis to be completely reviewed and; iv) simplification of the M&E process (focused outcomes, less indicators). Moreover, a close monitoring of main issues is required while the implementation process should be accelerated wherever possible.