### Summary of Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision 1</td>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee approves the draft agenda for the meeting giving the Executive Chair the possibility to change the order of the sessions if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 2</td>
<td><strong>Governing Document</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee establishes a Governance Working Group with a mandate to make recommendations on issues related to the governance of the partnership, and to revise the current Governing Document. The Steering Committee invites interested Steering Committee members to join this Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 3</td>
<td><strong>Minutes September</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee approves the minutes of the September 2016 virtual meeting, with the changes proposed by Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill to Session 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 4</td>
<td><strong>Minutes November</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee approves the minutes of the November 2016 Extraordinary meeting, after changing “George Chaima” to “George Yarngo”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 5</td>
<td><strong>Sector Ministers’ Meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee thanks UNICEF for the Sector Ministers’ Meeting Concept Paper and approves it. The Steering Committee asks the High-level Political Dialogue Working Group to: give guidance on its implementation; revise the draft agenda, taking into account the Steering Committee’s discussion and; implement Decision 9 on the Afternoon of Engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 6</td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee Elections</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee decides:&lt;br&gt;  a) to adopt the recommendations presented in the Steering Committee Elections Concept Paper concerning the May-July 2017 Steering Committee elections, together with the methodology and timeline.&lt;br&gt;  b) that from now onwards the elections, which take place every 18 months as outlined in the Governing Document, will take place in the months of July and/or January, with the next elections taking place in July 2017.&lt;br&gt;  c) to ask the Governance Working Group to consider recommendations presented in the Elections Concept Paper for inclusion in the revision of the Governance Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision 7</td>
<td><strong>Executive Chair Contractual Arrangements</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Steering Committee decides that:&lt;br&gt;  a) a sub-group consisting of Paul Deverill, Patrick Moriarty and Sanjay Wijesekera will consider each of the questions posed in Sanjay’s presentation, as well as additional questions posed during the discussion (see below) within the next four weeks. An extraordinary SC meeting will be convened in the first week of January to discuss options and adopt decisions in relation to each of these questions.&lt;br&gt;  b) Edou Muhima will support the group as a resource person knowledgeable in the UN Human Resources system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) the group will answer the following questions and make recommendations regarding:
   a. The pros and cons of establishing a post within the UN system.
   b. The pros and cons of establishing the post within UNICEF.
   c. The pros and cons of establishing the post with UNOPS.

d) the Group will make a concrete proposal to the SC regarding the long-term contractual arrangement for the EC;
e) the Executive Chair is engaged on a consultancy basis until 25 April. Another partner should further extend this contract for a further six months, if this proves necessary.

**Decision 8**  
**Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group**  
The Steering Committee thanks the GMHWG for its report and approves its January-June 2017 Workplan, requesting that it attempts to refine it to maximize synergies and minimize overlap with the Country Processes Working Group.

**Decision 9**  
**Afternoon of Engagement**  
The Steering Committee asks the HLPDWG to integrate the topics and issues that are part of the Afternoon of Engagement Concept Paper into the agendas of the FMM and SMM as well as the preparation process. A final decision about whether or not to hold an Afternoon of Engagement will depend on timing of FMM.

**Decision 10**  
**High-level Political Dialogue and HLMs**  
The Steering Committee encourages all constituencies that are part of the HLPDWG to contribute with ideas for the content of the HLMs, and requests that FMM and SMM conveners integrate these ideas into the agendas.

**Decision 11**  
**Country Engagement Strategy**  
The Steering Committee:
   a) thanks UNICEF for the paper on SWA’s Country Engagement Strategy.
   b) agrees that SWA needs to articulate a framework that describes what partners work on together in countries and how.
   c) the framework is composed of the following elements:
      i. Adhering to the Collaborative Behaviours
      ii. Structured around the Building Blocks
      iii. Work through a government-led inclusive planning and review process with a view of meeting the water, sanitation and hygiene related SDGs.
   d) proposes that interested SWA country partners and the CPWG lead a concerted effort to operationalize this decision in at least 2-3 countries during the preparation process for the April HLMs, to support the use of Building Block assessment questions and Collaborative Behaviors indicators, evaluating the usefulness of these as tools to inform a clear framing within six months.

**Decision 12**  
**Accountability Mechanism**  
The Steering Committee decides to:
   a) thank the Secretariat for the preliminary thinking done on refining the SWA Accountability Mechanism and requests the HLPDWG, in consultation with the CPWG, to further work on this issue, aligning it with the Results Framework and taking into account the discussions held at the current Steering Committee meeting, with a view to finalizing a
concept note in time for approval at the next virtual Steering Committee meeting (to be held in the first quarter of 2017).

b) request the HLPDWG to undertake further consultations between December 2016 and March 2017, in order to develop a few examples that show what milestones for countries and other stakeholders could look like, taking into consideration recommendations for country-level engagement.

**Decision 13**  
**Secretariat Workplan 2017**  
The Steering Committee thanks the Secretariat for its activities and notes the 2016 interim financial report. The Steering Committee approves the 2017 Secretariat Workplan and budget, and requests the Secretariat to add more narrative detail in the next month.

**Decision 14**  
**Establishment of a Finance Working Group**  
The Steering Committee decides to establish a Finance Working Group with the objective to advise and support the Secretariat in the preparation of annual workplans and budgets.

**Decision 15**  
**Executive Chair Workplan 2017**  
The Steering Committee decides to:

a) thank the Executive Chair for her activities and decides to approve the Executive Chair’s Workplan 2017.

b) ask the Executive Chair to prepare draft performance indicators to be submitted to the Governance WG for review.

**Decision 16**  
**Private Sector Partnership Drive**  
The Steering Committee decides to:

a) ask the Private Sector Task Team to develop a “Private Sector Engagement Concept Paper”, availing opportunities to the different constituencies to be part of this process, to be presented to the next face-to-face SC meeting.

b) request that this Concept Paper should reflect the Human Rights and Business Guiding Principles.

**Decision 17**  
**Community-based Organizations**  
The Steering Committee:

a) acknowledges the importance of giving a voice to CBOs.

b) decides that the CBO constituency will merge with the CSO constituency.

c) decides that within the CSO constituency one seat will be reserved for a CBO representative in the Steering Committee. The first selection for a representative will be done in the July 2017 elections.

**Decision 18**  
**Procedure for Review of New Applications**  
The Steering Committee requests the Secretariat to revise the Operational Note, taking into account the feedback from the Steering Committee, and the experience obtained in applying this procedure for the first time, and to submit the revised Operational Note for approval on a no-objections basis by email before end-December 2016.

**Decision 19**  
**New partners**  
The Steering Committee has reviewed submissions from a range of potential partners and decides that German Toilet Organization, German WASH Network, Initiative : Eau, SINAM – Sadayanodai Ilaignar Narpani Mandram, Water Integrity
Network (WIN), Wherever the Need India Services (WTNIS), Tanzania Youth with New Hope in Live Organisation (TAYONEHO), SpeakUpAfrica, Yoto River Waterkeeper, Action contre la Faim, and Nana Sahib Development Society will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.

**Decision 20**

**New partners**

The Steering Committee instructs the Secretariat to contact Plumbers without Borders and Daniel Iroegbu Global Health Foundation and suggest to them that they become partners in the Civil Society Organization constituency. If they agree, then they will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.

**Decision 21**

**New partners**

The Steering Committee decides that:

a) Unilever and ECOLOO AB are accepted into the Private Sector constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.

b) Jordan is accepted into the Country constituency.

c) requests the Secretariat to gather more information from Christian Outreach Justice Mission Sierra Leone (Comin-SL).

**Decision 22**

**SWA/SUN partnership**

The Steering Committee:

a) acknowledges the work of the SUN and SWA Secretariats in preparing a proposal for joint areas of engagement with specific activities for 2017.

b) endorses the joint areas of engagement and the action plan and encourages the creation of a joint working group comprised of partners from both global platforms who have the capacity and resources to support its implementation, with the initial intention to develop Terms of Reference.

Further, the Steering Committee requests an update from the Secretariat in mid-2017.

**Decision 23**

**HLPD Working Group Terms of Reference**

The Steering Committee decides that the High-level Political Dialogue Working Group:

a) is a Group mandated by the Steering Committee to give guidance to the Secretariat and to the conveners of SWA’s meetings on the meetings’:
   i. objectives
   ii. agendas
   iii. participants
   iv. preparatory process

b) shall also be consulted on and give guidance to SWA’s country engagement strategy and revised accountability system.

c) shall meet periodically and be composed of representatives of each SWA constituency.

**Decision 24**

**2017 Steering Committee meetings**

The Steering Committee decides that:

a) the 2017 face-to-face meetings will be held in the 3rd week of June and the first week of December.
b) the virtual SC meetings will be held in mid-March and mid-September.

Summary of Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee members to send Secretariat suggestions to improve the feedback form.</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill to send Secretariat alternative language for the September SC minutes.</td>
<td>Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPDWG to take into consideration the SC discussions, suggestions and concerns and to develop the agendas for the SMM and FMM.</td>
<td>HLPDWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Chair to contact Mexico regarding their limited engagement in Steering Committee proceedings and request them to step down from the Steering Committee in favour of Costa Rica. The Executive Chair should also approach Costa Rica with this proposal.</td>
<td>Executive Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPWG to develop a process to assess governments’ use of the Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles and their impact.</td>
<td>CPWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners to volunteer human resources to develop and managed the CPWG’s web-based toolkit.</td>
<td>All partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Chair to send email to Steering Committee requesting volunteers for the Governance Working Group and suggesting a timeline for the development of Terms of Reference.</td>
<td>Executive Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee members to consider hosting one or more SWA Secretariat staff members.</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Chair to add to her workplan 2017 a reference to her work supporting the implementation of the Country Engagement Strategy.</td>
<td>Executive Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Chair to consider attending regional events that focus on the achievement of the Agenda 2030, as well as visit the countries that will pilot the Country Engagement Strategy.</td>
<td>Executive Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator to align Secretariat workplan with the Results Framework.</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Chair to develop a first draft of success indicators for her 2017 workplan, to be reviewed by the Governance Working Group.</td>
<td>Executive Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Working Group to define roles of Executive Chair, Secretariat and Regional Advisors.</td>
<td>Governance WG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

Steering Committee Members
1. Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque, SWA Executive Chair and Steering Committee Chair
2. Ms. Ananda H. Jayaweera, Sri Lanka
3. Mr. Dominick de Waal, World Bank
4. Mr. Ghulam Qader, Afghanistan
5. Ms. Joséphine Ouédraogo, Burkina Faso
6. Mr. Kepha Ombacho, Kenya
7. Ms. Lajana Manandhar, Lumanti/FANSA
8. Ms. Nathalie Seguin, FAN-MEX
9. Mr. Nilton Trindade, Mozambique
10. Mr. Oselaka Zikora, AMCOW
11. Mr. Paul Deverill, DFID
12. Mr. Patrick Moriarty, IRC
13. Mr. Samson Shivaji, KEWASNET/ANEW
14. Mr. Sanjay Banka, Banka Biolo
15. Mr. Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF
16. Mr. Thilo Panzerbieter, German Toilet Organization/EWP
17. Mr. Tinayeshe Mutazu, Zimbabwe

Permanent Observers
18. Ms. Fiona Gore, WHO
19. Ms. Clare Battle, WaterAid
20. Mr. Jeff Goldberg, USAID
22. Ms. Leanne Burney, UN-Water

Observers
23. Ms. Cindy Kushner, UNICEF
24. Mr. Dennis Warner, Millennium WASH Alliance
25. Mr. Edou Muhima, UNICEF (partially)
26. Ms. Hannan Sulieman, UNICEF (partially)
27. Mr. Kevin Rudd, SWA Chair (partially)
28. Mr. Peter Mahal, South Sudan
29. Mr. Louis Boorstin, Osprey Foundation

Secretariat
30. Ms. Amanda Marlin, Coordinator
31. Ms. Alexandra Reis, Communications
32. Ms. Heloise Chicou, CSO Advisor
33. Mr. Muyatwa Sitali, Programmes and Outreach (partially)
34. Ms. Princess Jimenez, Events and Protocol (partially)

Regrets
Mr. Achille Kangni, Benin
Mr. Samuel Ome, Nigeria
Ms. Bayantuul Baasanjav, Mongolia
Ms. Claudia Coria-Bustos, Mexico
Mr. Jochen Rudolph, AfDB
Mr. Dick van Ginthoven, DGIS
Mr. Amjad Ehmidat, Palestinian National Authority
Session 1: Introductions and Overview
Catarina de Albuquerque, Executive Chair; Amanda Marlin, Coordinator

The Executive Chair welcomed the Steering Committee (SC) to the final in-person meeting of the year. She introduced Jessica Briton, the new representative from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Observer). After a tour de table, the Executive Chair asked the SC to approve the meeting's agenda, giving her the possibility to move sessions and adjust time depending on how work progresses. There were no objections from the group.

The Executive Chair (EC) then gave the SC an update on her 2016 activities. This included an overview of her efforts around the Partnership Drive (which resulted in 39 new partners, including six countries), preparation of and participation in the March 2016 Ministerial Meeting in Addis Ababa, chairing of different Working Groups, engagement with other partnerships, fundraising, having contacts with the media, publishing articles and op-ed’s about SWA and representing the partnership at events.

In her overview on the health of the partnership, the Executive Chair stated that currently the SC is more engaged than ever and reiterated her continuous push towards more transparency. She also pointed out to the importance of having more partners working towards ensuring that SWA has a pivotal role in the follow-up and review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), such as DFID. The Executive Chair also spoke about increasing the engagement of the SC members in general, in particular about the under-representation of certain constituencies in the Working Groups and how fundraising needs to be a joint effort in order to be effective.

Amanda Marlin followed the EC’s update with a review of the Secretariat’s work since the last in-person SC meeting (Lisbon, June 2016). Following the structure of the Results Framework, Amanda Marlin referred to the efforts being made to prompt dialogue in-country, in particular the webinars, where several countries have shared experiences on planning for the SDGs, applying the Collaborative Behaviours and Building Blocks, and preparing for the upcoming HLMs. She also mentioned the ongoing support to the work of the Chair, Executive Chair and Working Groups, as well as aligning the work of SWA, GLAAS and JMP. The Secretariat is also finalizing the final report on the 2014 High-level Meeting (HLM) commitments, and continues its work on processing new applications and implementing communications activities such as the maintenance of the website and media relations.

The Executive Chair then referred to the two documents for information that were part of the SC package - the Results Framework and the Governing Document – and opened the floor for comments. SC members pointed out that the Governing Document is silent or unclear on important points, such as the relation between the Chair, Executive Chair and Secretariat and their accountability towards the SC. The document should be revised by a dedicated and standing Working Group. There was a general agreement to this proposal.
A SC member also mentioned that SWA’s country-level engagement should feature more prominently in the EC’s future activities, as it is central to the partnership’s objectives.

The SC noted the low response of its members to the feedback form circulated by the Secretariat. Amanda Marlin pointed out that it was the first time that this accountability mechanism was used and asked the SC for feedback on its format.

The Executive Chair then asked the group to approve the minutes of the virtual SC meeting of September and the extraordinary meeting of November. It was pointed out that, in the September minutes, the discussion in Session 3 on the role of SWA in determining the SDG indicators did not reflect the discussions. The Executive Chair asked Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill to send the Secretariat alternative language. Another request was to replace “George Chaima” with “George Yarngo” in the November minutes.

There was a general request from the SC that the minutes should be more explicit, and that, for each suggestion from SC members, a concrete action or decision should be agreed.

**Action 1:** Steering Committee members to send Secretariat suggestions to improve the feedback form.

**Action 2:** Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill to send Secretariat alternative language for the September SC minutes.

**Session 2: Dialogue with SWA’s Chair**

*Kevin Rudd, SWA Chair*

The SWA Chair attended the SC meeting to present his priorities for 2017 and also to discuss the objectives and format of the 2017 HLMs. The Chair opened the discussion with a few remarks, where he pointed out that it had been very useful for him to spend time with ministers during the meeting in Addis Ababa in March, and how it had given him a better idea of the sector’s challenges. He also updated the SC on his recent meeting with the UK’s Under Secretary James Wharton, who is deeply committed and interested in SWA. He explained his priorities for 2017, including the establishment of the Global Leaders’ Group (which he will lead) to increase SWA’s political visibility.

The Chair then made some proposals on possible HLM formats to kick-off the debate: centre the debate on how to practically fund water and sanitation projects; choose some countries and bring the minister of finance, private finance, development banks and technical experts together to decide how financing that project might happen (SWA to become the go-to point for finding experts at global level on, for instance, open defecation). The emphasis would be on how partners learn and encourage each other and find results that work on the ground, and how the different political constituencies ensure sustainability through high-level political advocacy and communications.

The Executive Chair then passed the floor to Hannan Sulieman, UNICEF’s Director and Chief of Staff, who reinforced her organization’s commitment to SWA, the vital need to use a bottom-up approach to the partnership’s work, and how important it is to engage with ministers of finance at a practical and concrete level.

The SC discussion focused on the challenges of financing (and making the case for financing) water, sanitation and hygiene in order to make them sustainable and self-sufficient. There was a general agreement that even if a project is financed and wells or pumps are built, they often break down and are not fixed because not all interested parties work together – the sustainability of access to water and sanitation services often depends more on “soft components” such as coordination,
participation, reliable data, a strong accountability system and a rigorous focus on the most marginalized, than on infrastructure or funding. Hence the sector should not focus on a project type of approach, but should focus instead on systems and on making systems work in a sustainable manner. Several SC members also pointed out the importance of using existing funds effectively (the basis of the Collaborative Behaviours) and how demonstrating this could make a strong impression on finance ministers.

Transitioning to Session 3, Dominick de Waal gave a short overview of the World Bank’s proposal regarding the 2017 Finance Ministers’ Meeting (FMM) and how it focuses on 1) understanding the magnitude of the challenge of reaching the SDGs for the sector, 2) using existing resources more effectively, and 3) accessing new resources for the sector (e.g. how can commercial financing be leveraged?). He also pointed out the need to more aggressively prioritize disadvantaged groups, but admitted it was still unclear how this could be part of the FMM. The SC also discussed the role of advocacy to ensure governments are sensitive to the needs of the most marginalized and to present the costs of not investing in water, sanitation and hygiene. It was pointed out that the preparatory process might contribute to this type of advocacy. There was also a call for exploring the argument that water, sanitation and hygiene enable businesses to run (the same away as energy and telecommunications, but in a more indirect way) and how they influence the success of other sectors such as health and education.

During his final remarks, the Chair made further recommendations for the agenda of the FMM: start with a short reminder of what countries committed to with the SDGs, then follow with the role of SWA in ensuring water, sanitation and hygiene-related targets are achieved. After this introduction, include a short presentation about the economic and financial impact of investing in the sector (vs. others), followed by another short presentation on why water, sanitation and hygiene are a critical priority and on how ministers of finance can plan to efficiently finance them (including a variety of sources - taxes, tariffs, etc.). End with examples from countries on how financing solutions are working and not working. The Chair underlined the need to make clear that the end-users of water and sanitation services are also voters – the successful political prioritization of these actions leads to their sustainability.

**Session 3: High-level Political Dialogue**  
*Catarina de Albuquerque; Cindy Kushner, UNICEF; Dominick de Waal, World Bank*

As the chair of the High-level Political Dialogue Working Group (HLPDWG), the Executive Chair gave the SC an update on its recent activities. The Group focused on planning for the 2017 HLMs and on supporting UNICEF’s development of a first draft of SWA’s Country Level Engagement Strategy. She also requested countries (a constituency not represented at all in the Group) to join the HLPDWG and informed the SC that from now on and until the HLMs, the Group would meet monthly. She also made a proposal for the Group’s Terms of Reference.

The SC resumed the discussion on the FMM, bearing in mind the fact that Dominick de Waal had already made his presentation during the previous session.

When deliberating on the possibility to make changes to the FMM Concept Note, SC members agreed that instead of further revisions, the HLPDWG and those involved in organizing the HLMs should ensure the agendas and preparation process reflects the SC discussions.

Cindy Kushner then made a brief presentation of the proposed Sector Ministers’ Meeting (SMM) Concept Note, that included a draft agenda. She underlined that the objective was to have a clear continuation from the work started at the Ministerial Meeting in Addis Ababa and to link the meeting with the work being developed for the FMM. She proposed that the SMM’s discussion focus on what
underlies effective finance and on ensuring partners go back to their countries with a clear idea of what needs to be undertaken and how.

The SC discussed the proposal extensively and covered several topics. It was agreed that the body to apply these recommendations is the HLPDWG, where the conveners of the HLMs are also represented.

There was a debate on whether the focus should be on sanitation or water supply, and in general the SC agreed that it should be on how access to water, sanitation and hygiene must be in place to reach other SDG targets. Several SC members felt strongly about the need to explicitly discuss integrity, accountability and transparency, both during the meeting and in the preparatory process. Also, the link between the Collaborative Behaviours, the Building Blocks (both of which can be hard to communicate to a minister, but should be part of the preparations to the meeting and of the technical discussions) and their contribution to the SDGs must be clearer and relevant to the different countries – their importance must be practical and not only conceptual. There was also a call for a stronger and more meaningful inclusion of a focus on inequalities and on how to eliminate them (including by adequate policies and targeting of resources) in the agenda.

There was also a general agreement that the choice of moderators for the Ministerial Dialogues was critical in order to reach the SMM’s objectives. Some debate followed regarding the impact of high-level representation (e.g. UN Secretary-General or the World Bank’s President), with several SC members (in particular countries) supporting it for the political message it would send while the co-hosts pointed to the substantial time investment it would require (while the practical contribution of their presence to reaching the objectives of the HLMs was not clear).

Both the FMM and SMM conveners urged SC members to start advocacy in their countries and constituencies to ensure a ministerial presence at the HLMs. SC members representing countries asked the Secretariat to send invitations as soon as possible.

**Action 3:** HLPDWG to take into consideration the SC discussions, suggestions and concerns and to develop the agendas for the SMM and FMM.

**Session 4: Steering Committee Elections**

*Kepha Ombacho, Kenya*

Kepha Ombacho gave the SC an overview of the proposed process for the next SC elections. The next elections should take place in April 2017, but as that coincides with a particularly busy time for the Secretariat, due to the HLMs, the proposal is that they be postponed to July 2017, with the preparatory work beginning in May 2017. This would mean that a new SC will be in place by August 2017. Kepha Ombacho presented a proposal to put 12 SC seats up for election. He also informed the SC that the CSO elections will be coordinated by EWP, while the Secretariat will be responsible for the remaining seats.

There was some debate regarding SC members that have limited involvement and miss all or several meetings. One of the suggestions was for these members, as well as those elected before November 2015, to volunteer to put their positions up for election. Members were particularly concerned about the Mexico representative, who hasn’t attended any meetings. The SC agreed that the Executive Chair should contact Mexico and Costa Rica (which came second in the November 2015 elections for the Latin America position) to inquire whether the former could step down and the latter take its place. The Executive Chair agreed, but made the point that this issue is not related to elections, but instead to the decision taken in Lisbon regarding non-engaged members.
**Action 4:** Executive Chair to contact Mexico regarding its limited engagement in Steering Committee proceedings and request that it step down from the Steering Committee in favour of Costa Rica. The Executive Chair should also approach Costa Rica with this proposal.

**Session 5: Update from CPWG and GMHWG**

*Clare Battle, WaterAid; Jeff Goldberg, USAID*

As chair of the Country Processes Working Group (CPWG), Clare Battle gave the SC an overview of the Group’s activities between May and November. She highlighted the CPWG’s commitment to regularly take stock of its added value and role - even though it is a permanent Group, members want to regularly assess its value within SWA.

Clare Battle highlighted the wide range of constituencies represented in CPWG and the recent event the Group organized at the University of North Carolina’s Water and Health Conference, which explored how the Collaborative Behaviours can be put into practice. She also referred to the efforts to develop a monitoring system for the Behaviours with the support of the GLAAS team. Regarding the CPWG’s proposal for its 2017 workplan, Clare Battle highlighted several activities to promote the adoption of the Behaviours, and to facilitate, implement and monitor progress on them. She also referred to the upcoming work on the development of the “toolkit web portal” (scheduled to go live in June 2017).

The SC asked the CPWG and the GLAAS team to develop a mechanism to understand how the Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles can be used by governments, and their impact at country level. The SC agreed that the CPWG’s workplan is directly impacted by the upcoming SC discussions on country engagement and hence the decision to approve it should be taken only after such discussions take place. There was also a discussion on whether the toolkit could be developed and maintained by partners instead of hiring consultants. Amanda mentioned that currently the Secretariat does not have the necessary resources for developing and maintaining the toolkit, but that she would welcome a partner to take the work forward. Clare Battle supported this but underlined that that person would need to be managed by the CPWG.

Jeff Goldberg then spoke as chair of the Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group (GMHWG) and also gave the SC an overview of its activities between May and November. He highlighted that a draft of the voluntary standard for monitoring rural communal water point functionality was presented at the UNC Conference for feedback from sector stakeholders. The Group would now like to ask for the support of Research and Learning representatives in the follow-up work, including dissemination of the standard.

For 2017, Jeff Goldberg proposed four broad areas of work: 1) assess the completeness of Building Blocks and develop indicators for their monitoring, 2) finalize and disseminate a voluntary standard for monitoring rural communal water point functionality for use by SWA partners via the R&L constituency, 3) strengthen harmonization of institutional analyses and Joint Sector Reviews and 4) support the monitoring of the SWA Collaborative Behaviours. The SC supported these objectives, with some members questioning the overlap with the CPWG’s work and suggesting that the two groups might merge in the future. There was also a suggestion to, at some point, ask WHO or JMP to take forward and further develop, disseminate and monitor the voluntary monitoring standard. Jeff Goldberg underlined that it is not the objective of the GMHWG to monitor the rural communal water point functionalities, only to develop the common standard. He added that the Group is in close contact with the JMP.

**Action 5:** CPWG to develop a process to assess governments’ use of the Collaborative Behaviours Country Profiles and their impact.
**Action 6:** Partners to volunteer human resources to develop and manage the CPWG’s web-based toolkit.

**Session 6: Executive Chair Contractual Arrangements**  
*Sanjay Wijesekera, UNICEF; Edou Muhima, UNICEF*

Sanjay Wijesekera gave the SC an update on UNICEF’s efforts to implement the decision to change the Executive Chair’s current consultancy contract to a fixed-term, full-time position at an appropriate level. He mentioned that, on a practical level, this is a request from the SC to UNICEF, so his organization needs the SC’s guidance on three issues:

1. After benchmarking with other equivalent partnerships, the suggested level of the position is D2. In addition to the salary and benefits, the costs of creating this position at UNOPS include their management fees (7%), as well as UNICEF’s fees (8%).

2. If UNOPS creates the position, it still needs UNICEF to oversee the Executive Chair, so UNICEF needs to establish an accountability mechanism with the SC. For example, an agreed list of objectives and success indicators overseen in more detail by a SC sub-group. UNICEF is also looking into the possibility of increasing the SC’s accountability over this position by asking each individual SC member to sign an agreement with UNICEF.

3. Regarding the appointment, there are two options (if the EC is to be hired by UNICEF): a competitive rather than the selection process used for the Vice-Chair position (job title when Catarina was initially recruited as a part-time consultant) or 2) a direct appointment by UNICEF’s Executive Director.

In terms of timeline, Sanjay Wijesekera reminded the SC that the Executive Chair has a contract until 25 April, but if the recruitment process for the fixed position takes longer, the SC needs to agree on an interim solution, as UNICEF cannot renew her consultancy contract.

The Executive Chair then took the floor to describe the events from her perspective, from the initial call inviting her for the position, until she was informed that her consultancy contract could not be renewed beyond 25 April because UNICEF considered that her post should be a fixed-term one. She mentioned this was an unfortunate situation and informed the SC of her willingness to step down from the position should that make their decision easier. She also underlined that for SWA, herself and any future Executive Chair, a fixed-term position will bring long-term stability and security. She also asked the SC, independently of their decision, to give her clarity in terms of timeline. The Executive Chair then left the room for the SC to have an open debate and Sanjay requested Edou Muhima, HR Manager at UNICEF, to moderate the discussion.

The SC debated this topic extensively. It was agreed that the best solution for SWA is to have a full-time Executive Chair. It was also agreed that the instability associated with this process is not ideal and that a definitive solution should be found as soon as possible. One of the most debated issues was that of accountability, with the SC having a general sense that, as the partnership evolves, so should its level of accountability. Other topics included whether to base the position within the UN system, the need for further evidence on the level of the position, and the importance to further research the arrangements of similar partnerships, including some based at UNICEF.

The SC agreed that this discussion reiterated the need for a revision of the Governing Document, including accountability lines of the Executive Chair and Secretariat towards the SC and, related to that, whether the SC is a governance structure or an advisory group.
There were several concerned voices regarding the double overhead of a UNICEF/UNOPS process and how this should be avoided if possible, especially if UNOPS asks UNICEF to oversee the position. Amanda Marlin noted that one way to avoid the double-charge would be for a donor or a group of donors to transfer funds directly to SWA’s Geneva trust fund at UNOPS.

The SC reached the conclusion that currently it did not have all the necessary information to answer the outstanding questions. There was a general agreement with the suggestion of creating a Task Team to look carefully into this issue and present recommendations to the SC in an extraordinary meeting to be convened in early January 2017. Initial volunteers for this Task Team were: Sanjay Wijesekera, Paul Deverill and Patrick Moriarty. Edou Muhima will join the group in an advisory capacity.

Finally, the SC discussed an interim solution to ensure the Executive Chair can continue her work even if the process to create a fixed position is not finalized by the end of her current consultancy contract. A possibility would be for another partner to create an interim six-month consultancy contract for the EC if needed.

**Session 7: Executive Session 1**

**Decision 1: Agenda**
The Steering Committee approves the draft agenda for the meeting giving the Executive Chair the possibility to change the order of the sessions if necessary.

**Decision 2: Governing Document**
The Steering Committee establishes a Governance Working Group with a mandate to make recommendations on issues related to the governance of the partnership, and to revise the current Governing Document. The Steering Committee invites interested partners to join this Group.

**Decision 3: Minutes September**
The Steering Committee approves the minutes of the September 2016 virtual meeting, with the changes proposed by Fiona Gore and Paul Deverill to Session 3.

**Decision 4: Minutes November**
The Steering Committee approves the minutes of the November 2016 Extraordinary meeting, after changing “George Chaima” to “George Yarngo”.

**Decision 5: Sector Ministers’ Meeting**
The Steering Committee thanks UNICEF for the Sector Ministers’ Meeting Concept Paper and approves it. The Steering Committee asks the High-level Political Dialogue Working Group to: give guidance on its implementation; revise the draft agenda, taking into account the Steering Committee’s discussion and; implement Decision 9 on the Afternoon of Engagement.

**Decision 6: Steering Committee Elections**
The Steering Committee decides:

a) to adopt the recommendations presented in the Steering Committee Elections Concept Paper concerning the May-July 2017 Steering Committee elections, together with the methodology and timeline.

b) that from now onwards the elections, which take place every 18 months as outlined in the Governing Document, will take place in the months of July and/or January, with the next elections taking place in July 2017.
c) to ask the Governance Working Group to consider recommendations presented in the Elections Concept Paper for inclusion in the revision of the Governance Document.

**Decision 7: Executive Chair Contractual Arrangements**

The Steering Committee decides that:

a) a sub-group consisting of Paul Deverill, Patrick Moriarty and Sanjay Wijesekera will consider each of the questions posed in Sanjay’s presentation, as well as additional questions posed during the discussion (see below) within the next four weeks. An extraordinary SC meeting will be convened in the first week of January to discuss options and adopt decisions in relation to each of these questions.

b) Edou Muhima will support the group as a resource person knowledgeable in the UN Human Resources system.

c) the group will answer the following questions and make recommendations regarding:
   
   a. The pros and cons of establishing a post within the UN system.
   b. The pros and cons of establishing the post within UNICEF.
   c. The pros and cons of establishing the post with UNOPS.

d) the Group will make a concrete proposal to the SC regarding the long-term contractual arrangement for the EC;

e) the Executive Chair is engaged on a consultancy basis until 25 April. Another partner should further extend this contract for a further six months, if this proves necessary.

**Decision 8: Global Monitoring Harmonization Working Group**

The Steering Committee thanks the GMHWG for its report and approves its January-June 2017 Workplan, requesting that it attempts to refine it to maximize synergies and minimize overlap with the Country Processes Working Group.

***

**Action 7:** Executive Chair to send email to Steering Committee requesting volunteers for the Governance Working Group and suggesting a timeline for the development of Terms of Reference.

**DAY 2**

**Session 8: Country Engagement**

*Cindy Kushner; Catarina de Albuquerque*

The SC had previously asked UNICEF, in consultation with other partners, to draft a strategy that would define how SWA could increase its engagement and impact at country level. Cindy Kushner gave a short summary of the draft Strategy. She explained that SWA should evolve from focusing on convening global meetings to fulfilling its original mission of changing the way the sector delivers on the vision of “sanitation and water for all”, which ultimately depends on how change happens at country level.

She mentioned that a combination of the Building Blocks and Collaborative Behaviours (and their indicators), guided by SWA’s Strategy and Guiding Principles, are already starting to align all partners around a common language. The role of the proposed Strategy would be to continue that work through a common understanding of what all partners should do together at country level. The operationalization of the proposed Strategy will become a clear and practical framework for this in-
country work, led by governments and supported by partners. One follow-up activity will be to communicate the Strategy and other elements to partners.

She underlined that the achievement of these results depends on having the right human resources, including one or two coordinators per constituency in the Secretariat and the political influence of the Leaders’ Group.

The SC generally agreed that SWA needed partners to align around its Country Strategy and for more country-based activities. Several members admitted to difficulties in articulating SWA’s benefits for countries. There was also an agreement that SWA’s narrative should not be about the Collaborative Behaviours and Building Blocks in themselves, but about the direct connection between all SWA activities and the achievement of the SDGs in-country.

The group agreed that the more important debate should not be about the Strategy (which provides a vision and framework), but on how to put it into practice. The idea to implement it first in pilot countries was generally welcomed, as well as the suggestion that the CPWG should lead this work.

Suggestions that arose during the discussion included a call for prioritizing the creation of multi-stakeholder fora in all countries (through, for instance, an SWA structure in-country that supports their development and maintenance); a call for a closer alignment with regional bodies (i.e. the SANs); making use of permanent missions; and the need to include SMEs when engaging with the private sector, not just multinationals.

The Executive Chair then made a short presentation about the future of SWA’s accountability mechanism. The Executive Chair reminded the SC that previously, SWA coordinated a process where countries and donors tabled commitments at the HLMs and then revised them annually. Although this brought some benefits (e.g. increase of CSO involvement in governments’ decision-making), it also had disadvantages, as it was difficult to analyse at a global level, and it significantly increased country’s monitoring burden.

The Executive Chair’s proposal was for SWA to continue an “SWA branded” accountability mechanism, but ensure it was aligned with countries’ SDG processes. For example, countries could divide their SDG plan into 2-year objectives and table these intermediate milestones at the SMMs.

The SC welcomed the idea of continuing an SWA accountability mechanism that improves on the commitments system. Part of the debate revolved around the need to avoid over-positive reports that don’t reflect the reality.

**Session 9: Afternoon of Engagement**

*Catarina de Albuquerque*

The Executive Chair introduced the topic of the proposed Afternoon of Engagement. She referred to the possibility of a time break between the SMM and FMM, and the proposal to organize activities for attending partners during that time. The initial suggestion was to create a space where partners could (co-)convene events (workshops, seminars, etc.) under themes relevant for the HLMs.

The Executive Chair emphasized the financial and human resource implications of organizing the Afternoon of Engagement, especially for the Secretariat that will also be responsible for the logistics of both the FMM and SMM. She asked the SC if SWA should invest in the proposed Afternoon of Engagement and their opinion on the likelihood that ministers will attend it.
CSO representatives informed the group they had already begun to develop concepts for possible events, together with governments. They support the idea of the Afternoon of Engagement, especially because it allows their constituency to play a more active role in the HLMs. Also, it creates occasions to debate topics that might be neglected or overshadowed at the main meetings. They think the Afternoon of Engagement should be an integral part of the official FMM and SMM agendas.

Other SC members questioned the impact of the Afternoon of Engagement on the objectives of the HLMs, especially considering the resources it would require and the risk of limited high-level participation. Members pointed out that, even if there was a break between the HLMs, many ministers would prefer to spend their time consulting with their advisers.

It was generally agreed that the Afternoon of Engagement filled a need from non-country constituencies to be more involved in the HLMs, so the SC agreed that a good compromise would be to ensure that the topics for the sessions already being developed by the CSOs should be included in the official HLM discussions. The SC decided that this issue should be analysed by the HLDPWG. A final decision on whether to organize an Afternoon of Engagement was postponed until there is more clarity on the exact dates of the SMM and FMM.

Session 10: Secretariat 2016 Budget Update and 2017 Workplan and Budget
Amanda Marlin

Amanda Marlin gave an update on the 2016 Secretariat budget and spending. She noted that it was a difficult format to interpret because of the need to transfer funds from UNICEF to the Geneva office and EWP (for the CSO Advisor). She also referred to the funds currently unspent, pointing out that the budget was prepared when the plan was to organize two HLMs in 2016. That money will be spent in 2017. She also made a note of the underspending on staff and reminded the SC that some posts are currently unfilled, with recruitment ongoing.

She informed the SC that the budget’s format will change in 2017 as a direct response to their request for a more direct link between budget lines and the Results Framework. Staff costs will be allocated across the different objectives, instead of having a dedicated line.

Amanda Marlin is expecting some shortfall for 2017, which will be covered by the funds not spent in 2016, but has concerns for 2018.

The SC requested that in the future more narrative detail be supplied with the year-end figures. The group also asked for a narrative report to complement the end-year figures. In general, it was agreed that SWA would benefit from a closer engagement of the SC in financial matters, so the idea of forming a Financial Working Group was welcomed by all. This Group would support the Secretariat in preparation of annual workplans and budgets, and make recommendations to the Steering Committee on issues related to value-for-money, such as the pros and cons associated with having some SWA Secretariat staff members employed by UNOPS.

Regarding staff, the SC debated several topics that will be further developed by the Governance and HLDP Working Groups: benefits and disadvantages of having the Secretariat hosted in the UN system; the possibility of the Geneva staff also becoming UNICEF and hence avoiding the double charges; and the possibility of some positions being hosted by partners. The Executive Chair asked SC members to consider supporting SWA by hosting some of the Secretariat’s staff members, in particular the future Regional Advisors.

Action 8: Steering Committee members to consider hosting one or more SWA Secretariat staff.
**Session 11: Executive Chair 2017 Workplan**  
_Catarina de Albuquerque_

The Executive Chair presented the SC with a draft of her 2017 workplan, aligned with the Results Framework. Based on recent discussions, she suggested adding a line related to her contribution to the implementation of the Country Engagement Strategy. The SC welcomed this idea and generally supported more engagement from the Executive Chair in country-level work, suggesting visits to the countries that will pilot the Strategy.

The SC welcomed the format of the workplan and requested Amanda Marlin to use the same when developing the Secretariat’s version. Members also discussed in more detail the Executive Chair’s accountability and how the Governance Working Group should work on success indicators for the position. The SC asked the Executive Chair to develop a first draft for review by the Group.

Several SC members also asked the Executive Chair to consider attending events where the Agenda 2030 will be discussed, especially regional ones. There was also a call for the Governance Group to further define the role of the Executive Chair versus that of the Secretariat versus that of the future Regional Advisors.

The Executive Chair then introduced the topic of fundraising, reminding the group of its decision in Lisbon to support her fundraising efforts. She asked the SC if they had ideas on how they could practically do this and suggested using their contacts in key foundations and other potential donors. The SC discussed the importance of leveraging the Chair’s political visibility and influence, as well as that of the future Leaders’ Group. It was generally agreed that it is key for SWA to strengthen its in-country work, in order to be able to show value and impact.

**Action 9:** Executive Chair to add to her workplan 2017 a reference to her work supporting the implementation of the Country Engagement Strategy.

**Action 10:** Executive Chair to consider attending regional events that focus on the achievement of the Agenda 2030, as well as visit the countries that will pilot the Country Engagement Strategy.

**Action 11:** Coordinator to add more narrative to the Secretariat workplan.

**Action 12:** Executive Chair to develop a first draft of success indicators for her 2017 workplan, to be reviewed by the Governance Working Group.

**Action 13:** Governance Working Group to define roles of Executive Chair, Secretariat and Regional Advisors.

**Session 12: Private Sector Partnership Drive**  
_Sanjay Banka, BankaBioloo_

Sanjay Banka presented a concept paper for expanding the Private Sector constituency. He mentioned that these suggestions were guided by consultations with private sector partners, in particular during their meeting in Addis Ababa in March.

The SC debated the proposal, in particular the suggested list of industries SWA should strive to include in its membership, which was divisive. Several SC members feared a possible conflict of interest between some of those industries and SWA’s objectives. Other members felt that it was better to have those industries as part of the debate and within SWA - the partnership could also
encourage organizations that are already water, sanitation and hygiene champions to inspire others to become one.

There was a general agreement that SWA still needs to better define its rules of engagement with the private sector (i.e. what SWA offers and what is asked from companies). It was also agreed that all private sector companies joining the partnership should abide by its Guiding Principles, as well as OHCHR's “Human Rights and Business Guiding Principles”. SC members have the right to question and veto any application if they feel it would be negative for SWA.

The SC encouraged the Private Sector Working Group to develop a Private Sector Engagement Concept Paper that reflected this discussion.

*Session 13: Executive Session 2*

**Decision 9: Afternoon of Engagement**
The Steering Committee asks the HLPDWG to integrate the topics and issues that are part of the Afternoon of Engagement Concept Paper into the agendas of the FMM and SMM as well as the preparation process. A final decision about whether or not to hold an Afternoon of Engagement will depend on the timing of FMM.

**Decision 10: High-level Political Dialogue and HLMs**
The Steering Committee encourages all constituencies that are part of the HLPDWG to contribute with ideas for the content of the HLMs, and requests that FMM and SMM conveners integrate these ideas into the agendas.

**Decision 11: Country Engagement Strategy**
The Steering Committee:

- e) thanks UNICEF for the paper on SWA’s Country Engagement Strategy.
- f) agrees that SWA needs to articulate a framework that describes what partners work on together in countries and how.
- g) the framework is composed of the following elements:
  - iv. Adhering to the Collaborative Behaviours
  - v. Structured around the Building Blocks
  - vi. Work through a government-led inclusive planning and review process with a view of meeting the water, sanitation and hygiene related SDGs.
- h) proposes that interested SWA country partners and the CPWG lead a concerted effort to operationalize this decision in at least 2-3 countries during the preparation process for the April HLMs, to support the use of Building Block assessment questions and Collaborative Behaviors indicators, evaluating the usefulness of these as tools to inform a clear framing within six months.

**Decision 12: Accountability Mechanism**
The Steering Committee decides to:

- a) thank the Secretariat for the preliminary thinking done on refining the SWA Accountability Mechanism and requests the HLPDWG, in consultation with the CPWG, to further work on this issue, aligning it with the Results Framework and taking into account the discussions held at the current Steering Committee meeting, with a view to finalizing a concept note in time for approval at the next virtual Steering Committee meeting (to be held in the first quarter of 2017).
b) request the HLPDWG to undertake further consultations between December 2016 and March 2017, in order to develop a few examples that show what milestones for countries and other stakeholders could look like, taking into consideration recommendations for country-level engagement.

**Decision 13: Secretariat Workplan 2017**
The Steering Committee thanks the Secretariat for its activities and notes the 2016 interim financial report. The Steering Committee approves the 2017 Secretariat Workplan and budget, and requests the Secretariat to add more narrative detail in the next month.

**Decision 14: Establishment of a Finance Working Group**
The Steering Committee decides to establish a Finance Working Group with the objective to advise and support the Secretariat in the preparation of annual workplans and budgets.

**Decision 15: Executive Chair Workplan 2017**
The Steering Committee decides to:

a) thank the Executive Chair for her activities and decides to approve the Executive Chair’s Workplan 2017.

b) ask the Executive Chair to prepare draft performance indicators to be submitted to the Governance WG for review.

**Decision 16: Private Sector Partnership Drive**
The Steering Committee decides to:

a) ask the Private Sector Task Team to develop a “Private Sector Engagement Concept Paper”, availing opportunities to the different constituencies to be part of this process, to be presented to the next face-to-face SC meeting.

b) request that this Concept Paper should reflect the Human Rights and Business Guiding Principles.

**Session 14: Community-based Organizations**
*Lajana Manandhar, FANSA/Lumanti*

Lajana Manandhar presented the CSO constituency’s proposal regarding Community-based Organizations. She stated that having separate CSO and CBO constituencies presents several challenges, including the difficulty of recruiting enough CBOs to create a strong constituency; the risk of dividing the current CSO constituency (some organizations in the CSOs can be considered CBOs); and the challenge for the CSO Advisor to coordinate these groups and ensure good communication between them.

The recommendation of the CSOs is to amend the SC decision that created a separate CBO constituency and instead increase CBO representation within the CSO constituency. They propose to add a fifth position to the CSO constituency’s representation at the SC, always to be held by a CBO representative. Lajana pointed out that this would allow CBO participation and visibility while insuring a good coordination within the CSO constituency. There was no opposition to this proposal.
**Session 15: Procedure for Review of New Applications**  
*Patrick Moriarty, IRC*

Patrick Moriarty introduced the topic of the due diligence process for new applications. This included the Secretariat regularly submitting to the SC an overview of information gathered about each potential partner, e.g. whether or not they have a website or publicly-available Annual Reports.

Following some questions Patrick Moriarty clarified that if an organization does not have, for instance, Annual Reports, it is not automatically prevented from joining SWA. This would be just one piece of information to support SC members in their decision. Amanda Marlin also clarified that the Secretariat would not make recommendations on any of the applicants – they would simply collect the data and submit it to the SC for analysis.

In order to use the SC’s time more efficiently, the SC asked the Secretariat to submit batches of new applications only four times a year via email for a no-objection approval. Only the contested applications will be discussed by the SC during in-person meetings. The SC asked the Secretariat to adjust the Operational Note accordingly. There was a general call for more time to review the applications, so that the SC members could consult with their constituencies.

**Session 16: Consideration of New Partner Applications**  
*Amanda Marlin*

Amanda Marlin led the group in the review of the applications received by the Secretariat.

Several SC members questioned whether Plumbers Without Borders and the Daniel Iroegbu Global Health Foundation should belong to the CSO constituency instead of External Support Agencies. This triggered a discussion around the definition of each constituency and the implications of letting applicants make a first decision on which constituency they should belong to. It was pointed out that there will always be organizations that could legitimately belong to more than one constituency (e.g. social businesses), so one consideration for a future SC meeting could be to restructure the constituency system so it is not so prescriptive. The SC asked the Secretariat to contact Plumber Without Borders and the Daniel Iroegbu Global Health Foundation regarding a possible adjustment of their constituency.

There was also a debate on faith-based organizations and the possibility they could discriminate based on religious choices. It was agreed that SWA’s Guiding Principles were clear on non-discrimination of any sort, so it was essential to make a clear reference to them in the application form. It was also pointed out that the Governing Document allows the exclusion of a partner if they don’t follow the Principles. However, the SC decided to ask the Secretariat to gather more information on the Christian Outreach Justice Mission.

The SC asked the Secretariat to only officially accept the applications up for discussion if there were no objections from the SC by 21 December 2016. The exceptions are Plumbers Without Borders, the Daniel Iroegbu Global Health Foundation and Christian Outreach Justice Mission, that require follow-up action.

**Session 17: SWA/SUN Partnership**  
*Thilo Panzerbieter, German Toilet Organization/EWP*

Thilo Panzerbieter gave the SC a summary of the joint work carried out by SWA and SUN since the SC’s decision to engage further with sectors that depended on water, sanitation and hygiene to
achieve their SDG targets. He also presented the Concept Paper that will serve as a strategic framework for future joint activities.

Thilo Panzerbieter pointed out that it would be beneficial for both partnerships to interact, especially considering SUN’s robust in-country presence. The SC welcomed the partnership with SUN and the Concept Paper. Considering the Governance discussions in the previous session, several SC members pointed out the benefits of SWA also analyzing SUN’s structures and processes (e.g. do they have Regional Advisors? Do they have in-country multi-stakeholder fora?). Part of the discussion focused on the possibility of concentrating the work around system building, development effectiveness and changing donor behavior. There was also a call for looking into possible work related to monitoring and evaluation, e.g. adding nutrition-related questions to the GLAAS survey.

The SC generally agreed that the Working Group should include members of SUN, making it a Joint Working Group, and that its first task should be the development of clear Terms of Reference. On the issue of how these activities would have impact at country level, Thilo Panzerbieter pointed out that one of the Group’s priorities was looking at countries where the nutrition/water, sanitation and hygiene link has been successful, and capture these learnings. It was suggested that one of the countries that will pilot SWA’s Country Engagement Strategy could coincide with the ones chosen by the SWA/SUN Joint Working Group.

Session 18: Executive Session 4

Decision 17: Community-based Organizations
The Steering Committee:
  a) acknowledges the importance of giving a voice to CBOs.
  b) decides that the CBO constituency will merge with the CSO constituency.
  c) decides that within the CSO constituency one seat will be reserved for a CBO representative in the Steering Committee. The first selection for a representative will be done in the July 2017 elections.

Decision 18: Procedure for Review of New Applications
The Steering Committee requests the Secretariat to revise the Operational Note, taking into account the feedback from the Steering Committee, and the experience obtained in applying this procedure for the first time, and to submit the revised Operational Note for approval on a no-objections basis by email before end-December 2016.

Decision 19: New partners
The Steering Committee has reviewed submissions from a range of potential partners and decides that German Toilet Organization, German WASH Network, Initiative : Eau, SINAM – Sadayanodai Ilaignar Narpani Mandram, Water Integrity Network (WIN), Wherever the Need India Services (WTNIS), Tanzania Youth with New Hope in Live Organisation (TAYONEHO), SpeakUpAfrica, Yoto River Waterkeeper, Action contre la Faim, and Nana Sahib Development Society will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.

Decision 20: New partners
The Steering Committee instructs the Secretariat to contact Plumbers without Borders and Daniel Iroegbu Global Health Foundation and suggest to them that they become partners in the Civil Society Organization constituency. If they agree, then they will be accepted into the Civil Society constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.

Decision 21: New partners
The Steering Committee decides that:
a) Unilever and ECOLOO AB are accepted into the Private Sector constituency, if no objections are received by 21 December 2016.
b) Jordan is accepted into the Country constituency.
c) requests the Secretariat to gather more information from Christian Outreach Justice Mission Sierra Leone (Comin-SL).

**Decision 22: SWA/SUN partnership**
The Steering Committee:
a) acknowledges the work of the SUN and SWA Secretariats in preparing a proposal for joint areas of engagement with specific activities for 2017.
b) endorses the joint areas of engagement and the action plan and encourages the creation of a joint working group comprised of partners from both global platforms who have the capacity and resources to support its implementation, with the initial intention to develop Terms of Reference.

Further, the Steering Committee requests an update from the Secretariat in mid-2017.

**Decision 23: HLPD Working Group Terms of Reference**
The Steering Committee decides that the High-level Political Dialogue Working Group:
d) is a Group mandated by the Steering Committee to give guidance to the Secretariat and to the conveners of SWA’s meetings on the meetings’:
   v. objectives
   vi. agendas
   vii. participants
   viii. preparatory process
e) shall also be consulted on and give guidance to SWA’s country engagement strategy and revised accountability system.
f) shall meet periodically and be composed of representatives of each SWA constituency.

**Decision 24: 2017 Steering Committee meetings**
The Steering committee decides that:
a) the 2017 face-to-face meetings will be held in the 3rd week of June and the first week of December.
b) the virtual SC meetings will be held in mid-March and mid-September.