

SWA Steering Committee Meeting Minutes | 14 November 2013



Summary of Action Points

Action	Responsible
Proactively review lessons learned from the PM session focusing on other sector partnership experiences.	SWA Secretariat
Mobilize constituencies (against preparatory process already defined) and take leadership on the High Level Commitments Dialogue (HLCD)	Steering Committee
Undertake activities / review of tools and guidance around HLCD and HLM.	Secretariat / HLCD sub group
Start planning scenarios for how the 2-3 hours of the HLM will work, and to share these outlines with the HLCD sub group and SC	SWA Secretariat
Address issue of UNICEF vs. SWA email addresses; ensure clarity in communications	SWA Secretariat
Circulate and disseminate text of SWA statement on the post-2015 agenda to Partnership.	SWA Secretariat
Ask H.E. John Kufuor to confirm his willingness to continue as the SWA high level Chair	SWA Secretariat
Develop a profile and terms of reference for a high level Vice-Chair and a short discussion paper on implications, options and recommendations	SWA Secretariat
Amend the Governing Document to accommodate extension of Chair's term in office	Governance Task Team/Secretariat
See how the messages from the CPTT on aid effectiveness can fit into HLCD process and donor preparatory process	SWA Secretariat
Examine how the CPTT can link with other activities within the Partnership	CPTT
Send SC members an outline of expenditures against budget for key workplan activities	Secretariat
SWA constituencies are not currently fit for purpose. To be addressed by the team leading the SWA review.	SWA review team
Forward the April 2013 paper and rapid assessment notes to Ken Caplan (leading the SWA review team) so that this issue can feed into the scope of the Review.	Heather Skilling (USAID)
Revise the statement on Observers to reflect comments made during the SC meeting and ensure that the SWA Review looks at structure of other organizations, such as WSSCC, which may shed light on this issue.	SWA Secretariat

Steering Committee Members

1. Mr. Darren Saywell, Vice-Chair
2. Mr. Salisu Abdulmumin, AMCOW
3. Ms Sumitra Amatya, Nepal
4. Mr. Roberto Acosta, Paraguay
5. Mr. Peter Mahal Dhieu Akat, South Sudan
6. Mr. Jamie Bartram, UNC
7. Ms. Maimuna Nalubega, AfDB
8. Mr Henry Northover, WaterAid
9. Mr. Dominick de Waal, WSP/WB
10. Mr. Johan Gely, SDC
11. Mr. Henry Northover, WaterAid
12. Ms. Ebele Okeke, Lead Spokeswoman
13. Mr. Jean De Dieu Rakotondramihamina, Madagascar
14. Mr. Dibalok Singha, FANSA
15. Ms. Heather Skilling, USAID
16. Mr. Leonard Tedd, DFID
17. Mr. Dennis Warner, EWP
18. Mr. Chris Williams, WSSCC
19. Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF
20. Mr. Baker Yiga, ANEW

Observers

21. Mr. Bruce Gordon, WHO
22. Mr David Michaud, World Bank
23. Mr. Federico Properzi, UN-Water

Regrets

24. Mr Patrick Apoya, WSA
25. Mr Sana Jawara, The Gambia
26. Ms Almut Nagel, BMZ
27. Mr. Irfan Tariq, Pakistan
28. Mr. Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS

Secretariat

29. Ms. Clare Battle*
30. Ms. Clarissa Brocklehurst, Senior Advisor
31. Mr. Piers Cross, Senior Advisor
32. Ms. Ceridwen Johnson, Advocacy & Communications
33. Mr. Yaw Sarkodie, Advisor

*Providing Secretariat Support

A. Welcome

Darren Saywell, SWA Vice-Chair

B. Review of the Partnership Meeting

Darren Saywell, Vice-Chair & Yaw Sarkodie, SWA Secretariat

The 2013 Partnership Meeting was generally recognized to be a significant improvement from the Johannesburg meeting in 2012. There was a stronger consensus on scope, role and niche of SWA and broader literacy about how to describe the Partnership. Several points to note included:

- There remain continuing efforts to sharpen clarity about the Partnership, particularly in defining the boundary between what SWA does and does not do;
- There was consensus that the HLM remains the activity which adds most significant value and where SWA provides a unique offering ;
- There are significant differences concerning priorities between global and national partners. The mechanism by which global support can deliver at country level remains an area for continued attention;
- Partners appreciated the efforts to bring experiences from other platforms into the learning experience of the meeting. Wherever possible, these types of sessions (the University of North Carolina inspired session on influencing Ministers of Finance was cited) need a more prominent role in program design;
- Whilst the role and contributions of different Partners are steadily emerging, some constituencies will require further guidance on the scope of their contribution (Research & Learning constituency was cited);
- CSOs have a need for support that is not adequately being responded to. This issue needs to be addressed. The CSO constituency prepared a set of proposals after the meeting (Annex B.)

Summary of comments from SC members:

- Consensus emerged that the Partnership now needs to sharpen its high-level engagement activities in the political sphere, how it can best support national level planning processes, monitoring etc.;
- The work by the Secretariat in terms of preparation for the meeting was appreciated, particularly the efforts to ensure that the Partnership Meeting was led by Partners rather than the Secretariat.
- Many Partners expressed their satisfaction with the planning and organisation of the meeting which was characterized by its inclusiveness and participation. Recommendations for the future include;
 - Resist the temptation to overload the agenda or be overly ambitious in terms of session design;
 - Focus on dialog between Partners; on lessons learned from adjacent Partnerships in other sectors (including going 'beyond Partnership' to functioning as a 'movement');
 - Incorporate visioning exercise lessons learned into future strategic plans for SWA.

Decision: The SWA Review should use the outcomes of the visioning exercise as 'insider' intelligence and consider some of the outstanding issues outlined above

Action: Secretariat – to proactively review the lessons learned from the session which focused on the experience of other sector partnerships.

C. Strengthening the Political Dialogue

1. High Level Commitments Dialogue (HLCD) and High Level Meeting (HLM)

Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF

Sanjay Wijesekera reminded the SC that the success of the Partnership will depend on both individual and collective actions of Partners on the ground. He informed the meeting that UNICEF country Representatives will be contacted and asked to support government focal points to carry out an inclusive country-level preparatory process. He requested all SC members to mobilise their own constituencies to provide leadership in the HLCD in order to bring about a successful HLM in April 2014.

On the 2014 HLM, he informed the SC that the World Bank has been engaged on both format and content; their early engagement will also facilitate logistic requirements for the meeting. The proposed HLM theme is designed to cater for the interests of finance ministers, but will require some clarity on the main takeaway. It is proposed that a senior World Bank economist be requested to speak. The Secretariat, in collaboration with the HLM sub-group, is developing a concept note on the HLM.

Summary of comments from SC members:

- Some concerns were raised around communications relating to HLCD and HLM between NYC UNICEF and the respective country offices. The process does not always work well and this needs to be addressed;
- SWA country partners were encouraged to prepare a sector-wide, inclusive road map for the country level dialog and other preparatory processes for the 2014 HLM.
- A concern was voiced that UNICEF may be inadvertently capturing visibility with respect to the High Level Meeting. Sanjay assured SC members that UNICEF does all it can to ensure SWA has separate and independent “branding” and is confident that UNICEF’s actions in this regard ensure adequate separation between UNICEF and SWA;
- We need to recall that both donors and finance ministers will be at the HLM table. As such, the meeting is an opportunity to talk about principles of donor alignment and harmonisation and building country systems;
- We need to go back and help meet commitments that have not been met, rather than just sweeping them away - they need to be fed back into the broader monitoring process.
- How do we balance looking back and looking forward? How much of the HLM do we want to spend taking stock? Can we bring in advisors from ministries of finance to help guide the preparation of the meeting?

Actions:

- Steering Committee: mobilize constituencies (against preparatory process already defined) and take leadership on the High Level Commitments Dialogue (HLCD)
- Secretariat and HLCD sub group: undertake activities / review of tools and guidance around HLCD and HLM.
- Secretariat: start planning scenarios for how the 2-3 hours of the HLM will work, and to share these outlines with the HLCD sub group and SC
- Secretariat: address issue of UNICEF vs. SWA email addresses and ensure consistency and clarity in communications

2. Post 2015 Dialogue

Leonard Tedd, DFID

Leonard Tedd shared the proposed revised SWA statement on the post-2015 agenda. The version presented to the SC included resolution of wording around the inclusion of references to the Human Right to Water and Sanitation which members of the donor constituency had discussed. The SC was reminded that the intent of the document was that it is used as a resource by partners, the Chair etc. to ensure common language across the partnership in our advocacy work on this issue. A copy of the final, approved statement is attached to these minutes in Annex A.

Decision:

- Secretariat approved revised text, subject to minor editorial changes agreed during meeting.

Action:

- Secretariat: Circulate and disseminate text to Partnership for use.

3. Chair Engagement

Piers Cross, SWA Secretariat

The SWA Chair, H.E. John Kufuor began his current term in November 2011, just prior to the 2012 HLM, where his presence added huge value in catalysing political priority around the issue. In 2013, H.E. Kufuor has been more engaged at strategic initiatives and events, such as the High Level Panel, Presidential Initiative on WASH in Nigeria, the African Union, Stockholm Water Week, and at a high-level breakfast on nutrition and WASH around the time of the UN General Assembly. The SWA Secretariat has identified and learned of more effective ways to engage the Chair.

It is clear that the Chair is passionate about our cause and is increasingly comfortable in his growing role with the Partnership. The SWA Governing document determines a three-year term of office for the high-level Chair. Given that H.E. John Kufuor has indicated an interest in continuing beyond the terms of his current mandate, the SC proposed to begin a consultation with the President to confirm his interest and availability to remain in this position.

Summary of comments from SC members:

- There was general unanimity that the President has been exemplary in his role of raising sanitation on the political agenda.
- H.E. Kufuor is hugely respected in Africa. Could the Partnership benefit from a complementary high level Vice-Chair from Asia? Could the partnership accommodate a Vice-Chair, to mobilize more countries and communities?
- Consideration should be given to the sensitivities around recruiting a high level Vice-Chair. Introducing this for the next term would be preferred. Alternatively, the partnership could also consider having a “representational Chair” or a “strategizing Chair”

Actions:

- Secretariat: ask H.E. John Kufuor to confirm his willingness to continue as the SWA high level Chair for a further 3 year term; if agreed, Secretariat to amend Governing document accordingly. If Chair declines, Secretariat to develop a proposal to guide search for a new Chair;

- Develop a profile and terms of reference for a high level Vice-Chair and a short discussion paper on implications, options and recommendations to support SC decision-making on future high level Vice-Chair appointments. The Governance Task Team/Secretariat should amend the Governing Document to accommodate extension of Chair's term in office.

D. Country Processes Task Team

Dominick de Waal, WSP (Chair CPTT)

Dominick de Waal presented a review and update of activities and progress. He explained that the situation is getting more complex, as demand for short-term results gets stronger, willingness to provide budget support gets weaker, and engagement in fragile states increases. Over the last year the CPTT has:

- Facilitated internal discussions on aid effectiveness;
- Used D-groups to share information and resources;
- Continued dialogue with Liberia, which has been a rich learning experience;
- Sent a call to off-track countries to take part in NPRI (responses from Niger, Burundi, South Sudan);
- Developed a learning and research agenda, with work from IRC, WATERAID and WSP;
- Carried out a session at Stockholm World Water Week.

The key question to consider was summarized as: “what can we do to make aid more effective and influence aid modalities?”

Summary of comments from SC members:

- We need to link NPRI back to other levels of SWA such as the unmet commitments. There is logic to working across all the three priority areas of SWA, because they are all mutually reinforcing;
- The focus of CPTT should not be limited to fragile states. Those that have had a longer span of independence are still facing challenges around aid effectiveness issues, and ensuring development partner support to country systems will help to reduce sector fragmentation;
- What we are learning so far is that the ideal environment for aid to be does not exist in many countries. We need to look at how countries understand the process;
- We need to consider the links to the donor preparatory process, particularly as donors are not looking to put more money on the table at the HLM in 2014;
- We need to ensure we document this clearly, and feed into other relevant processes.

Actions:

- Secretariat: see how these messages can fit into HLCD process and donor preparatory process
- CPTT: examine how to link with other activities within the Partnership

E. Global Monitoring Task Team

Leonard Tedd, DFID

Leonard Tedd presented on behalf of the task team Chair, Laura Westcott. The following points were highlighted:

- The Global Monitoring Task Team (or GMTT) was created with widespread support from across the SWA Partnership. This was in recognition of the crowded and duplicative nature of the current global monitoring landscape and the need to increase co-ordination and country ownership on monitoring;
- The Task Team was formed in May this year and has since held discussions on current global and national monitoring instruments and the potential for improvements in cohesion and ownership. The focus of the GMTT is on processes – the ‘how’ and ‘why’ behind progress being made and likely to be made in future in WASH;
- The discussions of the task team have focussed on two main areas: harmonisation of existing global monitoring instruments and the potential for global monitoring standards to be applied at local, national and global levels. This has resulted in the identification of a number of possible actions for the task team to take forward;
- A key early aim of the task team was to convene a meeting of leads on the main WASH global monitoring instruments, along with developing country and other Partnership members, to discuss current initiatives to harmonise and to identify other opportunities for harmonisation and standardisation both across global monitoring instruments and with respect to local and national monitoring. This meeting took place during the week of the SWA Partnership meeting. The discussion was productive and resulted in a number of steps being identified to be addressed by the GMTT.

Next steps: A virtual meeting of the GMTT will be convened before the end of the year to review the outcomes of the Geneva discussions and to agree on the actions required to address the opportunities identified. These include follow-up with the research and learning constituency on studying existing approaches to national monitoring which draw on the global monitoring instruments, with the aim of identifying best practices and priorities for standardisation. The Vice-Chair thanked Laura Westcott on behalf of the Steering Committee.

F. Secretariat update

Clarissa Brocklehurst, Ceridwen Johnson & Sanjay Wijesekera, SWA Secretariat

Clarissa Brocklehurst drew attention to the reference document, the Secretariat Update, and briefed SC members on a summary of Secretariat activities since April 2013. To complement this update, Ceridwen Johnson gave a brief review outlining the new communication tools available from SWA which partners can use in their own advocacy work, specifically relating to visual identity, website, template PPT, Word documents and written copy explaining what is SWA. Sanjay presented a high level financial report on Secretariat income and expenditures.

Action:

- Secretariat - requested to send SC members an outline of expenditures against budget for key workplan activities

G. Strengthening the Partnership

1. Governing Document

Piers Cross, SWA Secretariat

Piers Cross presented the updates outlined in the revised Governing Document, focusing attention on the unresolved issues of SWAs constituency definitions and private sector engagement. A key

outstanding question is how to simplify and re-define these constituencies to create space for 'new' members to the Partnership.

Summary of comments from SC members:

- We are trying to build a strong, wide partnership. We need to understand the added value of the private sector and how they will contribute; the difference between CSOs and other Sector Partners; the balance to achieve between exclusivity and expansion of the membership. Significant strategic questions are raised by this issue.
- A "sunset clause" for SWA was proposed. We should seek to have achieved our objectives by a certain date, and plan an exit strategy.

Action:

- SWA constituencies are not currently fit for purpose. This has to be addressed definitively and it is recommended that the team leading the SWA review focus on this aspect during their deliberations on SWA governance.

2. Executive Function

Heather Skilling, USAID

At the April 2013 SC meeting, a paper was discussed with options for creating an 'Executive Function' within the governance structure of SWA to streamline and improve decision making processes. At the time, the decision was taken to delay a resolution on this item, instead allowing for improvements in the quality of governance structure support to take full effect. Heather Skilling was asked to revisit this issue ahead of the autumn steering committee meeting.

A rapid assessment was undertaken of partners' perceptions with regard to the improved functioning of governance for the Partnership ahead of the SC meeting. Email correspondence to SC members was sent, asking for opinions on relative progress and the need to address an Executive Function. A small number of SC members responded (7/25), but the general signal at this time was that members felt improvements had been realized.

Discussion within the group felt that the team leading the SWA review should further include this item in their scope of work and report back in 2014.

Action:

- Heather Skilling: to forward the April 2013 paper and rapid assessment notes to Ken Caplan (leading the SWA review team) so that this issue can feed into the scope of the Review.

3. Standing Observers

Darren Saywell, Vice-Chair

The Vice-Chair outlined the proposals included in the reference document, "Observers to the SWA SC", including a tabled request from UN-Water to become a standing observer. The SC discussed the note, making a number of editorial changes to the criteria to be applied to standing observers.

Decisions:

- The guiding principle is to keep the number of observers to the SC to a minimum;

- When observer status is granted, the SC is to be clear on the point/s of engagement of the member and they are encouraged to engage on those points;
- Observers cannot vote;
- Observers can review documents, but must channel comments through an existing SC member;
- UN Water, WHO and Germany are endorsed as standing observers but the focus of their engagement must be clarified.

Action:

- **Secretariat:** Revise the statement on Observers to reflect comments made during the SC meeting and ensure that the SWA Review looks at structure of other organizations, such as WSSCC, which may shed light on this issue.

4. Update on SWA Review

Piers Cross, SWA Secretariat

The meeting was informed of the two stages of the SWA Review:

- Stage one will take place in advance of the HLM and many partners will be interviewed. The consultant team will also focus on issues of governance during this period and a report on this stage will be produced by February 2014.
- Stage two will track HLM preparation and what happens at the HLM. The Consultants will bring it all together into a final report around June 2014.

Decision:

- SWA Review team to consider these issues for the Review ahead of February 2014.

NEXT MEETING: A virtual meeting in late February / early March 2014 should focus on the HLM meeting preparation and the inception report from the SWA Review. The next face-to-face SC meeting should take place one month after the HLM. It should be in a location that is “close to reality”, that is, in a partner developing country.