

GTF programme findings and recommendations from the *Final Evaluation and Global Impact Assessment*

The Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF) programme has been implemented successfully in 16 countries across Africa, Asia and Central America since 2008. The aim was to improve the accountability and responsiveness of duty bearers to ensure equitable and sustainable access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) for the poorest and most marginalised people. Working with 30 Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) across 16 countries, the programme used a sustainable rights-based approach to hold governments to account through evidence-based advocacy.

Over the past few months a global evaluation and separate impact assessment were conducted, building on country-level evaluations and impact assessments. This document brings together the executive summaries of both the *GTF Global Evaluation Report* and the *GTF Global Impact Assessment Report*.

It was agreed that country programmes would be responsible for selecting and hiring evaluator(s) to conduct the impact assessment as well as the final evaluation.

In spite of clear guidance and ongoing support, and although a number of countries produced robust impact assessment reports, some country programmes experienced a number of challenges in selecting evaluators who were able to deliver quality reports on time.



Primary School children on World Toilet Day

It is hoped this document will summarise the key insights, findings and recommendations that emerged from the two reports, but also guide future governance work.

The results are intended for use by all stakeholders working on demand and supply side governance. Ultimately lessons from this governance and transparency programme aim to increasing the accountability and responsiveness of duty-bearers globally to increase WASH service provision for everyone, everywhere.

[Read the full Final Global Evaluation here.](#)

[Read the full Global Impact Assessment Report here.](#)

For more information on the GTF programme, contact Papa Diouf, Programme Manager at papadiouf@wateraid.org

Executive Summary, *Global Impact Assessment*

This impact assessment has been commissioned by WaterAid. It serves a different but complementary purpose to the required DFID final evaluation. It is designed to support an honest and realistic understanding of the changes that the programme was able to achieve; and what WA and other stakeholders might do differently to secure greater changes in future programmes of this type.

The impact assessment applied a Theory of Change approach in order to facilitate an explicit focus on change; to reflect on the ways in which the GTF programme was able influence and achieve expected changes in its areas of operation, and to question the extent to which the Theory of Change was valid.

GTF Programme Theory of Change and Impact Assessment Framework

The impact assessment framework was informed by The DFID's CAR framework and their own expressed weighting for the GTF programmes; and the GTF programme development process within WaterAid at global and country level. It explored four key domains of change:

- Changes in the ways that CSOs function and network, and their capacity to influence WASH policies at all levels;
- Engaging communities in decision making processes;
- Ways in which members of local communities demand accountability and responsiveness;
- Changes in the ways that governments and service providers are accountable to citizens and end users in the WASH sector.

A detailed change pathway framework for the impact assessment was developed by the evaluator (see below). This pathway, together with a set of assumptions to test as part of the impact assessment process, appears in the full report. The evaluator highlights the importance of understanding that, in this GTF programme, the GTF **direct sphere of influence** stretches only as far as the target groups it works directly with. The implication is that **changes recorded for partners, networks and CSOs are assessed more rigorously than those for government (at all levels), and community members**



Conclusions

- There are numerous examples of effective networks having galvanised the voices of CSOs and contributing effectively to sector debates, policy development and changes in both responsiveness and provision of services. But this picture is, not surprisingly, not consistent bearing in mind the very diverse sizes and roles of the “networks” that are included in the programme.
- The findings do not tell us whether the networks are the only way of amplifying CSO voice and capacity. In some cases, alternative ways of galvanising and representing the voice of the community might be more effectively carried out by less formal entities or coalitions of interest.
- The report indicates that, on the whole, the most successful results have been achieved by organisations who were already working effectively before they became involved in the GTF programme (CONIWAS in Ghana and RICHE in Burkina Faso, for example), and that the programme enabled them to use their already established skills set to work towards common goals. Although there are other examples of less established organisations thriving as a result of GTF (VARENS in Zambia, FANSA in South Asia, and NICE in Malawi for example), it is worth reflecting on the extent to which GTF efforts are better spent on “backing a winning horse” as opposed to training up a novice in the hopes that it will become a winner.
- CSOs form a key role both within the communities in which they work, and with representing and amplifying the voice of the community with power holders and duty bearers. There have been very significant successes resulting from CSOs making sound judgement calls about how best to engage communities and facilitate their efforts to target the right decision makers in the right time and the right way.
- The opportunity to learn about and use a menu of new tools and methods for advocacy has been instrumental in ensuring that CSO staff is indeed stronger, more confident and more focused. Where there have been resounding successes, it is inspirational to note the way in which both CSOs and the community are confident and skilled enough to apply themselves to pushing for changes in other sectors.
- The findings do not cover examples where advocacy efforts have failed, and why.
- Although GTF has supported significant changes for communities in the WASH sector, it has not been possible to comment on the scope or scale of these results with confidence.
- There are some excellent examples of citizens’ voices and the results of their demands being fed into national fora and plans (India, for example).
- Equity and inclusion was not systematically embedded into the GTF programme, with the result that there is not a consistent focus on the marginalised members of the community.
- Where the focus has been explicitly on inclusion, as in India for example, the quality of life for the more marginalised members of the community appears to have improved dramatically in relation to WASH and, in some cases, other sectors.
- Although there are powerful examples of citizens acting for them in a number of cases, this is not consistently happening and is not characteristic of every country programme.
- There is a question mark and argument around whether to focus on fewer countries and communities and work for real and lasting transformation against “going large” and reaping some rewards in some areas.
- The many illustrations of ways in which duty bearers have been shamed, forced and/or encouraged to respond to the demands of citizens is remarkable; and the GTF

programme must take credit for the changes that have resulted in terms of changes in leverage, policy and legislation, and increased access to services.

- There is evidence to show that duty bearers do respond more effectively if they engage constructively with communities. But the other assumptions that underpin this Domain would benefit from further reflection: for example, communities may be more confident in demanding their rights, but what if there is systemic corruption (Uganda and Nigeria for example)? What if the District Official who has been supporting them moves to another position? What if there is civil unrest (Mali)?

Recommendations

The recommendations fall into three groups: Theory of Change, programme management and learning. They are designed to strengthen subsequent GTF type programmes in terms of its conceptual clarity, ongoing programme management and ultimately improving the impact of these types of programmes. (The names in brackets indicate who the recommendation is for):

Theories of Change

- Revisit and strengthen the CAR framework (DFID)
- Revitalise and strengthen a global Theory of Change for Governance and Transparency in
- the context of Water Aid's overall strategy and portfolio of programmes (WaterAid globally)

Programme Management

- Develop a programme management package that supports this new type of programming.
- (WaterAid globally and Country Programme offices).
- Plan to conduct a full impact assessment of this and any future work that WaterAid undertakes in relation to governance and transparency in five years time

Learning

- Ensure that lessons learned from this GTF programme are fed into future sector programming (DFID, FAN, WaterAid globally and country programmes); and that materials produced as a result of the programme are shared widely and strategically.

Executive Summary, *Final Global Evaluation*

Purpose, Scope, and Audience of the Review

This independent evaluation was commissioned by WaterAid UK, in accordance with its contract with DFID. Its main purpose is an assessment of the degree to which the programme purpose stated in the logical framework has been achieved, the reasons for this progress, and how it has contributed to the overall GTF objectives of strengthening capability, accountability and responsiveness to make governance work for the poor.

Conclusions

The conclusions are presented by evaluation criteria and are given a traffic light according to the Global Evaluation Rating. So, 1 and 2 are green, 3 is amber, and 4 and 5 are red. Finally the report closes with numbered and prioritised recommendations to DFID and WaterAid. Where possible the recommendations have been targeted at specific departments in WaterAid.

Evaluation Criteria	Rating and Traffic Light	Summary	Some examples of how, with hindsight, the programme could have been improved? These are illustrations before the recommendations.
Relevance	2	WASH problems require context specific solutions. This is amplified in a governance or RBA programme; where partners work with citizens to build voice around an issue. The flexible funding of GTF has allowed CSOs and networks to invest in very relevant national, regional and local advocacy priorities. For WaterAid, it has provided the opportunity to connect with international priorities. Unfortunately however the lack of a relevant regional structure in Africa has had an impact.	WaterAid may have benefited from approaching existing Pan African networks to see how they could be supported after ANEW was dropped as crucial network partners.

Efficiency	3	<p>The inefficiencies of the inception phase have had an impact on the GTF. No new systems or processes were established to manage the GTF. WaterAid has excellent risk and financial management processes that have been externally validated. An established Internal Audit team completed a timely review of the GTF in line with risk which resulted in key governance changes and better alignment of financial accounting systems. While there have been some 'unexpected' differences in budgeted versus expenditure for certain countries, on the whole this can be explained by the 'outsourcing' of the programme management to a new regional network (FANCA). The underspend is clearly a function of partner financial mismanagement that was identified and dealt with appropriately. Current projections suggest WaterAid will spend its £5m. Finally the link between significant expenditure and programme outputs has been established; the emphasis has been on building capability and demand.</p>	<p>While there is great merit in harmonising systems, arguably this programme was new to WaterAid on two fronts: i) it was its first advocacy only programme; and, ii) it was the biggest multi-country programme at that time. Therefore, perhaps with hindsight it might have been valuable to consider the drivers of monitoring and performance measurement before committing to management structures and existing MEL systems and processes. The lack of an ongoing aggregated view of programme performance has made it very difficult to assess performance. From a governance point of view, the lack of a regional African network meant that there was no comparable monitoring structure for Africa in comparison to Central America and South Asia who had regional logframes. Therefore there is nothing between the global view of the global logframe and the country level partner driven logframes.</p>
Value for Money	3	<p>There is a positive message from this section; direct investment in advocacy works. The GTF has been good value for money. The flexible nature of the funding has had a direct contribution to this result.</p>	<p>Again, perhaps because of how new this type and size of programme was to WaterAid, there could have been greater or more visible linkages with the Policy Department from the beginning. So that over the course of the term of the grant, IPD was kept up to date with thinking and methodologies on measuring influencing.</p>

Equity	3	<p>When progress against the Global Strategy was reviewed, the GTF work in India often provided the best examples of empowering people who were previously voiceless. It is difficult however to move from a general increased awareness of people being marginalised to then differentiating amongst the marginalised and more generalised systemic change. It is conceivable that a different level of sophistication is required to pick up on a more subtle sub-division of voices to empower people. We should begin to ask, how long does it take to move from being disempowered to being empowered in a governance programme? Then WaterAid can begin to develop its own empowerment model. Perhaps providing WASH solutions is the easy step. Through this development process, staff ability to understand the empowerment process will be tested and therefore the impact of GTF will be further understood. There remains a lot to be done before a final global evaluation across 16 countries is able to find evidence which points, for example, to women fully and freely participating in civic discussions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the monitoring and evaluation system and approach to tackling equity needs to be strengthened in order to capture better data. Across the portfolio there is very limited evidence of connectedness between local networks and the national level with central government and donors on the one hand and then on the other, national networks working with local governments and service providers. Neither direction (upward nor downward) is consistently being responsive to the needs and rights of these groups.</p>	<p>Defining how to integrate equity into advocacy and expectations management would have assisted GTF partners.</p>
--------	---	---	---

Effectiveness	3	<p>Similarly to the MTR, five countries were given a green traffic light meaning in the case of the final evaluation, they had met their objectives. Costa Rica, Mali and Uganda were joined by India and Ghana who moved from amber to green. The poor quality of Honduras' final country evaluation made it very difficult to assess progress and it moved from green to amber. Nicaragua dropped from green to an amber/red. In contrast, Malawi has convincingly moved from red to amber/green. Ethiopia, Burkina Faso and Madagascar have been solid performers (amber at both MTR and FE). Nigeria moved from amber to an amber/red and Guatemala has dropped from amber to red. Again the poor evidence base (final country evaluation) meant the evaluator was unable to sufficiently validate and verify progress. In contrast, Bangladesh has move on from red to amber. Kenya and Zambia remained on red.</p> <p>The GTF has struggled with collecting robust monitoring data on governance advocacy changes and has not used suitable indicators for this purpose. The final logframes were of poor quality and working at the output level. It has therefore been difficult, without data from a programme monitoring framework to assess progress against the purpose statement.</p>	<p>By recognising from the outset that it would take more time to understand the move away from service delivery programming to solely advocacy governance. GTF is an innovative attempt to revamp the institutional mechanism that would allow for greater community participation and theoretically greater accountability and transparency.</p> <p>By increasing the type of monitoring with GTF partners (once they were WaterAid partners) to understand what was happening and to generate feedback between beneficiaries and organisations on the governance advocacy process. Better outcomes, better indicators. This could have been done more comprehensively. One common limitation of partners across the programme is their inability to spread the "programme influence zone" to district and state levels. Perhaps a different indicator could have been put forward at the Mid-Term point that was more realistic.</p>
---------------	---	--	---

Partnership & Mgt Arrangements	2	<p>In 2010 ANEW, the East African FAN network was dropped from GTF because of misappropriation of funds. WaterAid has learned significantly from the GTF partnering arrangements; how to give evidence to the HR Commissioner; how to make linkages with other network partnerships, how to build transparent platforms at local and regional levels. The flexibility in funding also allowed for partnerships with existing strong performers, collaboration with established networks and creating space for new networks to fail and be replaced by new and different models. There is high demand for capacitated networks that can competently span the gap between the local and the national level. Positioned correctly, at the right time, the results are tremendous.</p>	<p>By debating and agreeing what a CSO is, its purpose and setting expectations of how a CSO interacts with different players at local, regional and national levels. Refining a way of 'understanding' what modus operandi was being used by GTF partners (networks, forum, partnerships, civil platforms, network of partnerships) and what this meant for the country before the GTF began. Ultimately this then informs the portfolio wide Theory of Change.</p>
--------------------------------	---	---	--

Advocacy	4	<p>WaterAid is not systematically monitoring their influencing. GTF was an opportunity to try and monitor their contribution in relation to other stakeholders and begin to put some sort of value (high, medium or low), that is if WaterAid chooses not to 'count numbers'.</p> <p>The GTF Programme has shown the value in consensual insider advocacy, useful tools and integrating influencing with a sustainable programming approach. But arguably this view requires refreshing as frequently as the analysis of governance and drivers in the sector as well as the power relations. The key is understanding more clearly what WaterAid's advocacy niche is and being able to track this contribution as it relates to agreed changes they are trying to influence. To do this they can look at who else is doing what, the general dynamics of the sector and how actors are associated to each other, and find out what difference their advocacy is making in relation to changes in numbers. Then it is a question of finding resources to continue with governance advocacy.</p>	<p>By agreeing what the role of media was at various levels. For example, an interesting dynamic for future consideration is how countries directly or indirectly employ the use of media. The final global evaluation found that there is a real contrast between those who have used the media in a more standard form eg mobilisation for global or national WASH days, press releases etc and sometimes monitored the resulting media activity, as compared to those who have set up a media partnership from the outset. Examples of the latter can be seen in the case of Burkina Faso's Information and Communication Network on Water, Hygiene and Sanitation (RICHE) or in Uganda's successful use of radio programmes. In Burkina Faso, a press caravan took local elected representatives to poor areas. In the case of Uganda, a community radio programme provided an opportunity for the community members to call in and contribute their solutions on how the duty bearers could address the WASH situation. This led to resolution of issues by the government through construction of water points and toilets.</p>
----------	---	---	--

Sustainability	3	<p>WaterAid's management systems are geared to regulate and manage risks associated with reducing sustainability. However, it is not clear how these 'organisational' values were aligned with GTF. Some exit planning has been carried out and the leverage figures positively note new/additional grants. However it is the models of engagement that provide the most interesting conclusions. The various modalities for partnering have an impact on the sustainability of the outcomes. WaterAid needs to better understand the differences between different types of networks, at different levels and choose what works best for the sector. Then integrate this way of working/ roll out consciously with programme implementation.</p>	<p>By recognising the different roles that WaterAid and FAN needed to take earlier on in the programme. This was not a 'partnership'. Making country programmes the ultimate 'owner' of GTF partners before the mid-term point, when it was clear that regional structures were not working and FAN was not capable of running the MEL of a programme of this size. When WaterAid's role became more dominant, due to compliance requirements, it would have also improved integration of GTF and therefore impact, if more focus had been placed on featuring GTF within the country programme strategy.</p>
Replication and Innovation	1	<p>The mapping of evidence against the sustainability model built during GTF demonstrates the highly innovative and replicable nature of GTF. There are many reasons to be optimistic. To echo the first quarter report by the GTF Programme Manager, 'A five-year governance programme is a relatively short strategic intervention, in relation to ensuring that progress is sustainable. Indeed, few WaterAid/FAN GTF programme partners would claim that transformations in governments or communities have been total, or that, at this point, their sustainability can be guaranteed... [However], this provides a sound foundation for future developments.' (WaterAid/FAN 2013:5:27)</p>	<p>The Learning Handbooks are a great resource. Perhaps it would also have been good to highlight how replication and innovation sit within a sustainability approach.</p>

Impact	3	<p>By building and embedding consensus on the programme theory of change at the design stage. How do outputs contribute to the purpose; more courage in agreeing what was in and out of scope for the programme e.g. this was a small scale programme at the country level, what was a realistic contribution for it to make?' This was not a programme that could tackle governance at all layers, so opt out of supply side or alternatively, tackle everything on a smaller scale.</p>
--------	---	--

Recommendations

The following recommendations are designed to strengthen future governance programmes in WaterAid and DFID both in terms of conceptual clarity and programme management:

For DFID (and other potential donors)

1. Revisit and strengthen the CAR framework and develop this into a more coherent Theory of Change which provides an overview of how change happens in relation to governance and transparency, a clearly articulated vision of change, the potential role for networks, NGOs and CSOs in this context, and the assumptions that it makes along the way. This is likely to result in more joined up efforts across the board. Perhaps DFID could consider giving more guidance on how impact/contribution should be monitored, especially in multi-country programmes.
2. For multi-country programmes there is a need to revise the Final Evaluation TOR. The TOR would be more useful if it were a synthesis and gave the grantee flexibility to adapt the questions. For example replace advocacy question on country level impact to how far did GTF shape CSP advocacy priorities?

For WaterAid: PSU: Monitoring Programmatically

3. Learn from the experience of managing and strategically 'owning' a multi-country programme; carry out a comprehensive review of current systems and processes' 'suitability' for large and/or multi-country programmes. This review is of strategic importance given the current size of the programme portfolio in IPD and the delayed roll out of the global management information system. Work with the final evaluator and impact assessor to design the Terms of Reference so that questions like the following are answered: what is the required guidance for MEL of large multi-country programmes? What is good practice in terms of roles and responsibilities to donor and to WaterAid? Who owns the programmes at a senior level? Why is monitoring from intermediate outcome level to purpose level difficult? How can the MEL system be adapted for larger programmes to provide a useful system for Programme Managers? In future, how will countries be selected for large donor programmes? Generally reflect on what could be done better next time.

4. Refresh the IPD Approach Paper for the next Strategic period: Given what this evaluation has brought to light, how might WaterAid now choose to hone its approaches over the next Global Strategy period for: i) designing governance advocacy programmes; ii) assessing impact of governance work; and ,iii) monitoring multi-country programmes.
5. Review the remit, role and responsibilities of the Regional Advocacy Managers: how do they prioritise their time at country versus regional level? What linkages are they encouraging and for whom?

For WaterAid: For IPD and Policy Department

6. Continue to invest in and build on results of governance advocacy work from GTF.
7. Be bold and build a governance advocacy strategy (theory of change and framework) for WaterAid and look at how refreshing the Sustainability Framework (to integrate this work) could create a 'blueprint' for sustainable programming. Arguably a worthy successor to citizen action has been found. A longer term model of engagement, building capacity of partners and strengthening networks. It has strengthened the bottom up processes of advocacy work and complimented the top down work of SWA. It has understood the different types of advocacy required for influencing.
8. Develop a framework for assessing influencing, look at work being done throughout the sector to address difficult contribution/attribution issues – DFID, WSP, UNICEF, PLAN. There is a wealth of data from GTF programmes to test the tool on within different contexts. Please refer to the excellent GTF change pathway and impact assessment framework in the Global Impact Assessment Report for a starting point.
9. Begin to sketch out a process (perhaps as part of the next Global Strategy) parallel to the post-implementation surveys for 'assessing the impact' of Advocacy, Influencing and Policy programmes. The rationale here is that the 'unexpected' positive and negative impacts of programmes in governance advocacy are slowly emerging and the sector could learn much from them. Given the evidence from this final global evaluation, WaterAid could do more to make their programmes sustainable. Begin to address the complexity of supply and demand side governance. Integrate with IPD to build a sustainable programming approach to: i) corruption in local, state, national governments (for example Uganda or Nigeria); ii) when local government employees, District Officers move to another position; and iii) managing the change if there is an election (Mali and Malawi). It stands to reason that demand must be balanced by capacity, resources and motivation on the supply side if programmes are to be sustainable and universal access to WASH is to be achieved.
10. Explore how/if WaterAid CPs in Africa could begin to feed into a global framework on governance such as the Ibrahim Index of African Governance¹. Use the evidence from GTF as 'a crisis of governance' in the WASH sector to open up discussions with donors.

For WaterAid: Senior Management Team

11. If WaterAid wants to be an inspiring leader in WASH, it could consider integrating, where possible, governance advocacy into international programming during the

¹ Please see further information at www.moibrahimfoundation.org/interact/. This index now contains historical data from 2007 onwards and is increasingly recognised as a sustainable and longer term method of monitoring change. Under Human Development and Welfare the Index contains data on access to water and sanitation.

next Global Strategy period. What is the 'operating package' that drives value for money: is it based on an accurate and up to date understanding of power relations (at the national, regional and international level) and works towards sustainable programming?

12. Package up a WaterAid RBA to community empowerment and start to organisationally address why and when WaterAid should lead in countries where there is limited CSO and CBO capacity. Use the examples set by SATHEE in India to have difficult conversations and understand how WaterAid will respond to communities who no longer seek funding but strategic support (links to recommendation above).
13. Put equity centre stage: provide the Equity and Inclusion Senior Officer with space to lead on producing a learning paper tackling the complexity of how WaterAid could operationalise RBA across international programmes and policy based on the experience of GTF partners (e.g. SATHEE in India). Reflect on what evidence did and did not come through in the Global final evaluation. Are there any remedies that can be integrated into current workplans? The GTF Programme has contributed to WaterAid employees and partners now having a much more nuanced understanding of governance, transparency and accountability at the local level. Because WaterAid only seeks to work with the poorest of the poor and the consistently excluded, this greater level of sophistication means that difficult questions will become more and more central to the sustainability of programmes. Test out some of the implicit assumptions that remain unanswered after GTF: why do certain countries require more work to create capability before empowerment can take place and rights can be demanded? Which countries and why? What does this say about their and your Theory of Change?
14. Strengthen and reinforce the work that has begun in annual reporting by CPs on contextual drivers and leverage figures. Publish a position statement on why WaterAid believes assessing rather than measuring impact is the way forward for sustainable and equitable programming. Demonstrate why leverage figures can better reflect sector effectiveness.
15. Hold a roundtable discussion on: Who is WaterAid partnering with at the global level and for what purpose? Given the emphasis on developing the post-2015 global targets for development, how best can WaterAid position itself to deliver universal access to WASH?
16. Commission further research on network partnerships to fully understand the phenomenon that is emerging in the CSO space and consider how, given the crowded nature of the landscape, WaterAid is best placed to 'use' this model for delivery and sustainable programming. Address the conflicts that emerged from the GTF Programme around WaterAid supporting the set-up of national platforms and then being unable to retract or detach itself due to financial instability and how this perception is borne out with local partners (and members) of the platform.
17. Commission a project to advise on new and innovative knowledge management options for the next Global Strategy. WaterAid must strive not to let the wealth of data, publications (partner related, country related) that has been built up from the GTF. By commissioning a study, WaterAid begins to tackle the problem of information overload and how appropriate and useful dissemination supports wider sectoral development (an issue that is bigger than GTF).