

FINAL REPORT

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE SIDA SUPPORT TO THE
UNDP WATER GOVERNANCE PROGRAM 2008 – 2011**

STOCKHOLM IN JUNE 2011

JOHAN HOLMBERG

NORDIC CONSULTING GROUP SWEDEN AB



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms

Executive summary

PART I: THE SETTING FOR THE REVIEW	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background and report outline	1
1.2 Project history.....	2
1.3 Project agreements	3
1.4 The Water Governance Program defined	5
1.5 The Water Governance Facility.....	7
2. Conduct of the review	9
2.1 Literature review	9
2.2 Interviews	9
2.3 Online survey	10
2.4 Local consultants	10
2.5 Field visits to Jordan and Palestine	11
PART II: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	12
3. Achievement of the work plan	12
3.1 The goal and outcomes in the project document	12
3.2 The Water Governance Facility.....	16
3.3 GoalWash	19
3.4 Overall conclusions	21
4. Findings and conclusions from the online survey	23
4.1 Findings	23
4.2 Conclusions from the findings.....	27
5. Local consultancies and field visits.....	29
5.1 Consultancies in Tajikistan and Kenya	29
5.2 Field visits to Jordan and Palestine	30

5.3	Tentative conclusions	32
6.	Assessment of WGP	34
6.1	Relevance to key beneficiaries	34
6.2	Value to UNDP and to Sida.....	34
6.3	WGP response to current challenges and reform needs	35
6.4	Cost efficiency and effectiveness	36
6.5	Achievement of outputs: quantity, quality and timeliness	37
6.6	Value to WGP of SIWI as a hosting partner	38
6.7	Value to WGP of other partners and the strength of partnership arrangements	38
6.8	WGP contribution toward poverty reduction	40
6.9	Cooperation with other donors, UN agencies and other stakeholders.....	42
6.10	Application of the OECD evaluation criteria	43
PART III: THE DESIGN OF WGP GOING FORWARD.....		45
7.	Recommendations for the future of WGP.....	45
7.1	Continue WGP	45
7.2	Improve the format for Sida support	45
7.3	Rewrite the UNDP Water Governance Strategy	46
7.4	Disseminate water governance more widely within UNDP	47
7.5	Focus the work plan better on the core business	48
7.6	Broaden the financial support base.....	50
7.7	Promote support to the Community Water Initiative	51
7.8	Continue GoalWash and align it better with other UN initiatives.....	51
7.9	Develop more knowledge products and raise the WGP profile	53
7.10	Assign JPOs to strengthen UNDP COs in their coordinating role	54
8.	Strategic focus of WGP.....	56
8.1	Toward a vision for the future	56
8.2	More focus on WSS utilities and their regulation	57
8.3	Elements of a new WGP strategy	59

9.	The 4th phase project: modalities, organization and next steps	62
9.1	The inclusion of Cap-Net	62
9.2	Modalities for the Sida support	63
9.3	Governance arrangements	66
	Annex 1: Terms of Reference	68
	Annex 2: Main documents used for this review	72
	Annex 3: Persons interviewed.....	75
	Annex 4: Status of WGF activities in Jordan and Palestine	79
	Annex 5: Summary of recommendations	82
	Table 1: Sida-UNDP Water Agreements 1998 – 2011	
	Table 2: UNDP Water & Ocean Governance Program – Resources Mobilized 2007 – 2011	
	Table 3: WGF personnel as of March 2011	
	Table 4: WGF costs during 2008 – 2010 (USD)	
	Table 5: Intended outcomes and actual achievements: a summary	
	Table 6: WGF country overview	

Acronyms

AAP	African Adaptation Program
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFD	Agence française pour le développement
AMCOW	African Ministers' Committee on Water
B&H	Bosnia and Herzegovina
BDP	Bureau for Development Policy (of UNDP)
CC	Climate change
CC-A	Climate change adaptation
CO	Country Office
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CWI	Community Water Initiative
DGIS	Netherlands Directorate-General for International Cooperation
DHI	Danish Hydraulic Institute
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EDM	Every Drop Matters
EUWI	European Union Water Initiative
FAO	United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization
FWG	Finance Working Group (of EUWI)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GWA	Gender & Water Alliance
GWP	Global Water Partnership
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
HDR	Human Development Report
IBNET	International Benchmarking Network for Water & Sanitation Utilities
IRC	International Water & Sanitation Center
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
JPO	Junior Professional Officer

KWAHO	Kenya Water for Health Organization
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDG-F	MDG Achievement Fund
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OGC	Oslo Governance Center
PA	Palestinian Authority
PDR	People's Democratic Republic (of Laos)
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Program
PWA	Palestinian Water Authority
RBA	Regional Bureau for Africa (of UNDP)
RBO	River Basin Organization
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SEI	Stockholm Environment Institute
SGP	Small Grants Program
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SWP	Shared Waters Partnership
TI	Transparency International
ToR	Terms of Reference
SEK	Swedish Crowns
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWP	Shared Waters Partnership
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDP-PAPP	UNDP Program of Assistance to the Palestinian People
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program

UNESCO	United Nations Educational & Scientific Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollars
WB	World Bank
WGA	Water Governance Alliance
WGF	Water Governance Facility
WGP	Water Governance Program
WGS	Water Governance Strategy
WHO	World Health Organization
WIN	Water Integrity Network
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WOGP	Water & Ocean Governance Program
WRM	Water Resources Management
WSP	Water & Sanitation Program
WSS	Water supply & sanitation
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development (in Johannesburg in 2002)
WWD	World Water Day
WWF	World Water Forum
WWDR	World Water Development Report
WWW	World Water Week

Executive Summary

In 1998 Sida and UNDP initiated a program of cooperation in water governance. The Sida-UNDP Water Governance Program (WGP) is now in its 3rd phase, and consideration is being given to a 4th phase starting in 2012. The program has not been evaluated previously, and the existing project agreement does not provide for an external evaluation. In 2010 the parties decided that an external review should be carried out during the first half of 2011 to provide a basis for decisions on a 4th phase project.

Since the inception in 1998 Sida has allocated SEK166.6 million to its cooperation with UNDP in water, equivalent to about USD27 million. This includes SEK65.5 million that Sida has allocated in two phases to Cap-Net, a project that provides training in the water sector and that is financed also by the Dutch DGIS. The intention of Sida and UNDP is that support to both WGP and Cap-Net shall be merged into one agreement from 2012.

Since March 2005 the Sida support has included the Water Governance Facility (WGF) hosted by the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI). WGF has about 4.5 staff working to support UNDP Country Offices and partner countries on water governance issues.

The UNDP Water & Ocean Governance Program is very much larger than the part of WGP supported by Sida. The total amount of resources mobilized for this program during 2007 – 2011 was USD409.07 million of which Sida's contribution, including Cap-Net, is only 4.5 per cent. Most of the finance comes from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and from a few bilateral donors, particularly Spain and Japan.

Information for this review was collected through various means. There was an extensive literature review, covering a wealth of reports generated directly and indirectly by WGP. Interviews were carried out with UNDP staff at headquarters in New York and in the field, with Sida staff, with staff from SIWI and WGF, and with representatives of partner organizations. An online survey was designed and implemented to explore attitudes to WGP, 161 questionnaires were issued and 66 replies received. Local consultants were hired in Tajikistan and Kenya to review pilot projects supported under WGP. The reviewer carried out field visits to Jordan and Palestine to assess WGP-supported activities.

The overall objective stated in the Sida-UNDP agreement refers to water governance improvements in developing countries. This objective is only attainable in the long term, and the agreement provides no indicators or benchmarks. All that can be said is that some progress has been made toward this overall objective, it is yet premature to identify significant impact.

The agreement also lists 22 intended outcomes of the 3rd phase project. Some of these were formulated much too ambitiously in the project document, seemingly keeping the 'global WGP' in mind rather than the much smaller Sida-supported project. Apparently, this was done at Sida's behest in 2008 when the project document was prepared. Still, achievement of the intended outcomes has been termed very satisfactory and rated almost 2 on a scale of 0 – 3. The biggest discrepancy between stated intended outcomes and what has actually been

achieved with the Sida support is in the area of cooperation on transboundary waters, while achievement of outcomes in e.g. global and regional advocacy and cross-cutting issues is much better. Valuable work has been done on horizontal issues such as water integrity, gender mainstreaming in water, and application of Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA) to water.

The GoalWash initiative was not foreseen in the original project document and was launched in 2009. With a total cost of about USD2 million it is the largest single component of the Sida support to WGP. It aims to accelerate achievement of the water supply and sanitation (WSS) MDG targets through strategically targeted interventions to strengthen governance of WSS services, primarily in countries that lag seriously behind in achievement of the targets. Following assessment of 11 countries to identify needs that the initiative could address, pilot projects were launched in these countries (some were later added, a few fell away). Each pilot project should have a budget of no more than USD200,000 and a feasible impact within 2 – 3 years. These pilot projects are now being implemented. There are requests for more projects and also for expansion of ongoing projects into more geographic and thematic areas.

The conclusion from the online survey is that WGP is generally seen to be addressing priority issues. There is concern that WSS services are generally not well managed, climate change is seen as an increasing problem as is corruption in water. The local consultants in Tajikistan and Kenya both felt that the pilot projects had been well executed but that wide dissemination of findings and experiences was far from assured.

WGP was found to be highly relevant to its key beneficiaries, an indicator is the strong demand for new GoalWash activities. Within UNDP the program is much respected, e.g. for its work with gender and HRBA issues. However, there is little evidence that Sida in recent years has been able to benefit much from WGP outcomes. WGP is generally seen to have been responsive to current challenges and reform needs in water, but it is argued that going forward it should give more attention to WSS utility management. It has enabled UNDP to become more active in the global water policy dialogue than it otherwise would have been, in particular through the coordinating mechanisms UN-Water and UN-Oceans.

By locating WGF at SIWI it is possible to derive several benefits that would not be present, if it were to be located in New York, as has been mooted. One such benefit is that SIWI has developed into a significant centre of excellence in water and some staff work part-time for SIWI and part-time for WGF, allowing valuable flexibility of work planning. Another is that costs are significantly lower in Stockholm. Yet another is the access to shaping the World Water Week (WWW), the world's largest annual professional conference on water and a much appreciated recurring venue for conferences, workshops and networking.

WGF has collaborated with the partner organizations GWP, WIN and GWA, networks created to promote causes such as integrated water resources management (GWP), water integrity (WIN) and gender equity in water (GWA). These organizations add legitimacy, expertise and outreach to WGF, and collaborative arrangements are generally strong. Collaboration with the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre could be somewhat stronger.

An earlier phase of WGP included the Community Water Initiative (CWI). Sida decided in 2006 to end its support to CWI which is being brought to a close, as the last remaining funds from Luxemburg are being exhausted. CWI has been implemented through UNDP's GEF Small Grants Program and has benefited from its large and well tested infrastructure. CWI had a direct impact on poverty which most of WGP does not. Still, by strengthening institutions and hence the performance of the water sector WGP makes an important, albeit indirect, contribution to poverty reduction.

The review makes several recommendations for the future of WGP:

- i. The Sida support should be continued in a 4th phase of four years.
- ii. The format for this support should improve, intended goal achievement should be better specified, there should be annual reviews (covering also Cap-Net) held in New York and not on the margins of WWW, and Sida should retain a monitoring consultant.
- iii. The UNDP Water Governance Strategy should be revised during 2012.
- iv. Water governance should be more widely disseminated within UNDP, which Sida could quite reasonably expect after so many years of support.
- v. The WGP work plan should be better focused on the core business of water sector reform and strengthening institutions.
- vi. Continued efforts should be made by UNDP to broaden the financial support base.
- vii. External support to CWI from other sources than Sida should be sought by UNDP
- viii. The GoalWash initiative should be continued but aligned better with other UN initiatives, pilot projects should be transferred to programs financed by others.
- ix. WGF should have an added focus on WSS utilities and their regulation.
- x. UNDP should initiate a "Water Governance Alliance" with UNICEF, WB and UN Habitat to promote water governance linked to WSS programs.
- xi. There is a demand for more knowledge products on water governance and a related need to raise the WGP profile, i.a. through a publication series.
- xii. Junior Professional Officers (JPOs) should be assigned to 2- 4 UNDP Country Offices to help strengthen UNDP's coordinating role in water.

The outline of a project document for the 4th phase is suggested. If there proves to be insufficient time to prepare the project document before the end of the year, an extension with additional funds until the end of 2012 of the current agreement should be sought. .

PART I: THE SETTING FOR THE REVIEW

This part has two chapters. It starts by outlining the background to the review, the project history, and the project agreements now in force. It provides a description of the Water Governance Program and also of the Water Governance Facility. In the second chapter there is an account of the conduct of the review and the means of collecting information.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and report outline

”Water is life” is a slogan often uttered as a banal truism. But in parts of the world it stands for a grim reality where water availability, and associated sanitation services, is so scarce that life, in fact, cannot go on. According to the WHO, in 2010 about 884 million people worldwide lack access to improved drinking water supplies and 2.6 billion lack access to basic sanitation. The situation is worsening, particularly with regard to sanitation, despite efforts by governments, international organizations, and donor agencies. Population growth and urbanization are expected to drive demand for water up 40 per cent within 20 years, according to sources close to the World Bank¹. It is further aggravated by climate change (CC) which is already reducing water supplies in large parts of the world, particularly those where poverty is most prevalent.

Water is a major development priority. Because of the different roles that water plays in society, achievement of the water and sanitation (WSS) targets that form part of the 7th Millennium Development Goal (MDG)² impacts also on several other MDGs. For example, water availability affects economic growth (the 1st MDG) and is of particular importance in developing countries where agriculture is a major sector for economic growth and employment. It affects gender equality (the 3rd MDG), maternal health (the 5th MDG), the spread of disease and health (the 6th MDG) and the environment (targets a and b of the 7th MDG). It is no exaggeration to say that sustainable water management and the provision of WSS services determines much of the development agenda or, put differently, that the performance of the water sector is decisive for sustainable development and poverty eradication.

Against this background Sida and UNDP in 1998 initiated a programme of cooperation in water governance. At the time Sida was very supportive of UNDP’s water agenda and its evolving focus on water governance, an area to which no other UN agency had paid much attention. The Sida-UNDP Water Governance Programme (WGP) is now in its 3rd phase, and consideration is being given to a 4th phase starting in 2012. It has not been evaluated previously, although the Water Governance Facility (WGF) in May 2007 issued a self-assessment of its work during 2005-2006. Unusually, the Sida-UNDP agreement for the 3rd

¹ NY Times of 22 March 2011, citing a report from the 2030 Water Resources Group, an association of the World Bank

² MDG target 7c: “Reduce by half (by 2015) the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation”.

phase project does not include any provision for an evaluation. In November 2010 the parties therefore decided that an external review should be carried out, and Sida allocated SEK0.5 million for this purpose. Sida asked UNDP to administer the review, and the Terms of Reference (ToR) shown at Annex 1 were mutually agreed.

This review report has three main parts, reflecting the ToR. Part I describes the overall context of the review in two chapters. Chapter 1 provides the background and outlines the contractual and institutional ramifications that pertain to WGP, while Chapter 2 describes the conduct of the review. Part II presents findings and conclusions divided into four chapters. Chapter 3 summarizes achievement of the intended outcomes stated in the project document. Chapter 4 presents the results from the online survey conducted for the review and Chapter 5 the findings from local consultancies and field visits. In chapter 6 conclusions are drawn on the particular issues raised in the ToR. Part III discusses the future design of WGP based on the conclusions presented in Part II. Chapter 7 has a set of specific recommendations, Chapter 8 suggests a strategic focus for WGP, and Chapter 9 discusses modalities and governance of the 4th phase project.

1.2 Project history

At the outset it is necessary to explain the concept of water governance, a tricky subject often poorly understood. One definition originating from UNDP's own writings and used for the online survey reads as follows: *Water governance is the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's water affairs at all levels.* This definition raises issues of institutions and their performance and interrelationships, the exercise of power and influence, the formulation of policy, and the distinction between national, regional and local levels.

The Sida-UNDP cooperation on water governance dates from the secondment by Sida of a senior water specialist (Ingvar Andersson) to UNDP HQ in 1998. From 2001 the cooperation was extended in a second phase during which UNDP absorbed the cost of this specialist. The 2nd phase agreement was extended three times, twice more funds were added. With an allocation of SEK 30 million made under the auspices of the 2nd phase agreement the Water Governance Facility was launched in April 2005, hosted by the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI). The 3rd phase agreement was signed in September 2008 and covers the period 1 March 2008 – 31 December 2011.

Meanwhile, Sida decided to support a UNDP project originally called Integrated Network for Capacity Building in Integrated Water Resources Management, nowadays always referred to only as Cap-Net, with SEK29.5 million in its 2nd phase. Sida has also extended the support to Cap-Net in a 3rd phase with SEK36 million covering January 2010 – January 2013. The launch of Cap-Net, its 1st phase, was enabled by a grant of USD4 million allocated in late 2000 by the Dutch DGIS. Cap-Net was subject to an evaluation in 2008/2009 and is not

covered by this review. However, Sida is considering to merge its support to WGP and Cap-Net into one programme, and the consequences are analyzed in Chapter 9 below³.

This project history is summarized below.

Table 1: Sida-UNDP Water Agreements 1998 – 2011

Purpose	Duration	SEK million
First Sida - UNDP agreement	Sept 1998 – Dec 2000	6.0
Second Sida - UNDP agreement	Jan 2001 – Dec 2002	15.6
	Extended through Dec 2003	3.0
	Extended through Dec 2005	30.0
	Extended through Dec 2007	No cost ext.
WGF, Phase I	March 2005 – Feb 2008	6.5
Cap-Net, Phase II	Dec 2006 – June 2009	29.5
	Extended through Dec 2010	No cost ext.
Third Sida – UNDP agreement	March 2008 – Dec 2011	40.0
Cap-Net, Phase III	Jan 2010 – Jan 2013	36.0
Total		166.6

Since the inception in 1998 Sida has allocated a total of SEK166.6 million, at the current exchange rate of SEK6.15 about USD27 million, to its cooperation with UNDP in water⁴.

1.3 Project agreements

There are three project agreements relevant for this review. The first is the 3rd Sida - UNDP project agreement from 2008⁵. The objective mentioned in this agreement is “to improve water governance ... in developing countries”, but there is no guidance on how this is to be assessed. The agreement calls for “yearly analytical reports” by 31 March each year and says that Sida and UNDP shall meet once per year to review progress. Such meetings have taken place on the margins of the annual World Water Week (WWW). This is an occasion when all participants are busy with multiple meetings and other arrangements, and the focus on WGP is less than total. It has therefore been suggested that the review meetings should be held on another occasion.

The agreement refers to the UNDP project document “Water Governance Program Funding Proposal to Sweden for 2008 – 2011”, revised on 5 September 2008. It says that the envisaged support from Sida is intended “as a core program contribution strategically aiming at the realization of UNDP’s Water Governance Strategy”. The text goes on to say that “UNDP wishes to utilize the WGF towards scaling-up coordinated support to countries and strategically taking UNDP’s Water Governance Strategy ... forward” , and that the agreement

³ Annex 1, page 3.

⁴ In the 3rd phase project agreement the exchange rate of USD1 = SEK6.84. At present (June 2011) the rate is about SEK6.15. Whenever the current exchange rate is used, this is mentioned in the text.

⁵ Sida reference 2008-001107, registered on 2008-09-30

with Sida “will embrace all elements and strategic priorities of the UNDP Water Governance Strategy”.

There is then a list of 22 intended outcomes with estimated allocations for each under the following six headings: (i) WGF, (ii) national strategies for equitable management and governance of WSS and IWRM, (iii) cooperation on transboundary waters, (iv) adaptation to climate change, (v) global and regional advocacy and collaboration on water governance, and (vi) cross-cutting themes: gender, HRBA, integrity, etc. The funds allocated to each of these areas over the four years add up to SEK40 million. Since there is no indicator mentioned on achievement of the overriding objective, evaluating WGP becomes a matter of assessing whether the 22 intended outcomes have been achieved.

The project document says that “approximately 50 per cent of the requested Sida funds are foreseen to be programmed through the WGF”. In fact, SEK14.035 million is in the project document directly allocated to WGF for staff, travel, website etc. with the remainder up to about SEK20 million, 50 per cent of the total, to be allocated based on projects developed and implemented by WGF. The GoalWash initiative is managed by WGF but the funds, about USD2 million or SEK13.7 million, are administered differently (see below). The project has thus three parts, one is WGF, then there is GoalWash, the third is what is executed directly by UNDP.

The second agreement covers the activities implemented by UNDP through UN channels. It was concluded between UNDP and UNOPS in November 2009 and is valid until 31 December 2011. The value of this agreement is USD1,193,917, at today’s exchange rate about SEK7.3 million, to be financed from the Sida contribution to WGP. This agreement includes a results framework with intended outputs and indicative activities consistent with the project document from September 2008.

Paragraph 15 of the UNDP-UNOPS agreement makes reference to the GoalWash initiative which includes a consultancy and about a dozen country projects. Implementation of GoalWash is managed by WGF and funded directly from the Sida-UNDP trust fund with modest co-finance (USD200,000 per year) from the Basque regional government in Spain.

A third agreement is between UNDP and SIWI for the hosting by the latter of WGF. This is a long and legalistic document that was signed in December 2008 and terminates on 31 December 2011. It specifies essentially that SIWI shall employ the personnel of WGF and that UNDP shall contribute the financial resources required. It allows SIWI to communicate with governments of partner countries, using the UNDP name and emblem in connection with project work, and it obliges UNDP to facilitate access for WGF staff to information, advisory services and other support through its Country Offices (COs).

It is essential to comment briefly on the UNDP Water Governance Strategy (WGS), since it forms an integral part of the Sida-UNDP project agreement as Appendix 1 of the UNDP project document. WGS was written in 2006/7 as an outcome of the widely acclaimed UNDP HDR 2006. Since it was written various developments have taken place not foreseen at that

time. For example, the Community Water Initiative (CWI) is being closed down, while the GoalWash initiative had not yet been conceived.

WGS is a long and detailed document, arguably too detailed to provide the broad guidance expected from an overall strategy. It mentions five “strategic priorities for water”, and three cross-cutting themes, but lists so many activities under each that the overall picture becomes less than clear. Climate change adaptation (CC-A) is one of the five priorities, although CC-A should today probably be seen as an overriding priority for much of UNDP’s work generally and most of its work in water. It does not provide a coherent definition of what precisely is water governance, and some of the activities it does mention seem to have at best only an indirect relationship to governance. WGS does not mention any achievement indicators, is not subdivided by donor, it covers the ‘global WGP’, it is full of detail and lacks an overview, and hence it is difficult to measure progress of the Sida support to WGP against it.

All of the 22 outcomes mentioned in the WGP project document are derived from the WGS, so there is a clear link with the steering document. This review will focus on these outcomes rather than the WGS as a whole.

1.4 The Water Governance Program defined

Above water governance has been defined, but it is also necessary to define what is meant by the very subject of this review, the Water Governance Program. That is not as straightforward as it might seem.

As of early 2011, the formal UNDP name is the Water & Ocean Governance Program (WOGP) which includes is a small component for oceans covered by the Sida support, one of the 22 outcomes. Still, this review will use the name Water Governance Program or WGP, often referred to as the ‘global WGP’.

Table 2: UNDP Water & Ocean Governance Program - Resources Mobilized 2007-2011

Programme/Project	Sources of Funds	Amount (\$ millions)	Per cent	Comments
UNDP/GEF International Waters	GEF	\$90,00	22.00	About 50/50 freshwater/marine
Every Drop Matters	Coca Cola	\$10,00	2.40	
EU Water Initiative - AMCOW Support	EU	\$1,40	0.30	
Spanish MDG Fund Econ Gov window Knowledge Management	Spain	\$0,75	0.002	Knowledge management at WGF
Cap-Net Phases 2 & 3	Sida	\$10,38	3.00	
UNDP Water Governance Pgm (WGF, HQ Wat Gov, GoalWash)	Sida	\$6,34	1.50	Incl. WGF, GoalWash, UNDP HQ
MDG GoAL-WaSH	Basque reg. gov	\$0,36	0.001	

Transboundary River Basin Initiative/Shared Waters Partnership	US State Dpt	\$1,00	0.20	
IWRM in Central Asia	EU	\$5,40	1.32	
Spanish MDG Fund Democratic Econ Gov window (10 wat/san projects in 10 countries)	Spain	\$59,34	14.50	WSS projects in 11 countries
UNDP Water & Coastal Related CC Adaptation Porfolio	GEF, Japan, Spain, Bilaterals	\$220,60	53.91	Also funding from other bilaterals
Arab States Water Governance Programme	UNDP, Coca-Cola	\$3,50	0.86	
	TOTAL	409,07	<u>100</u>	

Source: UNDP, 2011

Then there is the question of what exactly is WGP. The UNDP Fast Facts brochure from November 2006 states that “the UNDP Water Governance Program is active in over 150 countries” with a total portfolio of USD1.5 billion, including cash and in-kind co-finance. This includes the International Waters focal area of GEF. It mentions that UNDP has established 11 national and nine regional water management capacity-building networks with 300 member institutions.

Table 2 lists the resources mobilized for the ‘global WGP’ during 2007 – 2011. It is evident that the contribution from Sida is only a small part, in fact a tiny part (1.5 per cent of the total, 4.5 per cent if Cap-Net is included) of the total finance of WGP⁶. The bulk of the finance comes from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and some bilateral donors, Spain and Japan in particular. The CocaCola Foundation contributes more to WGP than Sida does (excluding Cap-Net).

It is evident that the definition of WGP can differ widely, depending on the perspective adopted. From a UNDP perspective WGP is a multi-million program extending across the world. The Sida-UNDP agreement refers to WGP in the much more narrow sense as a set of activities listed in the project document, and the brief for this review is to focus on them. But since WGP is much broader than what is covered by the Sida-UNDP agreement, there were problems of specifying the precise purpose of this review in the survey and the interviews. The review therefore had to be done pragmatically, there were cases of confusion of the ‘global WGP’ with the ‘Sida-supported WGP’, sometimes ‘WGP’ was used synonymously with ‘WGF’. However, it is not believed that this has materially affected the findings and conclusions outlined below.

⁶ Note that the table does not include Sida contributions prior to 2007

UNDP emphasizes that the Sida contribution is catalytic by providing small but crucial funds that pave the way for other contributions to WGP and support the development of methodologies applied across all of the ‘global WGP’. There is evidence that some such methodologies developed by WGP in previous years, for example in gender mainstreaming, are being widely applied by UNDP and others beyond WGP. However, it is not clear that the Sida contribution, small in the overall context, has impacted significantly on the very large components financed by GEF and a few bilateral donors. In any event, it has not been possible in this review to find strong evidence of such impact.

1.5 The UNDP Water Governance Facility

As already explained, the UNDP Water Governance Facility (WGF) is hosted by SIWI in Stockholm. WGF has no legal identity of its own, it is a unit within SIWI, and agreements committing WGF to carry out activities are signed by SIWI⁷. WGF personnel are contracted by SIWI and paid according to its salary scales.

WGF has the personnel listed below:

Table 3: WGF personnel as of March 2011

Name	Responsibility	Time working for WGF
Håkan Tropp	Project Director	100 %
Alastair Morrison	GoalWash Programme Manager	100 %
Alice Jaraiseh	Programme Officer	80 % (20 % for MDG-F)
Maria Jakobson	Programme Officer, Water Integrity	50 % (50 % for SIWI)
Per Bertilsson	Deputy Executive Director, SIWI	20 % (80 % for SIWI)
Marianne Kjellén	Knowledge Manager, MDG-F	50 % for MDG-F (50 % for SEI)
Bogachan Benli	Project Manager, EDM (hosted by SIWI) ⁸	100 % for EDM
John Joyce	Water Economist	20 % (80 % for SIWI)

In addition, several SIWI staff collaborate with WGF on specific projects (Jakob Granit, Andreas Lindström, Anton Earle, Mats Eriksson and others). All told, WGF has a capacity equivalent to about 4.5 full time positions, including MDG-F but excluding EDM.

During the first three years of the project period the budget utilization of WGF is shown below:

⁷ This gives rise to misunderstandings, since parties to agreements with SIWI regarding WGF, for example the UNDP CO in Jordan and UNDP-PAPP in Palestine, believe that SIWI is the donor, not unreasonably since SIWI signed the agreements.

⁸ EDM is hosted by SIWI but not technically part of WGF, since it focuses on WSS service delivery and not on governance.

Table 4: WGF costs during 2008 – 2010 (USD)

Item	2008		2009		2010	
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
WGF staff	220,000	256,000	364,000	364,000	375,000	375,000
Travel	40,000	13,000	45,000	34,000	40,000	35,000
Projects	341,000	87,000	464,000	369,500	353,000	238,100
Total	601,000	356,000	873,000	767,500	768,000	648,100

Source: WGF annual reports 2008 - 2010

The table shows that WGF implementation is lagging somewhat behind the work plan, the accumulated surplus at the end of 2010 transferred to 2011 was USD119,900. In 2010 there was less spending than foreseen primarily on projects in Kenya and Rwanda and on analytical tools for CC-A. However, WGF works with field projects on a demand basis, and implementation difficulties cause delays and reduced use of the budget. For example, the project in Kenya was delayed because of the unrest that followed the election in that country in 2008 (see Chapter 5). Staff constraints at WGF have also contributed to actual costs below budget, for example the GoalWash program with activities in about a dozen countries (and requests from many more) is managed by one single individual.

2. Conduct of the review

2.1 Literature review

The assignment started with a review of a large number of reports and related material prepared by UNDP, WGF and partner organizations. A list of these reports was prepared by UNDP and updated several times, the latest version is at Annex 2. To this list was added numerous documents collected in connection with visits to UNDP HQ and to the field and from other sources. The most important additional documents not mentioned in the annex are referred to in the footnotes.

Documents of particular significance include the project document from September 2008, the annual reports from UNDP and WGF, outputs from WGF such as training manuals, regional intelligence reports etc., documentation on GoalWash, reports specifically commissioned in the context of the Sida support to WGP, and the Swedish government policy documents providing guidance to Sida relevant to WGP. Other important reports are mentioned in Table 5 below on achievement of intended project outcomes.

2.2 Interviews

The individuals contacted for this review are listed at Annex 3. The interviews can be summarized as follows:

1. They started at SIWI where ten staff members were contacted, several more than once, some many times. Representatives of UNDP, Cap-Net and GWP were also interviewed in Stockholm.
2. At Sida five interviews were held with officials responsible for WGP and for water affairs.
3. At the United Nations in New York 14 interviews were held. These included one representative from UNICEF, one from UN-Water and the others from UNDP. The visit was organized by UNDP.
4. There were five telephone interviews with UNDP regional water advisers in Panama City, Pretoria, Belgrade and Bangkok (two) respectively.
5. There were interviews by telephone or email with the partner organizations WIN and GWA. These were somewhat less successful than hoped, the GWA representative could only be contacted by email, and one of the WIN representatives fell ill and could not be reached.
6. There were around a dozen interviews by the reviewer in Jordan and Palestine.
7. Interviews carried out by the consultants in Kenya and Tajikistan are not included in Annex 3. They are listed in the reports by those consultants which, for reasons of space, have not been appended to this report.

A total of 68 individuals were contacted. Since there was more than one participant in some interviews, about 50 meetings were held for the review, some conducted by telephone.

2.3 Online survey

The ToR makes provision for an online survey to allow “stakeholders and clients who have a relationship with WGP to provide comments and substantive inputs to the review”⁹ This tool was therefore conceived by UNDP from the outset and not by the reviewer. Such a survey on WGP has never previously been conducted.

A questionnaire was designed with 30 questions, most of them multiple choice. The questions ask respondents about their views on matters related to water resources and WSS services in their countries, what WGP does well and less well, and what its priorities should be in the future. The questionnaire was tested on about ten individuals and certain corrections were made before its release.

The target population for the survey consisted of “the WGP family”: UNDP staff in the field, partner organization representatives, consultants, and WGP beneficiaries, all working in some capacity with activities initiated by WGP. However, some respondents were working with GEF projects and thus connected to the ‘global WGP’ beyond the Sida-supported part. A total of 161 respondents were identified by WGF and 66 replied to the survey, a response rate of 41 per cent.

Findings from the survey returns are summarized in Chapter 4 below. For reasons of space the full survey, including the questionnaire, is not appended to this report, but it is available with UNDP.

2.4 Local consultants

The design of the review included provision for two local consultants to assess WGP activities in selected partner countries. The reviewer decided to work with such consultants in Tajikistan and Kenya respectively. These two countries were selected because they offered opportunities to review pilot projects initiated by WGF, in addition to the availability of suitable consultants. The reviewer had a different assignment in Tajikistan in February 2011 and then had an occasion to visit the UNDP CO¹⁰.

Also in this case space reasons dictate that the full reports from the two consultants are not appended to this report, but they have been made available to UNDP. The ToR prepared for the consultants focused on the relevance of the pilot projects, their sustainability and efficiency, and prospects of wide dissemination of experiences learned from them. The consultants were also asked to summarize project activities related to WGP in each of the two countries. The local consultants’ findings and conclusions are summarized in Chapter 5 below.

⁹ Annex 1, page 3

¹⁰ This assignment was to participate in a feasibility study for EBRD of WSS utilities in four rural towns, “the Central Tajik Water Rehabilitation Project”.

2.5 Field visits to Jordan and Palestine

The review design also included field visits by the reviewer. It was agreed with UNDP that such visits would have to be carried out in “the near abroad”, since time and resources would not permit intercontinental travel. Visits were therefore organized to Jordan and to Palestine, where WGF has been active. Three full working days were spent in each country¹¹.

Annex 4 has a chronology of the involvement of WGF in Jordan and Palestine, Chapter 5 below has a brief summary of the nature of this involvement and an assessment.

¹¹ Palestine is, of course, not yet a country, but plans to declare statehood in September 2011.

PART II: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this part the assessment of WGP performance is made. Chapter 3 compares the objective and intended outcomes of the project document with actual achievements. Chapter 4 presents the findings and conclusions from the online survey, while Chapter 5 summarizes the reports by the local consultants retained in Tajikistan and Kenya. Chapter 6 discusses WGP performance with regard to the issues raised in the ToR, offering another dimension than that of Chapter 3.

3. Achievement of the work plan

3.1 The goal and outcomes in the project document

The paragraph on the overriding objective for WGP in the Sida – UNDP agreement reads as follows in full:

“The objective of the program is to improve Water Governance of government agencies, civil society organizations and other stakeholders in developing countries. The Water Governance Program provides strategic support for improved water governance to advance socially equitable, environmentally sustainable and economically efficient management of water resources, including water and sanitation services to improve the livelihood of poor people”.

In the project document annexed to the agreement there is a budget with a table listing 22 intended outcomes under five headings, all derived from the UNDP WGS. This is the entire goal structure of the WGP project. The following comments may be made:

1. The overriding objective talks about improvements *in developing countries*, whereas some of the activities, indeed the outcomes in the project document, refer to changes in UNDP and the UN system. Overall, the distance between the upstream activities that will achieve the intended outcomes and actual improvements on the ground, in the partner countries, that the agreement refers to must be considered to be so long as to be impossible to measure, absent a longer time frame and a much more ambitious study.
2. There are also problems of attribution, since the contribution that WGP can make is often relatively minor compared to that of other donors, and what partner governments do themselves.
3. No indicators are provided of overall goal achievement nor of the intended outcomes. Appendix 4 to the project document includes “WGP Planned Results Framework 2008 – 2015”. However, this applies to the ‘global WGP’ and not only to the small part that is covered by Sida’s support (cf. the discussion of about the definition of WGP above in Section 1.4). For some of the outcomes listed in the project document the indicators in Appendix 4 seem relevant, but by no means for all.
4. The 22 outcomes listed in the project document are of very varying nature. Some assess the performance of the WSS sector in the light of MDG target indicators 7.8 (safe drinking water) and 7.9 (improved sanitation), without even any specification of

countries or regions, which must be considered to be far from the ability of the Sida-supported WGP to influence. Several refer to IWRM, but IWRM seems subsequently to have been somewhat downplayed in the Sida-supported project. Whether countries better understand the vulnerability of their coastal and water resources to climate change will always be difficult to gauge and in any event, again, beyond the ability of the Sida-supported WGP to influence significantly. On the other hand, delivering “training of trainers on gender mainstreaming” is a very straightforward outcome, easy to measure. So the 22 outcomes are very different, some are difficult and others easy to measure.

Since the overriding objective in the project agreement is so difficult to assess in the absence of indicators, the focus has to be on the 22 intended outcomes. Table 5 on the following two pages provides a summary of what has been done to date to achieve them. Several comments should be made to the table.

1. The figures in brackets in each box in the right hand column indicate a rating of achievement of the intended outcome on a scale of 0 – 3. This rating is subjectively done by the reviewer based on the information submitted on activities carried out related to the intended outcomes in order to try to gauge achievements made with the Sida support. A rating of 3 means that the outcome is considered to have been fully achieved, 2 means significant progress toward such achievement, 1 means some progress, and 0 no progress, all in the context of the Sida-supported WGP.

Table 5: Intended outcomes and actual achievements: a summary

Intended outcomes shown in project document	Summary of actual achievements as of March 2011
<u>1. National strategies for equitable management and governance of WSS and IWRM</u>	
1.1 National frameworks for IWRM in place and sustainable	GoalWash country assessments carried out in 11 “WSS MDG deficit” countries, identifying needs for water sector reforms. Alignment with UNICEF/WSP process in some countries. Pilot projects launched in most of these countries and in some others. WGF prepared first draft proposal on enhancing IWRM in Iraq in consultation with UNDP-Iraq and also a WASH scoping note (3)
1.2 IWRM mainstreamed into national development strategies (PRSP, UNDAF etc.)	UNDP active in the preparation by UN-Water of the <i>Status Report on IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans</i> for CSD16 in May 2008 in response to a decision by WSSD. (1)
1.3 National capacities developed for effective and sustainable IWRM	As of February 2009 Cap-Net had provided training in IWRM to 1,800 people (against a target of 1,200) (3)
1.4 The intended outcome of the Cap-Net program is increased institutional and human resource capacity to achieve the MDGs on WSS and sustainable management of water resources	Cap-Net was subject to an external review in 2008/2009 with generally very positive conclusions. The project had reached or exceeded its targets. Training materials developed by Cap-Net were considered excellent and have been widely replicated. Courses are well targeted and adapted to local situations. (3)
1.5 Countries have mechanisms in	Water sector reforms initiated by UNDP with WGF support in some

place (plans, financing, capacity) to achieve or exceed WSS MDGs by 2015	countries, e.g. Tajikistan and Palestine, to strengthen capacities to reach the MDG targets. (1)
1.6 WSS mainstreamed into national development strategies (PRSP, UNDAF etc.)	The GoalWash initiative has contributed to this outcome. (1)
1.7 Proportion of people with access to safe water and/or sanitation increased	On drinking water most countries except in SSA are on track to meet the MDG target, while on sanitation most countries in SSA and in Asia are not on track to meet the MDG target ¹² . However, whatever progress there has been toward these targets cannot be attributed to WGP. (0)
<u>2. Cooperation on transboundary waters</u>	
2.1 Multi-country agreement on transboundary waters priority concerns, impacts and causes	The Shared Water Partnership launched with a “quick survey” of potential support activities covering 20 TB water commissions and/or GEF International Waters Project. Survey not yet complete, further action awaiting US Department of State support. (1)
2.2 Multi-country agreement on governance reforms and investments to address priority transboundary environmental and water resources concerns	This outcome has been addressed by GEF projects outside the Sida support. (0)
2.3 New multi-country waterbody regional legal frameworks in place	WGF prepared regional water intelligence reports on Central Asia and on the Nile Basin and Southern Sudan. (1)
2.4 Newly established and/or strengthened (existing) transboundary water institutions	UNDP used Sida funds to finance a high-level mission to Iraq in 2011 to explore how Iraq’s transboundary water negotiations could be enhanced and national IRWM applied.(1)
2.5 Regional and national governance reforms and investments under way to reduce environmental and water resources stress on shared waterbodies	Project initiated by WGF with USAID support on water governance benchmarking in six countries in MENA region. Support given to a UNDP regional water governance program in the Arab states. (2)
<u>3. Adaptation to climate change</u>	
3.1 Countries understand the vulnerability of their coastal and water resources to climate change and incorporate those risks into national development planning	A review has been carried out of UNDP’s work with CC-A: <i>Report on UNDP Water and Climate Change Adaptation Activities and Projects</i> , draft issued in March 2011. It was based on a report on UN knowledge gaps prepared for UN-Water covering 16 UN agencies as well as GWP and SIWI. Information material on the CC-A and water linkage has been prepared for UN-Water. (2)
3.2 Decision-making frameworks and tools to manage climate change risks, deal with uncertainties and formulate adaptive management responses in place	Collaboration was initiated with the British NGO Tearfund on the report “ <i>How to integrate climate change adaptation into national-level policy and planning in the water sector: a practical guide for developing country governments</i> ”, issued in March 2010. There is also work being done by WGF on cost-benefit analysis of water-related CC-A and on institutional development to support CC-A to be complete in about a year. (3)
<u>4. Global and regional advocacy and collaboration on water governance</u>	
4.1 UNDP global leadership on water governance strengthened	In the UN system UNDP has a leading role on water governance that has been strengthened by WGP. It is probably leading among other donors also, since few donors take an active interest in water governance, except in “easy” countries.(3)
4.2 Enhanced awareness of water-poverty linkage	An information kit on sanitation has been produced and distributed for the International Year on Sanitation (2008). A website on sanitation was prepared and linked to UN-Water (www.sanitation2008.org). UNDP supported advocacy activities on water and sanitation at several events (WWD, WWW, WWF etc.). WGF coordinated the preparation

¹² WHO and UNICEF: Progress on Sanitation and Drinking-Water, 2010 update

	of chapters on governance in the 2 nd and 3 rd WWDR.(2)
4.3 UN-Water normative, coordination and knowledge management functions strengthened to scale up UN system joint delivery on WSS MDGs and WSSD IWRM target	UNDP has been active in UN-Water and chaired its Task Force on Country Level Coordination which issued a report in March 2010, it has also participated in other task forces. "One UN" approach supported by WGF in e.g. Bosnia & Herzegovina, Mongolia and Jordan. Consultancy carried out in 2009 to apply the UNDP Waterwiki website to UN-Water, implementation to start shortly.(3)
4.4 UN-Oceans normative, coordination and knowledge management functions strengthened to scale up UN system joint delivery on fisheries, ICM, ballast water management, etc. WSSD and other marine and coastal targets	UNDP chairs UN-Oceans with 11 UN member organizations working to achieve the ocean related goals established by WSSD. UN-Oceans operates through ad hoc task forces open to participation of NGOs and other international stakeholders. There are five task forces on e.g. biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, protection of the marine environment from land-based activities, and marine protected areas and other area-based management tools.(3)
<u>5. Cross-cutting themes: gender, HRBA, integrity etc.</u>	
5.1 Mainstreamed gendered approach and empowerment of women to participate fully in water resources management	Comprehensive resource guide on <i>Mainstreaming Gender in Water Management</i> revised in cooperation with Dutch NGO GWA in 2006 and translated into nine languages. GWA has handed out 20,000 CDs of the guide and claims 420,000 downloads from its website since 2006. (3)
5.2 Training of trainers delivered on gender mainstreaming in water resources management, WSS	The guide is widely used by GWA in its training activities, but no specific training of trainers has been organized. (1)
5.3 HRBA applied in water programming and guidance on working with the human right to water developed	WGP pioneered application of HRBA to natural resources management within UNDP following a conference in Oslo in November 2008. Work initiated on a practitioners' guide on HRBA to WSS programming. HRBA methodology piloted on four countries by the UNDP Bratislava office, it will be incorporated in the practitioners' guide. HRBA to water governance applied to pilot project in rural Kenya terminated in 2009, continuation uncertain, see Chapter 5 (3)
5.4 Approach of integrity and anti-corruption in water developed and piloted	WGF worked closely in 2010 with WIN, Cap-Net and WaterNet to develop a training manual on water integrity as well as a course for three African sub-regions to be financed by Sida. WGF has been involved in launch of water integrity assessments in e.g. Tajikistan and Palestine and was active in an international conference on the subject in November 2010. (3)

2. As is evident from the table, much work has been carried out to achieve fully or partially most of the intended outcomes.
3. The focus of the first priority area (National strategies for ...) was on IWRM when WGP was launched, as per the project document written in 2008. As mentioned, the initiation of the GoalWash initiative with country assessments carried out (and published) in 11 countries seems to have shifted focus from IWRM to WSS service delivery, achievement of the MDG water-related targets, and water governance *sensu strictu*. That shift is judged positive and well in line with the overriding project objective.
4. The table includes Cap-Net which is not the focus of this review but which is relevant as the capacity-building arm of WGP (and supported by Sida).
5. In several cases the intended outcomes were written so ambitiously that there is inevitably a gap between what was intended and what has actually been done. The most glaring example is outcome # 1.7 where there seems to be a confusion of

what the ‘global WGP’ could realistically achieve, and what the ‘Sida-supported WGP’ could hope to accomplish (not even the ‘global WGP’ with all its GEF support could hope to impact much on that outcome).

6. The intended outcomes under heading 2. Cooperation on Transboundary Waters suffer most from this problem. UNDP implements a huge portfolio of GEF International Waters projects cumulatively valued at nearly USD2 billion, including USD412 million in GEF grants, ongoing projects have a value of about USD160 million. The outcomes listed in the project document were largely achieved but with funds from other sources than the Sida project. What has been done with the Sida funds has been valuable in its context but far from sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes under this heading.
7. On climate change valuable work has been done, although this appears to be another example of the gap between intended outcomes and what the “Sida-supported WGP” could hope to achieve.
8. The table also shows that there has been much activity under the headings 4 and 5. WGP has doubtless strengthened the leading role of UNDP in water governance, not only within the UN system. UNDP has been active both in UN-Water and in UN-Oceans, it chairs the latter and has chaired an important task force in the former. The Sida support to WGP has enabled UNDP to be active in gender and HRBA and to play a leading role in the application of HRBA to natural resources management and specifically to water governance.

3.2 The Water Governance Facility

WGF started in April 2005 with one full position, expanded to 1.5 positions in 2006 and 2 positions in 2007. In 2010 there was the equivalent of about 4.5 full positions (person-years), or 5.5 if the related project EDM is included. Since 2008 WGF is responsible for GoalWash with one staff member (Alastair Morrison) working full-time on this initiative. With these comparatively limited resources WGF is managing a large portfolio of projects of varying nature. As shown below, WGF had activities in 24 countries and three regions in 2010 (there remains an issue of defining precisely what is meant by an activity).

Table 6: WGF Country Overview

Country	WGF activity in 2010	GoalWash project
Iraq	IWRM program development	Expression of interest
Mongolia	Improving water and sanitation services	Strengthening WSS coordination and decentralization
Haiti	Reprogramming to disaster relief	
Jordan	Climate change adaptation in water	
Tajikistan	Water sector integrity assessment	Water rights and responsibilities campaign in rural areas, using HRBA
Kenya	Applying HRBA to water governance (project concluded in	

	2009, continuation being discussed)	
Rwanda	Strengthening water integrity	
Palestine	Water integrity assessment as support to water sector reform	
Turkmenistan	Water sector assessment	
Angola	Review of water governance status	Baseline study of WSS governance in Luanda and Moxico provinces
Nile Basin and South Sudan	Regional water intelligence report prepared (Dec. 2010)	Expression of interest by South Sudan
Zambia		Voice and governance – consumer representation and effective information dissemination (project not launched)
Afghanistan	Support to a national human development report discussed	
Pacific island countries	Technical advice to UNGP-GEF program provided	Request for new project in Solomon islands
Sierra Leone	Advice to UNDP on a CC-A program provided	Country Sector Assessment issued
Arab states	Support to a UNDP regional programme provided	
Madagascar		National water and sanitation master plan and capacity building
Mali		Governance and decentralization of WSS services to 166 local councils
Liberia		Making operational the Water Supply and Sanitation Commission
Djibouti		Capacity support for development of a national strategic water policy
Bosnia & Herzegovina		Raising awareness of water rights and responsibilities in municipalities
Belize		Country action plan to accelerate MDG achievement
El Salvador		Strengthening capacities for sustainable management of WSS services
Paraguay		National coordination and planning, policy and strategies to reach the MDGs
Middle East and North Africa region (six countries)	Water governance benchmarking initiative	
PDR Laos		Expression of interest
Central Asia	Regional water intelligence report prepared (March 2010)	Kyrgyzstan expressed interest

The WGF work program is divided into three areas: (1) Policy and technical advice and support, (2) enhance the water governance knowledge base and capacity, and (3) participate in global and regional monitoring and assessment processes.

Its work in the countries listed in Table 6 falls mostly within the first of these areas of operation. WGF has provided catalytic support to initiate projects related to water governance, but it is not operating any projects on its own and works on a demand basis. In some of the countries, e.g. PDR Laos, there have only been preliminary contacts not yet resulting in any project. In other countries, e.g. Iraq, much work has been carried out to

prepare the ground for future project activities. In yet others, e.g. Jordan, WGF was active in program formulation and has since provided advice on implementation. The GoalWash projects are in different stages of implementation, involving the UNDP COs. Supervising their implementation is time consuming and requires much travel.

The second area, enhancing the knowledge base, includes the project supported by MDG-F to manage knowledge generated by one of the eight thematic priorities of MDG-F, democratic economic governance. MDG-F has allocated USD750,000 for this project activity over 2.5 years from October 2010. It is linked to WGF but not funded by UNDP. There is a separate work plan for this project, updated in January 2011.

As mentioned in Table 5, outcome 3.2, advice is being provided in response to requests received from partner countries and UNDP COs on specific aspects relating to CC-A. Under outcome 5.4 a comprehensive training manual on water integrity has been completed in collaboration with WIN, Cap-Net and WaterNet with inputs from IRC. A training program making use of the manual has been designed for Sida, and it is hoped that Sida will finance its implementation in three African sub-regions later in 2011. WGF with partners is also exploring opportunities to finance water integrity training in other continents.

Under the third of its areas of operation WGF has in 2010

- (i) drafted a chapter on “institutions for sustainable development” to be completed in 2011 for the 2012 WWDR,
- (ii) contributed to a regional report assessing water governance in the Arab states in support of a regional UNDP project financed partially by Sida,
- (iii) with support of USD50,000 from USAID built a framework to use indicators and benchmarks to monitor progress on improving water governance in six countries in the MENA region,
- (iv) contributed expertise to the Sanitation and Water for All and the UN-Water GLAAS initiatives.

WGF has organized workshops on water governance at WWW in successive years. It has been active in WIN and chaired its steering committee until the autumn of 2010, in 2010 it participated in the WSP Council meetings in Vienna (2009) and in Stockholm (June 2010) and in an international symposium on rural WASH in Kampala, Uganda, in April 2010. WGF has also introduced sundry UNDP water governance studies at UN Headquarters in New York.

Every Drop Matters (EDM) is a small-grant programme focused on access to WSS and on CC-A, financed by USD10 million from the CocaCola Foundation. It was initially focused on Europe and CIS and is now being expanded to MENA and parts of Asia. It covers projects in 22 countries with grants of USD50-200,000 per country, the UNDP COs screen proposals

from participating countries. Since November 2010 it is co-located with WGF in Stockholm with a full-time project manager.

In February 2010 WGF redesigned its website www.watergovernance.org. From October 2009 – October 2010 the website had 47,003 visitors, while the number of visitors during February 2010 – December 2010 was 64,914. The figures are somewhat difficult to compare, since SIWI changed server in early 2010, but it is evident that WGF since launching the new site has considerably increased the number of visitors¹³. The ambition is to make major updates roughly twice per year and to have a low maintenance and easy to update website.

However, it appears that the WGF website needs to be further updated. It is strange that it does not provide direct links to EDM and to GoalWash on its home page, while there is mention of the MDG-F project.

In its 2010 annual report WGF provided an analysis of the follow-up of the recommendations from its 2007 self-assessment, the only evaluation carried out so far of its work. In response to those recommendations, WGF has

- become more active in regional programming, examples include the regional water governance program for the Arab states and the benchmarking initiative in the MENA region
- continued to develop its profile on water integrity
- focused on river basin organization, e.g. in the Nile Basin and in Iraq¹⁴
- diversified its funding base by securing support from MDG-F and USAID.

The SIWI-UNDP collaboration has been able to attract other funding, contributing to increasing the critical mass and indirectly benefiting WGF (while increasing the workload of concerned staff). The support from the CocaCola Foundation has been mentioned. Another is support from the European Commission to manage the Africa component of the EU Water Initiative, a contract of three years from 2010 valued at about EUR1 million. There is also a support from Danida of USD200,000 to SIWI-UNDP for the preparation of the report on water resources for Rio+20, a UN process.

3.3 GoalWash

The UNDP GoalWash initiative with the title “Governance, Advocacy and Leadership for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene” merits a separate section¹⁵. This initiative was not included in the original project document and was introduced with the 2008 annual report. It effectively

¹³ By comparison, the GWP website had during August – October 2010 a total of 19,061 visitors or 6,354 per month. The WGF website had an average of 5,901 visitors per month during most of 2010.

¹⁴ Where it proved difficult for political reasons to apply a transboundary perspective, as intended

¹⁵ The correct spelling of the acronym is GoAL-WaSH, not GoalWash. But since the correct version, when repeated many times in a text, becomes cumbersome and error prone because of the higher and lower case letters, the simpler acronym is used in this report.

replaces the outcome in the project document related to “national frameworks for IWRM” (outcome # 1.1 in Table 5 above).

According to the 2010 work plan, the cost of GoalWash is budgeted at USD2,006,090 which at the exchange rate used in the work plan corresponds to SEK13.7 million or over one-third of the Sida allocation. The cost for the (very busy) Coordinator at WGF should be added, bringing the total cost to over SEK15 million and making GoalWash easily the largest single component of WGP.

GoalWash aims to accelerate achievement of the WSS MDG targets through strategically targeted interventions to strengthen governance of water supply and sanitation services, primarily in countries that lag seriously behind in achievement of the MDG targets. The initiative resulted in part from the UNDP HDR 2006 which highlighted the importance of governance to attain these targets.

A country selection process was initiated in 2008 with UNDP regional technical advisors, Regional Bureaux and COs to select suitable countries, based on a number of criteria¹⁶. A senior consultant was hired to carry out so-called Country Sector Assessments to identify needs that the initiative could address. These assessments, covering 11 countries, were published in two volumes in 2009 and 2010. Since the assessments were carried out a couple of countries have been added and a few have dropped out. At present GoalWash is active in the following 11 countries: Europe: Bosnia & Herzegovina; Asia: Mongolia and Tajikistan; Africa: Angola, Djibouti, Liberia, Madagascar and Mali; Latin America: Belize, El Salvador and Paraguay. It is expected that South Sudan will shortly be added to the list. There are no funds for any additional countries, but dialogue is underway with other donors.

The titles of the GoalWash pilot projects appear in Table 6 above. Each project should have a budget of no more than USD200,000 and a feasible impact within 2 – 3 years. Several of them are linked to larger programs funded from the MDG-F or other sources.

A review of the project summaries suggests that they, on the whole, address real governance needs in the WSS sector. Questions can be raised regarding the projects in Bosnia & Herzegovina (B&H) and Tajikistan, both of which aim to raise awareness of the right to water. In B&H the GoalWash contribution has apparently been used to disseminate in schools a brochure by UNESCO called “Water for Life”, which cannot be a high GoalWash priority. In Tajikistan there are, as will be argued further in Chapter 5 below, more important actions that need to be taken to reform the WSS sector (and which are being taken by the UNDP CO) than a pilot project in a remote rural area.

The demand for GoalWash projects is high and by far exceeds the funds available. From Mali, B&H and Tajikistan there have been requests to expand into more geographic areas, and from

¹⁶ These are outlined in the 2008 annual report

Liberia, Mongolia, Paraguay and Belize there have been requests to expand into additional thematic areas. New GoalWash interventions are being requested by i.a. PDR Laos, Kyrgystan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Indonesia and Iraq.

There is a perception of GoalWash as an “outlier”, an initiative driven by UNDP HQ and not well aligned with a related initiative by UNICEF/WSP called Country Status Overviews carried out in some 30 African countries with (nominal) oversight by AMCOW. Some such criticism may be off the mark, there have been contacts with UNICEF as well as WSP, and the country projects have all been identified locally. Still, perceptions matter, and the UN family should not be seen to be involved in two different but closely related initiatives.

It is evident that the GoalWash initiative addresses an important need. It is the principal WGP component that directly helps to strengthen institutions *in developing countries* (italics added), as specified by the overall objective in the Sida-UNDP agreement. There is a keen demand for its services and, if the funds are available, a good case for its expansion.

3.4 Overall conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the findings presented above in Sections 3.1-3.3 of work carried out by UNDP, including WGF, under the Sida-supported WGP project:

1. The overall objective of WGP, as stated in the project document, cannot be said to have been achieved. It was written in such a manner that it can possibly be achieved only in the long term. Since no goal indicators have been provided, all that can be said is that some progress has been made toward that goal.
2. The conclusion of Table 5 is that many of the intended outcomes have been addressed, several important results have been achieved albeit not always attaining the level of ambition stated in the project document, in some cases (headings 4 and 5) imply achieving the intended outcomes. There several examples of a certain disconnect between what was written in 2008 and the activities actually carried out.
3. Apparently, the reason for this disconnect is that Sida advised in 2008 that UNDP should present its total program, not only that supported by the project. In the absence of indicators this makes it difficult to evaluate WGP goal achievement with precision.
4. However, achievement of the intended outcomes, used as a proxy in the absence of a measurable overall objective, has been estimated at an unweighted average of 1.95 on the scale of 0 – 3, corresponding to about 75 per cent achievement of intended outcomes. This must be considered very satisfactory (albeit admittedly subjective).
5. It is stated in the project document that UNDP views the Sida support to WGP as a “core programme contribution” that can be used flexibly in support of the strategic priorities of the UNDP WGS. As is evident from Table 5, the Sida contribution has in some instances been used to finance missions, consultants, or individual experts who have made catalytic contributions that have leveraged much larger support from other

sources. Perhaps the best illustration is not shown in the table: the support from the CocaCola Foundation of USD10 million was contingent on UNDP using Sida funds to finance the Project Manager for one year after his transfer to SIWI in Stockholm. So in that sense the Sida support has had some important multiplier effects.

6. The range of activities is very wide, arguably too wide. UNDP has a broad mandate that makes it difficult to decline opportunities for involvement. This applies also to WGF which with a small number of staff manages to be involved in a large number of activities and is expected to be demand-driven. In Part III of this report there will be a discussion of what might be done to “prune” the number of activities to achieve a stronger focus of WGP.
7. The GoalWash initiative is highly relevant and has potential to expand, if the resources are available in future years.

4. Findings and conclusions from the online survey

4.1 Findings

As explained in Section 2.3, the ToR includes provision for an online survey to assess perceptions and attitudes to WGP. Most respondents to the survey were located in developing countries where use of online communications may be hazardous due to poor internet connections. The first issue of the questionnaire resulted in almost 30 delivery failures because of incorrect email addresses or SPAM filters. For some of these the addresses were adjusted, but at least 10 per cent of the questionnaires may never have reached their intended recipients.

Another difficulty was that the survey targeted UNDP staff and beneficiaries at the same time. Ideally, there should have been a different questionnaire for each category, but this was not possible with available resources. In the event, there were 37 respondents (57 per cent) who classified themselves as UNDP staff members, nine as partner organization representatives, six as consultants, and eight as beneficiaries. The majority of respondents, almost two-thirds, had been associated with WGP activities for more than two years.

A total of 66 replies were received, although not all of those answered all questions. This is not sufficient to draw statistically significant conclusions from the survey. But it is enough to suggest what WGP may do more or less of respectively in the future. It also gives indications of the state of affairs of water resources management and WSS services in some WGP partner countries.

Cross-tabulating the beneficiaries did not yield any results significantly different from those of the total sample, the number of respondents in this category was too small. In any event, an online survey would not be a good tool to reach the ultimate beneficiaries (water users).

The majority of those responding (55 or 85 per cent) had been associated with a WGP activity for one or more years, 42 of them for more than two years. Respondents could therefore be said to be relatively familiar with WGP, its aims and activities.

Most of those responding were working at project level, as shown below:

- Small grants programme/CWI - 17
- UNDP CO project - 16
- MDG-F project - 11
- GoalWash - 12
- Cap-Net - 10
- GEF International Waters project - 7
- Every Drop Matters - 3

- Other - 5
- Total - 65

Most of them (73 per cent) said that they were very familiar with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), only three had no idea what UNDAF is. Of those who said that they were familiar with UNDAF almost half (49 per cent) felt that it gave at least adequate attention to the needs in the water sector. Two-thirds of them felt that the collaboration between the agencies involved in the UN Country Team (UNCT) was at least good, only seven felt that collaboration was not functioning well.

Over two-thirds of the replies (70 per cent) said that UNDP water projects are at least reasonably well coordinated with other development activities in the sector. Again, two-thirds of replies suggested that there are five or more international agencies active in the water sector in the respondents' countries, almost one-third said that the number of such agencies exceeds 11.

A large majority of the replies (87 per cent) stress the importance of an integrated approach to the management, development and use of water resources. An almost as large majority (73 per cent) agree strongly that poor governance and insufficient or non-efficient investments rather than water scarcity per se explains the insufficiency of WSS services.

WGF was well known to about three-fourths of those responding who, for the most part, could correctly locate it to Stockholm (two placed it in New York, four others elsewhere). All of those saying they were familiar with WGF could also correctly identify at least one project activity in which WGF had been involved.

A majority of those responding (60 per cent) felt that WSS services in their country were generally not well managed. They felt that the following issues were relevant (per cent of those responding, several replies were possible):

- Insufficient investment in sanitation facilities - 82
- Leaking water pipes - 68
- Illegal water connections - 55
- Lack of water meters - 47
- Centralized management that water users cannot influence in any way - 43
- Arbitrary billing practices - 38
- Widespread corruption - 37
- Discrimination against vulnerable groups - 32

Only 15 per cent said that services were generally satisfactory, 42 per cent said that there are problems but improvements are under way.

There were 50 replies to the question of whether female water users are treated more poorly than men. Of these 40 (80 per cent) said that women spend more time than men to fetch

water, 35 (70 per cent) said that women suffer most from poor sanitation services, and 21 (42 per cent) said that women's complaints do not get a fair hearing.

To the question of whether the acceptable standard for human right to water of 20 litres per person and day could be achieved in the area where they lived, almost three-fourths of those responding (76 per cent) felt that this standard was achievable. If allowance is made for a few respondents living in developed countries, that number falls to about two-thirds. Only nine replies (15 per cent) agreed that people in general are well aware of their rights to water, 32 (54 per cent) said that they were probably or certainly not aware.

To a question about climate change two-thirds replied that temperatures are rising, over half (54 per cent) said that it is raining less than it used to and that farmers' fields are drier; 13 (22 per cent) said that it is raining more than it used to. As a result of climate change, water is more scarce (58 per cent), wells are drying up (56 per cent), people have to walk longer to fetch water (41 per cent), the cost of water is increasing (42 per cent), and there is lower pressure in water pipes (34 per cent) (several alternative replies were allowed).

Corruption was rated as a problem by 42 respondents (71 per cent), of these nine (15 per cent) saw it as a big problem, 12 (20 per cent) did not see it as a big problem. The way to address corruption was, in the eyes of 48 respondents (87 per cent), to educate consumers about their rights, 42 (76 per cent) felt that citizens should be mobilized against corrupt practices, two-thirds felt that civil society organizations should be asked to take action against corrupt practices, and over half (55 per cent) felt that serious cases should be made public in other ways than through the newspapers. Many (62 per cent) felt that there should be more open talk about corruption in water.

Many replies (56 in total) suggested that there is much that UNDP can do to reduce corruption in water. Most (86 per cent) recommended support to civil society organizations, almost as many (82 per cent) suggested to teach citizens about their rights to water and the laws that apply, and a similar number (80 per cent) advocated information campaigns; these three options are obviously not incompatible with each other. Many (59 per cent) also suggested training of staff of water utilities and to approach senior politicians (46 per cent). Others (52 per cent) would like to mobilize financial support to make water more easily available.

As mentioned, virtually all respondents were working with WGP projects. But when asked about their familiarity with UNDP WGP activities in their country, only 20 (35 per cent) replied that they were very familiar, another 14 (24 per cent) said that they were somewhat familiar and 18 (31 per cent) claimed not to be very familiar. When asked what had been most successful WGP activities in their country, most of those responding (27 or 96 per cent) cited projects they themselves had been working with. There were 39 replies to suggest factors explaining successful outcome of projects which included the following (per cent of those responding, several replies were possible):

- Correct identification of key issue for project – 72
- Project addresses key needs in water sector - 67

- Close alignment with government plans - 59
- Replication of project experiences is easy - 59
- Project requested by beneficiaries - 56
- Project is/was well implemented - 49

To explain less successful outcomes so far of WGP projects the following factors were stressed by 27 replies (per cent of those responding, several replies were possible):

- Beneficiaries were not involved in project design and implementation - 56
- Project does not feature in government plans - 48
- Project did not address key needs in the water sector - 37
- Project was poorly implemented - 37
- The analysis of the issues to be addressed had not been correct - 37

Respondents were asked to rank 14 possible actions on a scale of 0 – 3 in order to suggest what UNDP should do more of in the water sector in their countries (support to WSS utilities was not included as an action). There were 54 replies to this question, and rating averages were computed for each action. The seven highest rating averages were the following:

- Integrated water resources management (IWRM) (rating 2.72)
- Support the development of tools and approaches to reduce any impact of climate change (rating 2.65)
- Replicate available experience on a national scale (rating 2.59)
- Work with civil society organizations (rating 2.46)
- Support institutional reforms, including new legislation (rating 2.46)
- Support more Human Rights Based Approaches to water (rating 2.44)
- Carry out advocacy toward politicians, ministries and decision-makers (rating 2.35)

The other seven possible actions had ratings considerably lower than those listed above.

Respondents were also asked whether there was anything that UNDP should do less of in their countries, there were 20 answers. These are difficult to list, the replies suggest that the question had been poorly understood. A few replied that “sanitation is not our comparative advantage”, others that UNDP should do less “infrastructure development” or “less in concrete works”.

To the open-ended question of what the UNDP WGP might to do enhance its performance there were 22 replies, of which the following can be mentioned:

- Some emphasized the value of the Community Water Initiative (CWI) as a vehicle to address priority WSS needs of the poor in a cost effective and sustainable manner
- Others stressed the importance of working with a long term time perspective to impact on water governance
- One long reply underlined the value of capacity building and leadership, both within UNDP and partner countries
- Another asserted that the initial funding of WGP activities per country is inadequate and should be increased.

4.2 Conclusions from the findings

The findings should be seen as indications of where WGP is and where it should go in the future. They tend to suggest that what WGP is doing is, on the whole, what respondents want it to do. Many replies to survey questions are unsurprising in the sense of confirming that WGP is doing more or less what it should. Some illustrations:

1. There are worries about the performance of WSS services. These focus not only on poor infrastructure, leaking water pipes and such, but also on centralized and seemingly untouchable management, illegal water connections, arbitrary billing practices, and generally poor management. Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not include improvement of WSS provision as a possible future action for UNDP.
2. Corruption remains a problem in this context, a niche area for WGF that could be further developed.
3. It is to be expected that climate change is reported as an increasing problem, justifying the emphasis that has been placed by WGP on that area so far that arguably should further increase.
4. Respondents felt that UNDP should do more work related to IWRM. That may be because the importance of IWRM has been inculcated upon them in the context of the projects they are working with. This is an area where WGP and not least Cap-Net has already been very active.
5. It was also emphasized that more work was needed to develop “tools and approaches to reduce any impact of climate change”. Such work is already being done by WGF and could conceivably be expanded in the future.
6. WGP has made significant progress in its work with gender and with HRBA to water, but survey findings suggest a need for more to be done, in particular to educate consumers about their rights to water.
7. The replies suggest a certain impatience with pilot projects, many felt a need to replicate experiences on a national scale.
8. Most respondents were working with WGP projects, but the familiarity with UNDP WGP activities in their country seemed not to be very high. This suggests that the concept of water governance is not well understood by all.

9. Respondents seemed to be reasonably familiar with WGF which suggests that it will be well placed to work on some of the areas highlighted by the survey.
10. The reference to more work on CWI is understandable, many UNDP COs would wish to see small infrastructure projects as 'carrots' to encourage communities to carry out governance reforms and to reward them for work done.

5. Local consultancies and field visits

5.1 Consultancies in Tajikistan and Kenya

Tajikistan. This country is said to be rich in water resources and poor in WSS service delivery because of antiquated infrastructure, ineffective centralized management, and pervasive corruption (it ranks 154 out of 179 countries on the TI Corruption Perception Index for 2010, a rank it shares with Kenya, Russia and eight other countries). UNDP is involved in two large water projects, one is a regional IWRM project in Isfara region involving also Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and supported by the EC and Norway, the other is a WSS project in the Khatlon region with support from Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) and Oxfam UK.

As part of the WSS project the UNDP CO has taken an important initiative to reform the water sector which remains highly centralized, old Soviet style. An inter-ministerial working party has been created with involvement of the President's office and all concerned ministries and other stakeholders. The aim of the reform is to decentralize provision of WSS services to utilities at municipal level, a change that is advocated by aid donors and other stakeholders but resisted by certain government authorities.

Then there are two smaller projects with WGF involvement, both initiated in 2010. One is called Water Sector Integrity Vulnerability Assessment covering all stakeholders from central authorities to final consumers with support from the Oslo Governance Centre (OGC), a UNDP unit, and a budget of USD200,000. In May 2010 WGF participated in a seminar that launched the assessment.

The other is a GoalWash HRBA campaign project in Ayni district with a budget of USD150,000, which seeks to raise the awareness of rural populations about their rights to water and the responsibilities of local administration to provide water. The consultant engaged in Tajikistan visited Ayni district and his findings and conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. Campaigns to raise awareness in a poor rural area should be accompanied by investments in infrastructure and improvement of WSS services, lest beneficiaries lose interest. A small budget has been set aside for this purpose.
2. There were problems with the accessibility of the Ayni district some three hours from Dushanbe by car, it could not be reached during winter because of snow avalanches in the mountain passes.
3. It is not clear whether the government is ready to adopt and disseminate experiences from the project on a nation-wide basis, but through its wide network of contacts UNDP is in a good position to encourage this.
4. The project has so far been implemented efficiently and on time.

5. The UNDP CO does not yet have a strategy for country-wide dissemination of experiences from the project. The intention is to address that issue through the ongoing Communities Program.

Kenya. The consultant engaged in Kenya carried out an assessment of a pilot project to improve water governance through the application of a HRBA in Bondo district in Nyanza province in the south-western corner of the country. The project was initiated in 2008 but delayed and concluded in 2010 after an extension. It was implemented by the local NGO Kenya Water for Health Organization (KWAHO) which in December 2009 issued a report with the title “*Enhancing Water and Sanitation Governance in Kenya – Human Rights Based Approach to Reforms in the Kenya Water Sector*”. The report outlines the water sector reforms in Kenya, how such reforms affect the principal institutions involved, how water sector governance could be improved using a HRBA, and what should be done about corruption in the water sector.

There were no other WGP project activities in Kenya at the time of this review.

The following points summarize the consultant’s findings and conclusions:

1. The pilot project was generally well executed and had a positive impact on the awareness of the beneficiaries in the project area of their rights and duties in relation to water services.
2. As a result, there are plans to legalize consumer groups on water (Water Action Groups or WAGs), there were some improvements in local WSS service delivery, and there was improved governance of local water service providers.
3. But there was no impact at national level. Contacts were taken with centrally placed officials in e.g. the Ministry of Water and the Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission, but that outreach was insufficient to achieve results at that level.
4. A follow up project is now under consideration. Such a project should not be done on a stand-alone basis but as a component of a wider, integrated program.
5. It should carefully explain what the constitutional provisions in Kenya entail on the right to water.

The two consultants’ reports are not appended to this review but have been made available to UNDP.

5.2 Field visits to Jordan and Palestine

In Jordan, four UN agencies (UNDP, WHO, UNESCO and FAO) have formulated a Joint Program (JP) to work as a “One UN” initiative. The UNDP component had support from WGF in 2007 to formulate its contribution to the JP focusing on a CC-A project in Zarqa River Basin. This is the only river basin that is entirely within Jordan’s territory, it is also the most densely populated basin with half of the country’s population and industry. With a per

capita consumption of 150 m³ per year Jordan is the third most water scarce country in the world¹⁷, with rising temperatures and declining rainfall the situation is set to worsen, and CC-A is an urgent priority.

The JP was called “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements” and includes a component dealing with integrated water resources management of the Zarqa River. It was formally launched in January 2008 but only became operational in February 2009. It is coordinated by UNDP and funded with USD4 million from the MDG-F. WGF contributes USD105,000 to a consultancy fund used to engage local consultants in the component carried out by UNDP and the Ministry of Environment in the Zarqa River Basin (it is not clear why this could not be funded by MDG-F). WGF provided a consultant and some advice when the project was designed in 2007, since then its involvement has been largely limited to commenting in December 2010 on some deliverables prepared by consultants working for the project.

It is envisaged that WGF will be more involved later in 2011 and in 2012, as project findings will be disseminated nation-wide and key activities taken over by the government. Of particular interest is the possibility of WGF using the project in Jordan as a case study to illustrate the cost and benefits of the CC-A approach used. This will be desirable to provide justification to the government for taking over the activities after the likely closure of the project in 2012¹⁸.

A visit to the site for pilot activities intended to make farming practices more sustainable suggested the difficulties ahead. Farmers now openly use the limited and polluted waters from the Zarqa river, seasonally reduced to a mere trickle, for irrigation. The practice is illegal but highly profitable and will not be easy to change. However, IUCN had some experiences that could be useful, involving a mixture of education and economic incentives, which will be applied by the pilot project.

Sida has a representative in Amman working with water, but she had not been in contact with the UNDP project.¹⁹

In Palestine the problem has been the lack of reform of the water sector. The Palestinian Water Authority (PWA) fulfils all functions: planning, policy development, legislation, provision of WSS services, and regulation of the same services. This creates numerous conflicts of interest and a confused situation in the sector. UNDP-PAPP therefore engaged a consultant in 2008 to develop a project document for support to a process of reforming PWA. WGF visited Palestine in September 2008 to collaborate with the consultant who the following year was able to visit WGF in Stockholm.

¹⁷ Water scarcity is generally defined as an availability of 1,000 m³ per capita.

¹⁸ The MDG-F can only finance projects for four years (three plus a one year extension). When it was pointed out that a project such as the one in Jordan is likely to require more time, there was no answer.

¹⁹ But she had contacts with WGF in connection with workshops relating to Iraq held in Amman.

The project document was finalized in March 2009. Eventually, the PWA reform process was supported by the World Bank, Norway and AFD (France). In 2009 and part of 2010 UNDP-PAPP was fully engaged in the clean-up after the war in Gaza and had little capacity left for the PWA reforms. Sida is set to become involved through a trust fund with the World Bank later this year, but there had been no prior contact with WGF.

Interviews with representatives of the Palestinian Authority (PA) suggested a strong consensus on the need for comprehensive reform of the PWA but, interestingly, much less agreement on precisely what shape that reform should take. It seemed likely that several months would be required until such agreement could be reached.

A delegation from Palestine visited SIWI in connection with WWW in August 2009, and it was then agreed that WGF would support a water integrity assessment as part of the PWA reform process. ToR for a consultant to carry out this assessment was drafted by WGF in early 2011. An agreement was signed between UNDP-PAPP and SIWI (for WGF) in April 2011, providing USD40,000 in support from WGF and USD25,000 from UNDP (using funds from a regional water governance project in the Arab states, also supported by Sida). Work on the assessment can likely be concluded only later this year, when the PWA reforms have been agreed upon and the new institutional arrangements are clarified.

A chronology of WGF's involvement in Jordan and Palestine is at Annex 4.

5.3 Tentative conclusions

These are four very different country situations, where the involvement by WGF has varied considerably. With the reservation that the two local consultants are not available to add to the further discussion (the points summarizing their findings listed above had been verified by both of them), the following points aim to draw out some tentative conclusions from the four case studies:

1. In three of the four cases (not in Jordan) WGF had contributed initiatives related to water integrity issues which were well justified and locally appreciated.
2. The UNDP CO in Tajikistan was acting very much in the spirit of WGP by supporting not only the water integrity assessment but also the WSS sector reform process, in addition to the GoalWash project. However, its initiative to support WSS sector reform is much more important for the performance of the sector than the HRBA pilot project in Ayni district. Arguably, the GoalWash initiative should have been designed to support the WSS reform process rather than the pilot project (although issues of timing may have made that difficult in practice).
3. There is clear evidence from both Tajikistan and Palestine that poor performance of key institutions is a severe impediment to the functioning of the WSS sector, and that sector reform in such situations therefore must have high priority.
4. Both in Kenya and in Tajikistan there were pilot projects in remote locations with uncertain prospects of national replication. Such projects are questionable, unless the

link to the national level has been built into the project design from the beginning or otherwise ascertained beforehand (often difficult to do in practice).

5. The project in Jordan illustrates the importance of development of analytical tools to justify CC-A actions.
6. That project is also a good and seemingly successful illustration of the “One UN” approach promoted by UNDP.
7. In Jordan and Palestine WGF has played a useful supportive role, based on demand, to strengthen particular aspects of the programs (in Jordan governance aspects of CC, in Palestine water integrity). But its involvement was not necessarily decisive, the initiatives taken by UNDP in both countries would likely have happened anyway.

6. Assessment of WGP

6.1 Relevance to key beneficiaries

Water sector reform is becoming increasingly urgent in several countries, as demands for water increase, the inefficiencies of current arrangements are becoming obvious, and complaints are more frequently heard from the general public and international donors. Two countries where this review has been able to take note of such a situation, and where UNDP has taken action, consistent with the WGP objective, are Tajikistan and Palestine, as described in the previous chapter.

The reforms in these two countries²⁰ are highly relevant to the institutions directly involved and, if ultimately successful, will yield substantial benefits to water consumers and hence the general public. However, attribution to WGP is not self-evident. The WSS reform involving the water utilities in Tajikistan is being undertaken within the framework of a program supported by the Swiss Development Cooperation and Oxfam, in addition to UNDP. In Palestine the PWA reforms were supported during 2009 and 2010 by WB and other donors. These were priority actions in both countries and the UNDP COs may have taken them, even absent WGP. The financial contribution by UNDP to the actual reforms is modest. There is in both cases much that remains to be done before the reforms can be said to be successful. Still, the reform processes were of strategic importance for the WSS sector in both countries, they were initiated by the UNDP COs, and WGF was involved in a supportive role on water integrity in both cases.

As explained in Chapter 3, there is strong demand for new GoalWash initiatives, there are also requests for expansion of ongoing GoalWash projects. Several GoalWash projects lend support to reforms of WSS service delivery. If demand can be used as a proxy for relevance, there is every indication that WGP, and certainly WGF, is very relevant to beneficiaries.

6.2 Value to UNDP and to Sida

There is no doubt that WGP has been of considerable value to UNDP as a tool to promote good governance in the water sector. Within the UN family UNDP is appreciated as an active and reliable member of UN-Water and as a lead agency with regard to water governance (see also Section 6.9 below). UNDP is credited for its work in water with gender and application of HRBA. According to responses from the online survey, country level coordination in water led by UNDP is mostly satisfactory.

WGP is a respected program within UNDP, on this point the responses from interviews at UNDP HQ were unanimous. But disseminating water governance principles more widely within UNDP is a different and more fraught issue. The water team responsible for WGP is

²⁰ Palestine is, of course, not a country, at least not yet.

organizationally located within the Environment & Energy Group which is part of the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP). As such, water is viewed as a sector issue²¹.

UNDP takes pride in being non-sector, generalism is a virtue, horizontal coordination is seen as its particular skill and its niche in relation to the UN specialized agencies. This leads to a climate that is not necessarily conducive to promotion of issues seen as sectoral. As one said, “UNDP has defined itself out of sectors. As soon as discussions get technical, people get nervous since so many of them are generalists.” Another comment was that “there is no strong champion for the water agenda” in UNDP. Attention to CC-A is now a strategic priority for UNDP and protection of the environment is being mainstreamed. But a conclusion from the interviews at UNDP HQ was that it would be a stretch to attempt to mainstream also water governance.

WGP was started in the late 1990s with personnel input from Sida, and during the first half of the 2000s there was active dialogue with what was then Sida’s Water Division. However, in subsequent years Sida was reorganized, later again reorganized and downsized, the Water Division was dissolved, and today there is only one professional officer to coordinate and monitor what Sida does in water. Sida’s sector capacity has been diminished and with that its ability to benefit from a program such as WGP (in fact, Sida is becoming just like UNDP an organization of generalists). There was no evidence that Sida had learned from WGF activities in Jordan and Palestine, notwithstanding its intention to support the PWA reform process through a WB trust fund arrangement.

6.3 WGP response to current challenges and reform needs

A conclusion that emerges from the discussion about the GoalWash initiative in Chapter 3, from the online survey in Chapter 4, and also from the case studies outlined in Chapter 5 is indeed the importance of governance for the performance of the water sector. In addressing this area UNDP is relatively alone or, put differently, securely in the lead. Some bilateral donors and WB support water governance in “easy” countries, but few do so in the “difficult” or “MDG deficit” countries.

Respondents to the online survey expressed worries about the quality of WSS sector management, a finding corroborated by experiences from Tajikistan and Palestine. In fact, the situation with centralized management of WSS service provision is similar in many formerly socialist countries, particularly those that were part of the Soviet Union, and many countries in MENA and in Africa. In several such countries the needs for water sector reform are acute.

For WGP this will mean a need not only for “more of the same” but also for institutional reforms in the more narrow sense. This is where the core of WGP, and of WGF, increasingly needs to be. It should not be necessary to refer to Douglass North²² to make the case that strong institutions are required for sustainable development in general and for improved water

²¹ Arguably, this is the wrong approach which tends to overlook the wide role water plays in human society, as illustrated e.g. by the large membership of UN-Water (26 UN agencies and 18 non-UN partner agencies).

²² Winner of the Nobel Prize in economics in 1993 for his writings on institutional change and economic performance

sector performance in particular. The key institutions in this context are those responsible for WSS service provision, the water utilities, and those in charge of water resources management, often water ministries or transboundary river organizations .

This will imply a gradual but real shift of focus for WGP, and also WGF. There may be a need for more emphasis on modern management techniques, including cost accounting and budgeting, and more needs for capacity building, enhancing the role of Cap-Net. WGP is still very much in the public sector domain. It must remain there, of course, but it should take on board more of the techniques and approaches used by the private sector (see also Section 6.9 below).

There should also be a more explicit recognition that expansion of WSS service provision cannot be financed only by foreign aid in poor countries and that all “three Ts” (taxes, transfers and tariffs)²³ must come into play. There is evidence from the EUWI Finance Working Group that there is much demand from WSS utilities for assistance in finance. Management and finance of provision of WSS services will provide a whole new agenda for action by WGF.

Another emerging priority is obviously CC-A, which already is a strategic priority for UNDP. The role of water in CC-A in poor countries is recognized, but the link to water governance does not seem to be widely understood within UNDP. Because of the difficulties of promoting sector issues within UNDP, it needs to be better clarified that CC-A in poor countries is mainly about better water management and that this requires improved water governance. UNDP should develop this linkage more in the future, a point that will be further developed below in Chapters 7 and 8.

WGP has doubtless enabled UNDP to become more active in global water policy dialogue than it otherwise would have been. UNDP has been active in UN-Water and UN-Oceans and contributed significantly to important outcomes within those frameworks. Findings from the online survey suggest that WGP is, for the most part, on the right track in addressing emerging priorities but, as mentioned, management of WSS services and attention to CC-A are two areas of increasing importance.

6.4 Cost efficiency and effectiveness

One of the interviews at UNDP HQ started with a question from the respondent: “What would Sida say about moving WGF to New York?” This review cannot pretend to speak for Sida. But the question is pertinent and has (at least) three answers and one conclusion.

The first answer is that UNDP derives substantial benefits from having WGF time-share personnel with SIWI. As explained in Section 1.5, several staff work part-time for SIWI and part-time for WGF, an arrangement that would not be possible in New York. WGF could perhaps be hosted by an institution in New York similar to SIWI, such an institution could probably be found e.g. at a suitable university, but it would not be at UNDP HQ (as was the

²³ On this, see for example OECD (2009): [Strategic Financial Planning for Water Supply and Sanitation](#), and EUWI FWG (2010), [Strategic Financial Planning for Water Supply and Sanitation in Africa](#)

intent of the question). Besides, moving WGF to New York would obviate the great advantages of having close access to WWW to promote issues and do networking.

The second answer deals with cost efficiency. Assigning staff to Stockholm is about 20 per cent cheaper than in New York, rental and other office costs are 30 per cent lower in Stockholm.

The third is that WGF works mostly with UNDP COs and partner countries, not toward other units at UNDP HQ. It is true that some communications would be simpler and cheaper, if WGF were to be located in New York, but others would be more complicated. Besides, by being in Stockholm WGF is spared much of the bureaucracy and efficiency loss that inevitably results from work in a large organization.

The conclusion is, therefore, that it is more efficient, from a cost perspective and from other perspectives as well, to keep WGF where it is.

In terms of cost efficiency of staff, there is evidence to suggest that the output per man/woman-unit of input is high, the staff involved with WGP at UNDP HQ and at WGF work very hard. Only a handful of professional staff, two in New York and about six in Stockholm (UNDP and WGF), cover a wide range of activities in almost all regions of the world. There is only one individual at WGF to manage a dozen GoalWash field projects and numerous inquiries for more.

If efficiency is doing things right, effectiveness is doing the right thing. As has been explained in the foregoing, WGP goal achievement is on the whole very satisfactory. What needs to be done better in the future, in the 4th phase project, is to specify more clearly what those goals are.

6.5 Achievement of outputs: quantity, quality and timeliness

As just said, the productivity of the staff working on WGP is high, albeit hard to quantify. A wide variety of reports is being generated, as shown by Table 5 in Chapter 3. The WWW serves the useful function as a benchmark for presentations of progress.

The pressure of time means, inevitably, that the quality of the outputs is variable. All is not intended for wide publication, but some could be. Many reports produced under WGP auspices appear in a variety of different shapes, sometimes their overall context is less than clear. Consideration may be given to issuing some of them in a publication series on water governance, an issue which will be revisited below in Chapter 7.

In each of the three years covered by this review (2008 – 2010) SIWI has received clean audit reports, covering also WGF. However, the financial reporting in the WGF annual reports is somewhat meagre and could be improved, for example by adding more analysis on differences between budget and actual spending. The annual reports would also benefit from a little less “cut and paste” from one year to the next.

The Sida-UNDP agreement specifies that “yearly analytical reports on results obtained (shall be) submitted no later than 31 March each year”. WGF has been able to meet this deadline. But it has proven difficult for UNDP to do so for WGF as a whole, since closing the UNDP accounts for the preceding year requires more time, and the reports to Sida therefore tend to be submitted after the date indicated.

6.6 Value to WGF of SIWI as a hosting partner

Since its inception the WGF has been hosted by SIWI in Stockholm. Some of the advantages of this arrangement were discussed above in Section 6.4. One more should be added.

SIWI has developed into a significant resource centre on water. Since the late 1990s SIWI has grown both in stature and size, mainly as a consequence of the World Water Week (WWW) organized by SIWI in August or September each year. The WWW is the world’s largest annual professional conference on water. The event has been highly successful and much appreciated by participants as a recurring venue for networking, scientific workshops and technical seminars. It has some 2,500 participants, including leading scientists and professionals in the water sector as well as senior politicians mostly from developing countries. SIWI has become known for organizing the WWW very efficiently and has hence been able to enhance its reputation among water professionals world-wide²⁴.

WGF benefits from the WWW in a variety of ways, not least as a forum for networking and advocacy. By locating WGF at SIWI, UNDP is able to have some influence on how WWW is organized.

As a result of WWW, SIWI has been able to attract several projects financed not only by Sida but also by other donors (Section 3.2 above) and to attain what may be said to be critical mass. It hosts representatives of some UN agencies (FAO and UNEP, in addition to UNDP). It is reinforced by its co-location with the Global Water Partnership (GWP). Together SIWI and GWP have some 65-70 staff, an impressive centre of excellence in water.

By being located at SIWI it is possible to derive several benefits for WGF that would not be present, if WGF were to be located at UNDP HQ. It could probably be possible to find another centre of excellence in water that could match SIWI and provide similar benefits to WGF, such as the IRC in Delft, but then the constructive synergies generated by WWW would not be the same. There are doubtless other centres in the world able to host WGF at a lower cost than in Stockholm, but moving WGF has never been seriously considered. It is safe to conclude that UNDP is well served by the present location of WGF.

6.7 Value to WGF of other partners and the strength of partnership arrangements

The partner organizations collaborating with WGF are primarily the Global Water Partnership (GWP), the Gender & Water Alliance (GWA), the Water Integrity Network (WIN), and the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre (OGC). UNDP uses WGF for collaboration with a wide

²⁴ Holmberg, Johan and Lars-Åke Adolfsson (2009): Evaluation of the Stockholm International Water Institute

range of organizations in the UN family, not least through UN-Water and UN-Oceans. This section is limited to a discussion of the first four, while Section 6.9 below covers UN partners.

As just said, GWP is co-located with SIWI in the same premises in Stockholm. It calls itself a “not-for-profit action network” open to all organizations involved in water resources management. Its strength is its wide network that includes a total of over 2,300 members in 154 countries, organized in 13 regional water partnerships and 74 country partnerships. By working with GWP it is possible for WGF to achieve an outreach in virtually all developing countries. This has been useful for training activities conducted by Cap-Net, for example the training courses conducted for GWP members in West Africa on water integrity in 2010.

The GWP strategy paper mentions water governance as a priority²⁵. However, GWP has been short of staff during the past year and unable to make much progress in this area. Both SIWI/WGF and GWP say that they would wish to collaborate more with the other²⁶. There is clearly potential to strengthen this link in the future, conceivably WGF could achieve wider impact by working more consistently with GWP.

GWA is a network dedicated to the promotion of women’s and men’s equitable access to and management of safe and adequate water for domestic use, sanitation, food security and environmental sustainability. It is based in the Netherlands and has more than 1,800 member organizations in 120 countries, over 80 per cent of its members come from countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. The members are mostly government agencies, NGOs, research institutes, universities, and consultants.

UNDP collaborated closely with GWA in the preparation of the Resource Guide (RG), “Mainstreaming Gender in Water Management” that was first produced in 2003 and later updated and revised in 2006. As said in Table 5, the RG has been widely disseminated since 2006. It is used by universities, international organizations and NGOs for training purposes all over the world. GWA does not keep records on individual users and therefore cannot say to what extent it is being used by UNDP, but it has been used by Cap-Net. There have been no specific training of trainers in the use of the RG but GWA always hands out the RG at its training sessions. The RG can now be said to be a common good available in the public domain as a result of an earlier WGP initiative.

WIN is yet another network created to support anti-corruption activities in the water sector worldwide by forging coalitions that can take action in ways that individuals or single organizations cannot. It is co-located with Transparency International (TI) in Germany. WIN aims to reduce poverty by fighting corruption. It welcomes organizations and individuals that view anti-corruption measures as central to sustainable development, economic efficiency and social equity. In the last two years WIN has expanded from 700 to 1,400 members, its field activities from one country (Uganda) to 12-16 countries at present.

²⁵ GWP (2009): Strategy 2009 – 2013, page 11.

²⁶ The same point was made in the 2009 evaluation of SIWI.

WIN was created as an outcome of a successful initiative taken by SIWI at WWW in 2004 (before WGF was in existence), and the collaboration between WIN and WGF has been close from the outset. The first chairman of the WIN Steering Committee was the current WGF Project Director. WGF has collaborated closely with WIN in the preparation of a training manual on water integrity to be used for training courses to be carried out by Cap-Net in three African sub-regions in 2011 for which funding is being sought from Sida.

OGC is a UNDP unit established in 2002 and located in Norway. It is part of UNDP's global policy network for democratic governance. Its purpose is to position UNDP as a champion of democratic governance, both as an end in itself and as a means to achieve the MDGs. It provides policy guidance and technical support to the more than 130 UNDP COs around the world. It works with leading policy and research institutes in different parts of the world. Its primary function is to provide support to governments to carry out "democratic governance assessments" resulting in knowledge products to measure democratic governance.

OGC hosted an important conference in November 2008 which can be said to mark the launch of the HRBA to water later promoted by WGP. OGC initiated the water integrity assessment in Tajikistan in collaboration with WGF. However, there do not seem to be many other good examples of close collaboration between OGC and WGF. OGC has carried out assessments in several of the countries where GoalWash projects have been launched and where WGF otherwise is active, examples include Mali, Palestine, Iraq, Southern Sudan. OGC does not list SIWI/WGF among its collaborating partners in its brochure. WGF could presumably benefit from the knowledge products generated by OGC (and vice versa). Since both OGC and WGF are parts of UNDP, it is strange that the collaborative links are not closer.

In conclusion, the network organizations (GWP, GWA and WIN) add legitimacy, expertise and outreach to WGF. There is a case for strengthening the working contacts with at least GWP, with GWA and WIN they are already close. There is also a case for WGF to work closer with OGC, particularly on the development of governance indicators.

6.8 WGP contribution toward poverty reduction

Some years ago WGP made an important contribution to poverty reduction through the Community Water Initiative (CWI), a program implemented by UNDP through its GEF Small Grants Program (SGP). In 2006 Sida decided to terminate (or not extend) its support to CWI. This support is therefore not included in the 3rd phase of the Sida support to the WGP and should therefore, strictly speaking, not be covered by this evaluation.

CWI has partially been replaced by EDM, which is more wide-ranging than CWI was and covers some 22 countries. As mentioned, the Sida support to WGP was used to move EDM to Stockholm. But EDM is not as integrated with SGP as CWI was and hence does not have the same potential for up-scaling by piggy-backing on the extensive GEF SGP infrastructure.

The Sida support to CWI was withdrawn before any evaluation had been carried out. Sida's rationale for withdrawing support to CWI is not entirely clear, but two reasons seem to have

been cited: “UNDP should not do such small projects” and “we can do such projects better in our bilateral programs”.

CWI is very similar in nature to SGP and uses the infrastructure of national coordinators and local steering committees that UNDP has built for SGP. CWI projects are typically smaller in size than regular SGP projects, they have a ceiling of UNDP support of USD25,000, while the ceiling for SGP projects is USD50,000. CWI projects generally focus on community-based WSS services, using low-cost systems manageable by local communities, including protection of water sources, and capacity-building for community-level water governance. During 2004 – 2010 89 such projects were implemented. Some projects were so successful that they received awards²⁷.

CWI was launched in 2004 with financial support from Sida (USD1 million), Norway (USD0.5 million) and Luxemburg (USD2 million). Initially, it operated in seven countries (Ghana, Guatemala, Kenya, Mauritania, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Uganda), later it was expanded to three more (Mali, Niger and Senegal). Now the CWI is being phased out, only funds from Luxemburg remain for “an orderly closure” and final evaluation.

Fortuitously, two recent reports have explored the performance of the CWI in the perspective of climate change adaptation²⁸. The conclusions of the two reports are positive. The second of the two (see footnote below) concludes on the basis of a review of 11 CWI projects:

“In summary, all these projects are low cost, relatively simple and straightforward to implement, have clear and valuable results and would be replicable in similar circumstances in other places. The costs of administering such projects relative to the costs of on-the-ground implementation are not known (to the author of the report), but they are likely to be of high benefit to total cost ratio”.

There is strong demand for community water projects in the UNDP/GEF SGP network, local communities request such projects in most countries. However, WSS projects cannot be supported under the GEF SGP unless they have a clear environmental component, such as a solar-powered water pump or tree plantations to protect watersheds, and these projects do not always have such components²⁹. There is therefore a strong unsatisfied demand for CWI projects.

UNDP has a well tested machinery for the GEF SPG that since its inception almost two decades ago has financed over 12,000 projects in 122 countries. CWI addressed poverty directly by supporting local communities. Sida’s justification for withdrawing its support is unclear. The possibilities of resuming support to CWI should be explored.

²⁷ Two CWI projects won the Wisions Award in 2008, another two were selected for the top 10 finalists for the Kyoto Grand Prize in 2009.

²⁸ UNDP GEF Small Grants Program (March 2010): [UNDP Community Water Initiative – Fostering Water Security and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation](#), and Young, Gordon (March 2011): [Draft Report on UNDP Water and Climate Change Adaptation Activities and Projects](#)

²⁹ This requirement can lead to spurious, even environmentally damaging projects, such as reliable solar pumps used to deplete aquifers in Djibouti. Available ‘green’ technologies are not always appropriate to provide WSS services in poor countries.

The 3rd phase of Sida support to WGP is making its most important contribution to poverty reduction by strengthening institutions and hence the performance of the water sector. This contribution is vital as a prerequisite to poverty reduction, but its impact on poverty is indirect and long term. The GoalWash projects may impact on poverty, but that can only be assessed during the 4th phase of the Sida support.

6.9 Cooperation with other donors, UN agencies and other stakeholders

One of the issues for WGF is its exclusive reliance on Sida as a donor of core support, prejudicing its sustainability. Should the Swedish support falter for whatever reason, the program would immediately be in jeopardy. SIWI is becoming increasingly successful in attracting complementary projects financed by other donors than Sida, but this is no substitute for core support. Steps should therefore be taken to explore the interest of other donors, a point further discussed in Chapter 7.

Of all the UN agencies that are active members of UN-Water the most important is arguably UNICEF with its large and very visible WSS programs in much of the developing world. UNDP has an undisputed leading role within the UN family in water governance, while UNICEF has the corresponding role in WSS service provision.

There are said to be misunderstandings in partner countries of UNDP's role with people asking why UNICEF is not active also in water governance. Although the roles may be clear to those directly involved, there would seem to be cases where clarifications should be provided to external partners. In particular, this would apply to situations in partner countries subject to GoalWash projects or other WGF activities.

UNICEF and UNDP are also among the two agencies most active in UN-Water, diligently attending all meetings and contributing actively to multiple task forces. This is at times frustrating business, the commitment of all UN agencies is not equally strong, meeting participants often change, there is much discussion and not always concrete outcomes.

In UN-Water UNDP has been active, using finance from Sida and other sources, and achieved some significant outcomes. It was involved in the preparation of a report on IWRM country plans to CSD16 in May 2008. In the UN-Water Task Force on Sanitation UNDP contributed significantly to the preparation and dissemination of advocacy materials for the International Year of Sanitation in 2008 and its follow-up. UNDP chaired the UN-Water Task Force on Country Level Coherence and Coordination which produced a report in March 2010. In December 2009 UNDP coordinated preparation of the report "Water-Wiki: An Opportunity for UN-Water" that would apply WaterWiki.net as a UN-wide, interactive knowledge base in the water sector; implementation of the project has been held up because of funding constraints but is now set to commence. UNDP was also heavily involved in the preparation by UN-Water of a policy report and a one page flier on the link between CC-A and water.

A finding from the online survey suggests that country level coordination led by UNDP is mostly satisfactory (Chapter 4). UNDP has taken initiatives to "One UN" programs in water,

for example in Jordan (Chapter 5). Some GoalWash projects, for example in B&H, are other examples of the same approach (Chapter 3).

The World Bank (WB) is often aloof from the activities of UN-Water and is not active in the UN Country Team (UNCT). WB is obviously a big actor in the WSS sector, often through its Water and Sanitation Program (WSP), but there is little evidence of collaboration between WB and UNDP on water governance at the global level beyond UNDP's participation in annual WSP Council meetings, there have also been contacts with WSP in some GoalWash countries. UNICEF and WSP have collaborated in carrying out WSS sector assessments in African countries and, as said in Chapter 3, future GoalWash activities should be better aligned with these initiatives. Generally, it would appear that working contacts with WB could be strengthened.

6.10 Application of the OECD evaluation criteria

On the basis of the foregoing in this chapter, and in Chapters 3 – 5 above, the following summary of WGP performance is attempted by application of the five OECD evaluation criteria.

Relevance. Improved performance of the water sector is required for sustainable development in a broad range of economic sectors and for achievement of several MDG targets. It is also required for the implementation of CC-A in poor countries, a strategic priority for UNDP. In the vast majority of developing countries water sector performance will not improve unless governance is strengthened. This is a neglected area, particularly in countries that are performing poorly with regard to the MDG WSS indicators and where UNDP is often one of the very few actors. Demand for support is strong and exceeds the resources available. The online survey gave support for the thesis that water scarcities can be explained more in terms of poor governance than water shortages per se. There is little doubt that the relevance of WGP is high.

Effectiveness. The overview in Chapter 3 supports the conclusion that, on the whole, significant progress has been made toward achieving the 22 intended outcomes listed in the project document. Using an admittedly subjective rating of achievement of the intended outcomes the conclusion was very satisfactory. UNDP is indisputably in the lead within the UN family with regard to water governance, but its dialogue with UNICEF and WB on this subject should be strengthened. The GoalWash initiative is developing well, and demand for new activities is keen. There is also an increasing demand for WGF to produce analytical tools relating to CC-A in water.

Efficiency. It is difficult to measure the cost efficiency of a diverse and wide-ranging program such as WGP. One indicator is the (hypothetical) alternative of locating WGF at UNDP HQ in New York, a “straw man” argument raised during one of the interviews for this review. By that indicator it is at least 20 per cent more cost efficient to retain WGF where it is in Stockholm. Another indicator is the hard work of staff, again hard to measure but obvious to see.

Sustainability. This has two dimensions. Are the achievements by WGP sustainable? And is WGP itself sustainable? Several of the past achievements of WGP have proven sustainable, examples includes the resource guide on gender mainstreaming, CWI as an approach to reach the poor, and the website WaterWiki.net “for water professionals world-wide” now being replicated in the context of UN-Water. Whether the results to be achieved by the GoalWash initiative will be sustainable is too early to say, but judging by the multiple expressions of interest there likely to be good ownership by countries. Most importantly, the very focus on water governance as a means to improve water sector performance has been found relevant and sustainable.

But it is not clear that WGF is sustainable over the long term, being so dependent on one major donor only, this applies also to GoalWash. The main threat to sustainability is the lack of adequate financial resources over the long term. Broadening the funding base should therefore be a priority concern for UNDP, and Chapter 7 will discuss on how this might be done.

Impact. According to the Sida-UNDP project agreement, the main objective is to achieve results on institutions in developing countries. It is yet premature to identify impact on such institutions as a result of the 3rd phase of WGP. Most of the GoalWash projects were launched only in 2010 and their impact cannot yet be assessed. There may have been impact in the way the UN family works with water governance, but it cannot be assessed whether this filters down to partner countries. The Sida support to WGP has contributed to a variety of important initiatives within the UN system, for example on the global policy dialogue relating to water governance, but linking them to concrete impact on the ground is hazardous. CWI may well have had impact on poverty in isolated locations, there are positive indications in that regard, but no specific evaluation of CWI has been carried out. The conclusion is that overall impact of the 3rd phase of the Sida support to WGP is yet uncertain.

PART III: THE DESIGN OF WGP GOING FORWARD

This part has three chapters and a focus on the future. Chapter 7 includes recommendations for the 4th phase of Sida's support to WGP, based on the findings and conclusions presented in Parts I and II and raised, approximately, in the order they appear in them. Chapter 8 discusses the strategic focus of WGP in a 4th phase project, and Chapter 9 suggests modalities and organizational principles for further Sida support. There are recommendations in these chapters as well, and at Annex 5 there is a list of all recommendations made in Part III.

7. Recommendations for the future of WGP

7.1 Continue WGP

One basic recommendation has to come first, namely that Sida should continue its support in a 4th phase. Water is key to development, the performance of the water sector must improve, and this will not happen in many countries unless water governance improves. The relevance of water governance is therefore high.

WGP is also highly relevant in relation to the strategy papers of the Swedish government that guide Sida's work. Of particular importance is the government's strategy paper on so-called global programs for 2011 – 2014 which lists as one of four thematic priorities “projects that strengthen the global efforts to promote access to clean water and sanitation and improved management of water resources”³⁰.

A theme running through many of the recommendations to follow in this chapter is the ambition in the 4th phase project to raise the level of the game for water governance inside and outside UNDP, to make it better understood and more widely known. This is justified by the high relevance that the subject has in general and its relation to the all-important priority of CC-A in particular.

The foregoing discussion has shown that WGP is effective and cost efficient. There are issues with regard to sustainability, there should be possibilities to address those. Assessing impact is difficult, attribution is often problematic and the time horizon too short. Still, there are cases where it seems evident that WGP has made contributions that may have significant future impact. In summary, there is a strong case for a continuation of the Sida support to WGP.

7.2 Improve the format for Sida support

That said, there is much that can be done to improve the format for the Sida support. It is frankly surprising that two organizations so skilled in development project preparation have signed off on an agreement as vague as that governing the ongoing 3rd phase project, the responsibility for this must lie primarily with Sida as financier³¹. The present project

³⁰ Free translation from Swedish. Utrikesdepartementet (2011-02-02): Strategi för globala ämnesstrategiska utvecklingsinsatser 2011 – 2014, utkast.

³¹ In contrast, the agreement governing the 3rd phase of Sida support to Cap-Net is more specific.

agreement is vague on how goal achievement might be assessed, and the overall project objective has no benchmarks or indicators. The 22 intended project outcomes are in many instances much too ambitious for the Sida-supported project and seem to have been prepared with the ‘global WGP’ in mind.

The agreement provides for annual reviews of progress by the parties, and such reviews have been held in connection with the WWWs. Holding these meetings in the margins of WWW is convenient since everybody is there. But it also tends to create a hurried atmosphere, because participants have busy agendas for WWW and multiple meetings to attend, and the Sida-UNDP meeting may not have the highest priority. WGP would gain from more focused, dedicated annual meetings at UNDP HQ held after WWW but when there is still time to approve the work plan for the next year, probably in October.

The agreement for a 4th phase of WGP will also include Cap-Net to which Sida has already agreed to provide substantial support (Table 1). The 4th phase of WGP, including Cap-Net, may therefore be a project of at least SEK20 million (about USD3 million) per year in contributions by Sida, perhaps more. Even if somewhat “pruned” relative to the 3rd phase (see Section 7.5 below), it will be a substantial and complex program with a large variety of different activities. Sida should contract a monitoring consultant to follow implementation of the WGP work plan in the 4th phase, visit field activities on a sample basis, and prepare for the annual review meetings jointly with UNDP.

The principal output of the review meetings would be an approved work plan for the coming year. Depending on progress and needs, the meetings would decide on reallocations of resources between WGP components.

This suggests the following four recommendations:

1. The agreement for the 4th phase project should have benchmarks and measurable indicators for the stated objectives relating to the Sida support.
2. There should be an annual review at UNDP HQ in New York at a time scheduled well in advance and not coinciding with WWW.
3. The annual reviews should be an occasion to discuss priorities and, if required, shift resources around within the ceiling provided by the agreement (that will include Cap-Net).
4. Sida should retain a monitoring consultant to prepare for the reviews on the basis of the UNDP’s annual report and his/her own findings from sample visits to project activities supported by WGP.

7.3 Rewrite the UNDP Water Governance Strategy

The point was made in Part I that the WGS should be revised. The present version was written in 2006/07 and needs to be updated. A new version should focus more on the broad, strategic approaches of WGS and link them to the overall UNDP strategic priorities.

The UNDP Strategic Plan for 2008 – 2011 (recently extended to 2012) includes the following four key results from the strategic priority on environment and sustainable development: “(i) *mainstreaming environment and energy in MDG-based policy and planning frameworks at the national level; (ii) generating new environment-based sources of finance to significantly scale-up investment in environment and energy to achieve the MDGs; (iii) promoting adaptation to climate change in order to lower the risks to the poor in developing countries and enable the attainment of the MDGs; and (iv) expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor as a foundation for poverty reduction and economic growth.*” WGP is mainly linked to results (i), (iii) and (iv).

Any revision of the WGS should be linked to the revision of the UNDP Strategic Plan and the key results mentioned in that revised document. It is not yet known whether the Strategic Plan will be revised in 2012 or at a later time, but plans in that regard should be known by 2012. It is recommended that the WGS be rewritten during 2012, the first year of the 4th phase of Sida support. If a change in schedule for the revision of the UNDP Strategic Plan justifies a delay in the preparation of a revised WGS, that should be decided jointly by the parties at the 2012 annual review meeting.

7.4 Disseminate water governance more widely within UNDP

The Sida support to UNDP for water governance started in 1998 and is with the 4th phase project set to continue through 2015, a period of 17 years. Allocations made to date by Sida add up to SEK166.6 million, including Cap-Net (Table 1). Before embarking on the 4th phase project, Sida should be able to expect, quite reasonably, that the imperative of water governance is more widely disseminated and accepted by UNDP. By ‘more widely’ is then understood the UNDP organization at large and beyond the 25 or so partner countries directly affected by the work of WGF.

The difficulties of promoting what is seen as a “sector” issue such as water within UNDP were discussed above in Chapter 6. The priorities spelled out in any new strategic plan would clearly impact on how water governance is disseminated within the UNDP organization. It is also understood that many different priorities clamor for attention within UNDP, anything from literacy to HIV/AIDS to malaria and beyond has a constituency of its own.

But CC-A is already a UNDP strategic priority, as explained in the previous section, much work is being done in this area not least with GEF support. Its strategic importance for UNDP is likely to further increase in future years. As said repeatedly above, CC-A in developing countries is largely a matter of better management of water resources, which in turn can be boiled down to improved water governance. There is a policy paper written by UN-Water, with significant input from UNDP, that explains the link between CC-A and water, and it

would not be hard to add water governance to that chain of logic³². In addition, Cap-Net has together with WMO and other partners developed a training manual on the pivotal link between CC-A and water resources management.

These linkages are obvious to water professionals but may not be so obvious to UNDP generalists. It is recommended that UNDP undertakes to explain the linkages between CC-A, water management, and water governance, and that this information is widely disseminated within UNDP with the support of its top management. Sida may wish this to happen before the 4th phase project agreement is signed, a matter for discussion at the 2011 annual review meeting.

UNDP management will want to decide how this should be done. Examples of conceivable options could include the following which are not mutually exclusive:

- A narrative developed by the Bureau for Development Policy and adopted by UNDP management could explain this linkage, building on CC-A as an already existing strategic priority. Such a paper could be followed up with workshops with the regional bureaux.
- Under a program called “Boots on the ground” national advisors on CC have been assigned to 24 UNDP COs supported by four regional advisors, a budget of USD5.6 million was allocated in 2009. It is understood from interviews that these advisors tend to spend most of their time assisting partner countries in the climate negotiations, but there seems to be no reason why they should not also promote water governance.
- The UNDP Africa Adaptation Program (AAP) supported by Japan has been designed to strengthen the capacities in 20 African countries to deal with CC-A. The program commenced in 2009 and is due to expire in 2012. UNDP should take steps to highlight water governance in these countries, there are no overlaps with GoalWash countries in SSA.

UNDP is a decentralized organization, the UNDP COs make their own decisions, and pressure from HQ tends to be resented. But the experiences from GoalWash suggest that there is demand, if a good product can be made available and widely known. With the right argumentation and appropriate resources there is every reason to expect more demand from the UNDP COs for support to water governance.

7.5 Focus the work plan better on the core business

For an external observer of WGP two initial impressions are strong. One is that staff works hard, as noted in Chapter 6. Since the program covers the whole globe, in principle, there is at any time someone calling in. The other is that the work plan is very diverse, an attempt to “be

³² An illustration is provided by UNDP-PAPP and Environment Quality Authority of the PA (2010): Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and Program of Action for the Palestinian Authority. The report lists eight “no-regrets adaptation measures”, all of which relate to water management, seven “low-regrets measures” two of which relate to water, and three “high cost adaptation options”, all of which relate to water.

all things to all people” with a variety of activities not always fully in line, at least not directly, with the overall purpose of the project agreement. There is obviously a connection between these two impressions.

It is recognized that UNDP views the Sida support to WGP as a core program that provides easily accessible financial resources to fill gaps and to enable key activities to leverage larger support from other sources. There are examples of such a mechanism at work, EDM has been cited and there are others. While convenient to UNDP, this approach tends to spread the Sida contribution thinly and to obscure the focus of this support and hence the impact that can be achieved. There is a goal conflict between gap filling on the one hand and focus and impact on the other. This can be much discussed, but this review comes down in favor of the latter.

It is easily said that WGP should focus more on its core business, but it remains to be defined precisely what is the core business. At this stage three recommendations come to mind:

- There is a need for a stronger focus of the Sida support to WGP.
- Water sector reform and the strengthening of sector governance and related institutions is at the core of the WGP business.
- WGP should spin off activities that have been successfully developed to be applied by other actors more specialized than UNDP. An example is the work on gender mainstreaming by GWA, another may be CWI, yet another may eventually be the work with water integrity by WIN (see Chapter 6). Another example will eventually be GoalWash pilot projects, as discussed in Section 7.8 below.

WGF is with a staff of less than five active in almost all developing regions of the world, the major exceptions being East Asia and South Asia (Table 6). One way to focus the work plan better is determine geographical limits for WGF, since available resources do not suffice for WGF to have a presence in every country where there is demand for WGP interventions. It is recommended that the geographical focus continues to be where it is at present, i.e. with no activities in East Asia or in South Asia, and that an effort is made not to initiate new activities in Latin America. There are GoalWash activities ongoing in three Latin American countries, and these obviously should be concluded in good order, but no new such activities should be started.

If there is strong demand for new activities in Latin America (or in any of the other regions recommended not to be focal areas for WGF), it is recommended that an effort is made to locate other institutions which could work on behalf of WGF. The UNDP regional technical advisors should be consulted about the selection of such institutions, which should not be too difficult to find. The alternative option is to substantially increase the capacity of WGF with cost implications that will impact on other uses of the Sida support (unless, of course, that support is much increased in the 4th phase).

The strategic focus for WGP in a 4th phase will be discussed further in Chapter 8 below.

7.6 Broaden the financial support base

The ToR says that the review should help UNDP/Sida to “build strategic partnerships and a developed funding base”. It was argued above in Section 6.10 that the lack of adequate financial resources over the long term is a threat to the sustainability of WGF. It has been shown elsewhere in the foregoing, for example in Section 3.3, that the demand for WGF services exceeds what can be done with the resources available. It will therefore be important to explore possibilities to mobilize additional support to WGF.

It would be reasonable for Sida to expect from UNDP an effort to raise core support for the ‘global WGF’ also from other donors, i.e. flexible funding of the kind that Sida has provided to UNDP and that other bilateral donors also provide. This report has argued that improved water governance is a prerequisite for many other priority actions, such as CC-A. Sida may take the position that its long term support to WGF will be contingent on efforts by UNDP to interest other donors in supporting water governance. Some donors have come on board to support projects, examples include USAID and the Basque regional government, but it would be desirable to have more of the flexible core support that Sida provides.

The first step should be to look at the other Nordic donors, primarily Denmark and Norway. The reason is that each of these three donors, Sweden included, has its own project of collaboration with a UN agency for which it would wish to diversify the support by engaging other core donors. Denmark supports UNEP through resources provided to the Danish Hydraulic Institute (DHI), Norway supports the Oslo Governance Centre (OGC), and Sweden supports WGF. No other donor gives core support to any of these institutions, since mobilizing additional support from others is difficult. Denmark is seen to “own” DHI, likewise for the other two, so other donors are not interested.

The Nordic donors have a joint committee to discuss and coordinate their activities in the water sector, it usually meets at least once a year. It is recommended that Sida raises the possibility of more mutual support to these programs, i.e. that Norway and Denmark consider support to WGF, Sweden considers supporting UNDP DHI, and so on. UNDP should prepare supporting material, if possible also participate in meetings. Preliminary contacts could be taken at the 2011 WWW where all agencies are likely to be represented.

Whether this is actually possible to achieve is far from clear. Apparently, Norad and Danida have smaller budgets for global programs than Sida does. There are often practical reasons why such exchanges of support are difficult to bring about, notwithstanding the broadly espoused principle of Nordic cooperation. Still, the Nordic donors have previously applied a principle of relying on each other to prepare projects for decision that they can mutually support. Discussing possibilities of mutual support to projects of common interest would be well within the mandate of the Nordic water coordination committee.

Obviously, initiating a dialogue with the Nordic donors on core support to WGF should not preclude contacts also with others. Those that first come to mind include the UK, the Netherlands, Germany and Japan.

Another possibility would be to approach the regional development banks, all of them support WSS projects. EBRD is active in WSS in several countries in Central Asia, one is Tajikistan. UNDP has talked to AfDB and ADB about water governance. These institutions are normally not keen to provide core support, but through the UNDP COs possibilities of support to specific projects should be explored. There may be opportunities for UNDP to raise governance aspects directly related to ongoing WSS projects that the banks support.

7.7 Promote support to the Community Water Initiative

CWI was described above as a successful poverty-oriented program linked to the UNDP GEF SGP. Demand for CWI is strong, poor local communities almost everywhere need better WSS services. CWI has effectively made use of the infrastructure built for GEF SGP through which thousands of community level projects have been implemented. The Sida support to CWI (together with other support from Norway and Luxemburg) may be viewed as a pilot phase that has been successfully completed, now the challenge is to scale-up this program³³. This may be difficult to do in the 4th phase project, since there is unlikely to be space both to continue GoalWash and to resume support to CWI.

It is recommended that UNDP actively seeks to raise renewed support for CWI. It may do so by raising CWI with the Nordic donors at the meeting of their coordinating committee discussed above. But it could also use other occasions, and possibilities of raising support from other bilateral donors should be explored.

7.8 Continue GoalWash and align it better with other UN initiatives

Also GoalWash is in a pilot phase which, at least this far, appears to develop positively. During the 4th phase of Sida support to WGP, it will be necessary to give consideration to how this pilot project may be up-scaled and also supported by other donors. The strategic perspective on GoalWash during the 4th phase should be that it is a pilot program that will either be phased out or supported by other donors in the framework of different and possibly larger programs. This is consistent with what UNDP said when GoalWash was launched in 2008.

In the 4th phase there should be sufficient financial resources for a cautious expansion of GoalWash. If it is (hypothetically) assumed that (i) six new GoalWash projects can be initiated at a maximum cost of USD200,000 each, and (ii) six of the ongoing projects need to be extended, for whatever reason, at a cost of USD50,000 each³⁴ (the other six are assumed to be phased out or taken over by other donors), then the total cost to the 4th phase project would be USD1.5 million or SEK9-10 million. This should be easily affordable within the likely Sida contribution.

³³ In some ways EDM could be seen as an effort to upscale CWI but with separate funding and outside the GEF SPG.

³⁴ Extension requests are typically much higher, USD200,000 – 900,000, far beyond what could be sustained by a 4th phase project.

GoalWash has the potential to grow and could crowd out other components in the 4th phase project that UNDP would want to keep or initiate. In the 3rd phase GoalWash at a cost of about USD2 million accounted for more than one-third of the Sida-support (36-38 per cent), and that proportion should be maintained in the 4th phase. It is recommended that the GoalWash initiative continues in the 4th phase at a total cost of about one-third of the Sida support.

Any expansion of GoalWash beyond its present level should be accompanied by staff reinforcement at WGF. It is therefore recommended that additional staff for GoalWash management be considered in the 4th phase, if the program is set to expand.

The other issue is how UNDP can facilitate the take-over by GoalWash project initiatives by other donors. Part of the answer was given in Section 7.4, a wider dissemination of the principles of water governance within UNDP at large. If water governance becomes more widely understood and accepted, there will be more opportunities to absorb GoalWash initiatives in other programs.

But at the outset it will be necessary to ensure that GoalWash is not seen as an “outlier” but well aligned with similar initiatives by other UN agencies, primarily UNICEF, WSP and perhaps also UN-Habitat. Such alignment has doubtless happened in many, perhaps most, of the countries where GoalWash projects are being implemented. Still, there remains the perception that GoalWash is a supply-driven initiative, and this needs to be addressed.

It is recommended that UNDP should propose the creation of a strategic alliance for water governance between the UN agencies involved. It would be called simply “The Water Governance Alliance” (WGA) and engage, as a first step, UNICEF, WB for WSP, and UN-Habitat. Later other agencies, such as bilateral or specialized organizations such as GWP, could be invited to join. An option would be to create WGA under the umbrella of UN-Water.

The purpose of this grouping would not only be to put an end to any sniping about “outliers” but, much more importantly, strengthen the focus on water governance as a key area, as has been repeatedly said, for water development and for CC-A. WGA would not be a new organization, not even a network, it would be more of a mutual understanding between the parties involved on who does what in water governance. It may partially overlap with other existing initiatives or networks, for example the ongoing “Sanitation and Water for All”, but with the significant difference that it would focus squarely on water governance which the others do not. By contributing UNDP’s convening power and coordinating role WGA could also usefully supplement the motley group of existing networks focusing on water utilities (see Section 8.2 below).

It should suffice, at least initially, with one annual meeting (probably during WWW). WGA could begin by systematically reviewing needs for water governance improvements in the WSS projects supported by the three UN agencies mentioned. That in itself would be an important assignment for WGF.

7.9 Develop more knowledge products and raise the WGP profile

There is evidence both from the interviews and the online survey that there is an increasing demand for so-called knowledge products related to CC-A and to water governance.

Satisfying this demand will continue to be an important function for WGF. It is recommended that WGF during the 4th phase project broadens its work on knowledge products.

Cost-benefit analysis of CC-A is an excellent example. The question of “what are the most cost-effective activities/actions for CC-A that can be undertaken” needs to be asked repeatedly by partner countries (and UNDP COs). WGF is working on development of a standardized methodology, pilot activities are considered in Uganda and Tanzania, and during the coming years this should be rolled out in additional countries. There is also ongoing work by WGF to develop a methodology for assessing critical linkages between the success of CC-A interventions and the effectiveness of their underlying institutions and infrastructures.

There is demand for more such tools. Many call for indicators of water governance to facilitate the analysis of specific country situations. Such work by WGF may build on the support it has received from USAID for water governance benchmarking in six MENA countries.

There was a cautionary note expressed by one respondent who said that development of knowledge products should proceed in close collaboration with the intended users to ensure that they meet perceived needs and are tailored to the users’ capacities, a point WGF should take into consideration.

The regional intelligence reports are knowledge products that, on the whole, have been well received. More of them could be produced during the 4th phase, provided that there is a clear demand from UNDP COs and Regional Centres, it is important that they are not seen to be supply driven. It could be considered also to prepare such reports for regions or river basins supported with GEF resources. The idea would be to analyze political, socio-economic and natural resource developments that impact on ongoing transboundary water management.

Water governance needs to be better explained and more widely understood, there is a related need to give WGP a stronger profile (not least in order to raise awareness within UNDP). During the course of this review a broad range of reports, or knowledge products in the broad sense, have been reviewed, many of them of a publishable quality. But their context is not always clear, and therefore they do not contribute as they should to building the WGP identity and “brand”. It is recommended that a “water governance publication series” is initiated by WGF with the aim of making water professionals better acquainted with the subject.

There was also a set of two-page fliers called the “UNDP Water Governance Facility at SIWI Issue Series” that came out in four issues and then apparently was discontinued. Such fliers are useful as hand-outs in connection with WWW and other events but do not suffice to raise the profile of WGP. The possible continuation of these fliers should be considered in the light of the aforementioned publications series, since there may not be capacity to do both.

7.10 Assign JPOs to strengthen UNDP COs in their coordinating role

Strengthening UNDP's coordinating role in the UN system has been important both in water and oceans covered by intended outcomes 4.3 and 4.4, as shown in Table 5. UNDP has certainly been active in both UN-Water and UN-Oceans with Sida support. However, intra-UN coordination is a constant uphill struggle that will never be fully won.

The most important aspect of coordination is probably what takes place at country level. As mentioned in Table 5, UNDP chaired a UN-Water task force that in March 2010 issued a report on this subject. This report includes many proposals to strengthen UN programs and activities at country level, examples include the following:

- Improving advocacy and communication to support country-level coherence, e.g. preparation of information materials on the role of UN-Water
- Improving advocacy and communication to raise awareness on country water-related issues, again entailing the preparation of information materials
- Facilitating inter-country knowledge-sharing through the creation of a email/web-based knowledge sharing mechanism
- Facilitating inter-agency capacity development on “coherence and coordination” e.g. through training and knowledge exchange by providing access to ongoing UN-Water mapping activities
- Developing a UN-Water strategy for scaling up joint UN delivery at country level
- Strengthening collaboration with national counterparts by building awareness and mainstreaming WSS in policy agendas.

These and other activities proposed in the report are useful but mostly beyond the existing capacity of UNDP COs, and the UN-Water report does not address the capacity constraints. The activities mentioned in the report seem suitable to be carried out by Junior Professional Officers (JPOs) working under the guidance of a senior officer at UNDP COs. JPOs may facilitate “One UN” approaches in countries where water is an important component of the UNDAF.

The Swedish government has issued a strategy for Sida's work to develop the Swedish resource base for work in development cooperation³⁵. It specifically mentions JPOs as one tool to increase the number of Swedish nationals working in programs given priority by Sweden. A special budget is allocated for this purpose. UN agencies are invited to submit proposals that will be evaluated by Sida.

³⁵ Utrikesdepartementet (2010-10-22): Strategi för kapacitetsutveckling och samverkan 2011 – 2013, utkast.

The Sida-UNDP cooperation in water governance should qualify as a Swedish priority. It should be valuable for Sida to increase the number of young Swedes with experience from working in water in developing countries. It is therefore recommended that Sida gives consideration to assigning JPOs to work with UNDP COs on the tasks identified in the UN-Water report. They would be financed from the separate budget outside the Sida-UNDP project agreement. How many JPOs could be assigned would depend on the finance available, but the aim should be for 2 – 4 positions to be assigned to UNDP COs where water is a priority.

8. Strategic focus of WGP

8.1 Toward a vision for the future

The ToR specifies that an outcome of the review should be to help Sida-UNDP to develop "a strategy for taking the WGP forward in a strategic manner". A strategy for WGP needs to depart from a vision of what WGP should achieve. Again, there is the possible confusion of what WGP is referred to in the ToR. It is assumed that it is the 'Sida-supported WGP' and not the 'global WGP'.

A strategy for the 'Sida-supported WGP' should be derived from WGS which should be revised, as recommended in Section 7.3. That in turn is linked to the revision of the UNDP Strategic Plan, which may (or may not) commence in 2012.

All these steps are related, and it is easy that the best becomes an enemy of the good if the interrelationships are stressed too much. A good starting point would therefore be to define a future vision for WGP and to explore whether that can be used as a basis for development of a strategy. This is done with reference to Section 7.5 above.

Water governance is not an end in itself. It serves the larger purpose as an instrument for the performance of the water sector in partner countries. Such performance relates to water resources management as well as the provision of WSS services. If water sector performance in a given country is poor, there will be problems to achieve the MDG targets for reasons outlined earlier. Water sector performance can be readily measured, worldwide data are available on the MDG targets as well as on irrigated agriculture, on water utility performance and other indicators, this is no abstract concept.

To improve water sector performance it is necessary to have a focus on the institutions that impact on the sector, organizations as well as legal regulations, public and private institutions, international, national and voluntary institutions. The role of water governance is to maintain that focus. Building capacity within the institutions is part of this role, but it is not all of it.

In all too many of UNDP's partner countries there is an acute need of reform of the water sector institutions as a prerequisite to the improved performance that is required to address current and future needs. Such reform often involves decentralization of management to communities of customers/beneficiaries, this may be particularly urgent in countries where centralized management used to be the norm. Reform may involve comprehensive reorganization, it usually involves capacity building in various forms, it may involve steps to improve water integrity, it may also involve actions to engage women more equitably.

Helping initiate, guide and sustain water sector reform is one of the main functions of WGP. But that does not necessarily mean that WGP itself should be doing all that is required. It should be accepted that certain activities, as suggested in Section 7.5, are spun off to other and

more specialized organizations when they have been developed under WGP auspices sufficiently to be taken forward by others, examples were given above.

Against this background it is possible to summarize the elements of a future vision for WGP as follows:

- The overall objective of WGP, its *raison d'être*, is to improve the performance of the water sector in partner countries, particularly those that are manifestly off the MDG targets.
- The principal means to improve water sector performance available to WGP is to strengthen the institutions that dominate the sector in partner countries (
- In many of these countries it will be necessary to undertake comprehensive reform of these institutions in order to ensure the required sector performance improvements.
- Strengthening the institutions often entails capacity building in its various forms as well as other areas where WGP is and has been active, such as gender, water integrity, HRBA. It will also involve the knowledge products and analytical tools discussed in Section 7.9.

Word-smithing a vision for WGP is probably best done by committee or as a result of a workshop. What follows is a first attempt only:

“WGP aims to improve the performance of the water sector in UNDP partner countries, particularly those that are not achieving the MDG WSS targets. It works by strengthening key water sector institutions, those engaged in WSS service provision as well as water resources management. Whenever necessary, it will support comprehensive reform of such institutions and their organization and operations. It recognizes the particular role played by WSS utilities in the delivery of services and the need to strengthen them through capacity building and other means. Its impact will be measured by water sector performance indicators, especially the MDG WSS targets.”

Developing a WGP strategy based on this vision is a project in itself but, it is suggested, a perfectly feasible project, once the overall UNDP strategic framework is in place.

8.2 More focus on WSS utilities and their regulation

It is recommended that WGF adopts a stronger focus on the very institutions responsible for WSS service delivery, the water companies or utilities that provide such services.

Respondents to the online survey expressed concern about the poor management of WSS service provision. Observations in two of the countries studied more closely as part of this review, Tajikistan and Palestine, confirm the justification for such concern, and it is possible to go further. To quote the WB homepage on water, “many WSS utilities are locked in a vicious spiral of weak performance, insufficient funding for maintenance leading to deterioration of assets and political interference”.

An *increased* focus on WSS utilities would not mean neglect of WRM institutions, such as river basin organizations (RBOs) and planning departments in water ministries. Good WRM is a prerequisite for sustainable provision of WSS services, so the two go together. WGF will work with the full range of water institutions, certainly not only water utilities. It is argued here that *more* work needs to be done on the WSS service providers, since their performance is an important determinant of whether the MDG targets will be achieved. The novelty of this shift should not be exaggerated, many of the ongoing GoalWash projects relate to WSS service delivery. UNDP is already involved with WSS utilities through Cap-Net.

WB has developed “a benchmarking kit” for water utilities and defined a set of performance indicators, such as the number of connections (customers) per 1,000 employees, but this dates back to 1999. UN-Habitat has also done some work on an index of performance for water utilities, but this does not seem to be fully developed. There is an “International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities (IBNET)”, www.ib-net.org, that claims to have “the world largest database for water and sanitation utilities performance data”, it covers over 2,000 utilities in 85 countries. UNDP should work more with the Global Water Operators’ Partnership hosted by UN Habitat, the Water Utility Partnership based in Abidjan and covering Africa, the Water Operators’ Partnership Program of ADB ³⁶ and others.

This should be seen in the light of the WGA proposed in Section 7.8. UNDP would work with the WB to contribute a focus on governance to the mentioned networks, giving them some added rigour and common standards. Conceivably, a division of work would evolve, whereby the WB through the WSP would work directly with the utilities and UNDP through WGP with governments to strengthen the regulatory functions mentioned below.

Focusing WGF increasingly on WSS utilities would be an important contribution in many countries to improving water sector performance. It would provide many opportunities for courses to be offered by Cap-Net. It would involve close collaboration with GWP, whose membership in no small part is based on water utilities. Experiences from the EUWI suggest that training opportunities organized for utilities with GWP involvement have good chances of being successful³⁷.

Work with WSS utilities will raise a host of new issues to which WGF to date has been giving scant attention, including management techniques, cost accounting, tariff setting, metering and billing practices, pipe network performance, and so on. Some of those issues may not be amenable to active involvement by WGF while others will be, WGF may need to supplement its staff in order to be able to address them effectively. Many of them will be suitable for training activities by Cap-Net.

³⁶ The ADB partnership dates back to 2007 and is supported by a grant of USD2 million from Japan. In Asia there is also the USAID-supported ECO-Asia Water and Sanitation Program.

³⁷ For example, the EUWI Finance Working Group organized several short training courses on finance for utilities, using a training manual on the subject developed by Cap-Net. These courses were much appreciated by participants.

Reform of WSS services would have to ensure that certain key regulatory functions are carried out at central level. Strengthening these functions should be part of a WGF mandate to strengthen WSS utilities. They may include the following:

- Approving tariffs. An agency independent of the WSS operators will be required to review and approve tariffs in the sector. The review should include the operators' costs to ensure that they are computed correctly and are not excessive.
- Checking quality. The quality of drinking water and of wastewater needs to be controlled. Often this is done by the Ministry of Health through its sanitary inspectorate.
- Developing policy. National policy for the WSS sector should be developed by the sector ministry responsible, it cannot be done by individual utilities, but there should be consultation with them.
- Maintaining contacts with other central government entities. The WSS operators' common interests should be represented in contacts with other ministries and public agencies.
- Providing common services. This would include negotiations and agreements with external donors, identifying needs and opportunities for institutional capacity development, organizing national facilities for training and technical support.
- Identifying and applying performance indicators for the sector. This would normally be part of the development of policy and is an essential element to enable sector performance to improve.

More attention also needs to be given to the role of the private sector and to private-public partnerships. There should be more recognition of the fact that the MDG WSS targets cannot be achieved with finance provided by foreign donors or even by governments alone, there has to be payment for services rendered by consumers/beneficiaries, and commercial principles have to be applied in the framework of "the 3Ts"³⁸. UNDP has recently initiated work to review the role of small scale private sector water providers in four, soon to be seven, African countries to identify governance gaps and entry points for national interventions to address that gap. Still, the role of the private sector is an aspect of governance that has not featured much in WGP work plans to date.

8.3 Elements of a new WGP strategy

If WGP should focus its work program and still do more on WSS utilities, what should it then do less of? As already suggested, it should gradually spin off such activities that can stand on their own. Perhaps strengthening WSS utilities can also be spun off after the 4th phase project, conceivably some of the work on analytical tools and knowledge products as well.

The same reasoning should apply to the GoalWash initiative which is in a first pilot phase. If and when it proves itself successful, the aim should be to diversify its funding and promote its upscaling with finance from other sources (as was recommended for CWI).

Cooperation on transboundary waters is an area where the discrepancy between the 'global WSP' and what the Sida-supported project could hope to achieve is large, as shown in Table

³⁸ See Section 6.3 and footnote 22.

5. The ‘global WGP’ will continue to have a substantial work program in this area, and using Sida funds to finance a few consultancies on the margin of this huge program does not seem highly relevant since UNDP has access to other funds for such purposes (such as GEF administrative resources). The role of Sida support should be only to support UNDP where it has a key role to play to foster political dialogue in selected transboundary basins, the Nile basin is one example. This could be done in the framework of the Shared Water Partnership (SWP), a program within WGP to use shared water resources to promote increased multi-country dialogue, peace, security and sustainable development that is under development with support from the US.

WGP should with Sida support continue to provide global and regional advocacy on water governance, an area where UNDP is uniquely well positioned within the UN system and where no other actor would likely replace UNDP.

A WGP strategy confined to what Sida may support should then have the following elements:

- The overall objective should be to improve the performance of the water sector in partner countries to enable them achieve the water related MDG targets.
- The contribution of WGP toward this objective is to strengthen key water sector institutions.
- Attention to HRBA, gender equity and water integrity would be part of the work to strengthen these institutions.
- The geographical focus is on those partner countries that are struggling to achieve the MDG water related targets with certain limitations for WGF.
- In many such countries the need for comprehensive reform of water sector institutions is a prerequisite for improved sector performance.
- CC-A would remain a priority with a focus on the same countries and on actions related to water resources management.
- Increased attention should be given to those institutions that are primarily responsible for WSS service provision.
- Cross-sectoral issues, such as gender and water integrity, would be important elements as part of water sector reform and strengthening institutions.
- Regulation of the utilities should be another important area.
- There should be closer alignment with other concerned UN agencies in a “Water Governance Alliance”.
- The GoalWash initiative would continue with a view to upscaling pilot projects with diversified funding from other sources.

- Work should continue on knowledge products that provide analytical tools for the UNDP COs and for partner countries and also serve to raise the profile of water governance.
- UNDP has an important role to foster political dialogue in selected transboundary river basins.
- Global and regional advocacy of water governance should continue, and the UNDP coordinating role in water governance would remain essential.

Using these elements as a basis it should be possible to prepare a project document for the 4th phase project of Sida support. They should also be useful as a contribution to the preparation of a strategy for the 'global WGP'.

9. The 4th phase project: modalities, organization and next steps

9.1 The inclusion of Cap-Net

Sida is supporting Cap-Net with SEK36 million over the period January 2010 – January 2013, SEK9 million per year. The agreement provides for an evaluation to be commissioned by UNDP but does not mention any annual Sida-UNDP reviews. It does specify that UNDP within two years shall provide “Sida and the other donors with a strategic document on Cap-Net’s long term institutional and governance arrangements”. This task is being carried out by UNDP but is not yet complete, a 2nd draft was prepared in April based on a consultant’s report from 2010.

The ToR for this review says that “the possible incorporation of support to Cap-Net into a single Administration Agreement” shall be analyzed. This will necessarily be done before the “strategic document” on Cap-Net in the long term has been prepared by UNDP. What can be said in this report on Cap-Net will therefore be limited to implications for the 4th phase project support to WGP and modalities for the Sida support. There is no description or analysis of Cap-Net since that has been done elsewhere³⁹.

Cap-Net works as a network of networks of local knowledge centres and capacity builders. This strategy has been recognized as largely successful, although there are challenges in various management constraints and financial issues. Cap-Net also suffers from the same problem of sustainability as WGP by being highly dependent on a few donors and needs to diversify its funding. The UNDP draft strategy paper therefore suggests that Cap-Net should be promoted with additional international partners, especially the development banks. Cap-Net should also build on existing partnerships, such as GWP, to develop a programmatic approach to working with these international partners.

Cap-Net is governed by a management board chaired by UNDP and with representation of UNOPS, the current donors (Sida and DGIS), technical partners (GWP and UNESCO-IHE), and network partners (two elected for 2 year terms). The board meets twice per year, once in person and once by teleconference. This arrangement is said to be functioning well. Future governance arrangements for Cap-Net are discussed in Section 9.3 below.

A strength of Cap-Net is that it has its “ears close to the ground”, through its networks it has good working contacts in partner countries. This is reinforced by its collaboration with GWP which has many member organizations that benefit from Cap-Net’s training activities. Cap-Net is able to tailor courses to the specific needs of beneficiary organizations, making the courses relevant and appreciated. Cap-Net would be well placed to be the capacity building arm within the recommended “Water Governance Alliance”. This would enable Cap-Net to develop working contacts with new partners, as suggested in the draft UNDP strategy paper.

³⁹ See for example PEM consult (February 2009): [Mid Term Review of Cap-Net phase II 2006 – 2010](#) and Cap-Net (undated): [Measuring Results, Monitoring Report 2006 – 2010](#).

The inclusion of the Sida support to Cap-Net in the Sida-UNDP agreement for the 4th phase WGP project would presumably mean that this agreement would absorb and therefore supersede the existing agreement covering Sida's support to Cap-Net, from 2012 there would be one Sida-UNDP agreement covering Cap-Net as well as WGP. This means that Cap-Net would be subject to the governance arrangements covering all the Sida-UNDP cooperation in water.

It would appear that UNDP so far has not been very diligent in promoting Cap-Net, not all UNDP regional advisors contacted for this review were clear on what Cap-Net does. Cap-Net is located in Africa and is seen as relevant mostly to African needs (although it does work also in several Latin American and Asian countries). Including Cap-Net under the same umbrella as the Sida support to WGP would facilitate broadening its contacts with other partners. It would provide improved opportunities for synergies between Cap-Net, WGF and SIWI, a current example is the training package on water integrity developed for Sida. It would also help develop more programmatic approaches of Cap-Net's work with international partners. The downside would be a risk that Cap-Net spreads itself thin by expanding too fast, but that risk that would have to be managed.

By being included under the same administration agreement as WGP, Cap-Net would also be subject to any shifts of resources decided by the annual reviews to be held under that agreement. When contacted for this review, the former Cap-Net director averred that "merging us with the Sida support to WGP is fine, as long as our budget is not touched". However, it should not be possible to ring-fence Cap-Net within one agreement covering two or more components. Besides, it is quite possible that Cap-Net would gain from this arrangement, since the recommended emphasis in the 4th phase project on WSS utilities and WRM institutions, and the proposed "Water Governance Alliance", would include strong elements of capacity building.

9.2 Modalities for the Sida support

It is assumed, indeed recommended, that Sida would proceed to allow UNDP develop a 4th phase project of four years for 2012-2015, the same duration as the 3rd phase.

The Swedish government strategy and instruction to Sida for so-called global programs⁴⁰ does not make any allocation of funds by program, this is for Sida to do. There is no indication of what allocation is intended for WGP in 2012 – 2015, but Sida's support to WGP is well covered by the priorities stated in the strategy. The volume of this support in the 3rd phase was SEK10 million per year (in addition to Cap-Net SEK9 million), and it is assumed that in the 4th phase this level would not be reduced. For the purpose of this report it is assumed that the Sida support, including Cap-Net, would be at least at the same level as in the past.

The Swedish currency is currently strong. It has of late appreciated considerably against the USD and is currently hovering around SEK6.15 per USD, a significant change compared to the current agreement which uses an exchange rate of SEK6.84. Of course, it is far from

⁴⁰ See footnote 30 .

certain that this favorable exchange rate will remain for the duration of the 4th phase and a large part of WGP costs is in SEK anyway. Still, if the current trend in SEK/USD exchange rates persists, there will be gains for WGP.

The 4th phase project would have the following features:

1. It would provide core support to UNDP's work with water governance, just as previous phases have done. Its overall goal would be "*to enhance the performance of the water sector in selected UNDP partner countries*".
2. Achievement of this goal would be measured by a set of indicators outlined in the project document. It is recognized that there will always be an issue of attribution, since UNDP is not sufficiently large as a development partner to impact on the overall goal alone.
3. Consistent with the recommendations in Chapter 7, it would have a stronger focus on what is perceived to be the core business of WGP, namely water sector reform and strengthening key institutions, including WSS service providers, associated regulatory agencies, and water resource management agencies. It would continue to support GoalWash, CC-A, and global advocacy on water governance, there would also be support to political processes in selected transboundary basins through support to SWP. This would give the following four priority areas for the Sida support to WGP (excluding Cap-Net):
 - Continuation of GoalWash which would still remain the largest single component of WGP but absorb no more than about one-third of the Sida support (see Section 7.8).
 - Support to water sector reform and institutions in countries in the regions prioritized for WGF ("local action on water and sanitation" in the current project document, see Section 7.5). As appropriate, this would include cross-cutting issues, such as water integrity and gender equity.
 - CC-A
 - Global and regional advocacy, including UN coordination and political processes in selected transboundary basins
4. For each of these four priority areas there would be a set of intended outcomes specified in the project document.
5. If Sida continues to insist that its support is an input to the 'global WGP', the project document should introduce a set of intermediary outcomes to which the Sida support could relate, and against which performance of this support could be measured.
6. Creation of the WGA could be an outcome of the Sida support.

7. The work with HRBA would continue.
8. The work with water integrity would also continue but with an increased involvement of WIN.
9. There would be an annual review meeting at UNDP HQ after WWW each year along the lines recommended in Section 7.2. Cap-Net would also be covered by these meetings.
10. In the third year (2014) there would be an external evaluation, covering all of the Sida support to WGP (including Cap-Net).

Financial reporting on the 4th phase project may be problematic, since with both WGP and Cap-Net a large variety of different activities will be involved. It is not difficult for UNDP to account for costs, but it is difficult and time consuming to attribute the Sida contribution to specific activities and to fit all program components into a single framework for purposes of reporting. Sida usually follows the rule that the recipient should apply its own normal financial reporting, which is assumed to apply in this case also. If this is not satisfactory to Sida, it is recommended that Sida makes use of its monitoring consultant to work with UNDP to design an appropriate financial reporting system that satisfies Sida's needs.

Preparation of a project document for the 4th phase would need to start forthwith with a view to having agreement by both Sida and UNDP on its contents well before the 3rd phase comes to a close in late December. For the next steps the following approximate time table is suggested:

- 15 June - Submission of the final and approved version of this report
- June/July – Preliminary contacts with Sida on the way forward
- August – Discussion by Sida and UNDP of the report at a meeting on the margins of WWW, approval (or rejection) of key recommendations, decision on how to proceed with preparation of the project document
- October – Submission of a first version of the project document, including a complete budget for the 4th phase project
- December – Approval of the project document by both parties

This time table is so tight that it is questionable whether it can be kept, careful preparation of a new project document is likely to require more than a few months. It could perhaps be accelerated if agreement is reached on the contents of the project document already in June. However, this would assume much work during July and August which many key actors would be less than enthusiastic about. There would seem to be three options for the preparation of the project document for the 4th phase:

- Hard work during October/November with a view to an agreement by the yearend, as suggested above. However, this may not be realistic in view of the required internal procedures within UNDP as well as Sida⁴¹.
- An extension of the 3rd phase agreement by six months through a simple exchange of letters to allow adequate time for the preparation of the project document and for internal decision-making procedures. This would need to be accompanied by additional funding on a pro rata basis.
- An extension of the 3rd phase agreement by one year until the end of 2012 to allow preparation of a revised WGS on the basis of which the new project document would be prepared, again with additional funding on a pro rata basis. Since the Cap-Net agreement expires in January 2013 it would then be convenient to merge the two agreements into one.

On balance, the recommendation is to pursue the third of these options.

It was noted above in Section 6.2 that it would appear that Sida has not derived much direct benefit from its support to WGP, at least not in the countries examined for this review. It is recommended that it should be written into the project document for the 4th phase that UNDP should make a point of seeking working contacts with the local Sida missions in those countries where Sida is engaged in the water sector.

A final word in this context on the conceptual confusion that plagues the subject matter and indeed this review: it is not easy for a non-specialist to keep apart ‘global WGP’, ‘Sida-supported WGP’, WGF and also WGS, sometimes even the specialists mix up ‘global WGP’ with what is supported by Sida. It is therefore recommended to distinguish more clearly in the 4th phase project document what Sida is supporting from the rest of WGP by consistently referring to the Sida support as ‘S-WGP’, giving it an acronym that separates it clearly from the ‘global WGP’.

9.3 Governance arrangements

The organization would be based on the recommendations made in Section 7.2. These can be recapitulated (and somewhat elaborated) as follows:

- There would be an annual review meeting after WWW, most likely in October. The meeting would cover WGP in its entirety, including WGF and Cap-net.
- This would be a meeting of the WGP steering committee.

⁴¹ If the total cost of the 4th phase project agreement exceeds SEK50 million, which it may well do, a different and more time consuming procedure applies within Sida before an agreement can be signed.

- The purpose of the meeting would be to review progress and decide on the next year's work plan. At the same time, reallocations of resources could be done within the ceiling of Sida's contribution. Governance issues would be discussed.
- The meeting would be prepared by UNDP with participation of Sida's monitoring consultant.
- Consistent with the recommendation to raise the profile of water governance within UNDP, it is recommended that the steering committee is chaired by UNDP at the level of the Director of the Environment & Energy Group or her designated representative.
- Other participants would include (i) UNDP representatives from HQ and from Stockholm, (ii) the WGF Project Director, (iii) the Cap-Net Director, (iv) representatives of donors providing core support to WGP and Cap-Net (currently only Sida, US and DGIS), and (v) the Sida monitoring consultant.
- Consideration may be given to inviting UNICEF and WB as observers to these meetings. In any event, all the parties to the "Water Governance Alliance" should be fully informed about the outcome of the meetings.

It is recommended that in March or April each year there would be meetings of management committees of WGF and of Cap-Net respectively. These would be chaired by UNDP, other participants would include (i) the directors of WGF and Cap-Net respectively, (ii) the Sida monitoring consultant, (iii) the Executive Director of SIWI in the case of WGF, (iv) representatives of donors providing core funding, (v) representatives of important partners, (vi) a representative of UNOPS in the case of Cap-Net.

The meetings concerning WGF can be conducted in Stockholm with participants easily meeting in person. The meetings of the Cap-Net management committee should to the extent possible be done as teleconferences.

The recommendation that annual review meetings not should take place in connection with WWW, where most participants are present anyway, but on a separate occasion in New York, will not be popular. It is considered justified since WGP now will include Cap-Net and hence be a much more complex program than in the past. It deserves participants' full attention which it is unlikely to get, if the meetings are tagged on to WWW. In addition, holding dedicated annual review meetings may contribute to enhancing the status of water governance within UNDP, an aim of the 4th phase project.

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

External Review of the Sida support to the UNDP Water Governance Programme 2008-2011

Background

The Water Governance Programme (WGP) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is a global programme within the UNDP Environment and Energy Group of the Bureau for Development Policy. The WGP aims to assist countries improve water governance, build capacities, and mainstream effective water resources management, and water supply and sanitation policy at different levels – the local, the national and the regional. The point of departure for UNDP's efforts to achieve equitable and sustainable development is poor people's needs, interests, capacity and conditions. UNDP works on achieving good governance in the water sector by promoting a conducive enabling environment within which management of water resources occurs. The WGP contributes to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through strategically targeted interventions that strengthen water governance at different levels.

UNDP implements the WGP through strategic partnerships with key organisations and initiatives, including global networks (e.g. UN-Water, Stockholm International Water Institute, Global Water Partnership, Gender and Water Alliance); private sector partnerships (e.g. The Coca Cola Company) and the Global Environment Facility (International Waters, Climate Funds and the Small Grants Programme). WGP activities are funded from core as well as non-core resources from different donor agencies. The partnership with the Government of Sweden / Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) has been instrumental for the development and institutionalization in UNDP of the WGP over the past twelve years. The Sida support has enabled UNDP to strengthen its assistance to countries through the UNDP Water Governance Facility at SIWI (WGF) which is a resource pool and UNDP technical assistance facility established in cooperation with the Stockholm International Water Institute.

In addition to supporting the WGP at large, since 2006, Sida has also supported Cap-Net through a separate Administration Agreement. Cap-Net is UNDP's global network to strengthen capacity building at the local level towards sustainable management and development of water resources and improved access to water supply and sanitation.

Within the framework of improving water governance, the WGP focuses on the following thematic areas: Integrated Water Resource Management, Transboundary Waters, and Water Supply and Sanitation. It also addresses four 'cross-cutting' themes: Gender and Water, Human Rights Based Approaches, Climate Change Adaptation and Water, as well as Capacity Development and Knowledge Management.

Objectives and Scope of Work

The main objective of this external review is to evaluate the Sida support to WGP's strategy and work 2008-2011, which has taken place in an evolving policy environment. The results of the review will contribute to delineate the future development of the WGP and the outcomes will provide a basis for

the dialogue on Sida's future possible support to the WGP. The overall scope of the work is to assess Sida supported activities as well as how these relate to other WGP activities through:

1 – Review the outcomes of the programme, mainly related to the stated programme objectives and the expected results and impacts.

2 – Assess the programme's relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of results through the assessment of:

- a. Relevance to key beneficiaries at global, regional and country levels;
- b. Its value to UNDP and Sida as a tool to promote good governance in the water sector;
- c. The programme's identification and response to current and emerging governance challenges and reform needs in the water sector;
- d. The effectiveness of the programme's approach for addressing governance related support to countries and the global water policy dialogue;
- e. Cost efficiency and effectiveness of the programme;
- f. Achievement of the outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness;
- g. The value to WGP of SIWI as a special hosting partner;
- h. The value to WGP of other partners (such as, GWP, GWA, UN Water, GEF) including their inputs to WGP as well as effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- i. The programme's contribution towards poverty reduction;
- j. Cooperation with others donors UN agencies, and other private sector and civil society partners.

3 – Provide recommendations to UNDP for the future of the programme aimed at:

- a. Comparison of intended and achieved outputs and results. Relevant constraints and bottlenecks are to be highlighted, and recommendations for their solution proposed.
- b. Formulation of the strategic niche / vision for the WGP in support of strengthening water governance and integrating water into national development strategies in order to accelerate progress on the MDGs.'
- c. Development of the programmatic set-up, integration and governance of the WGP within UNDP.
- d. A possible diversification and/or enlargement of the WGP funding base.
- e. Structure of the UNDP-Sida partnership arrangement including possible incorporation of support to Cap-Net into a single Administration Agreement.

The external review is jointly commissioned by UNDP and Sida. UNDP will approve terms of reference, work plans and reports, after consultation with Sida. The Team Leader of the Review Team, will be recruited by UNDP.

Methodology

The Reviewer(s) is expected to prepare a draft proposal on methods and process for the review as part of the bid. The proposal will be discussed and finalized together with the selected Reviewer(s).

The review shall involve, among others, direct interviews with UNDP staff relevant and BDP/EEG senior management, a selected number of Senior Programme Managers of WGP partner organisations, Coordinators/Directors of WGF, selected partners and representatives from current donors and key beneficiaries of the WGP at global, regional and country levels. This should be followed up by country and field visits to selected countries.

In addition, the review shall contain a questionnaire allowing additional stakeholders and clients who have a relationship with WGP a chance to provide comments and substantive inputs to the review. The Reviewer(s) is also expected to analyse existing documents, such as the Terms of Reference, Work Programmes, Annual Reports, Reports of the WGP Meetings, Operational Guidelines, Publications, Newsletters, and Websites etc.

The review should moreover include an assessment of the programme's overall resources - human, physical, information-based and financial - that are currently available and compare against targets and outputs. It should present concrete recommendations on future direction of the mechanism and of the required human and financial resources as well as governance structure for effective WGP implementation. A follow-up to the recommendations of assessment of the first phase of the Water Governance Facility at SIWI should be undertaken (Annex1).

Review

The review will cover thematic as well as institutional matters including an analysis of a possible incorporation of the Sida support to Cap-Net in the overarching WGP administration agreement. Based on the information gathered, the review should produce a document presenting concrete recommendations and suggestions (multiple options when appropriate) as to the potential further development of the programme, including both thematic activities and governance structure (modus operandi). The Reviewer(s) should also attempt to comment on cost-effectiveness and sustainability of the WGP.

The outcome of the review should help UNDP/Sida to:

1. Develop a strategy for taking the WGP forward in a strategic manner
2. Identify priority areas of collaborations within the WGP in order to improve water governance
3. Build strategic partners/partnerships and a developed funding base
4. Develop the institutional architecture to more effectively deliver on the WGP

Recommendations and Lessons Learned

Based on the above, recommendations should be provided for the further enhancement and improvement of both governance and the performance of the WGP, including providing inputs and options for securing necessary and more long-term sustainability. Whenever feasible, recommendations should be given in the form of options to be considered, in order to stimulate discussion on new directions and their implications.

Deliverables

The final report to be delivered must be backwards looking evaluating past performance related to the Sida Administration Agreement in support of the Water Governance Programme for the period 2008-2011 and forwards looking relating to analysis and recommendations for the WGP developing towards an even more coherent and effective programme and giving recommendations on future directions. It should include at least the following headings:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Methodology
- Findings
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Lessons learned

Duration and input

The consultant is expected to carry out the review in the period February-March 2011 and the report should be available in April-May 2011. The consultant's proposal should include a filled out time plan similar to the example in Annex I.

The maximum input from an international consultant is 6 working weeks. In addition the proposal shall specify travel, reimbursables and possible local consultants.

Required Competencies and Skills

The reviewer(s) is expected to have relevant (and documented) evaluation/review experiences, have a good understanding of UNDP and the UN system as well as of Sida and Swedish Development Assistance priorities, have experience from governance and financing modalities within development cooperation as well as experience in international water-related policy development and programme implementation. The reviewer(s) is also expected to be an excellent report writer. The language of the report should be English.

Annex 2: Main documents used for this review

The documents listed below were sent by UNDP for the external review of WGP 2008-2011. In addition, many other documents have been perused, the most important are mentioned in footnotes in the text.

Document /publisher	Report/URL for soft copy	Have provided hard copy
GoAL WaSH 1 and 2	http://www.undp.org/water/priorityareas/goal-wash.html	x
WGF issue sheets 1-4	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x
WGF Kenya case study, Bondo Village	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x
UNDP Fast Facts water supply and sanitation	http://www.undp.org/water/index.html	x
UNDP Fast Facts WGP	http://www.undp.org/water/index.html	x
Water adaptation on NAPAS	http://www.undp.org/environment/water-governance-library.shtml	x
Enhancing water sanitation governance in Kenya: HRBA to reforms in the Kenya water sector	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x
UN-Water 1 pager and policy brief on CC-A	http://www.unwater.org/documents.html	x
Mapping of integrity and accountability in water activities and relevant capacities in the SADC-Region	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x
UN-Water, 2nd World Water Development Report, Chapter 2	http://www.unesco.org/water/wwap/wwdr/wwdr2/	x
UN-Water, 3rd World Water Development Report, Chapter 14	http://www.unesco.org/water/wwap/wwdr/wwdr3/	x
Corruption risks in Water Licensing, with case studies from Chile and Kazakhstan	http://www.undp.org/environment/water-governance-library.shtml	x
Regional Water Intelligence report Central Asia	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x
Regional Water Intelligence Report: The Nile Basin and the Southern Sudan Referendum	http://www.watgovernance.org/resources/WGF_publications	x

Mainstreaming gender in water management, resource guide , CDROM	http://www.genderandwater.org/page/2414	x
UNDP	Sida support to WGP annual reports 2008-2009	x
Water supply in shared rives, Harlin & Morrison	http://www.formas.se/formas_shop/StartPageShop_1841.aspx	x
Several publications: WGF project implementation	http://www.watgovernance.org/implementation	
Several publications: WGF capacity development	http://www.watgovernance.org/capacitybuilding	
Several publications: WGF monitoring	http://www.watgovernance.org/monitoring_assessment	
Promoting transparency, integrity and accountability in the water sector in Uganda	http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/page/512	x
Addressing corruption in climate change water adaptation, Jacobsson & Tropp	http://www.springerlink.com/content/153567m15k17074w/	x
Water governance: trends and needs for new capacity development, Tropp	http://www.iwaponline.com/wp/009S2/wp009S20019.htm	x
Global Corruption Report 2008	http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/page/512	
UN Water Status on Integrated Water Resources Management and Water Efficiency Plans for CSD 16	http://www.unwater.org/documents.html	x
UN-Water interview with J. Harlin on Country Level coordination	http://www.unwater.org/documents.html	x
UN Water Climate Change Adaptation: The Pivotal Role of Water	http://www.unwater.org/documents.html	x
UN Water	Task Force on Country Level Coordination, Summary of activities and findings 2008-2009 for SWA	x
UN Water Decade Programme on Capacity Development	Capacity Pool, Issue No. 10, 2010, Interview with J. Harlin on IWRM	x

PEP	Linking Poverty Reduction and Water Management	x
Cap-Net	Completion Report 2006-2010	x
Cap-Net	Measuring Results: Monitoring Report 2006-2010	x
UNDP	A human rights-based approach to water supply and sanitation, Background Paper for Oslo 2008 workshop, prepared by Inga Winkler	x
UNDP and University of Oxford	International Conference on the right to water and sanitation, November 2008, Conference Report	x
UNDP and University of Oxford	International Conference on the right to water and sanitation, November 2008, WORKSHOP Report	x
UNDP	Shared Waters Partnership	x
UNDP	IWRM and HRBA, draft discussion paper	x
UNDP	Developing a methodological framework for monitoring and verifying the effectiveness of investments for institutional development to support adaptation in the agriculture sector	
UNDP	UNDP strategic investment to address climate change in least developed countries. EEG support: “boots on the ground”	
Tearfund	How to integrate climate change adaptation into national-level policy and planning in the water sector	
UN-Water	Water-Wiki: An opportunity for UN-Water, by Gordon Young	
UNDP	Report on UNDP Water and Climate Change Adaptation Activities and Projects, by Gordon Young	

Annex 3: Persons interviewed

SIWI/WGF

Anders Berntell	Executive Director, SIWI
Per Bertilsson	Deputy Executive Director, SIWI
Håkan Tropp	Project Director, WGF
Alastair Morrison	GoalWash Coordinator
Marianne Kjellén	Knowledge Manager, MDG-F
John Joyce	Economist
Maria Jakobsson	Program Officer
Alice Jaraise	Program Officer
Bogachan Benli	Global Project Manager, EDM
Jakob Granit	Economist (by telephone)

UNDP HQ

Joakim Härlin	Senior Water Resources Advisor, BDP (based at SIWI in Stockholm)
Andrew Hudson	Cluster Leader, BDP
Susanne Schmidt	Water Governance Advisor, BDP
Veerle Vandeweerd	Director, Environment & Energy Group, BDP
Gerd Trogemann	Deputy Director, Donor Relations, BRS
Jenny Karlsen	Donor Relations Adviser, BRS
Gonzalo Pizarro	Policy Specialist, BDP
Oksana Leshchenko	Program Specialist, RBEC
Leo Horn-Phathanothai	Policy Specialist, RBA
Julia Kercher	Policy Analyst, BDP
Douglas Gardner	Deputy Assistant Administrator
Olav Kjörven	Assistant Administrator and Director, BDP
Sulan Chen	Project Officer, GEF SGP

Laura Hildebrandt	Gender-Net Facilitator, Gender Group, BDP
Ingvar Andersson	Water Specialist, retired (by telephone)
Monica Lorensen	UNDP Partnership Bureau, liaison officer for Sweden (in Stockholm)
<u>Other UN agencies in New York</u>	
Clarissa Brocklehurst	Chief, WASH, UNICEF
Fredrik Pischke	Interagency Water Advisor, UN-Water
Johan Kuylenstierna	Former Chief Technical Advisor, UN-Water
Nurit Bodemann-Ostow	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, MDG-F
Emilie Filmer-Wilson	Policy Specialist, Human Rights Coordination, UN Development Coordination Office (by telephone)
<u>UNDP regional water advisors</u>	
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya	Senior Technical Advisor for CC-A, Bangkok (by telephone)
Nick Remple	Global Advisor on Resilient Communities and Living Landscapes (by skype)
Jürg Staudenmann	Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP CO, Serbia (by telephone)
José Erez Padilla	Regional Technical Advisor for Marine, Coastal and Island Ecosystems, Bangkok (by telephone)
Akiko Yamamoto	Regional Technical Advisor for Water Strategies & Adaptation, Pretoria (by telephone)
<u>UNDP CO, Tajikistan</u>	
Kibriyo Jumaeva	Program Analyst
Nargizakhon Usmanova	Program Associate, Energy and Environment
Alisher Karimov	Water Sector Integrity Assessment
Rustam Faiziev	Senior Engineer, Communities Program
Firuz Khamidov	Area Manager of UNDP Office in Ayni district
Firuz Odinaev	Project Manager, GoalWash, HRBA

Jordan

Munjed Al-Sharif	Joint Program Coordinator
Maha Al-Zu'bi	Environment Analyst, UNDP CO
Lama Masalha	Chief Technical Advisor, MDG-F
Mufleh Abbadi	Project Manager, REWARD Program, IUCN
Fadi Shraideh	Deputy Coordinator, REWARD Program, IUCN
Mazen Malkawi	Technical Officer, WHO Regional Office
Hussein Badarin	Director, Ministry of Environment
Batir Wardam	Project Coordinator, Ministry of Environment
Mohammed I. Al-Qinna	Professor, Environmental Soil Physics & Land Management, Hashemite University
Salahuddin M. Jaber	Professor, Environmental Management & Policy, Hashemite University

Palestine

Rima Abu Middain Barghoti	Team Leader, Natural Capital, UNDP-PAPP
Husam Tubail	Program Analyst, Natural Capital, UNDP-PAPP
Ruba El-Ghoul	General Services Officer, UNDP-PAPP
Philippe Wealer	Program Analyst, Natural Capital, UNDP-PAPP
Ana Gren	Consul, Development Cooperation, Consulate General of Sweden
Kasim Abdo	Director General, Ministry of Agriculture, PA
Ahmed I. Abu Thaher	Director General, Environment Quality Authority, PA
Taghreed Hithnawi	Director General for Infrastructure, Ministry of Planning, PA
M. Aiman J. Jarrar	Director General, Project Management Unit, PWA, PA

Cap-Net

Paul Taylor	Director (retired)
-------------	--------------------

Sida

Daniel Klasander	Program Officer, Global Programs
Cecilia Scharp	Chief of Division (formerly in the Water Division)
Katarina Perrolf	Lead Water Specialist
Ulf Källstig	Director of Department, Global Programs
Bengt Johansson	Chief, Sudan & Somalia Team (formerly in the Water Division, by telephone)

Partner organizations

Maël Castellan	WIN (by telephone)
Joke Muylwijk	Director, GWA (by email)
Ania Grobicki	Executive Secretary, GWP
John Metzger	Deputy Executive Secretary, GWP

Annex 4: Status of WGF activities in Jordan and Palestine

1. Jordan

1. In 2006 four UN agencies (UNDP, UNESCO, WHO and FAO) decided to pursue the “One UN” model in a Joint Programme (JP) in order to capitalize on the Spanish-supported MDG-F fund.
2. In that connection a representative of UNDP-Jordan (Amal Al-Dababseh) met a staff member from WGF (Anders Jägerskog) while both were attending a course in Amman. They agreed that WGF would support this initiative by UNDP.
3. WGF provide such support in the form of an international consultant who helped prepare a project document for the JP.
4. SIWI signed an agreement with UNDP-Jordan, effective from 1 January 2008, according to which WGF would through SIWI contribute USD105,000 to the Joint Programme. This contribution would be used as a consultancy fund in support of output 2.4 of the JP, *“Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened”*.
5. The JP was subsequently much delayed because of difficulties in obtaining release of the contribution from the MDG-F, totally USD4 million over three years. The first instalment was only disbursed in February 2009 at which time the JP became operational.
6. The JP Coordinator was appointed in July 2009 and had a functional office in October 2009. He proceeded to hire consultants locally (the Science Triangle, Jordan University for Science and Technology, JUST, and University of Jordan, UJ, consortium), and their first draft reports were available in the autumn of 2010.
7. WGF provided technical comments on these reports on 15 December 2010. Representatives of the consultants averred that they were generally positive about the comments but felt that some of them would be answered by subsequent reports.
8. The report on CC impact in the Zarqa River Basin was released in early April 2011 and will also be sent to WGF for review.
9. To date the JP Coordinator has met the WGF director (Håkan Tropp) three times and the WGF economist (John Joyce) once. He says that WGF’s services will be required to advise on the pilot project in the Zarqa River Basin due to commence in May – June 2011.
10. The JP will be asking for a no cost extension beyond February 2012. It could be extended by 4 – 6 months after a MEG-F secretariat review, further extensions are not possible under the current rules of the MDG-F.

2. Palestine

1. In the spring of 2008 UNDP-PAPP (Rima Abumiddain) prepared ToR for a so-called Tokten consultant⁴² (Michael Talhami) to study the needs for reform of the Palestinian Water Authority (PWA).
2. The Regional Technical Adviser for Arab States (Mirey Atallah), based in Bratislava, contacted WGF and asked for comments on the ToR. These were provided in consultation with UNDP-PAPP.
3. In July 2008 the consultant prepared a concept note on a water governance programme to reform the PWA and on 15 September 2008 he delivered a still incomplete first draft of a project document.
4. In mid-September 2008 two experts from WGF (Anders Jägerskog and Alice Jaraiseh) visited Palestine to work with the PWA and the consultant on the draft project document. This was subsequently revised and a final version was issued in March 2009. This version makes no mention of neither UNDP nor WGF.
5. In February 2009 the UNDP consultant visited Stockholm in connection with a TB water management course and had discussions with WGF. In August 2009, during the WWW, a delegation from Palestine visited Stockholm invited by Sida. It was tentatively agreed that WGF would support work on water integrity as part of the water sector reform process.
6. In 2009 the World Bank, Norway and AFD (France) pledged support to the PWA reform programme, consultants were hired, and work commenced on a report with proposals for comprehensive reform of the water and wastewater sectors. The draft report was issued in March 2011.
7. Meanwhile, UNDP contributed about USD100,000 from its own resources to support donor coordination by PWA and also to train its staff in negotiating techniques. But during much of 2009 and part of 2010 UNDP-PAPP was fully absorbed by clean-up and rehabilitation activities in Gaza following the war in late 2008/early 2009 and unable to be active in the water reform programme.
8. There was no progress on water integrity until a visit by the WGF director (Håkan Tropp) in October 2010 when the discussions from August 2009 were revived. It was agreed with PWA and UNDP-PAPP that WGF would prepare a project document for a water integrity assessment.
9. This was submitted by WGF on 31 January 2011. The project would cost USD65,000 of which WGF would contribute USD40,000, while UNDP-PAPP would add USD25,000 from the Regional Water Governance Programme for the Arab States. The project agreement between SIWI/WGF and UNDP-PAPP was signed in early April 2011.
10. At that time it was concluded that the water integrity assessment could not be completed until the water sector reform programme had been completed and final decisions taken on new institutional arrangements. It appeared at that time that

⁴² A consultancy created for an expatriate Palestinian, a format used by UNDP to attract such individuals to work in Palestine.

lingering controversies related to the outcome of the reforms could take some time to resolve.

Annex 5: Summary of recommendations

Only recommendations underlined in the text are included below.

Chapter 7

- The Sida support to WGP should continue in a 4th phase.
- The format for Sida support should improve, meaning that (i) the agreement and the 4th phase project should be benchmarks and measurable indicators for the stated objectives, (ii) there should be an annual review at UNDP HQ in New York at a time scheduled well in advance and not coinciding with WWW, (iii) the annual reviews should be an occasion to discuss priorities and, if required, shift resources around within the ceiling provided by the agreement (including Cap-Net), and (iv) Sida should retain a monitoring consultant to assist UNDP in preparing the reviews.
- The UNDP Water Governance Strategy should be revised in 2012.
- Water governance should be disseminated more widely within UNDP, explaining the linkages between CC-A, water management, and water governance and spreading this narrative with the support of top management.
- The work plan should be better focused on the core business, meaning that (i) there is a need for stronger focus of the Sida support to WGP, (ii) water sector reform and the strengthening of related institutions is at the core of WGP business, and (iii) some activities launched under WGP should be spun off to be further developed and applied by other actors more specialized than UNDP, examples include the work on gender mainstreaming, CWI, water integrity, and the GoalWash pilot projects.
- WGF should maintain its present geographical focus and not expand to other regions.
- If there is strong demand for WGF to work in Latin America, an effort should be made to locate a suitable institution to work on behalf of WGF in that region.
- The financial support base for WGP should be broadened, in the first instance by Sida and UNDP contacting the Nordic donors.
- Support to the Community Water Initiative should be promoted by UNDP.
- The GoalWash initiative should be continued but be better aligned with other UN initiatives. Its total cost should not exceeded approximately one-third of the Sida support. Any expansion of GoalWash should be accompanied by staff reinforcement at WGF.
- UNDP should take an initiative to create a “Water Governance Alliance” with UNICEF, WB and UN Habitat.
- WGF should in the 4th phase broaden its work on knowledge products.
- WGF should also initiate a “water governance publication series”.
- JPOs should be assigned to strengthen UNDP COs in their coordinating role.

Chapter 8

- WGF should adopt a stronger focus on WSS utilities and their regulators.

Chapter 9

- If necessary, an outline of the financial reports on WGP required by Sida would have to be prepared with the participation of the Sida monitoring consultant.
- The current agreement for the 3rd phase should be extended by one year to allow revision of the WGS and preparation of a 4th phase project document
- UNDP should establish working contacts with the local Sida missions in those countries where Sida is engaged in the water sector
- The Sida support to WGP should be clearly distinguished from the 'global WGP' to avoid confusion, perhaps by use of the acronym S-WGP.
- The WGP steering committee should be chaired by the director of the Environment & Energy Group of BDP at UNDP HQ.
- Management committees for Cap-Net and WGF would meet in March/April each year.