

2014 WASH SUSTAINABILITY FORUM

RAI
Amsterdam

30 June - 1 July, 2014



The 2014 WASH Sustainability Forum and the development of this report have been supported by:



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands



The views contained in this report are representative of those expressed at the Forum and are not necessarily the views of the organizations that supported the Forum and this report.

I. BACKGROUND TO THE 2014 WASH FORUM



Patrick Moriarty (IRC)

Beyond the difficulty reaching universal WASH coverage and achieving the MDG targets by 2015, the challenge maintaining WASH services in the long term is now recognised as of critical importance for the sector and calls for a break away from the “business as usual” approach.

At the 2014 WASH Sustainability Forum, the challenge of public investment wasted in WASH systems that break down soon after the end of the project or fail to perform to their agreed level of service, was highlighted by Patrick Moriarty (Director, IRC); Dick van Ginhoven (Senior WASH advisor, DGIS) and Glenn Pearce Oroz (Regional Director, WSP) during their keynote addresses, where they gave overviews of measures taken by their respective organisations.

Shifting from concepts to practice

Over the past five years, a series of events collectively referred to as the WASH Sustainability Fora, has focused discussions on the growing concern to keep services flowing and maximize impacts. These events bring together a wide range of practitioners, policymakers and funders from around the world to advance sustainability thinking through a structured framework of learning and reflection. The series of WASH Sustainability events, starting in 2010, established a common theoretical foundation for sustainability, moving from broad concepts of service delivery to specific roles for stakeholders and the overarching principles that became the WASH Sustainability Charter.¹

While significant progress has been made through these events, many organizations still have difficulties translating broad discussions into programming. Additionally, these fora have seen a focus placed on sustainability for water services, with limited attention to sanitation and hygiene. Building off of the previous events², the 2014 WASH Sustainability Forum provided a platform for introducing practical approaches and tools for applying sanitation, hygiene, and water sustainability principles.



Dick van Ginhoven (DGIS)

1. <http://sustainablewash.org/wash-sustainability-charter>

2. <http://www.sustainablewash.org/wash-sustainability-forum-series>

Overview of the 2014 WASH Forum

The 2014 WASH Sustainability Forum, held in Amsterdam, continued discussions about WASH sector sustainability by focusing on practical tools and approaches useful to sector stakeholders in their daily operations.

The Forum was organized by SustainableWASH.org, a consortium of organisations including Aguaconsult, Global Water Challenge, IRC and WASH Advocates. Additional support in organizing this Forum has been provided by a wide array of experts, as well as advisors including UNICEF, the Netherland's Government Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS), the World Bank's Water and Sanitation Program, and Helvetas.

With over 150 attendees representing NGOs, donor governments, foundations, officials from developing countries, advocacy organisations, multilateral donors and academia, this event was the best attended and shifted participation from more USA based to more Europe based organisations. The full list of participants can be found in Annex 1.



Harold Lockwood (Aguaconsult)



Brian Banks (GWC)

The two day event was facilitated by Harold Lockwood (Aguaconsult) and structured around three themes - hygiene, sanitation and water - each led by stakeholders with specific expertise in each of these fields. Stef Smits (IRC) and Jose Gesti Canuto (UNICEF) led the water track, Julia Rosenbaum (FHI360, USAID/WASHplus Project) led the hygiene track and Guy Norman (WSUP) and Evariste Kouassi (UNICEF) led the sanitation track. This was to ensure adequate focus on sanitation and hygiene sub-sectors, generally under-represented in sector events and discussions.

The first day's sessions were held in plenary to allow keynote speakers to present a specific perspective on the topic. These plenary sessions were followed by three parallel sessions for each stream, focusing on particular tools or sub-sector specific issues related to sustainability. A set of additional tools not covered in the tracks were presented during the tool fair on day one. More cross-cutting discussions were held on day two during a Pecha Kucha and a panel discussion, respectively facilitated by Ariel Sayre (Global Water Challenge) and Elynn Walter (WASH Advocates). The full forum agenda can be found in Annex 2

Tools presented during the parallel sessions and the tool fair were selected through a public call for contributions prior to the forum. The full list of tools, together with a brief overview, can be found in Annex 3.

This brief report does not intend to provide a full overview of all sessions that occurred during these intense two days of learning and discussions. Instead, it aims to provide a summary of the main points discussed and key messages emerging.

II. INTRODUCTION

As an introduction to the discussions and parallel sessions, and to provide some strategic perspective, Harold Lockwood presented the main findings of a sustainability tool mapping, carried out by Aguaconsult, in the context of the Triple-S initiative, led by IRC.

This mapping aimed to identify existing sustainability tools and provide a brief overview of each according to four categories: i) application ii) complexity and iii) scalability and iv) cost to encourage dissemination and cross-learning. Tools were considered for inclusion if they met the three following criteria: i) provided a tangible output, ii) were content specific, iii) had a reproducible methodology. Based on these criteria, 25 tools were included out of the 190 considered. The findings of the analysis suggested that although there is a growing number of tools available and increasing demand for additional tools, there is still a significant gap in relation to National Government processes and systems. Lockwood laid out the policy implications of this as markers for the coming two days of discussion, including:

- The need to integrate tools better with national, government-led systems and processes and make strong accountability linkages to end users;
- The need to invest more in the enabling environment and national capacity and systems;
- To think about the use of the massive amounts of data being generated, especially from monitoring tools and what the implications are for learning and improvement of services by closing the loop;

This introduction provided a broad perspective of available tools and hence the basis for the discussions in the three tracks.

The following section provides an overview of each track, the understanding of what sustainability entails, as defined by the track leads, the tools selected and presented, along with the key messages emerging from the thematic discussions.

III. WATER TRACK

As part of the forum preparation, the track leads, Stef Smits (IRC) and Jose Gesti Canuto (UNICEF), provided background information on what the concept of sustainability entailed specifically for water, based on personal experience and literature review:

- Sustainability is often defined as the maintenance of the perceived benefit of investments after the end of the active period of project implementation and whether water continues to flow over time, and continues to provide an agreed level of service. According to this definition, the main factors affecting sustainability are social, technical, financial, institutional and environmental.
- The second definition considers that sustainability eventually manifests itself in the level of service received by users, i.e. the quantity, quality, accessibility and reliability of the supply. These not only describe whether the water flows, but also the characteristics of that flow. This cluster of characteristics argues that the service levels depend on the performance in service delivery tasks at different institutional levels, covering: i) the performance of the service provider (who carries out operation, maintenance and administration tasks), ii) performance of the service authority (responsible for planning, coordination, support and oversight roles) and iii) the national enabling environment entities.

Tools submitted for this track were categorised along the four following groups:

Type of tool	Description
Tools considering sustainability comprehensively	These cover all, or at least most of the mentioned dimensions of sustainability and is arguably one of the biggest groups of tools. These tools serve often a purpose of monitoring a number of projects or systems in an area and come to an assessment of how many of these are likely, or not, to be sustainable, based on the comprehensive review of all the factors in the different dimensions.
Tools considering aspects of sustainability	These only cover one of the dimensions of sustainability and are oriented towards identifying possible actions in that particular dimension of sustainability.
Tools considering service delivery performance	These seek to take a snapshot of service delivery, including service levels and the performance on (almost) all the levels and are very much directed at identifying where bottlenecks in service delivery are at which institutional level.
Tools assessing performance at a single institutional level	These include tools that only cover service provider performance or only the enabling environment. They go to a higher level of detail than the previous tools and allow for more structural reform measures at that level.

Overview of water sessions

	Topic	Presenter
Day 1	WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (WASH BAT)	<i>Evariste Kouassi-Komlan, UNICEF</i>
	AtWhatCost	<i>Gordon Mumbo, Water For People</i>
	CUPSS (Check Up Program for Small Systems)	<i>Anne Namakula, Vitens Evides International</i>
	Sustainability Metric for Assessing Safe Water Access in Healthcare Facilities	<i>Katharine Robb, Emory University</i>
	SIASAR	<i>David Michaud, WSP World Bank</i>
Day 2	Open Discussion and Conclusions	<i>Facilitated by Stef Smits, IRC and José Gesti Canuto, UNICEF</i>

The following key elements emerged from the presentations and discussions:

- The category of water specific tools was by far the largest both in number and type, thus reflecting the findings of the initial mapping and the current focus of the sector.
- Most tools presented were said to have contributed to broader advocacy rather than direct corrective actions. This is mainly due to the level of application and scope. For example, the Bottleneck Analysis Tool (BAT) from UNICEF leads to the identification of a large number of areas of sector weaknesses which are not easily translatable into immediate action.
- Generally the costs of developing and applying these tools are not monitored and therefore known by the organisations, which impedes the general uptake and scale up.

Focus: SIASAR Information System for Rural Water and Sanitation

This tool was initially developed by WSP but is now fully owned by national Governments and streamlined into existing systems, with external financial support from a range of organisations.

SIASAR is a regional platform to monitor the sustainability of rural water services in Central America (Honduras, Panama, Nicaragua and Dominican Republic) and expanding into additional countries. The data is collected at all levels ranging from systems to provider and lead agency and is made public by national Governments, thus increasing general transparency.

For more information:

<http://siasar.org/sistema/login.php>

IV. SANITATION TRACK

As part of the forum preparation, the track leads (Guy Norman, WSUP and Evariste Kouassi-Komlan, UNICEF) provided background information on what the concept of sustainability entailed specifically for sanitation, based on personal experience and literature review:



Guy Norman (WSUP)

Sanitation sustainability can be understood in two different ways:

- The “Environmental” concept of sustainable sanitation, adopted by the Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA) and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), goes beyond the sanitation service itself, and includes requirements for protection of the wider environment: “In order to be sustainable, a sanitation system has to be not only economically viable, socially acceptable, and technically and institutionally appropriate, it should also protect the environment and the natural resources.”
- Another definition of sanitation sustainability refers to the levels of services delivered to beneficiaries and does not cover the environmental aspects of sanitation.

The second definition was chosen as the starting point to focus discussions on the ability of an intervention to maintain its benefits over time. Tools submitted for this track were categorised along the three following groups:

Type of tool	Description
Sector Analysis Tools	These help assess the WASH sector within a given jurisdiction, often with the aim of identifying technical, financial, political or structural bottlenecks constraining progress. The tools may not focus exclusively on sustainability, but sustainable service delivery is typically at the heart of the “outcome state” that these tools aim to move towards.
Planning Tools	These can support WASH intervention planning ranging from small NGO project interventions to major city-level or national WASH programmes.
Sustainability Scoring Tools	These are designed to assess the likely sustainability of a given organization, project or district. Unlike the other two categories, these tools focus specifically on assessment of sustainability, whether by predictive assessment or look-back assessment.

Overview of sanitation sessions

	Topic	Presenter
Day 1	Service Delivery Assessment Approach to Faecal Sludge Management	<i>Barbara Evans, University of Leeds</i>
	CSO/SDA/MAPAS Scorecard	<i>Susanna Smets, World Bank</i>
	WASHCost Calculator	<i>Catarina Fonseca, IRC Nick Dickinson, IRC</i>
	Sustainability Checks	<i>Evariste Kouassi-Komlan, UNICEF</i>
Day 2	Discussion: Where Next for Sanitation Sustainability Tools?	<i>Facilitated by Guy Norman, WSUP</i>

The following key elements emerged from the presentations and discussions:

- While the forum purposefully disaggregated the three sub-sectors to ensure adequate focus on sanitation and hygiene, few tools focused specifically on sanitation
- Inherently, sustainability of sanitation interventions is a combination of hardware and software (behaviour change), closely linked to hygiene, health and educational aspects, which are more difficult to monitor and maintain sustainability.
- The cost of developing and applying these tools are not systematically monitored, but when available, these ranged between \$1k to \$10k and are generally financed by external organisations which raises the question of the sustainability of their use and uptake by Governments.
- Tools presented were generally useful for advocacy purposes and provided input into policy changes. However, direct action does not necessarily result from their application.

Focus: The Faecal Sludge Management (FSM) mapping tool (WSP)

This tool was developed to support city planners to understand sanitation at the city scale. It can be used to help a city determine where the sludge is and where it is going (using the « shit-flow » diagram) which also gives a rough estimate of how much faecal sludge is being improperly managed. Once the diagnostic is done, the result can be used for policy and budgeting advocacy with local and national Governments to effect change.

The tool has currently been applied in 12 cities, with high potential for uptake, both within WSP and by cities themselves.

For more information:

<http://www.wsp.org/sites/wsp.org/files/publications/WSP-Fecal-Sludge-12-City-Review-Research-Brief.pdf>

V. HYGIENE TRACK

For the purposes of this forum, the definition of “hygiene” was limited to handwashing with soap (HWWS) and household drinking water treatment, safe handling and storage (HWTS), rather than a broader treatment of hygiene which includes food hygiene, menstrual hygiene, and compound hygiene including topics such as safe disposal of animal faeces.



Julia Rosenbaum (USAID/WASH)

As part of the forum preparation, the track lead (Julia Rosenbaum, FHI360, USAID/WASHplus Project) provided background information on what the concept of sustainability entailed specifically for hygiene, based on personal experience and literature review:

- The focus of sustainability relates almost exclusively to sustaining consistent and correct practice – or behaviour change rather than keeping systems functional and services running.
- Determinants such as social norms, policies, and presence of “enabling technologies” are the primary factors required to sustain behaviours; key knowledge is necessary, but not sufficient. These technology and systems issues primarily lie within the household domain rather than within the community or government.
- Factors influencing behaviour change as applied to water treatment practices include self-efficacy, cost of the treatment product, taste of the treated water, current practice, belief/perception that the water is dirty and needs to be treated, and belief/perception that the water can make them or their children sick.
- All factors influencing sustained practice of HWWS and HWTS in the long term are less known, but some of them have been identified, including: the presence of enabling technologies, particularly a fixed handwashing station; the availability of spare parts or key supplies; ability and willingness to pay for related enabling technologies, like treatment methods and soap; key knowledge; and supportive social norms.

Overview of hygiene sessions

	Topic	Presenter
Day 1	Assessing Cost Effectiveness of Hygiene Interventions	<i>Amélie Dubé, IRC Mélanie Carrasco, IRC</i>
	Handwashing Promotion: Monitoring & Evaluation Module	<i>Pavani K Ram, University at Buffalo</i>
	Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluating Household Water Treatment and Safe Storage	<i>Ryan Rowe, The Water Institute at UNC</i>
	Fit for School	<i>Bella Monse, GIZ Ralf Panse, SEAMEO INNOTECH</i>
	Discussion: What hygiene sustainability tools are still needed? AND What can we learn/borrow from other WASH tools?	<i>Facilitated by Hajra Mukasa, Independent WASH Specialist, Uganda</i>
Day 2	Panel on Corporate/Private Sector Approaches Contributing to Sustainable Handwashing	<i>Lilly Dimling, Global Soap Project Ariel Sayer, Global Water Challenge Lewis Temple, iDE – Intl Development Enterprise Susanne Peters, Issuemakers</i>

The following key elements emerged from the presentations and discussions:

- Only a small number of hygiene specific tools were submitted. This is reflective of the sector and confirms the findings of the initial mapping with regard to the general focus of existing tools on water and/or WASH in general.
- Sustaining and monitoring behaviour change is a huge challenge and is inherently complex and costly, especially considering the close links between the hygiene sub-sector and health, environment and education. The outcomes of water and sanitation interventions contribute to hygiene behaviour change and effective behaviour change contributes to sustaining service delivery of water and sanitation.
- The issue of collecting longitudinal vs. cross-sectional data to monitor behaviour change has an important bearing on the quality of the data and results produced, but also on the cost of collection and should therefore be considered carefully. One solution would be for national governments and donors to ‘forward fund’ such assessments.

- Although the hygiene sub-sector is lagging behind in terms of development of specific tools, a lot could be learned from other more advanced sectors also focusing on behaviour change like the education and health sectors.

Focus: The methodology for monitoring the cost effectiveness of hygiene Interventions (IRC)

This tool was developed by IRC to support project implementers and service authorities in the development of effective policies and budgets for improved long term investment in hygiene.

The methodology- still in development -considers both the costs of the hygiene interventions and their outcome, by monitoring behaviours before and after. Once finalised and tested more widely, it should allow for benchmarking interventions, both in terms of costs and efficiency.

For more information:

<http://www.ircwash.org/resources/assessing-hygiene-cost-effectiveness-methodology>



On the second day of the Forum, a panel discussion with Eric Harvey from WaterAid, Naabia Ofofu-Amaah from the Global Environment Technology Foundation, Evariste Kouassi-Komlan from UNICEF, and Dick van Ginhoven from DGIS and moderated by Elynn Walter of WASH Advocates brought out highlights and gaps related to national level tool adoption, impact, and sustainability.

- Tool ownership is a major challenge – the tools are often created by implementing organisations or academic institutions with little to no government or community engagement but governments and communities are expected to adopt and use the tools.
- National and sub-national level tools are needed but tools that focus on districts and towns are not as common as national level or community level.
- There is an enormous gap linking the tools to national and global level processes.
- Tools need to build on existing structures.

Three organisations doing things differently...

USAID and DGIS are two bilateral donors who have put sustainability at the forefront of their strategies and interventions and developed tools to support this ambition.

Over the last 7 years, **DGIS** designed and tested these instruments to increase accountability for sustainability amongst both implementing and Government partners. The Sustainability Clause is now part of all financing agreements and introduces the requirement for implementing partners to carry out annual Sustainability Checks and subjects them to financial penalties for non-functionality of interventions for 10 years after project implementation. DGIS also introduced a Sustainability Compact signed by UNICEF in West Africa region and Government partners, listing joint long term commitments for sustaining WASH service delivery.

USAID has recently made a conscious effort to push sustainability to the top of its agenda. This has materialised in the development of a new WASH strategy, the introduction of the Sustainability Index Tool, soon to be compulsory for monitoring of all WASH interventions; and the active contribution to broader sector discussions on service delivery and the role of donors, especially with regard to monitoring.

IRC- International Water and Sanitation Centre in the Netherlands provides long term support to National and Local governments in its focus countries, to achieve Everyone Forever. This ambition translated into delivering, through national systems and public funding, access to WASH services (not only the physical infrastructure) for an unlimited period of time.

VI.

CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATIONS

A synthesis of the discussions across all three tracks was presented on day two by Julia Boulenouar and Ryan Schweitzer (Aquaconsult). The following section outlines the trends and recommendations that were presented then:

Emerging trends:

- Most contributing organisations indicated that their tools were freely available in the public domain. However, in most cases, the documentation relative to the adaptation, application of tools and interpretation of results is not generally readily available, thus limiting uptake by other organisation and scale-up.
- Overwhelmingly, the tools presented were part of a larger project (generally part of a monitoring framework for the specific project) and externally driven by either NGOs or donors and largely used and owned by these organisations for the lifetime of the project.
- These tools mirror the way WASH is funded and projects implemented, externally driven, short term, with little country ownership or links with Government systems and processes.
- In most cases, the development and application of these tools raise issues about the difficulty striking a balance between complexity and simplicity; rigour and availability of resources; strategic oversight and operationality.
- Generally, the costs of developing and applying the tools are not monitored by organisations and the impacts of applying the tools on the sustainability of interventions cannot be identified at this early pilot stage. As a result, it is difficult to draw up a cost-benefit analysis of the tools' application.

Preliminary recommendations:

- To improve cross-learning and encourage uptake of existing tools by other stakeholders, tool owners should make a conscious effort to document the use of their tool and write up methodologies.
- Given the commonalities between tools, there is room for sharing all or certain aspects across organisations, particularly on the understanding of sustainability and the definition of indicators, but also the methodology for collecting and analysing data.
- With the growing number of organisations monitoring sustainability of their interventions, there is a need to share the data more systematically in order to make sense of the results to improve existing and future programmes. Various options were discussed including the creation of platforms and improving shareability of indicators.
- More government engagement- less tools and more government strengthening.

SustainableWASH.org can amplify and support the vibrant conversation already taking place across diverse platform on the operationalization of the concepts and tools that support sustainability. Additionally, clear opportunities exist to align with global conversations such as SWA and the post-2015 SDG discussions.

VII.

NEXT STEPS

Following the fifth edition of the sustainable WASH forum, the organising committee's view on the way forward, confirmed by the general feedback received from participants is the following:

- The challenge of sustainability has gained momentum, but there is a need to continue the engagement in the WASH sector.
- There is general agreement that any future event should take place in country, to bring the dialogue closer to the realities, with greater representation of national and local governments.

VIII. FEEDBACK

We received a lot of feedback both during and after the forum from participants, both on the content of the sessions and the general organisation of the forum. The table below presents the aggregated average scores given by participants on the content of the forum (out of a total of 5 points), after each session during the forum:

Questions	Hygiene	Sanitation	Water	Average
The tools or practical approaches presented in this session are of high quality.	3.69	3.82	3.55	3.69
I intend to use the tools or practical approaches showcased in this session in my work.	3.39	3.32	2.90	3.20

The table below presents average scores given by participants on the content of the forum, after the end of the forum (out of a total of 5 points):

Questions	2013	2014	Trend
The Forum objectives were clearly communicated in advance.	3.22	3.73	+
The Forum objectives were met.	3.37	3.55	+
The Forum leader(s) effectively moderated the meeting.	4.03	4.21	+
Forum attendees had an opportunity to participate.	3.77	4.20	+
The right people were invited to the Forum.	4.08	3.50	-
The session content and tools covered were relevant/of interest.	Not asked	3.68	N/A
Average	3.69	3.81	+

Participants were also asked to provide general thoughts on areas of improvements of the forum. Main trends emerging from the feedback are below following three categories (attendance, content and organisation):

Attendance:

- The majority of participants were from NGOs/ donors and from the North. A greater number of participants from the South, local and Government representatives would have allowed the discussions to be more grounded.
- Other categories of stakeholders could have been better represented: bilateral and multilaterals and service providers.

Content:

- Many tools were presented, but little time was left to allow in depth discussions on specific tools, to allow participants to take away technical knowledge on specific ones.
- The discussions focused on monitoring sustainability through the use of various tools, with little focus on how sustainability could actually be improved by doing things differently.

Organisation:

- Although networking naturally happened in-between sessions, more structured networking could have been organised.

ANNEX 1: PARTICIPANTS LIST

Last Name	First Name	Company
Andriambahiny ép Rasamison	Michèle Solange	Fonds d'Appui pour l'Assainissement / GSF Madagascar
Annis	Jonathan	CARE
Arfeen	Shamim	AOSED
Asfaw	Henock	waterschap Hollandse Delta
Ayers	Ben	The dZi Foundation
Bakker	Eline	Freelance Urban Sanitation Consultant
Banka	Sanjay	Banka BioLoo
Banks	Brian	Global Environment & Technology Foundation
Barak	Bruerd	Blood:Water Mission
Barnhoorn	Claire	BeDataDriven
Beers	Paul	Fairwater
Beilharz	Jossekin	SeeSaw
Blesgraaf	Roel	Simavi
Bogale	Abraham	World Vision
Bos	Leendert	SNV Netherlands Development Organisation
Bostoen	Kristof	IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre
Boulenouar	Julia	Aguaconsult
Bouta	Harm	WASH Consultant
Brooke	Rebecca	Vitol Foundation
Brown	Christopher	WEL Group
Brussee	Petra	IRC
Bukachi	Vera	Arup International Development
Burbidge-van Velde	Kaat	Max Foundation
Burn	Nick	Water for People
Carrasco	Melanie	IRC
Carriger	Sarah	Water Writes Communications Consulting
Casella	Deirdre	IRC
Chattopadhyay	Chaitali	Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC)
Codonyer	Sergio	Equatorial Coca-Cola Bottling Company
Cramwinckel	Joppe	WBCSD
Cronk	Ryan	The Water Institute at UNC
Crowder	Jane	Department for International Development (DFID)
da Silva Wells	Carmen	IRC
Davis	Susan	Improve International
De Veer	Tom	Connect International
De Vette	Maaike	Aqua for All
Dickinson	Nicolas	IRC
Dietvorst	Cor	IRC
Dieuwertje	Damen	Dutch WASH Alliance
Dimling	Lilly	Global Soap Project
Dube	Amelie	IRC
Evans	Barbara	University of Leeds
Fanomeza	Rija	MCDI
Feltman	Maaike	Aqua for All
Fields	Michael	Xylem Watermark
Fisher	Michael	UNC Chapel Hill

Last Name	First Name	Company
Fonseca	Catarina	IRC
Furey	Sean	Skat Foundation
Gborie	Amos	Ministry of Health-Liberia
Gembi	Michel	DORCAS
Gesti Canuto	Jose Antonio	UNICEF
Goel	Prakhar	Control Union
Grayson	Claire	Aguaconsult
Hamilton	Helen	Sightsavers
Harvey	Erik	WaterAid
Heeger	Jan	RedCross
Holtslag	Henk	Connect International
Hurhsheas	Thomas	
Jackson	Rod	StrategicWASH
Jaffrey OBE	Marc	IRC
Jansen	Joshua	Marie-Stella-Maris
Kabore	Roger	Centre DEV Attitude
Karup Pedersen	Jesper	OECD, COWI
Keita	Malick	Global Environment & Technology Foundation
Kolham	Felia	Coca-Cola
Kouassi-Komlan	Evariste	UNICEF
Kragic Kok	Darja	LeAF
Krukkert	Ingeborg	IRC
Lammers	Ella	RVO
Le Poole	Steven	Max Foundation
Leger	Christophe	Vergnet Hydro
Liang	Kaida	The Water Institute
Libaudiere	Paul	Lib'EAU
Lockwood	Harold	Aguaconsult
Lowik	Marianne	Stichting Humana NL
Maas	Hanny	WASH Alliance
Mann	Ben	Tetra Tech ARD
Mann	Ben	WASH Advocates
Martinho	Cristina	Acquawise Consulting
McCull	Noah	charity: water
McGriff	Joanne	Center for Global Safe Water at Emory
Meerman	Robert	RAIN Foundation
Mendes	Raquel	Acquawise Consulting
Mergenthaler	Andre	Water Missions International
Mgina	Walter	SHIPO/CI
Mgina- van Vugt	Ester	DORCAS
Michaud	David	World Bank
Moe	Christine	Center for Global Safe Water at Emory University
Monse	Bella	GIZ
Morand	Nicolas	HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation
Moriarty	Patrick	IRC
Morris	Malcolm	Millennium Water Alliance
Moureaux	Camille	SeeSaw
Mukasa	Hajra	Ministry of Water and Environment
Mumbo	Gordon	Water for People
Namakula	Anne	Vitents Evides International
Neeffes	Pauline	UNICEF
Norman	Guy	WSUP
Nothomb	Christophe	IRC
Ofosu-Amaah	Naabia	Global Environment & Technology Foundation
Olugboye	Dayo	University of Wolverhampton
Oosterlee	Anita	Aqua for All

Last Name	First Name	Company
Oradei	Diana	UNESCO IHE
Panesar	Arne	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Panse	Ralf	SEAMEO INNOTECH
Pearce	Joseph	IRC
Pearce-Oroz	Glenn	WSP, World Bank
Pedlingham	Nigel	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Pelgrim-Adams	Alida	PRACTICA Foundation
Rainey	Rochelle	USAID
Ram	Pavani	University at Buffalo
Rasamoelina	Eugene de Ligori	ONG MIARINTSOA
Robb	Katharine	The Center for Global Safe Water at Emory University
Rosenbaum	Julia	USAID/WASHplus Project (FHI360)
Rowe	Ryan	The Water Institute at UNC
Saenz	Lucia	
Saltzman	Brad	Living Water International
Sayre	Ariel	Global Water Challenge
Schaub-Jones	David	SeeSaw
Schmidtke	Jürgen	PartnerAid
Schweitzer	Ryan	Aguaconsult
Shah	Seema	The Foundation Center
Sijbesma	Christine	WASH2gether
Simms	Tiambi R	BusinessOfWater
Singh	Awadhesh Narayan	Public Health Engineering and Water Supply Department
Skilling	Heather	USAID
Smet	Jo	IRC
Smets	Susanna	World Bank/WSP
Smit	S. J.	Fairwater
Smits	Stef	IRC
Soedjak	Charlotte	Akvo
Sorokovskiy	Viacheslav	DESPRO Swiss-Ukrainian Decentralisation Support Project
Spierings	Josje	Akvo
Stone	John	Stone Family Foundation
Szanto	Gabor	PRACTICA
Temple	Lewis	iDE-UK
Tolsma	Ethjel	SNV
Uytewaal	Erma	IRC
Van den Berg	Kathelyne	Akvo
van den Broek	Angela	WASH Alliance
van der Meijden	Geerte	Mott MacDonald
van der Sommen	Jeroen	Akvo Foundation
van der Ven	Coline	IRC
Van der Vliet	Hans	H2OnSite
van der Vliet	Marco	H2OnSite
Van der Voorden	Carolien	Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC)
van Galen	Ewout	Simavi
van Ginhoven	Dick	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands
van Woersem	Bert	BVW
Vargas-Ramirez	Miguel	The World Bank
Veerdig	Henk	SNV
Verplanke	Jeroen	ITC - University of Twente
Walter	Elynn	WASH Advocates
Warambourg	Camille	Stars Foundation
Weyrich	Christine	Siemens Stiftung
Yeboah	Charles	Safe Water Network
Zoued	Samia	Stars Foundation

ANNEX 2: 2014 WASH SUSTAINABILITY FORUM AGENDA (DAY 1)

Monday 30 June

- 08.30** Coffee and mingle
- 09.00** Welcome and participant introductions
Harold Lockwood, Aguaconsult;
- 09.15** Keynote address
Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS
Glenn Pearce-Oroz, WSP, World Bank
- 09.35** Background and Presentation of the Program
Brian Banks, Global Water Challenge
- 10.00** Presentation on Political Economy of Tools
Harold Lockwood, Aguaconsult
- 10.15** Track Introductions
Water Track Leads
- José Gestí Canuto, UNICEF
- Stef Smits, IRC
Sanitation Track Leads
- Guy Norman,
Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor
- Evariste Kouassi-Komlan, UNICEF
Hygiene Track Lead
- Julia Rosenbaum, WASHplus, FHI 360
- 10.45** Tea/Coffee/Health Break
- 11.00** Parallel Session I (see Track Agenda)
- Sanitation, Room E103
- Hygiene, Room E107
- Water, Rooms E104-E106
- 12.30** Lunch
- 13.30** Parallel Session II (see Track Agenda)
- Sanitation, Room E103
- Hygiene, Room E107
- Water, Rooms E104-E106
- 15.00** Tea/Coffee/Health Break
- 15.30** Parallel Session III (see Track Agenda)
- Sanitation, Room E103
- Hygiene, Room E107
- Water, Rooms E104-E106
- 17.00** Reception and Tool Fair
Welcome by Patrick Moriarty, IRC
Tools:
- Agent-Based Modelling, IRC
- Continuous Quality Improvement in WASH Programs, Water Institute at UNC
- Financing for Environmental, Affordable and Strategic Investments that Bring on Large Scale Expenditure (FEASIBLE) Tool, COWI
- FLOW, Akvo
- Governance into Functionality Tool (GiFT), CARE
- Sustainability Snapshot, WaterAid
- Technology Applicability Framework, IRC
- WASH and the Neglected Tropical Diseases: A Global Manual for WASH Implementers, Improve International and Sightsavers
- WASH Sustainability Assessment, SustainableWASH.org
- WASH Sustainability Index Tool, USAID
- Water Compass, PRACTICA Foundation
- Water Station Performance Metrics, Safe Water Network

ANNEX 2: 2014 WASH SUSTAINABILITY FORUM AGENDA (DAY 2)

Tuesday 1 July

08.30 Coffee and mingle

09.00 Recap of Day 1 and Outline for Day 2

Track Leads

09.30 Keynote

Patrick Moriarty, IRC

10.00 Tea/Coffee/Health Break

10.30 Parallel Session IV (see Track Agenda)

- Sanitation, Room E103

- Hygiene, Room E107

- Water, Rooms E104-E106

12.00 Lunch/Pecha Kucha

Facilitator: Ariel Sayer, Global Water Challenge

Presenters:

ODF Program in Nepal

Ben Ayers, dZi Foundation

**Sustainability Monitoring Framework (SMF)
and its Sustainability Index (SI)**

Kristof Bostoan, IRC

Resolution Action Brief

Susan Davis, Improve International

The “U” Approach

Dr. Rija Fanomezza, Medical Care

Development International

TAF

Sean Furey, Rural Water Supply Network

SMART Centers

Walter Mgina, SHIPO/CI

Akvo FLOW

Charlotte Soedjak, Akvo Foundation

13.00 Applying Tools and Approaches:
Panel Discussion

Moderator: Elynn Walter, WASH Advocates

Panelists:

- Erik Harvey, WaterAid

- Evariste Kouassi-Komlan, UNICEF

- Naabia Ofofu-Amaah, Global Environment
Technology Foundation

- Dick van Ginhoven, DGIS

15.00 Tea/Coffee/Health Break

15.30 Wrap-up/Feedback/Next Steps

Synthesis of the Forum

*Julia Boulenouar and Ryan Schweitzer,
Aguaconsult*

Quick fire question session

with participants

Next Steps

Brian Banks, Global Water Challenge

16.45 Closure

ANNEX 3: FULL LIST OF TOOLS PRESENTED DURING THE FORUM

Water	
WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tool (WASH BAT)	http://www.ircwash.org/resources/wash-bottleneck-analysis-tool-wash-bat
AtWhatCost	http://klemme.tap.waterforpeople.org/files/atwhatcost-tools
CUPPS	http://epa.gov/cupps/
Sustainability Metric for Assessing Safe Water Access in Healthcare Facilities	-
SIASAR	http://siasar.org/sistema/login.php
Sanitation	
Service Delivery Assessment Approach to Faecal Sludge Management	http://www.wsp.org/sites/wsp.org/files/publications/WSP-Fecal-Sludge-12-City-Review-Research-Brief.pdf
CSO/SDA/MAPAS Scorecard	-
WASHCost Calculator	http://www.ircwash.org/washcost
Sustainability Checks	http://wedc.lboro.ac.uk/resources/conference/34/Godfrey_S_-_719.pdf
Hygiene	
Assessing hygiene cost-effectiveness : a methodology	http://www.ircwash.org/resources/assessing-hygiene-cost-effectiveness-methodology
Handwashing Promotion: Monitoring & Evaluation Module	http://globalhandwashing.org/sites/default/files/UNICEF%20M%26E%20Toolkit%20Final%2011-24%20Low%20Res.pdf
Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluating Household Water Treatment and Safe Storage	http://www.who.int/household_water/resources/toolkit_monitoring_evaluating/en/
Fit for School	http://www.fitforschool.ph/
Tool Fair	
Technology Applicability Framework	http://www.washtechnologies.net/en/
Water Compass	http://www.watercompass.info/dst/sanitation/
Agent-Based Modelling	http://www.ircwash.org/news/tools-change#
Water Station Performance Metrics	-
FLOW	http://akvo.org/products/akvoflow/
Financing for Environmental, Affordable and Strategic Investments that Bring on Large-scale Expenditure (FEASIBLE) Tool	http://www.oecd.org/env/outreach/methodologyandfeasiblecomputermodel.htm
Sustainability Snapshot	http://www.wateraid.org/~media/Publications/indicators-water-sector-malawi.pdf
WASH Sustainability Index Tool	http://www.washplus.org/rotary-usaid
WASH/NTD Toolkit	http://endtheneglect.org/2014/03/new-manuals-on-ntds-for-wash-practioners/
WASH Sustainability Assessment	http://sustainablewash.org/self-assess
Continuous Quality Improvement in WaSH programs	http://waterinstitute.unc.edu/monitoring-evaluation-learning/