Summary of Decisions

**Decision 1**
The Steering Committee decides to:

a) ask the sub-group in charge of making proposals regarding the EC’s contractual arrangements to revise its proposals on the basis of the discussions held at the current meeting.

b) ask its members to send comments on the Matrix, in particular with a view to correcting factual mistakes.

c) hold another extraordinary SC meeting during the week beginning on 16 January 2016 to adopt decisions regarding the EC’s contractual arrangements.
Participants

Steering Committee Members
1. Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque, SWA
   Executive Chair and Steering Committee Chair
2. Mr. Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS
3. Mr. Dominick de Waal, World Bank
4. Mr. Jochen Rudolph, AfDB
5. Ms. Lajana Manandhar, Lumanti/FANSA
6. Mr. Patrick Moriarty, IRC
7. Mr. Paul Deverill, DFID
8. Mr. Samson Shivaji, KEWASNET/ANEW
9. Mr. Sanjay Banka, Banka Biolo
10. Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF
11. Mr. Thilo Panzerbieter, German Toilet Organization/EWP
12. Mr. Tinayeshe Mutazu, Zimbabwe

Not attending
Mr. Amjad Ehmidat, Palestinian National Authority
Ms. Ananda H. Jayaweera, Sri Lanka
Ms. Bayantuul Baasanjav, Mongolia
Ms. Claudia Coria-Bustos, Mexico
Mr. Federico Properzi, UN-Water
Mr. Ghulam Qader, Afghanistan
Mr. Jorge Mora Portiguez, FANCA
Ms. Joséphine Ouédraogo, Burkina Faso
Mr. Keph Ombacho, Kenya
Mr. Nelson Gomonda, AMCOW
Mr. Nilton Trindade, Mozambique
Mr. Achille Kangni, Benin
Mr. Samuel Ome, Nigeria

Permanent Observers
13. Mr. Bruce Gordon, WHO

Observers
14. Ms. Cindy Kushner, UNICEF

Secretariat
15. Ms. Amanda Marlin, Coordinator
16. Ms. Princess Jimenez, Events and Protocol
17. Ms. Fiona Baker, Administrative Assistant
Extraordinary Virtual Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes | 11 January 2017

Session 1 Creation of a full-time, fixed term staff position for the role of SWA Executive Chair
Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair; Paul Deverill, DFID

The Executive Chair (EC) welcomed participants to the call and introduced the single agenda item: the establishment of a staff position for the EC. As agreed in December, a sub-group of the Steering Committee (SC), composed of Sanjay Wijesekera, Patrick Moriarty and Paul Deverill, supported by UNICEF HR specialist Edou Muhima, prepared a proposal to present to the SC.

The EC proposed that members discuss the different questions in the proposal one by one, followed by the draft decision and organize a vote if there is no consensus. There were no objections to this proposal.

Paul Deverill reminded the SC that the purpose of the sub-group was to examine the current situation of the EC’s contract and make recommendations on how/if a post should be established. He then introduced the matrix containing an examination of the different possibilities around the creation of the position, as well as recommendations (drafted with the help of Piers Cross, SWA Senior Advisor). The recommendations of the sub-group were the following:

- The EC’s position should be full-time, especially considering the expansion of the partnership.
- There is some overlap between the roles and responsibilities of the EC and the Coordinator. The delegation of roles, could be strengthened to ensure cohesion and compatibility between the roles. The sub-group asks the Governance Working Group to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Chair, EC, and SWA Coordinator.
- It is challenging to make a direct comparison between SWA’s structure and that of other partnerships. SWA EC doesn’t manage a fund, but does lead the SC. Also, SWA will be moving more towards country and regional work, which makes a direct comparison even more difficult.
- Regarding the EC’s level, a D2 is very high-level and would possibly open further opportunities for SWA e.g. speaking engagements and meetings at a higher level. However, this level could also be too high, as SWA’s strength lies in the depth and width of the partnership. Donors are unlikely to support a D2 post. The sub-group recommended a D1 level post, given current and expected funding.
- Currently the SC relies on the EC to provide her own job performance assessment. The sub-group recommends that one of the first tasks of the Governance Working Group be to create an accountability mechanism for the EC.
- One of the pros of the EC post remaining in the UN system is the strong links to governments and other UN bodies. A con is that the recruitment process will be bound by UN procurement rules, another is the cost that a UN position implies. The recommendation is to keep the position within the UN system.
- The position of EC should be a fixed-term post as this provides SWA with a timeframe which gives long-term high-level security. A fixed-term post will help to attract and retain high-
value individuals. A system will need to be developed to allow the SC the ability to review this decision in three years.

- The current situation of UNICEF subcontracting to UNOPS results in paying overhead charges twice and clashes with the idea of value-for-money, raising questions with donors. Hence, the sub-group recommends that the fixed-term EC post for the next three years be hosted by UNICEF.

- The post should be advertised and go through a competitive selection process, with the objective to have it completed by the end of 2017. The incumbent EC is strongly encouraged to apply. In the interim, a partner should volunteer to host the EC between May and December 2017.

The SC then discussed the recommendations. There was a debate regarding the level of the position, with some members supporting the sub-group’s analysis regarding the cost implications, and with other members emphasizing the higher political profile a D2 would bring. It was also pointed out that there are risks to a competitive process and that a direct appointment could be a better solution.

The group agreed that the Governance Working Group had to look into several questions that arose from this process, in particular, the clarification of roles (including that of the SC, e.g. who is empowered to take what type of decisions?), the need for a robust EC accountability mechanism and the time limit of the EC position.

Catarina de Albuquerque then intervened, agreeing that the fixed-term EC should be recruited using an open competition process to get an individual with the highest qualifications possible for the post. She reminded the group that her current contract ends on 25 April (four days after the HLMs), and although IRC has offered to host her, she asked the SC to find a solution within the UN system, as otherwise she would have to pay around 40-45% in taxes. Regarding the level of the position, she believes that a D2 position would benefit SWA more than D1, and it would be comparable with other partnerships. She also made the point that, in terms of cost, there is not a significant difference between D1 and D2.

Catarina de Albuquerque agreed that the EC position needs a stronger system of accountability, and that should apply also to the Chair, Secretariat and Working Groups. She ended by informing the SC she found the matrix to be somewhat confusing and that there were some factual errors and information gaps. On funding, she informed the SC that SWA could afford a D1 or D2 position, if funding levels remained at least the same.

Paul Deverill then addressed some questions posed by the SC, saying that it would be unprecedented for a consultant to get a fixed-term UN post without a competitive process. He also underlined that donors are especially sensitive about D2 positions due to their cost, and that such a choice could undermine future DFID funding.

Sanjay Wijesekera informed the SC that in the UN system it is rather difficult to end a fixed-term post (usually only due to negative performance or if a position is no longer relevant). On the suggestion that the post be a P5, Sanjay Wijesekera mentioned it would create difficulties because the
Coordinator is a P5. A D level position would better correspond to the leadership role the EC is expected to play.

After the discussion, the SC approved the sub-group's suggestion that the current matrix be amended to correct mistakes and reflect some of the comments made during the discussion. The EC proposed that comments be made by Monday, 16 January 2016 and then have another SC meeting the week beginning in 16 January 2016. There were no objections.

Apart from the amendments to be received by email, the members attending the meeting requested a table comparing the following figures:

- The cost difference between D1 and D2 and implications of where the position is based.
- The cost of the previous consultancy contracts, including the present arrangement and that of the future interim one.

The SC also discussed whether it was possible to make decisions regarding the EC position ahead of the amendment of the Governing Document, with the group generally agreeing that, for the sake of time and efficiency, this should be the case.