

HAITI

SWA COLLABORATIVE BEHAVIOURS: COUNTRY PROFILES 2017

An introduction to the profiles

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

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

Using the profiles

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

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

About development partners' responses


A main data source for development partners in the country profiles is the GLAAS 2016/2017 External Support Agency (ESA) survey. All development partner data in the profiles are from the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey unless otherwise stated. For Haiti, three ESAs^{1,2} provided feedback specifically on the country (out of 25 ESAs that responded to the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey). Because not all ESAs answered the GLAAS ESA survey for each country (they were each asked to answer for their top 14 countries), the country profiles do not capture all development partner activity in the country. Further work is required to collect more data from ESAs to better show their work in countries.

¹ The three ESAs that provided country-specific data for Haiti in the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey are: IDB, USAID and Water.org.

² In the GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey, the World Bank provided information on how it works in all countries. World Bank data in this profile are not specific to Haiti.

BEHAVIOUR 1

ENHANCE GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP OF SECTOR PLANNING PROCESSES

| INDICATORS | GOVERNMENT | DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1.1 A regularly reviewed, government-led national plan² for WASH is in place and implemented | ★☆☆☆☆ ⁴ | |
| 1. Sanitation | ✗ Urban plan ✗ Rural plan | |
| 2. Drinking-water | ▣ Urban plan ▣ Rural plan | |
| 3. Hygiene promotion | ▣ | |
| 4. Institutional WASH (e.g. schools and health care facilities) | ✗ Schools ▣ Health care facilities | |
| 5. Policy and plan coverage targets for specific WASH areas | Data not available | |
| 6. Policy and plan specific measures to reach vulnerable groups ⁵ | ✗ | |
| 1.2 A formal government-led multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism exists for sector planning and review | ★★★★★ | Insufficient data |
| 1. A government-led formal mechanism exists to coordinate activities of different organizations/sectors with responsibilities for WASH (health, education, environment, public works, etc.) | ✓ | |
| 2. Multi-sector coordination process bases its work on agreed national plan | ▣ | |
| 3. Mechanism includes all ministries and government agencies that directly or indirectly influence service delivery | ▣ | |
| 4. Mechanism includes donors that contribute to WASH activities nationally | ✓ | |
| 5. Mechanism includes non-governmental stakeholders (i.e. NGOs, civil society organizations, advocacy groups) | ✓ | |
| 6. Coordination process is documented and publicly accessible | ✓ | |
| 7. Development partners ⁶ that are active and regularly participate in national coordination platform | | ▣ Water.org ⁷ Data not available for other partners |
| 1.3a Percentage of WASH activities that are a) captured in the national WASH plan or b) aligned with a government national WASH plan through a mutual agreement (e.g. MoU, SWAp) | Insufficient data | Data not available |
| 1. TOP 5 GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES/NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (in terms of WASH budget) | | |
| a. Ministry of Public Works / National Directorate of Drinking-Water (DINEPA) | 1% | |
| b. Ministry of Public Health and Population / Directorate of Health Promotion and Protection of the Environment | Data not available | |
| c. Ministry of the Environment / Directorate of the Environment | Data not available | |
| d. Data not available | Data not available | |
| e. Data not available | Data not available | |
| TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water & sanitation aid, 2013–15 disbursements) | | |
| a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| b. Canada | | Data not available |
| c. Japan | | Data not available |
| d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| f. United States of America | | Data not available |
| 2. Donors have signed an agreement (i.e. MoU, compact) with the government that cites support to government-led national plan | Compact signed (2013) ⁸ | |
| 1.3b ODA allocated to strengthening/supporting or developing (in the absence of) sector planning processes as a proportion of ODA | | |
| 1. Proportion of water and sanitation ODA allocated to water and sanitation policy and administration and education and training⁹ | | |
| | |  <p>8%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WASH ODA allocated to policy, administration, education and training WASH ODA annual average 2013 to 2015 (US\$ 32 million) |

✓ Yes ▣ Partly ✗ No

BEHAVIOUR 2

STRENGTHEN AND USE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

| INDICATORS | | GOVERNMENT | DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS |
|-------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2.1a | Government has defined public financial management and procurement systems that adhere to broadly accepted good practices^{10,11} | ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆ | |
| | 1. Completeness of annual financial reports | ▣ | |
| | 2. Procurement methods | ✗ | |
| | 3. Public access to procurement information | ✗ | |
| | 4. Quality of budget and financial management information ¹² | ▣ | |
| | 5. Quality of public sector management and quality of institutions ¹³ | ▣ | |
| | 6. Supreme Audit Institution independence | Data not available | |
| | 7. Supreme Audit Institution publishes reports on WASH | ▣ | |
| 2.1b | Public sector budget and expenditure reporting enables the number and cost of civil servants working at central, regional and local levels to be estimated for different sectors¹⁴ | ★ ★ ☆ ☆ ☆ | |
| | 1. Degree of integration and reconciliation between personnel records and payroll data | ✗ | |
| | 2. Timeliness of changes to personnel records and the payroll | ✗ | |
| | 3. Internal controls of changes to personnel records and the payroll | ▣ | |
| | 4. Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers | ▣ | |
| 2.2a | Development partners adhere to country planning processes and policies | | Data not available |
| | 1. Percentage of ODA spending using country procurement system(s) (%) | | |
| | TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements) | | |
| | a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| | b. Canada | | Data not available |
| | c. Japan | | Data not available |
| | d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| | e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| | OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| | f. United States of America | | Data not available |
| | 2. Development partners using country public financial management systems ¹⁵ | | |
| | TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements) | | |
| | a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| | b. Canada | | Data not available |
| | c. Japan | | Data not available |
| | d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| | e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| | OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| | f. United States of America | | Data not available |
| 2.2b | Amount of ODA allocated to strengthening country systems compared to WASH infrastructure projects | | Insufficient data |
| | 1. Proportion of water and sanitation ODA where participatory development and good governance (PDGG) is principal (and/or significant) objective | | 16% Significant 2% Principal |
| | 2. Proportion of water and sanitation ODA to support strengthening sector systems/capacity | | Data not available |
| | TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements) | | |
| | a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| | b. Canada | | Data not available |
| | c. Japan | | Data not available |
| | d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| | e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| | OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| | f. United States of America | | Data not available |

✓ Yes ▣ Partly ✗ No

BEHAVIOUR 3

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

| INDICATORS | | GOVERNMENT | DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|
| 3.1a | A formal government-led multi-stakeholder review mechanism exists | ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆ | Data not available |
| | 1. A national assessment for drinking-water, sanitation, and hygiene is available (year of latest assessment) | ✗ | |
| | 2. A review mechanism is in place to assess progress on a regular basis and results are acted upon | ✓ | |
| | 3. The mechanism applies evidence-based decision-making, including consideration of agreed indicators (e.g. access, WASH related disease, WASH finance) | ▣ | |
| | 4. Development partners that indicate being part of a mutual assessment exercise | | Data not available |
| 3.1b | Routine monitoring systems provide reliable data to inform decision-making in WASH | ★ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ | |
| | 1. Routinely collected data are available on sanitation and drinking-water | ▣ | |
| | 2. Information and results are accessible to all stakeholders (i.e. data are reported in a usable format) | ✗ | |
| | 3. Data collected are used to inform decision-making (i.e. results are incorporated into country monitoring systems or reviews and acted upon) | ✗ | |
| | 4. Data are timely, reliable and endorsed by a multi-stakeholder forum | Data not available | |
| | 5. Level of disaggregation allows for assessment of inequalities ¹⁶ | ✗ | |
| | 6. Members of the public have an effective mechanism to file complaints regarding WASH services | ▣ | |
| 3.2a | Data collected through partner programs feed into country monitoring systems | | Insufficient data |
| | 1. Donor results are incorporated into country monitoring systems | | ✗ Water.org ¹⁷ |
| | 2. NGO and civil society results are incorporated into country monitoring systems | | Data not available for other partners |
| 3.2b | ODA allocated to strengthening or developing (in the absence of) monitoring and evaluation systems | | Insufficient data |
| | 1. Donors providing ODA to support strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems ¹⁸ | | ✓ AFD, BMGF, IDB, JICA, Switzerland ▣ BMZ, EC, UNDP, UNICEF, USAID Data not available for other donors |

✓ Yes ▣ Partly ✗ No

BEHAVIOUR 4

BUILD SUSTAINABLE WATER AND SANITATION SECTOR FINANCING STRATEGIES THAT INCORPORATE FINANCIAL DATA FROM TAXES, TARIFFS, AND TRANSFERS AS WELL AS ESTIMATES FOR NON-TARIFF HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE

| INDICATORS | GOVERNMENT | DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS |
|---|--|--|
| 4.1 Data are available on taxes, transfers, and tariffs and their contribution to the WASH sector | Insufficient data | Data not available |
| 1. Information is available on national budgets and expenditures (taxes and transfers) | | |
| a. WASH budgets are available from government ministries and institutions | ▣ 1 of 3 ministries | |
| b. WASH government expenditure reports are available | ✗ | |
| c. WASH government expenditure data are available | ✗ | |
| i. Central government | Data not available | |
| ii. State/provincial government | Data not available | |
| iii. Local level | Data not available | |
| d. WASH external support expenditure reports are available | ✗ | |
| e. WASH external support expenditure data are available | ✗ | |
| i. International public transfers (if applicable) | Data not available | |
| ii. Voluntary transfers (NGOs and foundations) (if applicable) | Data not available | |
| 2. Revenue estimates from tariffs are available from utilities or other service providers | | |
| a. Sanitation | Data not available | |
| b. Drinking-water | Data not available | |
| 3. Non-tariff household expenditure data (self-supply) on WASH are available | | |
| a. Sanitation | Data not available | |
| b. Drinking-water | Data not available | |
| 4. Proportion of total spending published and shared with ministries | | |
| TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements) | | |
| a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| b. Canada | | Data not available |
| c. Japan | | Data not available |
| d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| f. United States of America | | Data not available |
| 4.2 Finance plan exists and defines if operations and basic maintenance is to be covered by tariffs or household contributions | ★☆☆☆☆ | |
| 1. Urban sanitation | ✗ | |
| 2. Rural sanitation | ✗ | |
| 3. Urban drinking-water | ▣ | |
| 4. Rural drinking-water | ▣ | |
| 4.3a WASH assistance is a) on treasury or b) on budget | | Data not available |
| 1. Donors going through national budget (disaggregated) | | Data not available |
| 2. Per cent of donors providing targeted support for sector funding | | Data not available |
| 3. Proportion of total water and sanitation-related ODA that is included in the national budget | | Data not available |
| 4. Proportion of total water and sanitation-related ODA that is channeled through the treasury | | Data not available |
| 5. Sector budget support to governments (not targeted to specific projects) | | Data not available |
| TOP 5 EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES (in terms of water and sanitation aid, 2013–2015 disbursements) | | |
| a. Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Special Fund | | Data not available |
| b. Canada | | Data not available |
| c. Japan | | Data not available |
| d. EU Institutions | | Data not available |
| e. Switzerland | | Data not available |
| OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCIES THAT PROVIDED DATA ON HAITI | | |
| f. United States of America | | Data not available |
| 6. Number of donors using pooled funding ¹⁹ | | 2 donors ²⁰ |
| 7. Number of donors providing general budget support | | 3 donors ²¹ |
| 4.3b WASH financing is predictable | ★★★★☆ | Insufficient data |
| 1. Funding committed versus funding dispersed over the last three fiscal years | Domestic absorption Urban and rural sanitation Urban and rural drinking-water supply Over 75% | Absorption of external funds Urban and rural sanitation Urban and rural drinking-water supply Over 75% |
| 2. Donors committed to multi-year funding (three or more years) under a multi-year investment plan or strategy ²² | | ✓ AFD, BMGF, BMZ, IDB, JICA, Switzerland, UNDP, UNICEF, USAID ✗ EC, WB Data not available for other donors |

✓ Yes ▣ Partly ✗ No

BEHAVIOUR 1

3. A plan sets out targets to achieve and provides details on implementation (based on policies where these exist). It indicates how the responsible entity will respond to organizational requirements, type of training and development that will be provided, and how the budget will be allocated, etc.
4. Aggregate score of sub-indicators. Level of achievement is based on score divided by possible total. Eighty per cent and higher ($\geq 80\%$) is five stars; sixty (60%) to less than eighty per cent ($< 80\%$) is four stars; forty (40%) to less than sixty per cent ($< 60\%$) is three stars; twenty (20%) to less than forty per cent ($< 40\%$) is two stars; and below twenty per cent ($< 20\%$) is one star. Aggregate score is not computed if more than half of the responses are "Data not available".
5. Access for vulnerable groups: specific measures exist for "poor populations" (GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey).
6. Development partners include civil society, nongovernmental organizations, donors and others involved in aid development.
7. Country response indicated that three to 10 partners were active and participated in national coordination platform (Haiti GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey).
8. <https://www.internationalhealthpartnership.net/en/ihp-partners/haiti/>
9. Percentage and total amount shown is based on annual average disbursement from 2013 to 2015; Source: OECD-CRS, 2016.

BEHAVIOUR 2

10. Dimensions 1-3 and 6 are PEFA (Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability) scores, based on an A to D scale (<https://pefa.org/content/pefa-framework>).
11. Dimensions 4 and 5 are CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scores based on a 1.0 to 6.0 scale.
12. Quality of budgetary and financial management assesses the extent to which there is a comprehensive and credible budget linked to policy priorities, effective financial management systems, and timely and accurate accounting and fiscal reporting, including timely and audited public accounts. (1=low to 6=high) Source: <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=country-policy-and-institutional-assessment,2015>.
13. The public sector management and institutions cluster includes property rights and rule-based governance, quality of budgetary and financial management, efficiency of revenue mobilization, quality of public administration, and transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector. (1=low to 6=high) Source: <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=country-policy-and-institutional-assessment,2015>.
14. Dimensions 1-4 are PEFA (Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability) scores, based on an A to D scale (<https://pefa.org/content/pefa-framework>).
15. Data for this indicator are not currently collected at the global level.

BEHAVIOUR 3

16. Inequalities are assessed for "poor populations" (for water, sanitation and hygiene promotion) (GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey).
17. Haiti GLAAS 2016/2017 country survey indicates that three to seven partners are reporting results of monitoring back to government institutions. The World Bank GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey notes that all World Bank investments and results are in the public domain.
18. Data for this indicator are not country specific. Source: GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey question on if monitoring and evaluation is a priority for the ESA WASH strategy and/or activities in the WASH sector.

BEHAVIOUR 4

19. Pooled funds aim to reduce the transaction costs of aid for recipients by channeling finance from multiple donors through one instrument (e.g. pooled or basket fund).
20. GLAAS 2013/2014 ESA survey. Donors indicated using pooled funding mechanisms: European Commission and the World Bank. Donors did not provide country specific information.
21. OECD-CRS, purpose code 51010. The three donors are: EU Institutions, France and IMF (Concessional Trust Funds).
22. This could include sector investment plans and medium-term expenditure frameworks. Data for this indicator are not country specific. Source: GLAAS 2016/2017 ESA survey.

Background on the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles

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

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

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

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