## Decisions

### Decision 1: Agenda
The Steering Committee approves the draft agenda for the meeting.

### Decision 2: Minutes
The Steering Committee approves the minutes of its March 2017 virtual meeting.

### Decision 3: SWA Mutual Accountability Mechanism
The Steering Committee approves the Mutual Accountability Mechanism as proposed by the High-Level Political Dialogue Working Group and asks the Executive Chair to lead a task team to finalize the document and to propose a plan on how to operationalize it by the next (virtual) Steering Committee meeting. The task team shall take into account the conclusions from the Country Processes Working Group case studies and the discussion points raised in the Steering Committee meeting.

### Decision 4: HLPD Looking Forward
Concerning the timing and location of the 2018 meetings in the High-Level Political Dialogue cycle, the Steering Committee, taking into account what this implies for subsequent meetings, decides the following:

1. To ask the Secretariat to develop, by mid-July, a table that considers options for meeting(s) (e.g. SMM, PM, SMM+PM, SMM merged with PM)
2. And for each of these, identifies:
   - Purpose(s)
   - Implications – political, capacity (Secretariat, host government and lead SWA partner), financial
   - Location (which region)
3. For the HLPDWG to discuss these options and make recommendations to the SC by end July.
4. For the SC to make a decision by email by mid-August which is sufficient to allow the Secretariat to approach potential country hosts and to start preparations for the meeting(s).

### Decision 5: Country Processes Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the CPWG for its report and approves its work plan for the remainder of 2017.

### Decision 6: SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles.
In conformity with SWAs Guiding Principles, namely that evidence must be transparently shared to inform policy-making and action at all levels, the Steering Committee decides to make available, via the SWA website and other means, the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles after a quality assurance and peer-review process led by the CPWG. This work should be accomplished, for 5 Country Profiles, by the end of September 2017. In September, 2017 the CPWG will also propose a timeline for finalization of the remaining profiles.

### Decision 7: Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the GMHWG for its report, thanks Jeff Goldberg for his work as Chair of the CMHWG, decides to suspend its work and reactivate it when a particular need for work on monitoring harmonization arises.
**Decision 8: Update from the Executive Chair**
The Steering Committee thanks the Executive Chair for her activities and requests her to share her revised work plan by the end of July 2017 and her upcoming report with the Governance and Finance Working Group in advance of the December Steering Committee meeting.

**Decision 9: Secretariat Update and Financial Report**
The Steering Committee:
- Thanks the Secretariat for its activities and notes the 2017 interim financial report and asks the Secretariat to revise the 2017 budget forecast in line with predicted expenditure.
- Asks the Governance and Finance Working Group and the Secretariat to agree on a set of formats for financial, narrative, and outcome reporting by the end of August 2017.

**Decision 10: Work planning and reporting**
The Steering Committee requests that the Executive Chair and the Secretariat enter into a biannual sharing and review of work plans and reports with the Governance and Finance Working Group in advance of all future face-to-face Steering Committee meetings.

**Decision 11: Support to countries**
The Steering Committee requests that the Executive Chair and the Secretariat work together with the Country Processes Working Group to develop proposals for strengthening capacity to support countries, to be submitted for discussion at the September 2017 Steering Committee meeting.

**Decision 12: UNOPS Geneva**
The Steering Committee decides to discontinue the arrangement for employment of a P3 Communications Officer and related communications activities in Geneva with UNOPS from 01 January 2018, notwithstanding the outcome of the Governance Review.

**Decision 13: Governance and Finance Working Group**
The Steering Committee thanks the Governance and Finance Working Group for its report.

**Decision 14: Executive Chair post**
The Steering Committee thanks UNICEF for its offer to create a P6/D1 position for the Executive Chair for Sanitation and Water for All and undertakes to ensure that the Governance and Finance Working Group creates a mechanism to manage the performance of the post-holder.

**Decision 15: Secretariat accountability**
The Steering Committee, in order to ensure clearer accountability lines between the different components of SWA, decides that the Secretariat will be accountable to the Executive Chair, who in turn will be accountable to the Steering Committee. UNICEF will no longer be accountable for the performance of the Secretariat. This decision will enter into force once the new Executive Chair position is filled.

In line with these decisions (14 and 15), the Steering Committee acknowledges that SWAs new Governing Structure will need to clarify that the positions of Executive Chair and Chair of the Steering Committee are separate. Equally, it will need to fully clarify the role of the Steering Committee and its Chair in overseeing and making accountable the role of the Executive Chair.²

---

¹ A correction was made to the decisions to reflect that the post would be at the P6/D1 grade.
² The statement complementing Decisions 14 & 15 was approved based on a no objection decision from email sent on 14 July 2017 by Catarina de Albuquerque, SWA Executive Chair.
**Decision 16: Partnership Applications for Discussion**
The Steering Committee has reviewed the submission from Christian Outreach Justice Mission Sierra Leone (Comin-SL) and decides it they will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency.

**Decision 17: Private Sector Working Group**
The Steering Committee asks the Private Sector Working Group to:
- reassess its composition;
- develop a strategy and work plan to be presented at the next face-to-face Steering Committee meeting.

**Decision 18: WASH-Nutrition Working Group**
The Steering Committee thanks the WASH-Nutrition Working Group for its report and approves its work plan for the remainder of 2017.

**Decision 19: Global Leaders Group**
The Steering Committee thanks the Executive Chair for her report and asks her to reactivate the Global Leaders Group search committee. Noting the similarity between this action and the proposal from The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to fund the establishment of a high-level commission on WASH, the Steering Committee requests the Secretariat to explore potential linkages, and if appropriate link this to the work of the Global Leaders Group.

**Decision 20: Global Architecture Task Team**
The Steering Committee requests the representative of The Netherlands to set up and chair a task team to develop a position for the partnership on the links between WASH and Integrated Water Resource Management, including SWA's position in the global water architecture.

**Decision 21: Steering Committee elections**
The Steering Committee endorses the revisions to the proposal for the 2017 SWA Steering Committee Elections as presented in the attached operational note. Specifically, the Steering Committee decides to:

a) apply a standard principle to open for election all sub-constituencies with a single seat;
b) adopt the proposed process for the elections including: the measures to merge the CSO and CBO constituencies, and the provision for the CSO constituency to oversee its electoral process; plans to approach the only partner in the developed countries constituency to take up the vacant seat; and the entire work plan ending with the announcement of the full Steering Committee Members soon after the votes;
c) request the Governance and Finance Working Group to discuss procedures for future elections, particularly for the CSO constituency and Private sector where networks are involved (in particular deciding on whether members of networks are to be automatically considered as SWA partners);
d) appoint Muyatwa Sitali as the SWA 2017 Steering Committee Election Officer.

---

3 Decision 21 was added an approved no a no-objection basis by 7th July, 2017.
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**Session 1: Introductions and Overview**  
*Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair*

Catarina de Albuquerque welcomed the Steering Committee to Budapest and proposed a change to session 16 - Any Other Business – to add an update on the upcoming Steering Committee elections. There were no objections and nothing additional to add. The agenda was approved.

The Executive Chair noted with thanks the updates that were submitted by Steering Committee members on their activities, but also requested that members engage with their constituencies throughout the year and submit papers on time in advance of Steering Committee meetings. She then suggested to move on to the next agenda item, the approval of minutes from the March Virtual Steering Committee meeting.

Thilo Panzerbieter raised a question on the text on pg. 8, regarding the Steering Committee being a part of the selection panel of the recruitment for the Executive Chair. He asked for clarification of how that would work. It was explained that this would be further discussed in a later session and the minutes were approved.

**Session 2: Accountability Mechanism**  
*Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair and Clare Battle*

CTA started her presentation by providing some historical context, explaining that the discussion on the need for an accountability mechanism for SWA had been going on for some time. Prior to the adoption of the SDGs, SWA had a mechanism called ‘commitments’ which were made at the HLMs, and had mid-term assessments, and final reports using a traffic light system. Without the commitments, the need for an updated mutual accountability mechanism became apparent, although noting that the accountability mechanism should not create a parallel reporting requirement to any existing reporting mechanisms.

CTA presented a breakdown of the proposed accountability mechanism presented in SC paper 5, and possible ways to operationalize it. She concluded the presentation by noting that it is important for SWA and the Steering Committee to consider the following questions:

- What kind of framework can accompany the Building Blocks to ensure we can encourage partners to make commitments that are better aligned with the SDGs?
- What is the role of the Guiding Principles? Are they sufficient?
- Should there be an element of independent assessment/review to the accountability mechanism?

CTA then invited Clare Battle from the Country Processes Working Group to present preliminary findings from the Country Case Studies. CB explained that the case studies are due to be complete at the end of the year, but as they provide good insights into how SWA works at country level, she had been invited to share preliminary findings to support the discussion on accountability.

[See presentation]

**Discussion on Accountability Mechanism**

Fiona Gore noted the great progress since the last revision, but emphasized that the language needed to be stronger to show that SWA is putting the country at the centre. She suggested that the
health sector could be used as inspiration, in particular that having an independent review is critical. She also stated that there are existing mechanisms and noted that the success factors for the health mechanism were independent review and the fact that the accountability mechanism has a human rights focus.

CTA responded that it is the full intention of the accountability mechanism to have the country at the centre, and suggested that the language could be strengthened in the next review to better reflect that.

Sanjay Wijesekera said that the accountability mechanism is fundamental to the partnership: we need to know what we are doing and assess how well we are doing. He said UNICEF likes the idea that this paper speaks to the framework and that there is a commitment to seeing and monitoring how countries progress and to seeing how, through the Collaborative Behaviours, we are all accountable for supporting countries.

Peter Mahal referred to the information presented on the Country Case Studies, and said that is the conclusions also relevant to other countries. He stated that we have to draw out the best of what has been going on. He said we will see best results from countries if there is appropriate support at the global and regional level.

Amanda Marlin raised the question of how do we avoid forcing a reporting rhythm on countries that doesn't work for local planning schedules.

In response, it was recognized that the timing issue is difficult, but one way to do it is to have the SMM forum as a review of the latest report and not to ask for a report connected to meeting schedules.

CTA suggested that the session on the following day, “Strengthening the partnership at the national level” would be another place to speak about the national focus. She explained that when putting in place an accountability mechanism, the discussions at the global level could start with a technical meeting that would make recommendations to politicians; this meeting would lead to a political level meeting, where recommendations are endorsed.

Paul Deverill congratulated the team working on the paper saying that in his opinion, the document is 98% there. He urged that it should be finalized at this meeting. He also suggested that we build a ‘door frame’ into the document that suggests a connection to the High Level Political Forum. Paul also suggested that we ‘calendarise’ the JSRs, so we can know when they are happening, as this would also shift the emphasis to the country timeframe.

Canisius Kanangire also stated that the accountability mechanism is important and said that he agreed that it be at country level as that is where commitments need to be made. However, he also said he would like to focus on the global and regional levels and ensure coordination and collaboration, so we can create synergy and not swamp or overwhelm countries.

Federico Properzi reiterated the point that mutual accountability goes to the core of why SWA exists. He also made the point that there has been a shift (since 2005), where we now seldom see the word accountability in any documents. He said that the universality of the agenda needs to be improved and built upon in the document and that SWA needs to use its existing link to the HLPF. He strongly urged the Steering Committee to ensure this mechanism does not create another system of monitoring and reporting.
Patrick Moriarty agreed with the comments from PDe and reflected that it is important to develop strong national systems so that turnover of ministers does not interrupt progress. He said it is part of our job to ensure there are strong national processes that make it easy for new ministers to step into their roles.

TP also congratulated everyone who worked on the document and welcomed the fact that the guiding principles are anchored in the document. Civil Society has been talking about this a lot and they also agree on avoiding duplication. He said that with the old accountability framework we told countries commitments had to be SMART. For CSOs who want to engage with governments, it is important that there is a timeline – so they would be looking for commitments that would define the steps involved.

The discussion then continued on to ensuring the wording in the decision takes into account the recommendations from the case studies and considered who would work on ‘operationalizing’ the document. It was noted by FG that 90% of the Building Blocks are already being monitored. There was also some discussion on whether or not the document needed common indicators, but there was no consensus.

It was agreed that the Executive Chair would lead a small team of people to finalize the document. PMo, TP, SW, FG, CB, PMa and the Secretariat volunteered to continue working on the paper.

**Session 3: Looking Back – High-level Political Dialogue**

**Update from the HLPD Working Group**

*Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair*

CTA reported that the HLPD Working group had held: 4 meetings (3 pre-HLM, 1 post-HLM). The focus was to work with UNICEF and World Bank on HLMs (strategy, themes, agendas, speakers). The group is currently working on the accountability mechanism, and considering the location of upcoming HLMs. In coming weeks they will be working on the Stockholm World Water Week strategy.

**Report on Finance Ministers’ Meeting (FMM)**

*Mr. Dominick de Waal*

Dominick de Waal provided a report on the FMM, noting that he had seen the CSO feedback, which the Bank thought was good and raised valid points. The chosen theme was ‘financing the SDGs and how to plug the gap’. He noted that the preparatory work leading up to the meetings was really positive and that the efforts to get costings to countries, and the webinars, were a very good thing. He noted that the key weakness was that we failed to get sector ministers in country to talk to finance ministers before they came to the meeting.

He further noted that while there was some follow through, the linkages between the SMM and the FMM could have been stronger and it was felt that the meeting was ‘over programmed’ and didn’t leave enough time for Ministers to speak. He suggested that for future meetings, a different format could be considered, for example, it could be a shorter meeting (45 mins) which involves short announcements and greater feedback from Finance Ministers. DDW also said that the time involved in preparing for the meeting is immense and recognized that UNICEF has shoulder this 3 times before.
He also said that the preparatory process helped contribute to a shift in the dialogue within the Bank with senior managers and led to a very positive change in management’s understanding of the issues of financing water. In addition there has been significant follow-up from Finance and Sector Ministers with several countries reaching out to ask for further support and information on how to better leverage the finance they have.

Report on Sector Ministers’ Meeting (SMM)

*Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera*

SW started his report on the SMM by thanking DDW and noted that getting the World Bank engaged in the way it did has been very important to the partnership. He agreed with the feedback DDW provided on the FMM.

On the SMM, he noted that the feedback had been that the content was really good. The plenary sessions were substantive and were not simply representational, addressing issues such as participatory budgeting and accountability as a discussion and not a lecture. He also emphasized the importance of the presentations from India and China.

SW also stated that the preparatory work was important and the number of countries that presented in the breakout groups was very high. He pointed out that the main thing missing from this series of meetings was the accountability mechanism. He pointed out that while participation was excellent and the meeting has been ‘institutionalized’, it is important that we have a clear purpose when we come together for these High-level Meetings.

Discussion

AM, speaking on behalf of the Secretariat explained that the Chair’s statement was issued directly after the meeting and the summary report is currently being prepared. She reported that ministerial participation at the two meetings was as follows:

- SMM - 41 sector ministers (compared to 30 in Ethiopia)
- FMM – 17 finance ministers (compared to 21 in 2013) and 30 sector ministers

PMo, speaking on behalf of the R&L constituency said that overall they were a well-organized set of meetings. He noted that from their perspective the preparatory process was not sufficiently strong and resulted in a sense of alienation from some constituencies with particular regards to the preparation of background documents and the shaping of the programme. On the country side, he explained that they interviewed 9 Ministers (6 in Africa and 3 in Latin America) and that it is clear that some strong country processes are lacking. He reported that all interviewed Ministers liked being there and stated that they came to learn, share and because they wanted access to money. All the countries said they have plans to do follow up and to put what they learned into action. When asked if something should be done differently, it was reported that there is real demand for more facilitated interaction at a regional level.

Samson Shivaji said that there was a shared feeling of very good ministerial participation, including from ministers from outside the sector, which expands the scope of the discussion. While the panels were multi-stakeholder and were very good, it was felt they could have dug deeper. He also noted that the ‘next steps’ were not very clear, but a link to the accountability mechanism would help with
that. While the content was good, he also noted that we need to work on developing simpler language to discuss technical issues with ministers. He echoed an earlier comment that civil society felt that the role of the HLPD Working Group in steering the orientation of the HLMs wasn’t strong enough.

PMa also explained how important it is that technical staff be allowed access to high-level meetings to provide support to their ministers. He also recommended that one person from a country/government should be a part of the HLPD Working Group to ensure their views are taken into consideration. He also noted that the preparation process, including webinars, was excellent.

Other feedback included: appreciation for the breakout sessions and a request to receive invitations for ministers earlier to facilitate better participation (4 months before the meeting); the need for time for Ministers to speak; and, the need to consider if future FMMs should be hosted by the World Bank, but convened by SWA to give partners more of a role in the content.

Session 4: Executive Session
During the executive session, the steering committee discussed and agreed on the following decisions.

**Decision 1: Agenda**
The Steering Committee approves the draft agenda for the meeting.

**Decision 2: Minutes**
The Steering Committee approves the minutes of the March 2017 virtual meeting.

**Decision 3: SWA Mutual Accountability Mechanism**
The Steering Committee approves the Mutual Accountability Mechanism as proposed by the High-Level Political Dialogue Working Group and asks the Executive Chair to lead a task team to finalize the document and to propose a plan on how to operationalize it by the next (virtual) Steering Committee meeting. The task team shall take into account the conclusions from the Country Processes Working Group case studies and the discussion points raised in the Steering Committee meeting.

Session 5: Looking Forward – High-level Political Dialogue

*Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair*

How do we take the HLPD forward from here, including agenda for 2018?

*Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque*

In opening the session, CTA recalled the Lisbon Steering Committee decision on the cycle of meetings, including this year’s SMM. She spoke of how the partnership struggled with the idea of a ‘lite’ SMM due to the demand from countries and partners and presented a set of criteria for selecting future hosts for SMMs. (see slide)

Considerations put forward included: We need time to operationalize the accountability mechanism and so a high-level meeting may not be feasible in March 2018 and the Secretariat requests 12 months from when we take a decision to hold the HLM to when it is held to allow for planning and logistics.
The discussion focused on the question on what the purpose of a 2018 meeting would be. Some members felt that the accountability mechanism would help identify the purpose for future meetings, while others felt that the meetings could benefit from having different partners/constituencies responsible for different sessions to emphasize the multi-stakeholder nature of the partnership. It was also mentioned that SWA meetings contribute to knowledge sharing, maintaining momentum, and strengthening the overall partnership.

There were many comments saying that a meeting should be held in 2018, but there were conflicting ideas of whether this should be an SMM or a Partnership Meeting, or a combination of the two meetings. Some Steering Committee members suggested delaying the SMM to 2019 and holding only a partnership meeting in late-2018. There were also comments on reviewing the frequency of the meetings, with one suggestion that meetings could be held every 18 months to allow the partnership to engage at regional fora between HLMs.

The concluding comment was that some feel that the purpose is not as clear as it was 10 years ago and SWA needs to be very clear on what it wants to achieve – which should in turn guide the purpose and periodicity of meetings.

There was a request that the Secretariat prepare a matrix considering the 4 options discussed, with some commentary that maps each of the purposes and one more column which looks at possible implications (funding, political, capacity, local organizational support i.e. UNICEF) as well as a consideration of location. PDe requested that the decision be taken via email in a matter of weeks – not wait until September to make a decision. CTA agreed that the HLPWG should have a discussion on it, finalize the matrix and then share with the Steering Committee via email.

In terms of the selection of a location, the Steering Committee suggested the region be selected first, and that a strong partner or regional body who can provide technical support on the ground would be critical.

**Session 6: Update from CPWG and GMHWG**

Presentation on the 2017 Workplan and Progress report from the Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group (GMHWG)

*Mr. Jeff Goldberg*

Jeff Goldberg presented an update on the workplan and reiterated that the purpose of the group was not to duplicate other work. He outlined the following on standardization and harmonization:

- **Standardization** - Continuing work on a proposed volunteer standard on rural water point functionality.

- **Harmonization** – look at the development of indicators. This work was put on hold in light of the HLMs given that many of the GMHWG members were involved in the HLM prep.

He said that the working group’s general feeling is that monitoring should be considered together with the accountability mechanism – and so asked the Steering Committee to consider merging the work of this working group with the group working on the accountability mechanism. JG also stated that he would be stepping down from the chairmanship of the group, but will stay actively involved.

SW raised a question about the overlap of this working group with other groups in the partnership and asked whether there could be consolidation. JG responded that form should follow function and
that the work of the group began before the Building Blocks were in place, so it could be possible to
have a ‘monitoring stream’ in the context of the accountability framework.

It was decided that a decision would be taken in the Executive Session.

Presentation on the 2017 Work plan and Progress report from the Country Processes Working
Group (CPWG)

Ms. Clare Battle

CB began her presentation with a reminder that the role and purpose of the SWA Country Processes
Working Group is to:

Ensure adoption of the Collaborative Behaviours by all SWA partners, to enable more effective country
processes and lead to strengthened national sector capacities for developing and sustaining universal
access to safe water and sanitation for everyone, everywhere, forever.

Progress Update Overview

- One face-to-face meeting, and two virtual meetings.
- Ongoing input to the evolution of SWA’s strategy and activities in key areas including the High
  Level Political Dialogue and mutual accountability mechanisms.
- Continued collaboration with the SWA Secretariat to more clearly articulate the SWA
  framework and develop appropriate communications materials.
- Identification of issues for consideration within the SWA Governance review, raised through
  the Governance and Finance Working Group.

Tools Portal update

- Terms of Reference for a consultant to support the development of the SWA tools portal were
  finalized and passed over to the SWA Secretariat for recruitment.
- Successful recruitment has been completed, and the consultant started work in mid-May. The
  CPWG is working with Secretariat to ensure an appropriate induction.

Country Profiles update

CB also recalled that in November 2016 the Steering Committee endorsed the list of indicators for
the Collaborative Behaviours (subject to minor revisions) and asked GLAAS to lead the collection of
data and development of country profiles to support the preparatory process for the Finance and
Sector Ministers’ Meetings in April 2017. Since then WHO GLAAS continues to lead the monitoring
strategy in close collaboration with CPWG and GMHWG and has produced 45 country profiles.

CB presented the following issue for discussion:

These profiles were not widely shared because there was some controversy around how the data
was presented, although the data comes from publically available sources. CB asked that the
Steering Committee have a discussion about what to do with these kind of issues.

At their meeting in December, CPWG members discussed how best to take forward the Steering
Committee decision on SWA’s engagement at country level.

Country Engagement Case Studies update
The CPWG is conducting a series of country case studies to document ongoing efforts to operationalize the SWA framework and contribute to understanding of how SWA can best enable/support national sector system processes.

Activities so far include the identification of a number (approx. 6) of case study countries, the development of a short guidance note, ongoing planning and delivery of case studies, and design and submission of a proposal for Stockholm WWW Session to share learning.

**CPWG Work Plan: May – Nov 2017**

- **HLPD:** Ongoing participation will continue to be used to promote the SWA Framework and ensure SWA’s engagement at country level is country-led, and focused on strengthening the country processes needed to deliver the SDGs.

- **Collaborative Behaviours’ Monitoring:** Contribute to support GLAAS team to refine monitoring of the Collaborative Behaviours, including revisiting the process for developing the profiles and / or the indicators themselves based on feedback received.

- **Toolkit:** CPWG will work with consultant to ensure effective delivery of tools portal in line with objectives.

- **Case Studies:** ongoing work, with the aim of presenting final overview of all case studies at the SC meeting in December.

- **Stockholm:** work with Secretariat to deliver effective session.

Discussion on the issue of publishing the country profiles:

It was explained that as the Collaborative Behaviours are about mutual accountability, monitoring and reporting on them are consistent with the drive for accountability. FG noted that this creates a baseline and could be used as a reporting mechanism.

The question was asked by DDW, if we can’t publish these documents, how can we have an accountability mechanism that publically monitors progress? SW pointed out that there is a lot of data available on governments, but not a lot on development partners and said that we should consider how we can improve data collection.

FG further explained that some of the original sensitivity on the data used came from misunderstandings from some governments on where the data and indicators were from. She explained that in Addis, preliminary indicators were presented and the feedback received was incorporated.

AM explained that at the HLMs in April copies of some completed profiles were printed with the intention of sharing them but it was decided not to do so at that stage – because a number of partners expressed concerns about the methodology.

SS made the point that in many cases it is not the country government partners who do not wish to publish and as the partnership has agreed on mutual accountability, it is important to publish the reports. PMo agreed with this statement and CTA pointed out that the SWA guiding principles are linked to human rights and to transparency.
DDW asked that the group consider one final round of peer-review and editing to ensure that what is published meets a rigorous standard. FG pointed out that some financial resources may be needed to cover this additional work and the discussion was adjourned to the executive session.

Session 7: Executive Session 2

Decision 4: HLPD Looking Forward
Concerning the timing and location of the 2018 meetings in the High-level Political Dialogue cycle, the Steering Committee, taking into account what this implies for subsequent meetings, decides the following:

To ask the Secretariat to develop, by mid-July, a table that considers options for meeting(s) (e.g. SMM, PM, SMM+PM, SMM merged with PM)
And for each of these, identifies:
- Purpose(s)
- Implications – political, capacity (Secretariat, host government and lead SWA partner), financial
- Location (which region)
For the HLPD Working Group to discuss these options and make recommendations to the Steering Committee by end July.

For the Steering Committee to make a decision by email by mid-August which is sufficient to allow the Secretariat to approach potential country hosts and to start preparations for the meeting(s).

Decision 5: Country Processes Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the CPWG for its report and approves its work plan for the remainder of 2017.

Decision 6: SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles.
In conformity with SWAs Guiding Principles, namely that evidence must be transparently shared to inform policy-making and action at all levels, the Steering Committee decides to make available, via the SWA website and other means, the SWA Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles after a quality assurance and peer-review process led by the CPWG. This work should be accomplished, for 5 Country Profiles, by the end of September 2017. In September, 2017 the CPWG will also propose a timeline for finalization of the remaining profiles.

Decision 7: Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the GMHWG for its report, thanks Jeff Goldberg for his work as Chair of the CMHWG, decides to suspend its work and reactivate it when a particular need for work on monitoring harmonization arises.

Session 8: Strengthening and activating the partnership at national level

Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair
Catarina presented an idea for mobilizing the partnership at the national level as follows:

Role of partners in country:
- SWA partners at national-level are key to develop the following in-country actions
- Trigger the partnership's strategy and framework (CBs, BBs), as well as Guiding Principles
- Raise awareness about the SDGs, including inequalities & gender
• Promote multi-stakeholder dialogues and processes (such as JSR)
• Put in place SWA mutual accountability mechanism
• Lead change, influence people and create an enabling environment

A proposal: SWA strengthening programme:

National training events and workshops focusing on:

• Sector capacity;
• Institutional capacity; and
• SWA accountability mechanism
• Led by SWA partners and collaborators with technical & training expertise
• Up to 18 participants from different stakeholder groups, fostering inter-personal, inter-constituency relationships
• Post-training support, maintaining group contact (personal, professional)
• Funding on-top of current SWA budget

The Executive Chair asked for the Steering Committee to move this to forward and bring the plan to life.

Discussion

PMA agreed that there is a strong need to support the countries to assess and support where they are still struggling. He suggested that if there are regional advisors, they should be well known in the region in the area of water and sanitation.

CTA further explained that the concept would enable countries to draw on the regional outreach advisor and the Secretariat.

The following discussion raised a number of concerns that this model of support could shift SWA towards becoming more of an entity and away from using partners at country level. Some partners felt that they could play this role themselves in country, however, country representatives (Sri Lanka and South Sudan) both agreed with strengthening the capacity of SWA, in particular the ability of SWA to do high level advocacy at the political level in countries.

The discussion centered around the fact that there is a coordination problem at the country level and that it is difficult, with current resources, to mobilize partners at the national level. Some SC members felt that the accountability mechanism would be sufficient to mobilize partners, and others, felt that this was a model for creating the regional advisor posts who could play the role of an SWA focal point and facilitate the work of the partnership.

It was also noted that the Secretariat is already playing this role on a smaller scale, including when running webinars, which bring expertise from the Secretariat as well as partners who speak and offer support on their area of expertise.

Based on the different comments, there were some supporting the idea of technical support from SWA and others calling for more political support from SWA. It was noted that this was quite a
detailed proposal and that no background documents had been shared in advance of the SC meeting.

**Session 9: Update on progress against the Results Framework**

Presentation on progress towards achievement of the objectives of the partnership including the work of the Executive Chair
*Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque*

CTA presented a report on SWA progress against the Results Framework (RF). As a number of the objectives are measured using data from GLAAS, she also invited FG to give an update on some of the indicators (part of Objective 1; Objectives 2 and 3).

CTA explained that this is the first report against the RF (approved March 2017) and that it focused on the entire partnership. The report covered the period from September 2016 (approval of the RF) to April 2017. She noted that during the reporting, the Executive Chair and Secretariat identified some results/indicators that could be improved, including the incomplete “Objective 6” on Governance.

Results framework - See presentation for details
GLAAS presentation from FG – see presentation

Some discussion points raised were:

- Level of disaggregation of data required (e.g. result 1.1.2)
- Sample size and impact on results (% versus # countries)
- Use of GLAAS as a data source
- Attribution of results and progress

**Discussion and feedback**

PMo felt that this level of reporting is too detailed for a full Steering Committee and that it should be discussed at a working group level. PDe noted that the framework (objective, outcome, and results) is extracted verbatim from the SWA strategy, but if need be, we can adjust the indicators. He suggested that the Secretariat and GLAAS bring the results together and ensure it is effective.

Presentation on the results of the Executive Chair workplan
*Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque*

See presentation.

**Discussion**

The Steering Committee thanked CTA for her work and for the report. A question was raised as to why the Global Architecture Working Group was not functioning, and CTA replied that an email had been sent inviting people to join, but no one had volunteered. It was decided this issue could be discussed later.

SW thanked CTA for all that she had done in the reporting period and noted that for some of this time she was on a contract break and was working without being paid. He said that the report was in line with the work plan approved by the Steering Committee. He called attention to the activity...
line on the regional advisors, where it stated – ‘Regional Advisors not hired’ noting that there was no formal decision to hire regional advisors although there had been a discussion on the topic of strengthening national processes. He noted that the lack of regional advisors was not impeding that objective, and suggested that the Executive Chair’s time may be better leveraged in priority countries to achieve that objective politically. CTA responded that she considered that there was an agreement to hire regional advisors, as there was an approved budget.

PDe thanked CTA for the very clear format and simple style of the report. He asked that the next set of Executive Chair activities go through a process of agreement with the Steering Committee, in particular the Governance and Finance Working Group.

Session 10: Update from the Secretariat
Presentation of the implementation of the workplan and finances
Ms. Amanda Marlin, Coordinator

AM presented on the 2016 Financial Report and 2017 budget versus expenditure and raised the following issues for discussion:

1. Format of financial reporting
2. Realistic Budgeting
3. Discontinuation of operations in UNOPS

PDe thanked AM for the presentation. He raised some concerns from earlier versions of reports that included some errors and asked the question of who is responsible for accuracy and quality. He noted that in the current configuration, it is UNICEF that is responsible, but as we are reviewing governance documents, it is important that we elucidate this issue, to be clear of what the roles are of the Executive Chair, the Secretariat, UNICEF, and the Steering Committee. In particular, he said, we need to think about how we can empower the Steering Committee to be absolutely responsible for SWA finances. He also asked for a differentiation between the multi-year aspirational budget – and the operational budget. The key thing is to have a proper annual operational budget and report against it.

PMo suggested that due to the size of the SC it is important that the detailed documents be shared with working groups in advance of the SC meetings so concrete proposals can be presented simultaneously. He suggested that the Governance and Finance Working Group could be mandated to undertake this kind of preparation with the Executive Chair and Secretariat.

SW also clarified that UNICEF is responsible for accuracy and quality of reporting, however, the level of reporting being asked for is not generated by UNICEF systems and so requires manual calculations and dual systems of reporting, meaning that it is important that we decide to what level of detail we are reporting.

The Steering Committee then discussed the closure of the office in Geneva. Some members felt strongly that maintaining a presence in the European time zone would be beneficial, and that the original decision to have that office was to maintain decentralization in the partnership. The point was also clarified that when we are talking about the presence in Geneva, we are specifically talking about one P3 post that is currently administered by UNOPS and hosted by another partner. That
hosting is coming to an end, and the cost of running the post through UNOPS is high, so the decision is budgetary.

**Session 11: Update from Governance and Finance Working Group**

Progress report from the Governance and Finance Working Group  
*Mr. Patrick Moriarty*

PMo presented on the work of the Governance and Finance Working Group which was established following decisions in Dec 2016 and March 2017 SC meetings. The group was created in response to emerging governance challenges as SWA grows and evolves – and a sense of urgency to ensure that we are able to make decisions that are needed.

PMo reported on activities (see slide - e.g. 4 virtual meetings since March) and explained there are currently 19 people on mailing list, but a core of 3 – 4 people actively involved. He urged that the group would benefit from country representation.

**Plan for the next 6 months**

- Governance review is about to begin – TORs approved and consultants on board
- Regular work
- Ad-hoc advice and support to Executive Chair and Secretariat
- Identification and pre-discussion of issues requiring Steering Committee decision

**Regular work**

- Feedback on Secretariat’s update and financial report
- Update on position Executive Chair: UNICEF
- Role of G&F Group in: filtering decisions into Steering Committee; overseeing performance of Executive Chair

SW offered an update on the position of Executive Chair and the hosting arrangements with UNICEF saying that the UNICEF Deputy Executive Director has approved the post of a P6/D1 for the Executive Chair in principle, but UNICEF has a question back to the partnership about what kind of partnership it wants to be and what kind of role it wants UNICEF to play. With regards to the position, UNICEF can host, with 2 conditions:

1. There is a mechanism for managing the performance of the post holder and that is part of the governance work of this group.
2. There is clarity about the role of the post. Hence the SC should decide between the two following options:
   a. Option 1 – UNICEF remains accountable for the results of the Secretariat and the EC TOR remains as it stands (SC convening, Advocacy etc.)
   b. Option 2 – Direct line of accountability from EC to SC and from the Secretariat to EC; UNICEF not being accountable for the results of the Secretariat. In this case UNICEF could still host SWA and use the financial systems etc. but the donor agreements would reflect the new lines of accountability.
The implications would be as follows:

- The Executive Chair, in addition to the current role, would be a staff member managing UNICEF staff and budgets. This could have an implication on the location of the Executive Chair if she/he is managing people.

- UNICEF would not be accountable for the results of the Secretariat. At the start of the partnership, it made sense to have UNICEF playing a more active role, but in this scenario, UNICEF would act more as a partner than a host.

- Strategically, the partnership would need to be independent and other partners may have to step up to take a more active role.

During the following discussion, many SC members voiced support for option 2, asking questions on timing and accountability. Since the mandate of the current Executive Chair runs to the end of the year, it was seen as appropriate to take the decision and to develop the new job description and associated accountabilities and lines of reporting associated with the new role. It was also agreed that UNICEF should maintain fiduciary and accounting responsibility.

After a short break, PMo presented on the Governance Review and the TOR of the consultants – (See slide) and ran through the Governance Issues – See slide (emerging issues)

The following discussion focused on the need for the governance document to remain light and to ensure there are effective mechanisms for hearing from partners – through constituencies and through other means.

**Session 12: Executive Session 3**

During this session, the discussions led to the following decisions being agreed:

**Decision 8: Update from the Executive Chair**

The Steering Committee thanks the Executive Chair for her activities and requests her to share her revised work plan by the end of July 2017 and her upcoming report with the Governance and Finance Working Group in advance of the December Steering Committee meeting.

**Decision 9: Secretariat Update and Financial Report**

The Steering Committee:

a. Thanks the Secretariat for its activities and notes the 2017 interim financial report and asks the Secretariat to revise the 2017 budget forecast in line with predicted expenditure.

b. Asks the Governance and Finance Working Group and the Secretariat to agree on a set of formats for financial, narrative, and outcome reporting by the end of August 2017.

**Decision 10: Work planning and reporting**

The Steering Committee requests that the Executive Chair and the Secretariat enter into a biannual sharing and review of work plans and reports with the Governance and Finance Working Group in advance of all future face-to-face Steering Committee meetings.

**Decision 11: Support to countries**

The Steering Committee requests that the Executive Chair and the Secretariat work together with the Country Processes Working Group to develop proposals for strengthening capacity to support countries, to be submitted for discussion at the September 2017 Steering Committee meeting.
Decision 12: UNOPS Geneva
The Steering Committee decides to discontinue the arrangement for employment of a P3 Communications Officer and related communications activities in Geneva with UNOPS from 01 January 2018, notwithstanding the outcome of the Governance Review.

Decision 13: Governance and Finance Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the Governance and Finance Working Group for its report.

Decision 14: Executive Chair post
The Steering Committee thanks UNICEF for its offer to create a D1 position for the Executive Chair for Sanitation and Water for All and undertakes to ensure that the Governance and Finance Working Group creates a mechanism to manage the performance of the post-holder.

Decision 15: Secretariat accountability
The Steering Committee, in order to ensure clearer accountability lines between the different components of SWA, decides that the Secretariat will be accountable to the Executive Chair, who in turn will be accountable to the Steering Committee. UNICEF will no longer be accountable for the performance of the Secretariat. This decision will enter into force once the new Executive Chair position is filled.

Session 13: Consideration of New Partner Applications
Presentation of applications that have been challenged by Steering Committee members
Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque

CTA presented on applications that have been challenged by Steering Committee members. Doubts have been clarified and a decision will be taken in the executive session.

Session 14: Updates from Private Sector and WASH-Nutrition Working Groups
Presentation on activities of the Private Sector Working Group
Mr. Sanjay Banka
SB presented on activities of the Private Sector Working Group (see presentation)

Members of the Steering Committee suggested development of a private sector strategy.

Presentation on activities of the WASH-Nutrition working group
Mr. Thilo Panzerbeiter
TP presented on the WASH-Nutrition working group activities (see presentation).

Session 15: Updates from Global Leaders Group Search Committee and Global Architecture Working Groups
Presentation from the Global Leaders Group Search Committee
Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque

---

4 The following statement complements Decisions 14 & 15, it was approved on a no objection decision from an email sent on 14 July 2017 from Catarina de Albuquerque, SWA Executive Chair. “In line with these decisions (14 and 15), the Steering Committee acknowledges that SWA’s new Governing Structure will need to clarify that the positions of Executive Chair and Chair of the Steering Committee are separate. Equally, it will need to fully clarify the role of the Steering Committee and its Chair in overseeing and making accountable the role of the Executive Chair”. 

SANITATION AND WATER FOR ALL
CTA updated that the High-level chair is willing to send/ sign letters once the Global Leaders Group is confirmed. Two organizations were asked to join and they said no. The only positive news regarding participation at the GLG, is that Dr. Chaudhry joined.

The Global Architecture Working Group is not yet active.

**Decision 19: Global Leaders Group**
The Steering Committee thanks the Executive Chair for her report and asks her to reactivate the Global Leaders Group search committee. Noting the similarity between this action and the proposal from The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to fund the establishment of a high-level commission on WASH, the Steering Committee requests the Secretariat to explore potential linkages, and if appropriate link this to the work of the Global Leaders Group.

**Decision 20: Global Architecture Task Team**
The Steering Committee requests the representative of The Netherlands to set up and chair a task team to develop a position for the partnership on the links between WASH and Integrated Water Resource Management, including SWA’s position in the global water architecture.

**Session 16: Any other business**

1. **Steering Committee Elections**
Recap of SC Decisions [Dec 2016]
(see presentation)
Suggested Recommendations to the proposal of December 2016
(see presentation)
Timeline
(see slide)

2. **Gates Proposal – Amanda Marlin**
AM took the opportunity to raise an issue. To provide context she explained that Gates Foundation have been a partner since the beginning, and are interested in continuing that so the Secretariat is negotiating a new funding agreement.

SWA’s strategic approach is to ask donors to fund the strategic plan/ strategy, however their preference is to negotiate more tailored agreements and to more finely define what it is they are funding. This is more difficult, as the Secretariat is not in a position to agree to receive funding for something that is outside of what the SC has agreed to be doing.

Gates have offered to run a session (perhaps in the margins of the Stockholm meeting) to have a brainstorming session with a small group of people to consider what they could fund.

She explained that although they haven’t talked specific numbers, their current funding is approximately $1m a year.

It was agreed that AM would continue the discussion and consult the Steering Committee when appropriate.
3. Global Architecture

PDe provided an overview of the current global architecture and noted that SWA needs to take a position.

If a commission is created, what is SWA’s role and position in that regard? He also referred to email correspondence with Pim van de Male (DGIS) suggesting that SWA consider linkages with others workings on IWRM.

4. Costa Rica offer to host an SWA HLM in 2018

The Executive Chair informed the SC of an offer from Costa Rica to host an HLM in 2018. This offer will be taken into account when decisions are made about the nature, timing and location of future meetings.

Session 17: Executive Session 4

Decision 16: Partnership Applications for Discussion
The Steering Committee has reviewed the submission from Christian Outreach Justice Mission Sierra Leone (Comin-SL) and decides that they will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency.

Decision 17: Private Sector Working Group
The Steering Committee asks the Private Sector Working Group to
a. Re-assess its composition;
b. Develop a strategy and work plan to be presented at the next face-to-face Steering Committee meeting.

Decision 18: WASH-Nutrition Working Group
The Steering Committee thanks the WASH-Nutrition Working Group for its report and approves its work plan for the remainder of 2017.

Decision 19: Global Leaders Group
The Steering Committee thanks the Executive Chair for her report and asks her to reactivate the Global Leaders Group search committee. Noting the similarity between this action and the proposal from The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to fund the establishment of a high-level commission on WASH, the Steering Committee requests the Secretariat to explore potential linkages, and if appropriate link this to the work of the Global Leaders Group.

Decision 20: Global Architecture Task Team
The Steering Committee requests the representative of The Netherlands to set up and chair a task team to develop a position for the partnership on the links between WASH and Integrated Water Resource Management, including SWA’s position in the global water architecture.

Note: Decision 21 was taken via email through no-objection motion by 07 July, 2017.

Decision 21: Steering Committee elections
The Steering Committee endorses the revisions to the proposal for the 2017 SWA Steering Committee Elections as presented in the attached operational note. Specifically, the Steering Committee decides to:
a. Apply a standard principle to open for election all sub-constituencies with a single seat;

b. adopt the proposed process for the elections including - the measures to merge the CSO and CBO constituencies, and the provision for the CSO constituency to oversee its electoral process; plans to approach the only partner in the developed countries constituency to take up the vacant seat; and the entire work plan ending with the announcement of the full Steering Committee Members soon after the votes;

c. request the Governance and Finance Working Group to discuss procedures for future elections, particularly for the CSO constituency and Private sector where networks are involved (in particular deciding on whether members of networks are to be automatically considered as SWA partners);

d. appoint Muyatwa Sitali as the SWA 2017 Steering Committee Election Officer.