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## Abbreviation and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Cluster Advocacy and Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Cluster Lead Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cluster Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRM</td>
<td>Cluster Coordination Reference Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEHF</td>
<td>Emergency Environmental Health Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST</td>
<td>Field Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWC</td>
<td>Global WASH Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWC-HPC</td>
<td>Global WASH Cluster High Priority Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Programme Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Level 2 system-wide emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Level 3 system-wide emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid Term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHWCP</td>
<td>National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>Strategic Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>Sanitation and Water for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Transformative Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWIG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the 2016-2020 Global WASH Cluster Strategic Plan (GWCSP) is sustained by the following principles: 1) a systematic review of the progresses made in the implementation of GWCSP; 2) the necessity to take into account the new contextual changes and anticipate future developments and needs; 3) the willingness of the partners to capitalize on a number of key lessons learnt during the next implementation phase of the GWCSP; and 4) the need to adjust the strategy wherever necessary, but to also keep the current momentum of the Global WASH Cluster.

During the first two years of the implementation of the GWCSP, The GWCSP has been mainly driven by the capacity of the Global WASH Cluster (GWC) to:

- Renew the governance of the partnership with the review of the GWC working arrangements, the restructure of the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) and the setup of a Consultative Donor Group;
- Alert and influence decision-makers on the weak capacity of the Humanitarian WASH sector, identifying the causes and providing a series of recommendations to respond adequately and in a predictable way to humanitarian crises;
- Strengthen the Support to National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms to fulfil their roles and implement the 6+1 coordination functions as described in the IASC Cluster Coordination Reference Module edited in 2015;
- Develop and implement a learning and training strategy identifying priority programmes, modalities and pathways for priority audiences;
- Set-up the foundations to collect and disseminate more systematically lessons learned in the humanitarian WASH sector.

Whilst these initiatives have been implemented, significant contextual changes have occurred in the broader humanitarian landscape with the Grand Bargain initiative encouraging a series of changes in the working practices of donors and aid organizations, among others gearing up cash programming, empowering national and local responders by increasing the share of financing available to them, improving the humanitarian-development nexus.

In addition, expectations of the partners on the Cluster Advocacy and Support Team (CAST) have increased: some partners are expecting CAST to play a greater role in setting up a game plan for humanitarian WASH at global level, while others consider that the capacity of CAST (and the FST) to deliver operational support to countries remain a first priority; new initiatives have been launched by the GWC partners that were not originally included in the 2016-2020 GWCSP (for instance the GWC partners set up three Technical Working Groups, TWiGs, to take new initiatives around cash and market, operational research, or quality assurance).

Therefore, the MTR exercise aims at integrating these initiatives in a coherent vision and result framework for 2019 and 2020, and set up the strategic framework for the Global WASH Cluster in for the next 2 years.

The present document was endorsed by the Strategic Advisory Group of the Global WASH Cluster on December 2018.

2 Scope and rationale

The MTR proposes a limited number of strategic changes in the GWCSP at output level that can be implemented until 2020. It is a light exercise that has been led by the Cluster Advocacy and Support Team (CAST) at no additional cost. No change in the four strategic objectives is proposed at this stage, considering that they remain relevant.
3 Analytical review

Since the first draft of the 2016-2020 GWC Strategic Plan was written, far-reaching changes have occurred both in the humanitarian sphere and in the Humanitarian WASH sector, impacting the strategic and operational priorities of the GWC partners implementing humanitarian WASH programmes.

The analytical review is therefore articulating these changes with the results achieved in the implementation of the 2016-2020 GWC Strategic Plan over the past two years and with the change in the GWC Governance. The objective is to identify the priorities the GWC partners should focus on in the coming two years and include them into a revised Strategic Plan.

3.1 The humanitarian landscape

The World Humanitarian Summit

The 2016-2020 GWC Strategic Plan was written while the World Humanitarian Summit1 took place in Istanbul on 23-24 May 2016. Key initiatives impacting the day-to-day operations of the partners implementing humanitarian WASH programmes emerged from the Summit. Among them:

- The Global Preparedness Partnership that is supporting risk-prone countries to be better prepared for responding to, and recovering from disasters caused by natural hazards. It encourages partners to develop nationally-driven programmes leading to improve the understanding of risks, vulnerabilities and capacities, and develop capacity to coordinate and manage relevant stakeholders;

- The Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation that addresses the innovation needs of the sector that cannot be effectively tackled by individual actors working on their own. It aims at connecting actors across humanitarian innovation by focusing on six proposed initiatives including innovation in emergencies, community engagement, global humanitarian research;

- The Network for Empowered Aid Response that was created from the desire by local and national NGOs from Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America to promote a more equitable and dignified humanitarian and development system. It aims to reshape the top-down humanitarian and development system to one that is locally driven and owned, and is built around equitable, dignified and accountable partnerships;

- The Grand Bargain that includes a series of changes in the working practices of donors and aid organizations and commits donors and aid organizations to providing 25 per cent of global humanitarian funding to local and national responders by 2020, along with more un-earmarked money, and increased multi-year funding to ensure greater predictability and continuity in humanitarian response. Signatories to the Grand Bargain committed to:

  1. Greater transparency
  2. More support and funding tools for local and national responders
  3. Increase the use and coordination of cash-based programming
  4. Improve joint and impartial needs assessments
  5. Reduce the earmarking of donor contributions
  6. Increase collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding
  7. A participation revolution: include people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives
  8. Reduce duplication and management costs with periodic functional reviews
  9. Harmonize and simplify reporting requirements
  10. Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors

Figure 1 shows the commitments that have impacted the GWC strategy implementation over the past two years.

1 https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/summit
Current Trends in Humanitarian Crisis

The 2018 Global Humanitarian Assistance Report confirms some trends that have been noted over the past years:

- The pattern of protracted, recurrent crises seen in previous years continued. Of the 20 largest recipients of official humanitarian assistance, 17 were either long- or medium-term recipients. This concentration of international assistance to long-running crises reaffirms the importance of developing longer-term, multi-year plans and funding. Responses need to address both immediate humanitarian need and underlying development and peacebuilding shortfalls in crisis-affected countries;

- It is now two years since the World Humanitarian Summit brought humanitarian donors, responders and affected people together to agree how crises need to be dealt with differently. Some important innovations are emerging, including more funding for cash transfer programmes, and greater investments from multilateral development banks;

- This contrasts with the slow-down in international humanitarian financing, inadequate long-term development funding, and little progress in supporting localization of aid. Actually, a small number of donor governments continue to contribute to the majority of international humanitarian assistance: in 2017, the three largest donors accounted for 59% of all government contributions in 2017;

- Estimates suggest that volumes of assistance provided through Cash-transfer programming are growing rapidly to US$2.8 billion, up from US$2.0 billion in 2015, an increase of 40%.

3.2 The Humanitarian WASH Sector

After a series of reviews identifying gaps and looking at challenges of the humanitarian WASH sector, the GWC cluster and the WASH Inter-Agency Group organized on October 2017 a stock taking exercise allowing the main stakeholders to outline a diagnosis of the challenges the humanitarian WASH sector is facing. The following were highlighted among them:

---

4 The WASH Inter-Agency Group involves: UNICEF, UNHCR, ACF, CARE; ICRC, IFRC, IRC, MSF and Oxfam
• Standards for implementing humanitarian WASH programmes have improved, but a focus on quantity has masked inadequacies in quality due to inadequate technical expertise in WASH interventions;

• The accountability framework of the humanitarian WASH sector is weak and the delivery of WASH services below acceptable standards (national or sphere) is rarely addressed, unless there is a strong and committed Government. National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms are not equipped to address issues, as they have no authority to enforce compliance of the WASH partner to agreed standards from the partners;

• The ability of the humanitarian WASH sector to implement emergency WASH programming – especially in the acute phase of an emergency and in restricted or urban environments – has reduced. This also reflects the lack of capacity in the whole humanitarian sector. National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms are expected to play a stronger role to coordinate and provide guidance on technical issues;

• The humanitarian WASH sector lacks evidences to strongly advocate for more resources and capacity for the sector beyond the obvious life-saving engagement during an acute phase of an emergency;

• The humanitarian WASH sector is systematically underfunded. Using data from FTS since 2009 less than 4 percent of all reported funding is dedicated to the WASH clusters and the humanitarian WASH appeals are funded around 40 percent.

Key priorities for the WASH sector were identified. The GWC partners must start addressing them:

• The development of better models for protracted crises and the subsequent need for the WASH sector to link more strongly the humanitarian response and the development strategies engaging in preparedness, multi-year, sustainable and functional WASH programmes, reinforcing the cooperation with national and sub-national stakeholders. In the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Grand Bargain, and the commitment of the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) partners to strengthen national sector leads to fulfil their leadership role (the four collaborative behaviours), the GWC can play an instrumental role both for preparedness and transition;

• The need to better connect the WASH agenda to other sectors at all levels of the humanitarian system, and to invest in resources to strengthen evidences and advocate for WASH interventions;

• The increasing of the number of mid-level WASH managers and coordinators and the strengthening of their competencies and the growing need to invest resources in the development of national education capacities and trainings for WASH as well as coaching and mentoring, targeting a wide range of professionals working in the sector but also in other sectors;

• Re-develop a capacity (in agencies and in professionals) to trigger rapid responses for the acute phase of emergencies;

• Invest resources and take responsibility for quality assurance processes, establishing peer-to-peer quality assurance review mechanisms of WASH interventions (possibly coordinated by National Humanitarian WASH Platforms) and fix bad quality work. More broadly, there is a need to review the way the sector monitors its performance as well as the delivery of service to the community affected by disasters. CAST should be able to develop a solid strategy for the coming years to support the GWC partners to improve quality of their programmes and NHWCPS to guide partners and set up quality monitoring systems;

• There is a need to strengthen initial and regular assessments in the humanitarian WASH (either sector specific or as part of multi-sector assessment), and reinforce the capacity of the National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms to coordinate assessment exercises, including Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) processes;

• While the capacity of international NGOs to implement operational WASH programmes in countries affected by humanitarian crisis is reducing, WASH partners are increasingly expecting National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms to extend their role beyond process and strategy development and provide more technical support and guidance for the response.
3.3 Governance of the Global WASH Cluster

The governance of the GWC and the working arrangements were revised in 2017 and endorsed by the partners after a series of consultations were organized in 2016. The revision aimed at increasing transparency, inclusiveness, and mutual commitments of all the GWC stakeholders by clarifying the respective roles and responsibilities of the different categories of membership, the GWC Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) and the Cluster Advocacy Support Team (CAST).

A new structure of the SAG, which members were renewed, was set up to involve more partners and increase diversity. Similarly, the relationship with the different donors of the GWC was better framed with the establishment of the GWC Donor Consultation Group Donor early 2018, gathering donors actively or potentially engaged in humanitarian WASH and offering an active platform to exchange and discuss strategic direction, overall priorities, performance of in country coordination and advocacy challenges.

While these changes brought the necessary clarification in terms of governance, the challenges around a collective implementation of the GWC Strategic Plan has remained. The degree of engagement of the partners is still strongly correlated to the capacity of CAST to mobilize resources to implement the activities associated to the Strategic Plan. Enhancing their commitments to the GWC Strategic Plan – including the collective approach to resource mobilization for the humanitarian WASH sector – requires a major shift in the way they are considering the partnership.

As the Cluster Lead agency, UNICEF has provided a continuous support to the GWC since 2013 representing more than 20% of the GWC funding. This support has also been materialized with the set-up of two new fixed-term positions within CAST at P3 (information management officer) and P4 level (cluster coordinator) in 2018. The efforts of UNICEF to provide coordination capacity in countries remains significant (figure 2). The institution however continues to face a series of challenges that negatively impact the implementation of the GWC strategy and need to be addressed in the coming years: 1) resource allocations must be more predictable; 2) the connection between the humanitarian WASH team of UNICEF Programme Division as and CAST hosted in UNICEF Emergency Division (EMOPS) as well as the strategic links between the Headquarters and UNICEF Regional Offices must be more structured and systematic, 3) opportunities of economy of scales by having the GWC hosted with other UNICEF led clusters in one Global Unit are not taken due to a lack of consolidated strategy.

![Figure 2: GWC Funding Analysis 2013 - 2018](image)
## 3.4 The 2016-2020 GWC Strategic Plan

The 2016-2020 GWC Strategic Plan is articulated around 4 strategic objectives, 11 expected outcomes and 36 expected outputs. The detailed monitoring framework and the detailed achievements end of June 2018 are shown in Annex 1.

### Review of the Strategic Plan Implementation: main achievements and constraints

*Green: on track; yellow: on track with major constraints identified; red: not on track.*

**SO1. Provide timely operational support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the TA 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Preparedness - In countries prioritized for emergency preparedness, National Humanitarian WASH Coordination (NWHC) platforms have an updated and operational emergency preparedness plan (including contingency plans) that are agreed among the partners and consistent with the national preparedness plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main achievement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Guidance Document on emergency preparedness for WASH was developed in line with the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness Guidance Document and disseminated to NWHCPs. Preparedness is part of the cluster functions and as such has been fully integrated into the WASH Minimum Requirements(^5) associated to the 6+1 IASC coordination functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main constraint</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite some FST capacity was initially dedicated to preparedness, the priority given to support NWHCPs to fulfil core coordination functions associated to the response prevented CAST to develop a systematic approach to roll out the preparedness agenda in identified priority countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Response - In HRP covered countries, National and sub-national WASH Humanitarian Coordination platforms deliver the 6+1 core functions and monitor the quality of the Humanitarian WASH programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main achievements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This outcome is clearly associated to the capacity of CAST to provide guidance and support to NWHCPs, but not only. The adherence of UNICEF to its CLA role and to support national and sub-national coordination capacities in high priority countries, as well as the compliance of the GWC partners to respect the partnership principles and play an active role in national coordination platforms are two core factors influencing the performance of NWHCPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An annual exercise to monitor the minimum requirements on WASH cluster/sector coordination in GWC high priority countries is carried out by the FST in close coordination with National WASH Cluster/Sector coordinators (see Annex 3). Overall, NWHCPs are partially fulfilling the minimum requirements of the 6+1 core functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsurprisingly, the minimum commitments related to the core functions 1 (supporting service delivery) and 3 (planning and implementing cluster strategies) are the highest met requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minimum requirements associated to the other cluster functions are less consistently met and variations exist depending on countries and contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main constraints</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis from monitoring the national platforms show that the key challenges NWHCPs are facing are related to AAP, quality assurance systems and response monitoring capacity (specific to key outputs/requirements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of all the 6+1 core functions, Accountability to Affected Populations is the lowest reported indicator with most platforms not even partially meeting the minimum requirements of this function. This has been widely reported for many years that clusters (not only WASH) have difficulty in understanding what role they play in promoting and ensuring AAP across the sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly related to AAP is challenge of setting up sector-wide quality monitoring systems and quality assurance systems and the lack of any substantial cluster led initiatives to ensure a higher quality of response. This was also verified by the feedback from the National Cluster Coordination Workshop held in December 2017 (see Annex 6): coordinators expressed that they lack the conceptual frameworks for quality assurance, and more importantly how they can practically implement cluster/sector led initiatives for quality assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response monitoring capacity of national platforms has made uneven progress in recent years and is largely dependent on the consistency for ensuring IM staffing resources within a country office of UNICEF as CLA. This is linked to the overall low reporting against minimum requirements associated to cluster function 4 to evaluate and monitor the response, which looks at the tracking of funding, tracking of indicators and monitoring of quality (above comments). At the same time, there is overall high reporting of the number of platforms with basic information management systems in place (website, activity reporting, information products) so there is a critical disconnect with these systems leading to an increased capacity to monitor the progress of the response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) See sub-chapter on “Consideration on additional initiatives” as well as Annex 5.
### 1.3 Transition - National WASH Clusters have a transition plan to national WASH coordination platforms that considers the sub-national levels

**Main achievement**
- Transition is here considered as “transition from a cluster activated coordination platform to a sector coordination platform led by the Government”. A transition process is linked to the strengthening of national humanitarian WASH coordination. A methodological process was developed by the CLA, and a series of initiatives were taken in West Africa after the Ebola crisis (Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea Conakry) as well as in Afghanistan, Palestine, Ukraine, which all received ad hoc support from the GWC FST.

**Main constraint**
- As for preparedness, the priority given to support NHWCPs to fulfil core coordination functions during the response prevented CAST to develop a systematic approach to roll out the transition agenda in cluster activated countries.

### 1.4 Systems - The delivery of humanitarian WASH coordination functions and the overall quality of the humanitarian WASH response are systematically supported, monitored and evaluated by GWC in HRP covered countries

**Main achievements**
- The foundation to support, monitor and evaluate the coordination and the quality of the response in the WASH sectors in countries has been set up (IASC Cluster Functions and the WASH minimum requirements for coordination, definition of focus areas for quality assurance systems).
- The direct support service to NHWCPs (FST deployed on request) is operational and has been assessed as one of the most valuable tool of the GWC. It is complemented with a series of tools and guidance (Coordination Tool Kit notably) the partners can upload from the GWC website.
- The GWC Help Desk providing on-demand field support service for national and sub-national HWCPs is fully operational and complements the Help Desk on technical issues (Knowledge Point).
- A TWiG on Quality of Response is set up and key conceptual elements of quality assurance systems agreed. Action reviews were carried out in some countries (Nigeria, South Sudan, Bangladesh).

**Main constraint**
- The systematic support and monitoring of the quality of the humanitarian WASH response in priority countries corresponds to a paradigm shift for the GWC partners and the NHWCPs usually focusing on processes, information analysis and response strategies. The setup of a systematic approach and inclusion of quality in NHWCPs’ agenda will take time and will cover two Strategic Plans (2016-2020 and 2021-2025). It is a topic that requires expertise, dedicated resources and strong commitments from the partners.

### 1.5 Partnership - Priority partnerships are in place at global level to strengthen the quality of the humanitarian WASH coordination and technical response

**Main achievements**
- The GWC Governance has been reviewed, the FST consortium is operational, the GWC Donor Consultation Group established and key TWiGs set-up (assessment, cash and market, quality assurance, operational research), grouping partners around priority topics.
- Collaborations with other clusters (Shelter Cluster on cash and market, Health Cluster on cholera and Nutrition Cluster on linking WASH and nutrition) have been strengthen.
- Strategic collaborations have also been established to roll out the first Strategic Objective of the GWC Strategic Plan (for instance with the usual donors of the GWC though the setup of the GWC Consultative Donor Group, CDC, REACH, the German WASH Network, the Global Task Force on Cholera Control and key academic institutions) or further explored (with the Sanitation and Water for All, the Triplex Coordination Group, the Sustainable Sanitation Alliance and UNDAC).

**Main constraint**
- The numerous initiatives and partnerships CAST is part of should be appraised against the resources available, while too few SAG members are committed to engage into some of these partnerships on behalf of the Global WASH Cluster (and not only on behalf of their own agency). A potential refocus on a number of limited key partnership could be beneficial.

### Synthesis

Overall, major progresses have been registered in the capacity of CAST to provide timely operational support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the IASC 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery. The current capacity to provide operational support from the Global Level to the National Levels is still fragile and remains very dependent on the capacity of CAST and the FST consortium partners to continue mobilizing further resources. This capacity needs to be consolidated and the support given the countries better articulated with the strategies of UNICEF Regional Offices to provide support to countries.
SO2. To ensure that key WASH stakeholders (sub-national, national and global) have the capacity to coordinate and deliver an appropriate and timely response in emergency

2.1 Systems - National Humanitarian WASH Coordination platforms and GWC partners benefit from a capacity building system established at global and regional levels to strengthen their ability to deliver the coordination functions

Main achievements
- A learning and training strategy has been established for the GWC until 2020 setting up the priorities for the humanitarian WASH sector, defining the targeted audiences and profiles, the training pathways (from incoming to expert levels) and the key competencies to develop.
- Essential training for NHWCs and partners have been developed (see Annex 4), and included as a regular offer in UNICEF Agora platform. Four out of the 7 UNICEF Regional Offices have been actively supported the piloting and roll out of the initial trainings.

Main constraints
- The development of key additional trainings (information management and assessment) have been delayed, while CAST is waiting for more clarity on the inter-cluster CLA and OCHA strategies on capacity development around these topics. A stronger coordination with OCHA and with the other clusters for the development of the trainings would have allow economies of scale and a more consistent and strategic approach to the development of the training. However, this would have also mean postponing key and urgent strategic initiatives for the GWC.
- The lack of predictable funding is a major constraint for the development, piloting, mainstreaming and scaling up of the trainings that forces CAST to explore alternative funding to secure the implementation of the capacity building strategy and generates delays.
- The mainstreaming of the trainings in UNICEF and in key academic partners is a long-term objective that requires a lasting engagement beyond the timeframe of the current strategic plan

2.2 Partnership - GWC partners have reinforced their capacity to support the delivery of core coordination functions of National and sub-National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms

Main achievements
- The FST model has evolved to gain flexibility, efficiency and more commitments of the partners to the support of the coordination function. This is the most significant achievement over the last two years.
- A series of associate members to the GWC such as Bioforce, IHE, WEDC, Tufts University, the LSHTM, Red-R, CDC continues to be engaged with the global WASH cluster in core initiatives.

Main constraint
- Idem as for 2.1.

2.3 WASH practitioners - The global pool of fit-for-purpose WASH practitioners to support humanitarian WASH coordination is sufficient to meet ‘normal ’ demand

Main achievement
- An average of 150+ practitioners have been trained each year, including a first pool of trainers for the trainings on WASH Operational Coordination and on Leadership and Coordination in 2018.

Main constraints
- The difficulty to give career perspective to trained WASH practitioners in the coordination sector is a major constraint to keep of pooled of trained and experienced cluster coordinators. This is a constraint that has been addressed by mainstreaming core competencies into the regular and formal trainings provided by the educational institutions involved in the sector (Bioforce, IHE, WEDC, etc...). However, this long-term objective would require a multi-year investment plan.
- It remains difficult to mainstream of core capacities associated to coordination and information management into the agendas of the partners.

Synthesis

The GWC has succeeded to develop a solid approach to address learning and training needs in the humanitarian WASH sector, set up the system and scale-up the trainings. This objective requires a long-term vision that must be accompanied with a solid and predictable funding strategy. CAST mitigated the lack of predictable funding by using every opportunity to implement the projects identified in the framework of the learning and training strategy developed for 2017-2020. The development of a multi-year project with key associated partners of the GWC should help addressing this constraint. Finally, a stronger push is required to mainstream core coordination skills into the agendas of the GWC Partners and the Cluster Lead Agency.
SO3. To influence and advocate for an effective humanitarian WASH coordination response and funding

3.1 There is an increased focus on Humanitarian WASH coordination, response and funding within global agendas

**Main achievements**
- After the meeting jointly organized between the GWC and the IAWG in Brussels, more than 30 agencies attended to brainstorm about the capacity of the sector to respond effectively and in timely manner to new and on-going emergencies. The humanitarian community has a better awareness and understanding of the numerous challenges of the humanitarian WASH sector and the risks associated to them. It was recognized by all, there is the need for the GWC to pursue this agenda.
- Humanitarian WASH related issues have been voiced both for countries where major bottlenecks were identified (Yemen, DRC for instance) through regular communication and webinar and in key fora (SWA, WWW, UNC...). A major advocacy campaign from CAST took place to highlight the capacity gaps in Yemen to respond to cholera. Several calls took place with UNICEF Emergency Director and INGOs counterpart (SC, ACF, SI, Oxfam, CARE) to understand the bottlenecks of the INGOs and help to facilitate the process of scaling up. This advocacy was considered successful as it was observed increase of capacity in Yemen.

**Main constraints**
- There is no specific funding / position affected at global level to this strategic objective.
- There is insufficient connection between the GWC members to synergize advocacy initiatives
- The GWC would have an advantage to develop a more systematic approach to advocacy (identifying areas of concern, prioritizing messages, voicing and following-up), and roll out the resource mobilization strategy that was developed in 2017.
- More proactive support from the GWC partners and the CLA is needed to bring issues to the attention of the GWC, and to advocate for issues related to WASH coordination.

3.2 The GWC partnership is strengthened and broadened at global level

**Main achievements**
- The GWC resource mobilization strategy was developed.
- The review of the GWC Governance (SAG and membership categories) allowed to consolidate the foundations for a better participation of the GWC partners in the decision-making process with the expansion of the SAG. It also allows to clarify the duties and responsibilities of each GWC members category.
- The Consultative Donor Group was established with the addition of new donors with a periodic consultation to allow discussions around the quarterly reports delivered by CAST, touching base on key priorities for the WASH sector, status of WASH coordination for priority responses and global initiatives supporting sector wide improvements.

**Main constraint**
- The initiatives taken over the past two years have not yet resulted into a higher and more predictable funding of the GWC However it was observed across the year a greater diversity on the source of funding, neither of the WASH response in the HRP countries as shown in figure 2.

**Synthesis**

All the elements to establish a more systematic and impactful approach to advocate of the humanitarian WASH sector have been set-up (internally within the CLA and externally). During the 2018 GWC meeting in Berlin, it was highlighted the needs to better profile the sector, as the WASH is “left behind” due the lack of better profiling/marketing compare with others sectors. There is an overall expectation that the CAST to drive this agenda as well as the capacity of the sector. The donor group is expected CAST and specifically the GWC Coordinator to influence the sector in more strategic way. Finally, the need to reinforce on advocacy objectives and the limited funding dedicated to their achievement is a contradiction in adjecto. The increase of the advocacy objective should be seen as a logical transition of the GWC function, while countries are becoming progressively more autonomous to fulfil the coordination functions.

SO4. To provide to the Humanitarian WASH actors a timely access to appropriate and accurate knowledge on coordination and response

4.1 Humanitarian WASH related Lesson Learned, evidences and innovative approaches corresponding to identified priority gaps are disseminated and used by GWC partners to improve coordination and response in subsequent emergencies

**Main achievements**
- In cooperation with the Elrha’s Research for Health in Humanitarian Crisis, CAST and a selected group of GWC partners identified and discussed priorities for humanitarian WASH research, as well as barriers to WASH research.
Priorities for research were proposed around 5 themes. The GWC TWiG on operational research for WASH was established to support and strengthen the sector with regards to addressing these issues.

- Hot topics for which knowledge must be generated have been identified and included into the capacity development strategy of the GWC (cash and market, epidemiology, assessment).
- After a series of trials, a system to disseminate knowledge to the GWC partners and generate specific knowledge on coordination is currently being developed with the cooperation of Tufts University. The system looks at managing knowledge for the humanitarian WASH sector as well as generating specific knowledge on coordination by identifying lessons.
- A community of practice of WASH coordinators has been established through the informal discussions that are taking place with the Helpdesk structure. There is a strong positive momentum among National WASH Cluster / Sector Coordinators around coordination practices through the Helpdesk that should be keep, even strengthened, in the coming years.

Main constraints
- The conceptual approach to collectively and sustainably generating and disseminating knowledge among the GWC partners, mixing flexibility and rapidity in the dissemination with the need to validate experiences into agreed lessons was challenging and generated delays.
- The lack of dedicated resources is the most important barrier to scale up the current initiatives.

Synthesis

After a series of progresses and setbacks, progresses are now registered on the implementation of the knowledge management component of the GWC strategy: objectives and milestones have been clarified. A community of practice around coordination has been established. UNICEF, as CLA, can play an instrumental role to sustain these progresses.

Consideration on additional initiatives

As series of initiatives were taken to consolidate the implementation of the GWC SP that are worth mentioning in the mid-term review process since they bring strategic perspectives for the coming years.

Cluster performance against cluster functions and minimum requirements

The IASC 6+1 coordination functions have been translated into a set of minimum requirements that NHWCPs are expected to set-up (see Annex 5). These Minimum Requirements have become central to monitor the performance of NHWCPs and structure the operational support delivered by CAST through the FST or when on mission. They are also constituting the backbone of the capacity development and knowledge management strategies for the cluster. This approach, with its pro’s and con’s, has allowed to streamline the implementation of the strategy.

Quality Assurance System

In 2017, the GWC Strategy Advisory Group endorsed the Humanitarian WASH Accountability Framework that details the priority areas NHWCPs and partners in countries should pay attention to. Ensuring that the WASH partners can provide to the affected populations a humanitarian response complying with minimum standards of quality has become a priority for the humanitarian WASH community. In order to address this challenge and establish accountability and quality assurance systems, the TWiG was set-up, a concept note written up to initiate a discussion among the partners, and pilot projects developed. Quality assurance systems are considering 6 focus areas. Among them:

- Centrality of Protection: The centrality of protection has been considered for all the components of the strategy (from the Minimum Requirements to the capacity building and the quality assurance systems), using the WASH minimum commitments for the safety and dignity of affected people;
- Accountability to Affected Populations: As such, HWNCPs are not providing direct services to the populations affected by a humanitarian crisis, but to their partners. As for the centrality of protection, it is however their

Effectiveness of WASH to prevent and control cholera, use of oral cholera vaccination with WASH interventions, Evaluating the use of hygiene kits, menstrual hygiene management and effectiveness of WASH integrated with nutrition programmes.
duty to develop systems, guide partners and monitor their performance in the sector around accountability of affected population.

In addition, UNICEF, as the CLA, started to carry out a series of After Action Reviews for the WASH response for important humanitarian responses (Nigeria, South Sudan), involving CAST and the Humanitarian WASH Team of UNICEF Program Division. These After Action Reviews are one of the possible modalities that can be used in the humanitarian WASH sector to monitor the quality of the responses provided by the partners.

Market Based and Cash Transfer Programming

Market Based and Cash Transfer Programming is moving fast in the humanitarian agenda. The global humanitarian community increasingly views market-based programming and cash-transfer programming as an effective and scalable response to address humanitarian needs of affected people and should be considered equally and systematically alongside other forms of humanitarian assistance, and where feasible, should even be the preferred and default modality (Grand Bargain commitment). These programming modalities bring a series of opportunities but also challenges to the humanitarian WASH sector the GWC partners must be aware of and must clearly communicate on.

In 2016, a Technical Working Group on Cash & Markets was established and a position paper with six key-recommendations for the way forward in the WASH sector was published by the GWC. The lack of evidences and capitalization on lessons is a challenge posed to the sector to provide technical and strategic advice on the use of cash modalities in the humanitarian response, influence the cash agenda and engage the sector in a dialogue in relevant fora.

Thus, initiatives were agreed over the past two years around capacity building, knowledge management, guidance and advocacy. These initiatives will aim at contributing to better understand the opportunities and mitigate the risk associated to this programming modality and better articulate it to the sector needs. Notwithstanding the little capitalization, WASH practitioners agreed that no single programming modality is sufficient for meeting WASH objectives related to achieving safe living environments and public health outcomes that benefit whole communities and mitigate the impacts of future disasters. There is a need for the development of WASH specific tools, guidance, capacity and experience around analyzing all relevant WASH markets in order to quickly and efficiently map, assess and analyze sectoral markets in order to increase opportunities for closer cooperation and two way dialogue between the broader cash and markets community and WASH technical specialists. Mutual education is key in finding the solutions to unlock the potential of CTP/MBP in the WASH sectors without compromising on sectoral outcomes.

Operational Research

The demand for a WASH Research agenda has been rapidly growing to try and fill the gaps in evidence required for effective and efficient humanitarian interventions. This demand resulted in a meeting hosted by Elrha’s Research for health in humanitarian crisis (R2HC) by various WASH agencies, academics and back donors in June 2017 in Windsor, UK.

The key conclusions and recommendations from this key event included7:

- Setting a clear and complimentary sector-wide research agenda is key to coalescing the academic, programmatic and funding communities around the goal of getting a coordinated set of priority WASH research studies developed and funded in the next 2-3 years.
- A Research repository with existing research and accepted protocols is urgently needed.
- Promoting the findings of research already conducted, and expanding the research agenda through the Emergency Environmental Health Forum (EEHF) and the Global WASH Cluster will continue.
- Finally establishing a Technical Working Group (TWiG) within the Global WASH Cluster is recommended.

---

7 WASH in Emergencies Prioritization Meeting: Briefing Paper by D’Mello-Guyett and Yates June 2017.
A GWC WASH and Operational Research TWiG, as a result, has been established with 13 members and 2 observing organizations. Tufts University are leading the TWiG with EAWAG (Sandec) co-leading. The TWiG should be in a position to identify 3 research areas by the end of 2018 that have a research partner and corresponding operational partner with funding support. Furthermore, progress in dissemination of reports and published works in the field of humanitarian WASH has been initiated through a new google group (emergency-wash@googlegroups.com) set up through USAID Water Communications and Knowledge Management (CKM) Project.

Assessment

The GWC WASH assessment TWiG was funded in 2016 at the initiative of the GWC in order to address the needs of better coordination among agencies implementing WASH assessment activities. According to its TOR approved in July 2017, the TWiG has the following objectives:

- Assist the national WASH platforms by providing assessment-related guidance, sharing tools and good practices;
- Develop reference documents to increase knowledge and capacity of WASH Cluster partners with regards to assessment;
- Strengthen WASH Cluster involvement in multi-sectoral assessment initiatives and discussions to ensure proper and harmonized collection of WASH indicators in coordinated and joint assessments;
- Provide strategic guidance to the WASH Cluster on assessment-related initiatives and activities.

The TWiG has faced challenges due to lack of resources delaying activities involving content production, such as developing reference documents and guidelines. Nevertheless, the platform has proved useful as 1) a community of practice where members update each other on their WASH assessment initiatives and 2) as a review body for key assessment tools. In this respect the TWiG has represented an invaluable source of technical input and opportunities for collaboration that contributed to the following outputs:

- DTM Data Dictionary: TWiG has been reviewing the WASH section of DTM indicators and questions, as well as new WASH sectoral analytical frameworks. The new tool will be structured around four modules aiming at understanding respectively the magnitude of needs, the severity, the underlying factors and priority groups;
- UNHCR 60 Sample Camp Survey – The new methodology designed by UNHCR for household rapid assessments in camp settings was reviewed and piloted by TWiG members in different contexts;
- GWC Question Bank – this repository that contains a list of 20 indicators and related questions has benefited from several TWiG’s reviews. The document is being now updated in order to ensure full alignment with UNHCR, JMP indicators and the new DTM tools.

Based on the above, discussions should be engaged with TWiG members on the opportunity of reviewing its TOR, in order to operate a formal switch from a content-production body to a community of practice and review platform, as this is what the TWiG has proved most useful, relevant and fit for purpose.

Funding

The lack of predictable funding is a major constraint to implement the GWC Strategic plan. From 2013-2018, an average of 74% of total funding goes towards operational support (figure 3). Capacity Building (4% of the funding breakdown), the Strategic Objectives on Advocacy and Knowledge Management (less than 1% of the funding breakdown) are consistently under-resourced, further limiting the capacity fund the sector (especially in emergency settings), develop capacity for coordination and building knowledge base in the sector.

The GWC partnership and the implementation of the GWC SP remain highly dependent to Donors’ commitments and funding priorities. More Donors could be approached to expand funding opportunities.
New initiatives

It is not proposed to drastically modify the 2016-2020 GWC SP, which the strategic objectives remain relevant. It is rather proposed to adjust some of the expected outcomes and outputs in the results framework of the strategic plan to better reflect the ongoing initiatives and better identify the level of accountability of the GWC stakeholders. Six initiatives are proposed for 2019-2020:

- Initiative #1: identify better the contributions of the GWC stakeholders (including those of the Technical Working Groups and the Donor Consultative Group) to roll out of the strategic plan at global, regional and national levels, based on the ways of working updated in 2017;
- Initiative #2: further mainstream the initiatives associated to the implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments into the GWC SP. This includes initiatives taken on the localization of aid, cash and market based programming, joint and impartial needs assessments, participation of affected populations, and humanitarian and development nexus;
- Initiative #3: ensure that the working framework developed by the GWC partners on quality programming in the WASH sector, and the steps taken to empower NHWCPs to guide, monitor, alert and propose corrective actions about the quality of the humanitarian WASH programmes is duly reflected in the strategic plan;
- Initiative #4: ensure that the initiative taken in close collaboration with the Inter-Agency WASH Group to strengthen the technical capacity of the humanitarian WASH sector is also duly reflected in the strategic plan;
- Initiative #5: develop new expected outcomes and outputs on capacity building, advocacy and knowledge management based on the lessons learned in the implementation of the GWC SP so far;
- Initiative #6: reflect better the intersectoral initiatives taken all across the four strategic objectives.

Revised GWC Strategic Plan for 2018-2020

5.1 Strategic Objectives and Focus Areas

Impact and strategic Objectives

The long-term expected impact of the GWC SP remains the same: The WASH response delivered by the GWC partners to the affected populations in countries affected by humanitarian crisis is delivered at scale and meets the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability.

The four Strategic Objectives (SO) the GWC SP remain unchanged. They are:
• SO1: Operational Support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the TA 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery;

• SO 2: Key WASH stakeholders (sub-national, national and global) have the capacity to coordinate and deliver an appropriate and timely response in emergency;

• SO 3: Influence and advocate for an effective humanitarian WASH coordination response and funding;

• SO 4: Provide to the Humanitarian WASH actors a timely access to appropriate and accurate knowledge on coordination and response;

Result chain
The initiatives have been grouped under 10 focus areas as show in the figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic objectives</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Operational Support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the TA 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery</td>
<td>1.1 Development and dissemination of guidance documents and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Set-up, implementation, evaluation and sustaining of support mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Monitoring of the performance of humanitarian WASH coordination and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Key WASH stakeholders (sub-national, national and global) have the capacity to coordinate and deliver an appropriate and timely response in emergency</td>
<td>2.1 Development and rolling out of key training packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Strengthening of humanitarian coordination capacity of National and sub-National WASH Coordination Platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Strengthening of the response capacity of GWC partners and national/local WASH partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influence and advocate for an effective humanitarian WASH coordination response and funding</td>
<td>3.1 Global advocacy for Humanitarian WASH coordination and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Supporting and relaying advocacy needs for Humanitarian WASH in countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide to the Humanitarian WASH actors a timely access to appropriate and accurate knowledge on coordination and response</td>
<td>4.1 Capture lessons in the Humanitarian WASH sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Develop new knowledge in the Humanitarian WASH sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Result Chain and Focus Areas per Strategic Objectives

The Theory of change has been structured around a result chain considering two levels of outcomes (see below) to take into account the complexity of the GWC Strategic Plan and the multiple results that must be articulated to achieve long-term and structural results.
## Strategic Objective 1: Operational Support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the IASC 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery

### Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes Level I</th>
<th>Outcomes L 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Development and dissemination of guidance documents and tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guidance</strong> is available for NHWCps to implement the 6+1 IASC coordination functions and monitor the quality of the Humanitarian WASH programmes and for GWC partners to actively contribute to (sub-) national WASH clusters fora and deliver high quality humanitarian WASH programmes</td>
<td><strong>Preparedness</strong> - In countries prioritized for emergency preparedness, NHWCps have an updated and operational emergency preparedness plan (including contingency plans) that are agreed among the partners and consistent with the national preparedness plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1.1.1 Minimum requirements (MRs) for the implementation of the 6+1 IASC coordination functions are agreed at GWC level and disseminated to NHWCps**
- **1.1.2 A Quality Assurance (QA) framework for the implementation of the Humanitarian WASH programmes is agreed at GWC level and disseminated to NHWCps and GWC partners**
- **1.1.3 Key GWC tools and guidance documents to support NHWCps and GWC partners are developed, agreed among partners and disseminated**
- **1.1.4 GWC website reviewed and maintained**

| **1.2 Set-up, implementation, evaluation and sustaining of support mechanisms** | **NHWCps and sub-NHWCps of GWC priority countries receive timely and effective support** to implement the 6+1 IASC coordination functions and to provide guidance to partners on quality programming | **Response** - In GWC-HPCs, NHWCps deliver the 6+1 IASC coordination functions and set mechanisms to monitor the quality of the WASH programmes implemented by the humanitarian partners. |

- **1.2.1 A GWC Field Support Team (FST) is operational**
- **1.2.2 FST provides effective and timely support on coordination functions (including quality monitoring), to NHWCps and sub-NHWCps**
- **1.2.3 WASH Coordination Regional Platforms (when existing) have established a systematic and coordinated approach to support NHWCps**
- **1.2.4 Intercluster arrangements based on type of crisis are set up jointly with priority clusters at global level to provide support and guidance to NHWC platforms**
- **1.2.5 Joint support missions with GWC SAG members (including Humanitarian Action Reviews) or with other global clusters are organized with priority Global Clusters**
- **1.2.6 FST model has evolved to gain flexibility, efficiency, and more involvement and autonomy of partners in terms of funding and staffing (including the mainstreaming of key FST functions into partners’ strategies and teams)**
- **1.2.7 Additional mechanisms and partnerships, other than FST deployments, are set up to strengthen and sustain the surge capacity in the WASH sector: assessment (UNDAC/REACH/JIAG), coordination/IM (UNICEF RRTs; SBP, rosters, agreements with GWC partner organizations to mainstream key coordination functions)**

| **1.3 Monitoring of the performance of humanitarian WASH coordination and response** | **The delivery of IASC coordination functions and the overall quality of the humanitarian WASH response are systematically monitored and evaluated in GWC priority countries.** | **Transition** - In countries where WASH cluster has been formally activated, National WASH Clusters have a transition plan to national WASH coordination platforms that considers the sub-national levels. |

- **1.3.1 Performance of NHWCps in GWC priority countries is monitored once a year using existing mechanism (CCPM, CDM, MRM)**
- **1.3.2 Quality of Humanitarian WASH response in GWC priority countries is monitored once a year using existing mechanism (CCPM, CDM, MRM)**
- **1.3.3 GWC prioritized for preparedness have preparedness / transition plans in place, validated by CAST**
Strategic Objective 2: Key WASH stakeholders (sub-national, national and global) have the capacity to coordinate and deliver an appropriate and timely response in emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes Level I</th>
<th>Outcomes L 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development and rolling out of key</td>
<td>2.1.1 GWC Strategy on Learning and Teaching has been developed</td>
<td>WASH practitioners involved in Humanitarian WASH coordination and response benefit from a set of training packages established at global and regional levels to strengthen their performance</td>
<td>Coordination - National and Sub-National Humanitarian WASH Coordination Platforms have reinforced their capacity to deliver the 6+1 IASC Cluster Coordination functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training packages</td>
<td>2.1.2 Training and briefing packages to improve coordination functions and the engagement of the GWC in national coordination platforms have been developed by GWC in 4 languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 Training and briefing packages are rolled out by UNICEF and GWC partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4 Partnerships on Learning and Teaching have been established with key academic / humanitarian partners (including UNICEF) who have at least included one GWC training package in their academic offer, and deliver it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.5 WASH practitioners are trained to fulfil their functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.6 A system for coaching or mentoring of national and sub-national CCs by GWC members is set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of humanitarian</td>
<td>2.2.1 UNICEF has developed a consolidated approach among the different Headquarters and Regional Offices (Compacts) to strengthen its capacity to fulfil its CLA role (linked to 1.2.1)</td>
<td>National Humanitarian WASH Coordination platforms, Governments and GWC partners benefit from a capacity building system established at global, regional and country levels to strengthen their ability to deliver the coordination functions</td>
<td>Response - GWC partners and national/local WASH partners have reinforced their capacity to deliver the humanitarian WASH response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination capacity of National and</td>
<td>2.2.2 WASH regional platforms have taken initiatives to reinforce the humanitarian coordination capacity of NHWCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-National WASH Coordination Platforms</td>
<td>2.2.3 Humanitarian WASH coordination is integrated in national WASH sector strategies and capacity development plans to enhance Governments leadership during preparedness, response and transition phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of the response capacity</td>
<td>2.3.1 GWC partners have identified the main gaps they face to deliver WASH responses with quality and coverage in humanitarian operations</td>
<td>GWC partners have reinforced their institutional WASH capacity to deliver a WASH response with quality and at scale and to actively participate in coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of GWC partners and national/local WASH</td>
<td>2.3.2 A referential framework (considering funding, HR and logistic components) is available for the GWC partners to strengthen their institutional capacity in humanitarian WASH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners</td>
<td>2.3.3 GWC partners have taken initiatives to strengthen their institutional capacity to carry out humanitarian WASH interventions in countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.4 A specific strategy has been developed to reinforce the institutional capacity of national/local partners active in the humanitarian WASH response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Objective 3: Influence and advocate for an effective humanitarian WASH coordination response and funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes Level I</th>
<th>Outcomes L 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Global advocacy for Humanitarian WASH coordination and response</td>
<td>3.1.1 GWC Resource Mobilization Strategy is developed</td>
<td>There is an increased focus on Humanitarian WASH coordination, response and funding within global agendas</td>
<td>Key humanitarian and development partners mobilize adequate resources for Humanitarian WASH coordination and response both at global and in countries The GWC partnership is strengthened and broadened both at global level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 GWC Strategic Plan is adequately funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 A mechanism ensuring regular coordination meetings of GWC with donors has been set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.4 Identified humanitarian WASH related issues have been formally voiced at global level in humanitarian and development fora and through global partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.5 Stock-taking exercise has been organized on the global capacity of the WASH oriented organizations to deliver WASH response of quality and at scale in humanitarian operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.6 A strategic initiative has been formally launched to strengthen the Humanitarian Development Nexus in the WASH sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Supporting and relaying advocacy needs for Humanitarian WASH in countries</td>
<td>3.2.1 GWC advocacy system (identification, prioritization, voicing, follow up) has been set up</td>
<td>There is an increased focus on Humanitarian WASH coordination, response and funding in countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2 Sensitive Humanitarian WASH related issues in GWC-HPCs are systematically identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3 Advocacy messages developed and voiced by CAST to relevant stakeholder to support NHWCps in GWC-HPCs facing sensitive Humanitarian WASH related issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Strategic Objective 4: Provide to the Humanitarian WASH actors a timely access to appropriate and accurate knowledge on coordination and response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes Level I</th>
<th>Outcomes L 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Capture lessons in the Humanitarian WASH sectors</td>
<td>4.1.1 A dedicated KM platform for GWC members and NHWCps to share experiences and have access to knowledge on humanitarian WASH is functional (linked to 1.1.4)</td>
<td>Humanitarian WASH related Lesson Learned, evidences and innovative approaches corresponding to identified priority gaps are disseminated and used by GWC partners to improve coordination and response in subsequent emergencies Partners are changing their practices towards more efficient coordination and better quality response based on lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 A data repository documenting outcomes and impacts of WASH interventions in emergency response is set up in coordination with other initiatives and regularly updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 A community of practice is set up among National WASH CCs and IMOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4 Existing knowledge on the outcomes and impacts of humanitarian coordination in the WASH sector is reviewed and published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.5 protocol to assess the outcomes and impacts of coordination in emergency response is designed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.6 Cluster coordination models and performance are systematically reviewed for L3 emergencies and priority countries to extract lessons learnt and best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Develop new knowledge in the Humanitarian WASH sectors</td>
<td>4.2.1 Gaps on evidences for humanitarian WASH are mapped</td>
<td>New knowledge on Humanitarian WASH is disseminated and used by GWC partners to improve coordination and response in subsequent emergencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Prioritization of operational research areas for WASH in emergencies is established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Key research initiatives on WASH in emergencies are disseminated in a coordinated manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4. Key research initiatives on the impact of humanitarian WASH in intersectoral actions are disseminated in a coordinated manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
5.3 Reviewed Monitoring Framework

The monitoring framework has been reviewed to match the new result framework, with adjusted output and outcome indicators. It is presented in Annex 7.

6 Roles and Responsibilities for outputs achievements

GWC SAG

- 2.3.2 A referential framework (considering funding, HR and logistic components) is available for the GWC partners to strengthen their institutional capacity in humanitarian WASH
- 2.3.4 A specific strategy has been developed to reinforce the institutional capacity of national/local partners active in the humanitarian WASH response
- 3.1.2 GWC Strategic Plan is adequately funded
- 3.1.4 Identified humanitarian WASH related issues are formally voiced at global level in humanitarian and development fora and through global partnerships
- 3.2.3 Advocacy messages developed and voiced by CAST to relevant stakeholder to support NHWCPs in GWC-HPCs facing sensitive Humanitarian WASH related issues
- 4.1.6 Cluster coordination models and performance are systematically reviewed for L3 emergencies and priority countries to extract lessons learnt and best practices

UNICEF

- 1.2.3 WASH Coordination Regional Platforms (when existing) have established a systematic and coordinated approach to support NHWCPs
- 2.2.1 UNICEF has developed a consolidated approach among the different Headquarters and Regional Offices (Compacts) to strengthen its capacity to fulfil its CLA role (linked to 1.2.1)
- 2.2.2 WASH regional platforms have taken initiatives to reinforce the humanitarian coordination capacity of NHWCPs
- 2.2.3 Humanitarian WASH coordination is integrated in national WASH sector strategies and capacity development plans to enhance Governments leadership during preparedness, response and transition phases

GWC Active Members

- 2.3.3 GWC partners have taken initiatives to strengthen their institutional capacity to carry out humanitarian WASH interventions in countries

GWC Active Members

- 1.1.1 Minimum requirements (MRs) for the implementation of the 6+1 IASC coordination functions are agreed at GWC level and disseminated to NHWCPs

CAST

- 1.1.4 GWC website reviewed and maintained
- 1.2.4 Intercluster arrangements based on type of crisis are set up jointly with priority clusters at global level to provide support and guidance to NHWC platforms
- 1.2.5 Joint support missions with GWC SAG members (including Humanitarian Action Reviews) or with other global clusters are organized with priority Global Clusters
• 1.2.7 Additional mechanisms and partnerships, other than FST deployments, are set up to strengthen and sustain the surge capacity in the WASH sector: assessment (UNDAC/REACH/JIAG), coordination/IM (UNICEF RRTs; SBP, rosters, agreements with GWC partner organizations to mainstream key coordination functions)

• 1.3.1 Performance of NHWCPs in GWC-HPCs is monitored once a year using existing mechanism (CCPM, CDM, MRM)

• 1.3.2 Quality of Humanitarian WASH response in GWC-HPCs is monitored once a year using existing mechanism (CCPM, CDM, MRM)

• 1.3.3 GWC prioritized for preparedness have preparedness / transition plans in place, validated by CAST

• 1.3.4 GWC Strategy on Learning and Teaching has been developed

• 1.3.5 Training and briefing packages to improve coordination functions and the engagement of the GWC in national coordination platforms have been developed by GWC in 4 languages

• 1.3.6 Training and briefing packages are rolled out by UNICEF and GWC partners

• 1.4 Partnerships on Learning and Teaching have been established with key academic / humanitarian partners (including UNICEF) who have at least included one GWC training package in their academic offer, and deliver it

• 1.5 WASH Practitioners are trained to fulfil their functions

• 2.1.1 A system for coaching or mentoring of national and sub-national CCs by GWC members is set up

• 2.3.1 GWC partners have identified the main gaps they face to deliver WASH responses with quality and coverage in humanitarian operations

• 3.1.1 GWC Resource Mobilization Strategy is developed

• 3.1.3 A mechanism ensuring regular coordination meetings of GWC with donors has been set up

• 3.1.5 Stock-taking exercise has been organized on the global capacity of the WASH oriented organizations to deliver WASH response of quality and at scale in humanitarian operations

• 3.2.1 GWC advocacy system (identification, prioritization, voicing, follow up) has been set up

• 3.2.2 Sensitive Humanitarian WASH related issues in GWC-HPCs are systematically identified

• 4.1.1 A dedicated KM platform for GWC members and NHWCPs to share experiences and have access to knowledge on humanitarian WASH is functional (linked to 1.1.4)

• 4.1.2 A data repository documenting outcomes and impacts of WASH interventions in emergency response is set up in coordination with other initiatives and regularly updated

• 4.1.3 A Community of practice is set up among National WASH CCs and IMOs

• 4.1.4 Existing knowledge on the outcomes and impacts of humanitarian coordination in the WASH sector is reviewed and published

• 4.1.5 Protocol to assess the outcomes and impacts of coordination in emergency response is designed

CAST and UNICEF

• 3.1.6 A strategic initiative has been formally launched to strengthen the Humanitarian Development Nexus in the WASH sector

CAST and FST Consortium members

• 1.2.2 FST provides effective and timely support on coordination functions (including quality monitoring), to NHWCPs and sub-NHWCPs
FST Consortium lead

- 1.2.1 A GWC Field Support Team (FST) is operational
- 1.2.6 FST model has evolved to gain flexibility, efficiency, and more involvement and autonomy of partners in terms of funding and staffing (including the mainstreaming of key FST functions into partners’ strategies and teams)

CAST with the support of GWC TWiGs

- 1.1.3 Key GWC tools and guidance documents to support NHWCPs and GWC partners are developed, agreed among partners and disseminated

GWC TWiG on Quality Assurance

- 1.1.2 A Quality Assurance (QA) framework for the implementation of the Humanitarian WASH programmes is agreed at GWC level and disseminated to NHWCPs and GWC partners

GWC TWiG on Operational Research

- 4.2.1 Gaps on evidences for humanitarian WASH are mapped
- 4.2.2 Prioritization of operational research areas for WASH in emergencies is established
- 4.2.3 Key research initiatives on WASH in emergencies are disseminated in a coordinated manner
- 4.2.4 Key research initiatives on the impact of humanitarian WASH in intersectoral actions are disseminated in a coordinated manner

7  Budget Needs

The table hereunder is a summary of the budget needs for the next two years. The breakdown is in Annex 8. The total amount required for 2019 and 2020 is 7,556,000 USD, representing an increase of 17% compared to the budget estimated in 2016 to achieve strategic objectives of the GWC SP in 2019 and 2020. This increase of the budget is in line with the scope of the new initiatives and the progress made on each strategic pillar.

SO1 (operational support to countries) continues to absorb a significant amount of the budget, but has slightly decreased both in absolute and relative values representing 62% of the total budget (compared to 80% estimated in 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (SO1 + SO2 + SO3 + SO4)</td>
<td>3,888,000</td>
<td>3,668,000</td>
<td>7,556,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global WASH Cluster coordination</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1: Operational Support to national and sub-national humanitarian WASH coordination platforms to meet the IASC 6+1 core functions and improve Humanitarian WASH service delivery</td>
<td>2,293,000</td>
<td>2,368,000</td>
<td>4,661,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2: Key WASH stakeholders (sub-national, national and global) have the capacity to coordinate and deliver an appropriate and timely response in emergency</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3: Influence and advocate for an effective humanitarian WASH coordination response and funding</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4: Provide to the Humanitarian WASH actors a timely access to appropriate and accurate knowledge on coordination and response</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>