

Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

Title: WaterAid PPA (General) PPA Extension 2014-2016		
Programme Value: £ 4,200,410 pa (£21,002,050 2011-2016)	Review Date: 1 July 2015	
Programme Code: 202621	Start Date: 1 April 2014	End Date: 31 March 2015

Summary of Programme Performance

Year	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15			
Programme Score	A	A+	A+	A+			
Risk Rating	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium			

Summary of progress and lessons learnt since last review

WaterAid has made excellent progress in 2014/15. Most notably at the global level, we made a significant contribution in the UN post-2015 process by engaging decision makers to ensure that the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include ambitious targets for universal access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). For example, through WaterAid's involvement in the 2014 Climate Change Summit, our Chief Executive addressed Heads of State on the role of WASH in the environmentally oriented SDGs. In Uganda our programme played an active role in the national consultation which was overseen by H.E. Sam Kutesa who has since played a pivotal role as the President of the UN General Assembly. The Africa Water Week in Dakar in May 2014 was an important moment for our advocacy, successfully securing a dedicated goal on water and sanitation, which was then included in the Dakar declaration. Until this point, whilst there was substantial support for a goal to be focused on water, there was still insufficient public support for a goal that explicitly focused on sanitation as well. WaterAid engaged in support and influencing activities to ensure African country governments publically backed a dedicated goal on water and sanitation in the Dakar declaration. This achievement and other influencing agendas, as well as our work with the media, parliamentarians, private sector and various stakeholders, has increased ours and our partners' resolve in promoting WASH. In 2015 we launched our Global Advocacy Priority on WASH and Child Health, '*Healthy Start*' and in 14/15 invested energy and thinking in developing and launching our new Global Strategy '*Everyone, Everywhere 2030*'.

At a programme level, the PPA is used strategically as part of our unrestricted funding and allows us to fund all our Country Programmes to deliver water and sanitation programmes and policy work, which has directly supported 2,021,673 people with access to water and 3,145,419 people to access sanitation, which was respectively in-line and significantly above expectations and contributes directly to DFIDs WASH target. We continue to make progress in embedding our programmatic approach, helping us to link learning from our practice work to our policy influencing work. Through our programmatic approach, we worked within a continuum that enables us to act and reflect based on constant analysis of what works, what doesn't and where we can make the greatest impact. We prioritised and invested in developing our equity, inclusion and rights based work, and continued our focus on strengthening sustainability to ensure we are delivering services that last. Emphasis was placed on strengthening partnerships both in diversifying partnerships to meet our strategic aims and improving the quality of our existing ones. Using our first ever partnership survey and Partnership in Practice trainings, we examined the outcomes to better inform our partnership approaches. With recognition that the Millennium Development Goal for sanitation is off-track, we broadened our sanitation approaches, looking beyond community-led total sanitation (CLTS), to develop sanitation marketing and school sanitation with varying levels of results in our countries. Further, we convened important workshops on sanitation and on the Human Rights Based approach. From

learning and experience in previous PPA years, we were better able to respond to challenges faced during the year. These ranged from political instability in Burkina Faso, the Ebola crisis in West Africa and the earthquakes in Nepal.

Summary of recommendations and actions for the next year

We made good progress in addressing recommendations from last year's report. Our tracking tool focus has shifted from the number of research pieces carried out to instead tracking dissemination of this research. We have broadened our evidence base for this report to increase the credibility and reliability of our reporting. A key action for 2015/16 has arisen from our Post Implementation Monitoring Surveys (PIMS), which highlighted weaknesses in long-term on-going support to users in the form of: management, financial and technical assistance to keep services running. WaterAid will be prioritising these areas as part of our programme design as well as addressing wider sector capacity through our sector strengthening work.

DFID Response

WaterAid have produced a clear, strong report, with an overall sound narrative. Individual sections discussed throughout the report and progress against each section were reviewed with WaterAid during 2015. Comments throughout the report are based on the narrative provided and subsequent discussion with WaterAid and with DFID's WASH team.

DFID welcomes the progress outlined in this section. WaterAid are to be congratulated on the reaching a total number of 2,021,673 people with access to water and 3,145,419 with access to safe sanitation – a small underachievement on water targets and an over-achievement on sanitation targets. The underachievement on water targets was caused by changes to legislation in East Africa restricting the way WaterAid could work with some of its partnerships.

We were pleased to learn that PPA funded programming has supported WaterAid's programme work enabling them to meet most of their targets. PPA funding is used strategically and its benefit and influence impacts across WaterAid's programmes. The PPA however has also been beneficial in supporting WaterAid to improve its influencing impact i.e. influencing governments; donors; supporters and key development actors about the crucial importance of WASH activities (and the links to health outcomes) and they should be credited for contributing to ensuring that there is now a specific SDG goal around water and sanitation.

WaterAid represents very good value for money with both extensive reach through the country networks as well as penetration through a wide range of partners operating in hard to reach, under-served villages and overcrowded, under-served, highly contaminated marginal urban environments. WaterAid is always on the front line with advocacy, learning and challenge which provides a healthy safety check on DFID WASH activities in general and the global sector. It is good to see that there is a real effort to integrate services into national programmes particularly school work and that funds are ear-marked to provide WASH services for people living with disability.

DFID would be particularly interested to learn more about WaterAid's work ensuring long-term sustainability of programmes and on-going support to users in next year's report.

A. Introduction and Context (1 page)

DevTracker Link to Business Case:	DFID
DevTracker Link to Log frame:	DFID

Outline of the programme

WaterAid's *Everyone Everywhere* report (March 2013) estimates that *'at least 783 million people still lack clean water and that taking population growth into account, there are almost as many people without access to sanitation worldwide as there were 20 years ago.'* We have evidence from over 32 years of experience that human development efforts and poverty reduction interventions are constantly undermined where access to clean water and sanitation are lacking. An experience that resonates with DFID's Policy paper, 2010 to 2015 government policy: water and sanitation in developing countries (May 2015), which highlights that *'Diarrhoea kills 4,000 children every day around the world. In Africa, it is the leading killer of children under 5 years old, causing more deaths than AIDS, malaria and measles combined. But there are very simple solutions to this problem - clean drinking water, hygienic toilets and effective hand washing.'* WaterAid's PPA aims to transform lives by improving access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene in the world's poorest communities. With support from DFID's PPA we have seen significant advancements against all four aims in our Global Strategy (2009-2015). For example, the complete review of our finance and programme management systems is well underway and expected to revolutionise our ways of working across all Country Programmes, increasing our organisational effectiveness and improving our ability to deliver against our own, and the PPA logframe. The PPA also supports our Global Strategy ambition to enable a further 25 million people to have access to basic services as a direct result of our work, and to reach an additional 100 million people through our influencing work. WaterAid's work supported by the PPA is a key contributor to the progression of DFID's WASH target as our programme responds directly to DFID's goal to reach 60 million people with access to water, sanitation and/or hygiene by 2015. The PPA has enabled WaterAid to support the SDG initiative through a number of activities ranging from direct support and influence with member states to engaging civil society across our Country Programmes so they are actively calling on their Governments to support the SDGs. Whilst WaterAid has only played a very small part in the process, we believe the inclusion of a Water and Sanitation SDG is a huge success and a massive step forward from the MDGs where WASH was excluded.

Over the two year PPA extension period we aim to work with our local partners to reach a total of 4 million people with water and 5.5 million with sanitation by March 2016, which contributes to our new overall aim of securing universal access to WASH by 2030. In development of our new strategy, we identified that this requires transformational change in the sector and that WaterAid cannot deliver this alone, and that we need to invest our energy in leveraging and influencing decision makers to help make this change. Externally, 2015 represents a key year in development with the UN Financing for Development meeting and UN General Assembly providing significant opportunities to engage with sector stakeholders. Our other key result areas reflect this and include: ensuring increased capacity for collective action by civil society and non-sector actors to campaign effectively for the rights of the poor to WASH; ensuring our global and national influencing work is contributing to more people potentially having access to water and sanitation and that in the countries where WaterAid works in Africa and Asia, WASH is recognised as an essential element of Health in national development frameworks and sector policies and implementation programmes.

In this reporting period we have continued to support the delivery of equitable, sustainable and scalable WASH interventions across the four regions of West, Southern, East Africa and South Asia. We carried out critical reviews across key thematic areas such as sustainability, Equity

and Inclusion showing us where we need to concentrate resources to improve the consistency and quality of our programmes. We supported specific initiatives in Country Programmes and regions that have produced evidence taken up for programming and advocacy, and made concrete contributions to sector wide learning.

Under the PPA, WaterAid have directly contributed to DFID's broader international development priorities on health through our direct engagement with the health sector enabling us to link our programme and policy work with health outcomes. Our second Global Advocacy Priority '*Healthy Start*' focuses on child health, providing the space to develop and deepen WASH linkages with the health sector. We have contributed to improving education through our work with the Ministries of Education by influencing school curricula to include WASH and developing and influencing the capacity of Ministries and those working directly with schools. The increased focus from DFID on evidencing through the PPA has encouraged us to prioritise the need to evidence progress and change more clearly. This is especially true for hard to measure activities such as advocacy and policy work. Therefore, within *Healthy Start* there is a commitment to evaluate, learn and demonstrate progress against indicators. This process is being embedded within the work plan and developing a process of continuous monitoring within this four year advocacy priority.

The WaterAid Coffey In Depth Review reports that the predictability of the PPA funding has given us space to reflect on our internal needs and invest in our Programmatic Approach which is a fundamental shift in our delivery style. While pieces of work such as this would be conducted without the PPA, the report notes that the PPA allows us to 'do better what was already being done or would have been done' without the PPA.

DFID Response

WaterAid have provided an excellent outline of the PPA and the overarching aims of PPA funding. We welcome details on how PPA funding is being spent; both in terms of supporting strategic investment and institutional strengthening.

We are pleased with WaterAid's ambition to ensure that everyone, everywhere has access to clean water and safe sanitation by 2030. This fits entirely with DFID's WASH vision. WaterAid's latest television advert states the 2030 aim clearly and it is refreshing to see how open and transparent they are including to the wider British public who may not necessarily be financial supporters of WaterAid. WaterAid's have linked their WASH work more to health outcomes in this reporting year. Their programming and institutional effectiveness work goes further now to evidence results against health and education outcomes which is welcomed.

It is interesting to note that they have, over the last few years, gone through an organisational shift of reviewing their partnerships, focussing more on the quality of partnerships and not the quantity. WaterAid acknowledge that they alone cannot meet the universal access for all target by 2030 and the capacity of partners will be a crucial step in the journey.

We look forward to hearing more about progress of '*Healthy Start*' in next year's report and how improvements/developments have positively influenced child health outcomes.

B: PERFORMANCE AND CONCLUSIONS (1-2 pages)

Annual outcome assessment

WaterAid are on track to achieve the three outcomes at the end of the programme. During 2014/15 we have strong evidence from regions and countries of increased confidence by civil society to lead change. **Outcome 1:** Our international advocacy efforts on the post-2015 process have enabled us catalyse action for change through collective civil society action. We continued to communicate our advocacy messages to UN member state representatives and UN agency staff involved in the post-2015 process to support and challenge discussions that should result in an improved post-2015 framework. All four WaterAid regions and the UK Policy and Campaign Department (PCD) reported strong capacity to drive change through civil society collective action at all levels. In Uganda, in partnership with the Uganda Water and Sanitation NGO Network (UWASNET), WaterAid conducted a study on budget allocation, performance and utilisation in the WASH sector, and found that low utilisation was caused by late fund release and low staffing levels within government. We worked in collaboration with the Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group and UWASNET to conduct training for CSOs and District Local Governments on budget advocacy, analysis and expenditure tracking, with the aim of strengthening the capacity of our partners to then develop the understanding and ability of communities to demand better WASH services.

Outcome 2: We have significant evidence from all four regions and PCD of our contribution to more people having access to water and sanitation. WaterAid's role and engagement in the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) influencing work at global and national levels has been remarkable. We played a critical role both in the delivery of the 2014 High Level Meeting itself, and in the preparatory SWA High Level Commitments Dialogue (HLCD). Across the four regions over 20 WaterAid Country Programmes engaged in the HLCD, including both advocacy actions to shape national government commitments and encouragement of their attendance, which was achieved.

Outcome 3: Despite this being an evolving and learning area for us, we have good evidence from four regions of our contribution to making effective linkages between WASH and health sectors. Our *Healthy Start* campaign, '*Child of mine*' report, an open letter to the UN signed by 60 health organisations and a World Toilet Day report on the impact of WASH on child health are key achievements. We have engaged with health organisations such as WHO, UNICEF and academic institutions and placed greater focus on WASH in healthcare facilities in our programmes. In Uganda, we worked with the Ministry of Health by supporting the development of their sanitation capacity building strategy. Our involvement in the Nepal Health Sector Programme III provided the opportunity to engage key stakeholders in identifying effective links between health and WASH.

Overall output score and description

Overall, we met and in some cases exceeded our milestones and results expected over the review period, and consider this output as having moderately exceeded expectation. Under **Output 1** we worked with our partners to enable **2,021,673** people to gain access to water and **3,145,419** people to gain access to sanitation as a direct result of our investments. In promoting services we put emphasis on ensuring that services will last by addressing factors that lead to service failures and limited long-term hygiene behaviour change. We ensured services are appropriate to the needs of all community groups, are affordable and are accessible through our equity and inclusion approaches. By delivering **Output 2** we continued to improve systems and

processes to ensure our services deliver intended results and that they are still functioning after 1, 3, 5 and 10 years. We considered that we have met expectations in this respect. Our Post Implementation Monitoring Survey (PIMS) provide long term monitoring of sustainability, which is critical to us in informing whether the approaches we and our partners use are working. We also led a “Sector Strengthening” initiative which involved workshops in all four regions to identify specific opportunities for WaterAid to strengthen the sustainability of government-led service provision in each country.

Output 3 enabled us to deliver the WaterAid Partnership in Practice training, which contributed to improving mutual partnership not only for WaterAid and its partners but for the wider WASH sector. For example, there has been better communications and a better ‘culture of understanding’ between WaterAid and partners in Pakistan, Mozambique, Madagascar as a direct result of re-assessing terminologies used such as ‘*Implementing*’ and ‘*Strategic*’ partners. Within this grouping of partnerships there was a communication error, with an impression that some partners were more important than others. All partners are now being referred to as simply ‘partner’. This change brought the feeling of ‘togetherness’ for a common cause. It also helped shape understanding and re-enforced mutuality in objectives and aspirations in partnership. Our performance is considered to be in-line with expectations. **Output 4**, as part of advocating for the essential role of WASH in human development, we continued to support embedding and application of the Right to Water by campaigning, lobbying, working with CSOs, supporting communities to engage with duty bearers, working with the government and supporting the right to water website. Nepal, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nigeria and the South Asia Regional Team launched campaigns to raise awareness on these rights.

Key lessons

WaterAid and our partners have learnt a number of key lessons during the reporting period. For example, the PIMS have highlighted key areas where there may be issues for us to address. These issues prompt further investigation to understand what is working and what isn’t working. In all of the surveys carried out, we see weaknesses in long-term on-going support to users in the form of management assistance, financial assistance and technical assistance to keep services running. Essentially local government capacity to provide on-going support is weak and more effort is required to strengthen it. Sustainability has always been a priority for us, therefore, as a result of this learning; we will continue to ensure that approaches to addressing sustainability evolve. The PIMS Results are critical for helping to inform the direction of that evolution. We have developed a new Global Strategy, which now places support to sustainable services at the forefront of our efforts. It is one of four core aims that will drive our work with local partners over the next five years.

Key actions

Although the first year of our new global strategy 2015/16 will be the last year of this round of PPA programme, and whilst we have made some strategic shifts, we are not envisaging a significant impact in the design of the programme for the remaining year. However, in addition to shifting focus to more sector strengthening initiatives leading to measurement of our impact beyond what we fund, we will be revising the user numbers in light of the reduced emphasis on simply reaching and counting the number of people reached. However, WaterAid will continue our aim to deliver cumulative target by the end of the programme. Based on our planning, we aim to complete the programme according to the timeline in the business case. The Programme Funding Unit (PFU) will remain responsible for coordinating the management and reporting of the PPA, working closely with our International Programme Department (IPD) and the PCD.

Has the logframe been updated since the last review?

We updated the logframe slightly due to the impact of the Ebola crisis in Sierra Leone and Liberia as detailed in our Ebola update (09/01/15). In Liberia we revised down our sanitation user numbers by 11%; this represents a 1,200 variance from the planned number of 11,300. In Sierra Leone, we revised both our sanitation and water user number down by 20% and 46% respectively. This represents a 3,000 and 20,000 variance from the planned number of 15,100 and 43,200 respectively. Overall, revisions have not had any significant effect on the overall programme results due to the size of the Country Programmes and relative contribution to achievement of outputs and outcomes. Output risk levels have also remained unchanged.

WaterAid have made excellent progress and are on track to meet all the Outcomes by the end of the PPA period. They have met or exceeded on 10 out of the 11 Output indicators and provided explanation of where progress was slower than anticipated.

This section provided a clear outline of progress to date and demonstrates their ability to adapt to lessons learned throughout the year i.e. by reviewing the PIMS which has shown that more needs to be done to ensure sustainability of their programmes. Through the Partnerships in Practice learning, WaterAid have strengthened their partnerships which will promote greater impact, coordinated influencing in-country and sustainability. Stronger partnerships should, in time, lead to increased support for WASH and we look forward to hearing about progress on this in the project completion report next year.

WaterAid were one of the first PPA CSOs to undertake an impact evaluation when the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) struck West Africa. They adapted programming where they could to minimise the disruption to their WASH work in West Africa. The PPA logframe revisions were reviewed by DFID Sierra Leone to ensure a co-ordinated approach was being taken by donors and CSOs alike and was approved enabling WaterAid to continue with highly relevant work in light of the need for strong hygiene practices to ensure Ebola was not transmitted. We acknowledge again our appreciation of their work during this tense time.

As noted previously, the 'Healthy Start' campaign could play a critical role in linking WASH interventions to improved child health outcomes and we would encourage WaterAid to consider how they will report on this next year.

Based on the achievement at the Outputs below, progress towards the outcomes and our discussions throughout the reporting year, we have scored this annual report as an A+.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	To develop and promote equitable and sustainable water, hygiene and sanitation services that are accessible, appropriate and affordable, ensuring these can be replicated and adapted in the 22 African and Asian countries where WaterAid works.		
Output number per LF	1	Output Score	A+
Risk:	<i>Medium</i>	Impact weighting (%):	45%
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
1.1 Number of people who have access to water as a result of our direct investment through partner organisations	2,180,000 people have access to water	2,021,673 people have access to water
1.2 Numbers of people who have access to sanitation services (improved and unimproved) as a result of our direct investments through partner organisations	2,595,800 people have access to sanitation	3,145,419 have access to sanitation
1.3 Number of WaterAid Country Programmes where our work demonstrates strong evidence of our Equity and Inclusion approach (This includes inclusive representation and participation of community members in the planning, implementation and use of services)	12 Country Programmes reported strong evidence 3 CPs reported some evidence of participation and inclusive elements.	16 Country Programmes report strong evidence of Equity and Inclusion. 4 CPs reported some evidence of participation and inclusive elements.
1.4 Number of key learnings (identified through learning and research studies) actively disseminated into the WASH sector through global and regional conferences, academic journals and sector networks.	8 learning products disseminated	8 learning products produced and disseminated

Indicator 1.1 and 1.2: During the year 2014/15 we reached a total of **2,021,673** with water (under-achieved by 7%) and **3,145,419** with sanitation (overachieving by 21%). Variance in the

water users reached has been due to varying challenges notably in East Africa where we were affected by changes to local legislations restricting working through partnerships. We exceeded the target for sanitation due in part to increasing our range of sanitation approaches. The majority of users were reached in a rural environment (72% water and 80% sanitation). Around 0.4% of our water users and 0.4% of sanitation users were people with disabilities. Our success on this indicator was due in part to the great success of the *Sanithon* in Burkina Faso where the President of the National Assembly, supported by WaterAid, mobilised about £120,000 for the construction of 1,500 family latrines in one evening.

Indicator 1.3: We overachieved against our target with 16 CPs reporting strong evidence and four CPs some evidence of our Equity and Inclusion (E&I) being integral to our programmatic approach. In Nigeria, there was an increase in the number of women participating in community project management committees. In Jigawa, where 26% of members are women, 80 of these are in leadership positions (in a population where women have limited voice). Our disaggregated data, suggests we reached a gender balance across all services: (25% men/25% women reached with water, 26% men/27% women with sanitation, 20% of both boys and girls (6-18 years old) with water and 18% of both with sanitation). A significant proportion our work targeted young children with 9% of children under 5 gaining access to WASH. The proportion of children and under-fives is likely to increase in the coming year due to our greater focus on child health. We continue to struggle to reach and monitor people with disabilities, with our data suggesting we reached less than 0.5%, well below the 15% (over 1 billion) proportion of people living with a disability. This is partly due to differences in the classification and recognition of disabilities across different countries, which impact poor data, rather than our work not impacting these groups of people. We commissioned an E&I review to assess the relevance and effectiveness of our work, which highlighted that our staff's understanding of the terms 'equity' and 'inclusion' and who it applies to determines what they try to practically achieve – further clarification on 'who' would help greater consistency and support better mainstreaming. Based on the review findings, clearer definitions have been developed and communicated to all staff. These are being reinforced as part of the individual country reviews where countries are being developed as thematic leaders in their region and influencing others. The terminology will also be imbedded into future trainings and resources for consistent messaging.

Indicator 1.4: Through workshops, conferences, journals, online webinars and meetings we met our target by disseminating eight learning products contributing to sector learning and best practice. One of these was published by Practical Action in the October '14 edition of *Waterlines*. This journal is distributed in print and online to agencies and technical experts in the WASH sector including; engineers, health professionals, community development workers, researchers and policy makers. The WaterAid journal article, '*Moving along the right track? The experience of developing a rights-based approach at WaterAid*' describes the shift at WA from service delivery towards a rights-based approach (RBA), providing programme example and concluding the RBA increases community demand for WASH and can help to increase sustainable access to WASH for the most marginalised. New findings and knowledge generated from learning products during 2014/15 have been used effectively by the organisation and significantly impacted or influenced the work that we undertake. For example all Country Programmes in Southern Africa, as well as India and the Programme Support Unit participated in the research aimed at developing a deeper understanding of the relationship between WASH and E&I. East Africa also carried out a 'Research into use' review helping to support capacity building in this area.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Indicator 1.4: We responded to the point raised in previous annual review on this indicator by moving focus from the number of research pieces conducted to level of dissemination. We developed a tracking system, which enabled us to monitor the various platforms through which

learning products have been disseminated. We further improved the tracking of learning and are exploring the possibility of our website tracking download requests in detail.

Recommendations: Based on in-depth analysis of the external context and where WaterAid believe we can make the greatest impact, a key recommendation for 2015/16 is to change the way we define success by decreasing our focus on achieving WASH user numbers and instead increasing our focus on sector wide change. We therefore suggest reducing impact weighting to 35% and are not proposing an increase in a user target in this last year. We will place a greater focus on sanitation as a key off-track MDG in the transition to SDGs. As part of the new strategy, WaterAid may also make the move towards using the terminology of 'equity and non-discrimination' because it has stronger links to rights.

Score A+ - moderately exceeded expectations.

WaterAid have met or exceeded 3 out of the 4 indicators. They have made good progress against this output, exceeding the milestone for indicators 1.2 and 1.3, meeting the milestone for indicator 1.4 and underachieving against the milestone for output indicator 1.1 as a result of partnership legislation changes in East Africa. We were aware that the changes in East Africa would negatively impact on work but acknowledge that this was entirely outside of WaterAid's control. We will remain engaged with them to discuss how the final targets for 2016 may be affected.

WaterAid's Equity and Inclusion framework recognises that the most socially excluded are rarely consulted or involved in decisions about WASH policy and programmes. To address this, their new global strategy has four aims- the first of which is to reduce inequalities in WASH access and use. The high levels of disability among the poorest people demonstrate that disabled people are at a greater disadvantage and WaterAid are working to ensure that disabled people are consulted and benefit from their programmes.

We changed the format of reporting for this year which has meant that we have lost the disaggregated data table (women/men/disabled people) that WaterAid usually provides. That information provides an opportunity for us to see how and where they are managing gender disparity and including disabled people in programmes. However we would encourage WaterAid to disaggregate their data where possible i.e at Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 above.

We are pleased to see that they are now monitoring the dissemination and possibly uptake of their publications as well as the production. This information will be useful to WaterAid in establishing possible areas where dissemination and uptake could be improved.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	To ensure and improve the effectiveness and sustainability of our service delivery by scaling up monitoring and review processes.		
Output number per LF	2	Output Score	A
Risk:	<i>Medium</i>	Impact weighting (%):	20%
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
2.1: Number of Country Programmes (CPs) using findings from post - implementation surveys (PIMS) to improve programme effectiveness including functionality, sustainability and use of water and sanitation facilities and hygiene practices.	10 CPs conduct PIMS 4 CPs show evidence of PIMS conducted in previous PPA period	10 CP conducted PIMS (2 Large scale and 8 small scale) 5 CPs showed evidence of change from PIMS conducted in previous years as well as this year
2.2: Number of Country Programmes (CPs) evaluated that report an improvement to their programme design in response to evaluation findings.	6 CPs conduct evaluation 2 CPs show improvement in programme design	6 CPs conducted evaluations 5 CPs have shown improvement in programme design

Indicator 2.1: To increase the sustainability of our services, we conducted PIMS in 10 countries during 2014/15 meeting our target for the year. Two of the PIMS (Bangladesh and Malawi) were large in scale, covering facilities installed in the last 10 years and a deeper analysis of the programme whilst the remaining eight (Pakistan, Nepal, Nigeria, Ghana, Mali, Madagascar, Mozambique and Zambia) were small scale focused on selected districts. Findings from one of the large scale PIMS in Bangladesh for example revealed that approximately 80% of the water points surveyed were functioning well, 6% partially and the remaining 14% were non-functional. In response to findings from the PIMS conducted during previous PPA periods, countries have put systems in place to ensure sustainable services and behaviour change through a mixture of approaches. In Ghana, Pakistan, Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Mali these included creating stronger demand for services; testing different service delivery methods; supporting the authorities mandated to deliver services; calling for better governance and building the resilience of service users to manage and respond to external threats. In Ghana, the PIMS (and also the CP evaluation) identified the need to intensify advocacy and influencing work with District Assembly's to provide regular and timely technical backstopping to Water and Sanitation

Management Teams for the effective management of water facilities. Joint advocacy plans will be developed, drawing on communities and partners, to address these findings and influence District Chief Executives and local utility providers to take action.

Indicator 2.2: We carried out six Country Programmes evaluations (Ethiopia, Malawi, India, Tanzania, Ghana and Mozambique) during the reporting period meeting our target. Of the six evaluations, an analysis of the key learning from four countries (Ethiopia, Mali, Malawi and Tanzania) suggested that there is good work taking place but there are areas of improvement, for example, developing our learning and sharing practices. This has triggered a comprehensive review of knowledge management led by PSU due to be completed in the next FY. In addition, it was identified that there were organisational challenges to implementing the findings from the CP evaluations. In response, PSU set up a high level committee (including IPS, Finance and Audit teams) to provide strategic oversight and review findings, identify trends and determine how we can work together to address key issues. In regards to analysis of and how we are responding to the national WASH sector, relevant policies and identified sector blockages, findings showed that *“WaterAid’s approach is clearly guided by a strong contextual analysis completed during strategy development”*. Examples are how we responded to the ‘Big Results Now’ initiative in Tanzania and the 2012 conflict in Mali. Meta-analysis of all CP evaluations has been completed and will be published in FY15/16, to identify broader thematic or programme issues. Five CPs (Malawi, Tanzania, Ghana, Ethiopia and Bangladesh) showed improvement in programme design as a direct response to the findings of evaluations. In Tanzania for example, one of the evaluation findings is that there is weak functional linkages between programmes, research, policy and advocacy with a potential impact of missing opportunity to add real value to the sector. To address this the Country Programmes is undertaking a situational analysis to map the policy environment and develop our influencing niche, ensuring clear objectives and targets to guide programming, campaign and communication work. This is already underway through the 2015/16 country planning and other recommendations will also be adopted and implemented as the CP develop the new 2016-2021 Country Programmes Strategy.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

There was a concern around *‘how the qualitative information from PIMS, particularly around sustainability of interventions, could be recorded and assessed by the logframe’*. We conducted further analysis of PIMS in Nigeria, Ghana and Mali which showed that *total functionality of all facilities was 77%*. Whilst this is a good percentage we continued to prioritise improvement in the sustainability of services we support. In Ghana, the functionality rate was found to be due to broken or faulty pumps, low water pressure and inadequate mains water flow from the Ghana Water Company. In this case, one of the PIMS findings identified that some Water Sanitation Management Teams (WSMTs) become ineffective after a few years. As a result, greater attention is being given to WSMT formation and the accompanying training processes from now on through intensified advocacy and influencing work with District Assemblies. Increased emphasis within the CP is on monitoring and partner support visits to ensure the highest quality delivery of both hard and software (e.g. hygiene promotion, WSMT formation and training) interventions.

A second issue raised was around *‘how we are incorporating beneficiary feedback into our PIMS’*. WaterAid has an interest in developing a greater understanding of how Country Programmes incorporate beneficiary feedback into their M&E and use these findings to inform programming. We approach beneficiary feedback at two levels i) Community level with end users and ii) Partner level. At the community level we are currently running a global Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting review, therefore the work on beneficiary feedback would be dependent on, and will be informed by the findings of the review. At our partner level, our recent independent review of our partnerships led by Keystone enables us to use partner feedback to improve our partnership approach and ensure systematic feedback.

Recommendations: As WaterAid transition into the new Global Strategy, sustainability will play a key role in our programming. The drive toward sustainability will inform programme contents and our ways of working, who we are, and how we define success beyond reaching numbers. Both the District Wide Approach and the Sector Strengthening initiative will be vehicles to promote the steps required for sustainable services.

Score A: met expectations

PIMS has proven to be effective in identifying areas of work that have not been sustainable due to a variety of reasons. WaterAid have used the PIMS analysis to target specific interventions with additional resource either capacity building of local networks or influencing of the local governance structures to ensure that sustainability is maintained beyond WaterAid's presence. This is a crucial piece of work that allows WaterAid to build capacity in-country at various levels whilst ensuring buy-in from communities and individuals – beneficiaries have a sense of ownership around the intervention. We are interested to hear how the same countries that have undergone PIMS i.e. Bangladesh have improved on the 14% of water points that were non-functional.

The review on sharing and learning practices is welcomed. WaterAid have valuable lessons to bring to other WASH actors and we encourage them to continue to produce, disseminate and analyse the uptake in order that lesson learning across the sector is improved.

WaterAid's Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting is very welcome and should provide valuable lessons on how beneficiary feedback is incorporated into programming. We look forward to hearing more on this as the review progresses over the coming months.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	To support governments and service providers in developing their capacity to deliver safe water, improved hygiene and sanitation.		
Output number per LF	3	Output Score	A
Risk:	<i>Medium</i>	Impact weighting (%):	20%
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
3.1: Number of Country Programmes (CPs) conducting partnership self-assessment to inform support to partners	11 CPs conduct new assessment 4 CPs conduct re-assessment	12 CPs conducted new assessment No re-assessment conducted due to when training was completed
3.2: Number of partners reporting improved satisfaction of support from WaterAid Country Programmes.	Keystone Partnership Survey is conducted and partners rank level of satisfaction with WaterAid's partnership practice and relationships.	Keystone Survey was conducted with an overall satisfaction Net Promoter (NP) score of 13 (above average in comparison with INGOs)
3.3: Number of CPs in Africa supporting sector level planning, coordination and performance monitoring.	12 CPs in Africa supporting sector level planning, coordination and performance monitoring.	15 countries in Africa supported sector level planning, coordination and performance monitoring.

Indicator 3.1: We conducted 12 CP self-assessments (Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Madagascar, Nepal, Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and India) during the year exceeding our target by 10%. We were unable to carry out any re-assessments mainly due to the timing of completion of the trainings and the competing priorities with the CPs and Regions to take them forward. Learning from the first round of trainings, action planning and re-assessments has highlighted the need to link the re-assessments to another activity (such as Regional Management Team events) to ensure they are conducted. While the CPs are developing their individual country strategies and also partnership strategies as part of the new Global Strategy, the re-assessments have been put on hold with the focus currently on the development and implantation of the self-assessment action plans. In 2016 the partnership discussion will have been embedded and changes at CP level will have taken place providing the opportunity to conduct a full review of changes in practice. Countries who carried out the self-assessment reported that it was a useful exercise and helped them to scrutinise their own

capacities across the building blocks of partnership such as selection, shared values, roles and responsibilities, monitoring partnerships, staff capacity, staff continuity, capacity building and partner sustainability. Countries have developed action plans to implement key changes to their partnership processes. In Tanzania, it was agreed that prior to signing memorandums of understanding and funding agreements parties should have a face-to-face dialogue to understand and agree on commitments, roles and responsibilities between parties.

Indicator 3.2: To improve our partnerships, WaterAid engaged with *Keystone Accountability* to conduct a survey on the partner's perception of WaterAid. Results showed there is room for improvement in specific areas to build stronger partnerships. According to the Keystone report '*WaterAid is rated 19th out of 65 in the cohort in terms of 'overall satisfaction' (this is based on an index of scores when respondents were asked to compare the performance of WaterAid across seven key areas against other international NGOs and funders). Its overall satisfaction Net Promoter (i.e. partners that rate WaterAid as 9 and 10 on the 0-10 point scale used in the survey) score is 13, above the average for the cohort of INGOs, which is 2. The picture that emerges from the survey is of an organisation that adds value to its partners, but could achieve significant gains through investing in improving certain aspects of its relationship with them.*' Findings from this process are feeding into trainings under development, ensuring an increased focus on providing strategic support to partners. They are also informing other departments plans, such as with finance (who are developing a partnership toolkit), the PMER process and individual CPs are analysing their specific findings to develop specific action plans.

Indicator 3.3: We overachieved our target for this output. This year 2015, representing the end of the MDGs period, presented an opportunity for countries such as Ethiopia, Rwanda and Uganda to shape their own national development agendas. We also took the opportunity of the transition of the MDGs to the SDG's to work with governments (in Tanzania, Malawi, Madagascar and Ghana) towards ensuring that national plans incorporate WASH as central to human development. We supported new coordination structures which are starting to take shape in Ethiopia and Rwanda, while in Tanzania and Uganda, we have questioned the effectiveness of current structures and are working with government to share best practices from other countries. In Bangladesh, Malawi, Mozambique and Ghana we supported engagement and coordination between a broad range of stakeholders through workshops and conferences and worked with partners to ensure governments set out a separate goal for water and sanitation during the Africa Water Week in West Africa.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Our last review raised an issue around *our partnership working, in particular, the suggestion that we carry out a post training survey to understand what participants learnt and where they felt there are existing gaps.* We carried out a self-assessment which considered understanding before and after the training. Seventy seven percent of learners completed the post-training self-assessment questionnaire and qualified for a completion certificate. The post assessment report showed that with regards to general partnership practice, '*there has been a marked increase in staff members' confidence levels and perceptions of their own partnership capabilities over the lifetime of the training.*' There was also a suggestion to '*include more country level examples*'. We have provided as many examples from countries as possible within the page limitations.

Recommendations: WaterAid will continue to strengthen our partnerships and increase our provision of technical assistance, especially in regions where the space for INGOs to operate is shrinking (East Africa and South Asia). We propose that the partnership re-assessments are removed from the logframe to be carried forward to 2016 when there will be a full review of changes in practice and gap identification with all CPs. Through our *Healthy Start* campaign we will deepen our engagement with health sector and focus on sector strengthening initiatives. We

consider that this output has greater importance and therefore the impact rating should be increased in the final year's logframe.

Score A: met expectations

WaterAid have made great progress in ensuring that the range of service providers they work with are better placed to ensure the delivery of WASH for the poorest people and to ensure sustainability of the current services. We were disappointed that no re-assessments were undertaken at indicator 3.1 although we understand the reasons for this. It would however have been useful for WaterAid to understand where country programmes were in terms of improved support to their partners since they are currently refocussing their partnerships to ensure that they are as effective as they can be. The Keystone survey certainly helps with this and allowed WaterAid to identify areas for improvement. We would like to see more on this in the PCR.

We are pleased that they have taken on board our comments from last year's review regarding undertaking post training surveys. It would have been useful to know if this was being undertaken again to further understand what trainees did learn and how they have applied the learning.

C: DETAILED OUTPUT SCORING (1 page per output)

Output Title	To advocate for the essential role of safe water, improved hygiene and sanitation in human development.		
Output number per LF	4	Output Score	A+
Risk:	<i>Low</i>	Impact weighting (%):	15%
Risk revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>	Impact weighting % revised since last AR?	<i>N</i>

Indicator(s)	Milestones	Progress
4.1: The number of WaterAid UK CPs where the profile of WASH is raised within health policy priorities and incorporated into policies, plans and programmes at various levels.	12 CPs report very strong or strong WASH policy situation. 8 CPs report strong WASH programming situation.	15 CPs reported very strong evidence 8 CPs reported strong WASH programming situation
4.2: The number of WaterAid UK CPs where mechanisms for the management and sustainability of school WASH services and facilities are incorporated into National WASH programming and policy.	4 CPs reporting baseline moderate performance, now report 80% of achievement of the strong School WASH (SWASH) definition indicators.	6 CPs move from moderate performance to strong mechanisms for SWASH management and sustainability

Indicator 4.1: Overall, we overachieved our target for this output with 15 countries and eight countries developing strong links with the health sector through various policy and programme work respectively including on nutrition. In Nepal we worked with the Department of Health on a project piloting hygiene promotion through routine immunisation. As part of our involvement in the Nepal Health Sector Programme III 2015-2020, we organised a WASH stakeholder's workshop to identify how to strengthen links between health and WASH in the Programme. In Bangladesh, WaterAid provides the WASH component of nutrition focused USAID project and also supports the development of indicators for the *Scaling up Nutrition* network, particularly on WASH and nutrition. Our capacity building efforts in Niger led to the development of a guide on nutrition in the education curriculum which can be used as a tool for teacher training. Our work in Tanzania focused on WASH in health care facilities in particular in maternity units.

At the global level, our '*Child of Mine*' report, the *open letter* to the UN signed by 60 health organisations and our *World Toilet Day* report on the impact of WASH on child health and need for a water and sanitation SDG provided opportunities to influence multi-sector efforts in transforming lives. Additionally, we launched the '*Healthy Start*' campaign as part of our second Global Advocacy Priority with a series of events and publications. This included publication of an advocacy briefing pack, presentations, and convening a WHO event on WASH in healthcare

facilities as well as a promotional video. In Mali, Ghana and Madagascar a variety of launch events with media and healthcare professionals were also held.

Indicator 4.2: Six CPs demonstrated strong evidence of effective mechanisms for the management and sustainability of School WASH (SWASH) programming and policy. We increased the scope and quality of our WASH in schools work with Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) being more integrated, girl friendly latrines designed and defining the national minimum package of WASH in schools. Our policy influencing efforts in Tanzania have been successful in integrating MHM in the national SWASH. This was the result of an in-depth analysis of the structural issues preventing schools from having an equal enabling environment for boys and girls to access quality education. Similarly, Tanzania's *Mtumba* approach had substantial success by gaining national recognition across local government authorities. It was adopted into the curriculum for training of environmental health professionals. In Uganda, WaterAid delivered a Policy Paper on Menstrual Hygiene in Schools in Uganda at the National MHM conference. The theme of the conference was, "*Break the Silence on Menstruation; Keep Girls in School*" with key decision makers discussing how to keep girls in school. The conference resulted in three key outcomes: the establishment of an inter-ministerial coordination task force on MHM, the development of an implementation framework with a monitoring and evaluation component and a press release by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) instructing all schools in Uganda to promote MHM. WaterAid was fundamental in facilitating these outcomes through our partnership with NETWAS-Uganda and SNV Netherlands and together, organised the first ever national MHM conference in Uganda.

Summary of responses to issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Feedback on moving from reporting CPs engaging with health and education sector to measuring positive change has been addressed through revising the logframe wording. We also agreed some clear change indicators which guided us in monitoring and reporting our impact in these areas. We recognise that delivering change through cross-sector engagement is an evolving area for WaterAid. We are, through the '*Healthy Start*' campaign for example, developing and deepening our knowledge and experience in linking WASH and health.

Recommendations: In response to our second Global Advocacy Priority - *Healthy Start*, and due to an increased priority on hygiene in our new strategy, Country Programmes across the four regions will build on the successes of the previous strategy by deepening their engagement with the health sector. To build on our successes this year, SWASH will be a major focus for sanitation in 2015-16. We will develop SWASH guidelines in the first instance to address the development of new SWASH programmes. In addition, we will promote action learning in SWASH programming, in order to improve programme delivery.

Score A+: moderately exceeded expectations

WaterAid have met all the indicators at this output. Linking WASH interventions to health outcomes is relatively new to them and they have made significant progress in the last year to ensure that WASH and health were clearly linked and promoted in their new Global Strategy. WaterAid's work on Menstrual Hygiene Management fits with DFID's vision of ensuring that girls are not excluded from school due to lack of access. We are pleased that WaterAid are undertaking work and thinking about the disparity between the barriers of girls and boys in attending school. We would like to hear more about this in the PCR.

We are pleased that WaterAid has revised the logframe to better demonstrate how change can be measured through work linking WASH with health and education work. We believe that this demonstrates the diversity of WaterAid's work and ensures that the links to other sectors is duly

measured and recorded. We are interested to learn how WaterAid have made those links and what lessons could be learned.

D: VALUE FOR MONEY & FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (1 page)

Key cost drivers and performance

WaterAid's key cost drivers are: **a) Influencing, campaigning and advocacy that has demonstrable (over period of time) results in people gaining access to water and sanitation.** For example, we have used our increased influencing activities to help persuade Governments to increase budget allocations to WASH services such as in Tanzania, India. **b) Number of users generated from direct service delivery. This is linked to the quality and sustainability of our programme work, which has a cost.** We have increasingly focussed on the quality and sustainability of our work, rather than looking at user numbers. **c) Fundraising activities.** Our income has continued to rise, presently a satisfactory 66:34 split between unrestricted and restricted funds. We achieved a return on investment of above 1:4, which is considered the industry standard, and we continue to grow overall income year-on-year. **d) Investment in new major systems and processes** (designed to improve our efficiency and effectiveness). We continued to embed the Restricted Income System, which increases the accuracy and speed of donor reporting; we have conducted a Programme Management Information System pilot project, which will help to ensure that we develop an appropriate and effective global programme management system; we are in the process of replacing existing customer relations management with a new system, which will improve how we manage our supporter data and **e) Staff costs (in WaterAid and our partners).** We continue to benchmark our staff salaries, to ensure that we pay the appropriate levels to retain and attract staff that will enable us to deliver our Global Strategy.

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case

We believe that during 2014-15 we have strengthened our understanding and approach to Value for Money. We have further embedded our VfM Framework and shared this across the organisation. Monitoring of the framework is in place and it was refreshed and updated in February 2015 led by the Head of Internal Audit. This has helped us to identify areas where we are strong and where we need to improve. For example, we are currently working to improve the efficiency of our planning and reporting processes, and to put in place more effective management information systems through the global PMER review. We continued to adopt a controlled approach to purchasing and procurement, to ensure that we obtain the right goods and services at the best price. Our processes are formally documented (e.g. Global Accounts Manual).

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money

As part of the 12 sampled agencies for an In-depth Research, part of the PPA Fund Level evaluation by DFID undertaken by Coffey, the detailed evaluation concluded that, overall, WaterAid had a good approach to VfM and demonstrated good value in the delivery of our programme. That evaluation also noted our commitment to continually improve our effectiveness; for example, through research, post-implementation monitoring, and Country Programmes evaluations. Our VfM Framework includes 28 key mechanisms that demonstrate VfM across economy, efficiency and effectiveness. We use a Red, Amber and Green self-assessment system to assess the effectiveness of the mechanism. Our update at February 2015 shows that 20 are currently green and 8 are amber, which are areas we need to improve. These include: building on and strengthening current benchmarking activities (e.g. salaries, fundraising costs); strengthening our management information systems; further embedding our approaches to conducting post-implementation monitoring surveys; and refining our approaches to capacity building work with our partner organisations.

Quality of financial management

The new UK finance team structure was consulted and fully implemented during the reporting period. The purpose of the restructure is to provide fit-for-purpose finance support and leadership. The International Finance team now provide both Country Programmes and regions

with professional and technical finance leadership for our international work. The corporate finance team provides finance service to the UK office, supports the Global Finance Executive and lead the WaterAid corporate finance function. All the new team members are now in post and undergoing an in-depth induction programme. The review of financial planning and reporting processes has now been completed with focused recommendation to improve our planning processes, systems and culture in financial management. The timeframe for this is aligned to our Global Strategy 2015-2020 as it links to the current focus on processes, systems and most importantly people (skills, behaviour and culture).

Date of last narrative financial report	DFID
Date of last audited annual statement	DFID

WaterAid have demonstrated good VfM across this reporting year. They have embedded a revised VfM framework across the organisation and we encourage country programmes to further embed this with partners.

WaterAid submitted a strong enhanced VfM offer last year and received feedback on it with no request to revise it. However, they felt that they could strengthen the offer incorporating our feedback. We were pleased that they felt that they could push themselves further whilst considering additional VfM measures i.e. the Programme Management Information System (PMIS) will be the primary tool through which they enable more efficient and effective planning, implementation and management of projects and programmes in country programmes. They have also reported this year on the introduction of partner and beneficiary feedback into the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Guide which will enable greater engagement from end-users through the project cycle and will enhance decision making.

Overall risk rating: Medium

Overview of programme risk: The overall risk level is assessed as 'medium', with 3 of the 4 Outputs assessed as 'medium' and 1 Output assessed as 'low'.

Outstanding actions from risk assessment:

To enable WaterAid achieve their global strategy aims, visions and mission, they continue to take managed risks and to capitalise on opportunities. WaterAid has a risk assessment and risk management process consistent with good management practice and benchmarks this against industry standards. As part of the extension MoU, they submitted an Environmental Policy as well as a revised Code of Conduct to DFID. Their corporate risk register was updated as of January 2015 and shared with their Audit committee. To address financial and legal risk WaterAid continued to strengthen controls such as on financial assurance monthly reviews of financial accounts of all countries, performance management and rolling out code of conduct and accounting policies to staff. In 2014/15, they worked towards financial assurance objective, with working group of Finance Heads to refresh and embed good practice in this area. In terms of fundraising, they continued to make steady progress towards ensuring a good balanced unrestricted and restricted funding by investing in and maintaining a broad portfolio of unrestricted funding and a 66/34 ratio of unrestricted to restricted funding. They continued to actively monitor and track retention of donors and have secured new donors across a portfolio of funding types; investing in people, processes and systems to increase the effectiveness of their management of income and expanding and developing the use of digital communications globally. To manage strategic risk for instance around operationalising the global strategy, they continued to review and strengthen planning, budgeting and reporting procedures at all levels, setting high level targets and indicators to monitor Global Strategy and ensuring UK and CP plans and budgets align with Global Strategy and reporting against strategic performance indicators.

Programmatically, they put systems in place to manage the Ebola crisis in Sierra Leone and Liberia and the earthquakes in Nepal allowing good management of the impacts on the overall programme delivery. For the Ebola crisis, they first developed a six month Adaptation and Response Plan with a purpose of ensuring they have designed a clear, realistic and achievable plan to adapt to the new context and to contribute to tackling the crisis. The Adaptation and Response Plan was followed by a twelve month Recovery and Stability Plan which covered the process of restoring the programme to its original focus with a clear and fresh strategic direction. In Nepal, they responded through a variety of ways. For example they created a UK-based Crisis Management Team and an In-country Management Team, with both working together effectively to manage the various risks associated with the earthquakes. They also experienced risks around political uncertainty, conflict and terrorism across many countries including in Pakistan, Nigeria, Mali, that have had major implications on current and future work, such as changes in regulation or tightening of regulations that effect INGOs. They have taken actions to mitigate these risks, for example in West Africa, they have appointed a Security Officer to provide advice to Country Programmes. In Ethiopia, they have worked on a new Country Strategy approach that is consistent with the new legislation, to ensure that they continue to work in the country but stay compliant with legal requirements.

F: COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (½ page)

Delivery against planned timeframe

Yes. The programme will be delivered within the agreed timeframe and within budget

Performance of partnership (s)

We continued to reflect on our range of partnership types as well as developing ways to ensure the different partnerships at all levels are effective and mutually beneficial. We developed new partnerships to support our increased focus on E&I for example in Nepal and Bangladesh and discontinued partnerships where partnership reviews showed less value addition for example in Tanzania. A survey of local partner perceptions of WaterAid conducted by Keystone Accountability (full report available on our [website](#)) showed that our performance is satisfactory (above average in comparison with 64 similar INGOs) but improvements are needed and suggested next steps included in the report, with over 50% of these already either being actioned or complete, such as collaborating with other NGOs facing similar issues and working to share best practice. Country and regional teams are using the findings, along with the learning from the Partnership in Practice year-long internal training to improve key aspects of WaterAid's partnership practice, the results of which are expected in 2016+ once the process of training, implementation and reflection are complete. Furthermore, we developed a partnership framework and toolkit for all WaterAid UK CPs to provide a consistent approach to partnership, basic guidance, and access to specific tools. This has been translated into French and many CPs are also sharing it with their partners.

Similarly, at a global level we have continued to strengthen existing partnerships and develop new ones with sector stakeholders. Our partnership with NewDea, a monitoring and evaluation Software Company has enabled us to develop and pilot a new Programme Management Information System (PMIS) in Southern Africa. We have also been working closely with mWater, a company that deals with technology for water and health to further develop the PIMS software. Through our partnership with Rural Water Supply Network and as members of the executive steering group we have supported development of their new strategy, especially the theme on equality, non-discrimination and rights. The UPGro project in Uganda benefitted from new partnerships with the Overseas Development Institute and the British Geological Survey, who brought their expertise on socio-economic situation analysis and hydrogeological to the project. Existing partnerships within SHARE, WASHTech and the organisations involved in the Knowledge Point project (RedR UK, Practical Action, IRC, EngineerAid and WASHCost) have continued over the reporting period. As reported in 2013/14, our focus is shifting away from monitoring the quantity of partnerships to focus on the quality of these. Using the Partnership Training and Toolkit we are doing more analysis, establishing the added value of working with partners to see where there are opportunities for more effective joint working. Through this process we are encouraging regular partnership reviews, asking questions about roles and responsibilities, incentives, participation etc., to monitor partnership quality. There is evidence of more people talking the language of quality and some shift in practice. This will be systematically monitored when the PMIS is rolled out (2017+) and reflects this approach across all Country Programmes. We are also co-leading the current theme in the PPA Partnership Learning Group on the subject: 'What is our impact as partners and how can we measure it?', with two webinars to share experience between PPA agencies.

Asset monitoring and control

Overall management of assets is shared across different areas within the organisation. For example Budget Holders establish and maintain clear lines of responsibility within their area for all financial matters. They are also responsible for monitoring assets and expenses within their cost centres. All members of staff have a general responsibility for the security of WaterAid's

property, avoiding loss and for due economy in the use of resources. In line with our Global Accounts Manual, all Country Programmes keep a Fixed Asset Register for items over £500, and those under £500 are listed on an inventory in each country/office (but don't form part of the Fixed Assets Register). The Heads of finance are responsible for reviewing the list and carrying out physical checks. In the UK office, we maintain an asset register and this is reviewed twice a year with a physical verification at the end of each financial year. Any lost assets are investigated and the senior management team takes the appropriate decisions. Obsolete and sold assets are accounted for and taken off the asset register. All vehicles in our countries are kept in secured office premises overnight or when not in used. Log books are used to record and charge mileage to budget holders.

Furthermore, external auditors and internal auditors perform audits of financial and operational activities and report if there is any issue. They have access to WaterAid's premises, all assets, records, documents and correspondence relating to any financial and other transactions of the organisation. The primary role of the external auditors is to report on WaterAid's financial statements and to carry out such examination of the statements and underlying records and control systems as are necessary to reach their opinion on the statements and to report on the appropriate use of funds.

WaterAid have demonstrated a strong commitment to considering the commercial implications of how they work. They have changed the way they engage with their partners and provided training to staff to ensure a consistent approach which is being rolled out to country programme partners. They have considered their commercial approach to partnerships and ensure that they are robust and justifiable. We expect to see further information about the impact of those activities in the next report.

WaterAid have also diversified their funding base which will enable them to strengthen existing systems and processes using partners' experience thus saving on costs. This will also allow for any changes to be implemented quickly allowing new processes and ways of working to be applied sooner. We would encourage WaterAid to consider how they can report on this in the PCR.

WaterAid have played an active part in the PPA Learning Partnership since its inception and it is encouraging to note that WaterAid is co-chairing a session on the impact with partners. We would encourage WaterAid to remain involved in the PPA LP and to consider ways in which it can continue after the current PPA funding ends in March 2016.

G: CONDITIONALITY (½ page)

Not relevant for PPA partners

H: MONITORING & EVALUATION (½ page)

Evidence and evaluation

Our integrated and universal Monitoring & Evaluation system is based within a Global Programme, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) Framework. The framework addresses the planning, monitoring and reporting needs of CPs and involves each CP developing plans on a three year rolling basis, which are reported against on a quarterly, six-monthly and annual basis, as well as specific programme and project evaluations. During the reporting period Country Programmes across all regions focused on strengthening PME systems and processes by introducing new technologies and reviewing existing systems and tools. For instance India, Nepal, Pakistan and the Southern Africa region focused on developing a Management Information System (MIS) to improve data management. Whilst India rolled out a new MIS which facilitates tracking progress against all key performance indicators enabling monthly reporting and improved data management. Both Pakistan and Nepal transformed their excel based M&E tool to web-based inventory and data management system.

As a result of its M&E review, the Southern Africa region piloted a Programme Management Information System (PMIS) led by NewDea which will be used to strengthen M&E. The platform called 'Project Centre' was developed based on the findings from the Global Programme Management Information System (GPMIS) work carried out in (2012/13). PMIS is an online system providing credible, real-time programme management information in order to support sound management decisions. Having such a system in place strengthens our accountability by making programme data visible and improving efficiency by supporting a jointly validated data. It will also support our fundraising and grant management activities, helping us to provide targeted and tailored support to our partners. The PMIS Trial was piloted in the Southern Africa involving South Africa, Malawi, Madagascar, Mozambique, Zambia and the UK. The decision was made in June 2015 by the Directors Team that PIMS will be rolled-out across all UK managed Country Programmes and is expected to be live in all regions in 2017.

Recognising the progress we have made in embedding our Programmatic Approach, ensuring better linkage between our practice and policy work and the need for a more robust M&E system, we are in the process of conducting a global operational Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Review (PMER) which started in January 2015. This two-fold review will focus on an M&E content analysis, which will be looking into the core information needs at different levels required by various stakeholders. It will also look at the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) processes building on the work done over the past few years such as data reliability audit, Country Programmes valuations, PIMS, PME review at regional level. The second part of the review aims to streamline these processes for a more robust and effective PME across the board. Overall we aim to develop an accountability framework that will guide our programming from the projects to global levels.

Monitoring progress throughout the review period

Throughout the review period, we have continued the process of bringing together the numerous programmatic principles and themes under the programmatic approach in such a way that this makes sense within our new theory of change that support sector strengthening with a rights based approach. Through our M&E system, we continued to monitor progress at all levels, reviewing and improving planning, monitoring and evaluation processes for instance to identify variances as well as trigger ways of addressing these.

WaterAid have demonstrated a strong commitment to monitoring and evaluation through their Global Programme, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) Framework. The PM&E framework ensures country programmes regularly report on impact and provides the opportunity for issues to be addressed quickly. A clear success of this is the PMIS which will promote better efficiency and effectiveness of programmes.

WaterAid have invested in the PM&E framework which has been developed incorporating lessons learned and adaptations made to former frameworks. The new global strategy will have PM&E firmly at its centre and PIMS Results are critical for helping to inform the direction of that strategy.

We are pleased that WaterAid have revised their global strategy taken account of lessons learned in relation to ways of working and placing greater emphasis on influencing this year; reviewing their partnerships to ensure that they are as effective as they can be and consolidating key M&E processes into one. We would be interested to hear how this has impacted on programmes in the PCR.

I: DISABILITY (½ page)

Does your organisation consider disability in its policies and programmes: Yes

If yes, please outline your approach

WaterAid embraces the principles of equality and non-discrimination to ensure universal access to water and sanitation for all and disability is imbedded within our mainstreamed Equity and Inclusion Framework which is available online in French and English (this will be redrafted after the E&I mainstreaming review in 2015/16). We recognise that the most socially excluded are rarely consulted or involved in decisions about WASH policy and programmes. To address this strategically, our new global strategy has four aims; the first is to reduce inequalities in WASH access and use. Disability is a core component of this as it is an individual-related inequality that is relevant in every country. We are an active member of the BOND Disability and Development Group and also sit on the steering group. We learn from disability organisations in the network and jointly share learning and advocacy on issues of inclusion and discrimination. For example we played an active role in contributing to the development of DFID's Disability Framework. DFID funded WaterAid, Water Engineering and Development Centre (WEDC) and Leonard Cheshire Disability to conduct collaborative research through the DFID funded Sanitation and Hygiene Applied Research for Equity (SHARE) consortium. The research aimed to understand and address the barriers that disabled, older and chronically ill people face when accessing WASH in Zambia and Uganda, resulting in development of an inclusive WASH approach.

As part of our equity and inclusion work in Liberia and Nigeria for example we have ensured WASH for disabled people and promoted hygiene for women prisoners in Mali. Facility designs are made inclusive and our advocacy led to Governments delivering inclusive designs of School WASH facilities in Ghana, Liberia, Mali, Niger and Sierra Leone. Every Country Programmes disaggregates its water and sanitation data by disability, age and gender enabling us to be more effective in tracking how we are reaching different groups. Despite this we continue to struggle to reach and monitor people with disabilities, reaching less than 0.5% during the year under review. This disparity with the relative global percentage relates to differences in the classification of people with disabilities in countries which affect data reliability. We are working collaboratively with governments and different stakeholder groups to manage this challenge.

We work in partnership with Disabled People's Organisations (DPOs) at the country level. This has brought useful insight and valuable support at country and community level. In Malawi, DPOs advised WaterAid on using appropriate language in their training materials and ensuring that the format was accessible for disabled people. These materials were also translated into local languages. In Madagascar we contributed to and supported the government in the ratification of the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The Malawi team are also considering the role of disabled girls and women in their menstrual hygiene work. In Mozambique WaterAid ran a campaign with the Association for the Disabled Mozambicans to lobby the government to construct public WASH services that are accessible to persons with disabilities. This is set out in the CRPD, which was ratified by the government of Mozambique in 2012.

Additionally, we conducted accessibility and safety audits with key stakeholders to effectively raise awareness about the barriers that disabled people face accessing public toilets in a number of countries. In Bangladesh, WaterAid did this with key government officials, private sector bodies and people with disabilities on 20 public buildings across Dhaka and Chittagong. Findings were disseminated through various forums including a press conference which led to the Dhaka and Chittagong Water Supply and Sewerage Authorities reconstructing their toilets

and entrances to make them more accessible. In Mali, WaterAid conducted an accessibility and safety audit of local government facilities in Bla, Touna and Kemeni, which resulted in the needs of disabled people being taken into account.

We were particularly interested in your work on disability. Your continued participation and active engagement with the Bond DDG group is valued. Although we acknowledge that the Equity and Inclusion framework does incorporate guidance on working with and for disabled people, we are keen to understand more about how partners work with disabled people too. It would be interesting to know in the next report if the Partnership Toolkit or PM&E offer any guidance to partners on this and how it has been adopted by partners. Feedback on uptake would be extremely useful as would any barriers or challenges that partners faced.

We acknowledge that WaterAid ordinarily provide a breakdown within the annual report on the numbers of disabled people reach via their programmes but did not do so this year due to the constraints of the reporting template.

Smart Guide

The Annual Review is part of a continuous process of review and improvement throughout the programme cycle. At each formal review, the performance and ongoing relevance of the programme are assessed with decisions taken by the spending team as to whether the programme should continue, be reset or stopped.

The Annual Review includes specific, time-bound recommendations for action, consistent with the key findings. These actions – which in the case of poor performance will include improvement measures – are elaborated in further detail in delivery plans. Teams should refer to the Smart Rules quality standards for annual reviews.

The Annual Review assesses and rates outputs using the following rating scale. ARIES and the separate programme scoring calculation sheet will calculate the overall output score taking account of the weightings and individual outputs scores

Description	Scale
Outputs substantially exceeded expectation	A++
Outputs moderately exceeded expectation	A+
Outputs met expectation	A
Outputs moderately did not meet expectation	B
Outputs substantially did not meet expectation	C

Teams should refer to the considerations below as a guide to completing the annual review template.

Summary Sheet

Complete the summary sheet with highlights of progress, lessons learnt and action on previous recommendations

Introduction and Context

Briefly outline the programme, expected results and contribution to the overall Operational Plan and DFID's international development objectives (including corporate results targets). Where the context supporting the intervention has changed from that outlined in the original programme documents explain what this will mean for UK support

B: Performance and conclusions

Annual Outcome Assessment

Brief assessment of whether we expect to achieve the outcome by the end of the programme

Overall Output Score and Description

Progress against the milestones and results achieved that were expected as at the time of this review.

Key lessons

Any key lessons you and your partners have learned from this programme

Have assumptions changed since design? Would you do differently if re-designing this programme?

How will you and your partners share the lessons learned more widely in your team, across DFID and externally

Key actions

Any further information on actions (not covered in Summary Sheet) including timelines for completion and team member responsible

Has the logframe been updated since the last review? What/if any are the key changes and what does this mean for the programme?

C: Detailed Output Scoring

Output

Set out the Output, Output Score

Score

Enter a rating using the rating scale A++ to C.

Impact Weighting (%)

Enter the %age number which cannot be less than 10%.

The figure here should match the Impact Weight currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Revised since last Annual Review (Y/N).

Risk Rating

Risk Rating: Low/Medium/High

Enter Low, Medium or High

The Risk Rating here should match the Risk currently shown on the logframe (and which will need to be entered on ARIES as part of loading the Annual Review for approval).

Where the Risk for this Output been revised since the last review (or since inception, if this is the first review) or if the review identifies that it needs revision explain why, referring to section B Risk Assessment

Key points

Summary of response to programme issues raised in previous annual reviews (where relevant)

Recommendations

Repeat above for each Output.

D Value for Money and Financial Performance

Key cost drivers and performance

Consider the specific costs and cost drivers identified in the Business Case

Have there been changes from those identified in previous reviews or at programme approval. If so, why?

VfM performance compared to the original VfM proposition in the business case? Performance against vfm measures and any trigger points that were identified to track through the programme

Assessment of whether the programme continues to represent value for money?

Overall view on whether the programme is good value for money. If not, why, and what actions need to be taken?

Quality of Financial Management

Consider our best estimate of future costs against the current approved budget and forecasting profile

Have narrative and financial reporting requirements been adhered to. Include details of last report

Have auditing requirements been met. Include details of last report

E Risk

Output Risk Rating: L/M/H

Enter Low, Medium or High, taken from the overall Output risk score calculated in ARIES

Overview of Programme Risk

What are the changes to the overall risk environment/ context and why?

Review the key risks that affect the successful delivery of the expected results.

Are there any different or new mitigating actions that will be required to address these risks and whether the existing mitigating actions are directly addressing the identifiable risks?

Any additional checks and controls are required to ensure that UK funds are not lost, for example to fraud or corruption.

Outstanding actions from risk assessment

Describe outstanding actions from Due Diligence/ Fiduciary Risk Assessment/ Programme risk matrix

Describe follow up actions from departmental anti-corruption strategies to which Business Case assumptions and risk tolerances stand

F: Commercial Considerations

Delivery against planned timeframe. Y/N

Compare actual progress against the approved timescales in the Business Case. If timescales are off track provide an explanation including what this means for the cost of the programme and any remedial action.

Performance of partnership

How well are formal partnerships/ contracts working

Are we learning and applying lessons from partner experience

How could DFID be a more effective partner

Asset monitoring and control

Level of confidence in the management of programme assets, including information any monitoring or spot checks

G: Conditionality (not applicable to PPAs – report on partnerships only)

Update on Partnership Principles and specific conditions.

For programmes for where it has been decided (when the programme was approved or at the last Annual Review) to use the PPs for management and monitoring, provide details on:

- a. Were there any concerns about the four Partnership Principles over the past year, including on human rights?
- b. If yes, what were they?
- c. Did you notify the government of our concerns?
- d. If Yes, what was the government response? Did it take remedial actions? If yes, explain how.
- e. If No, was disbursement suspended during the review period? Date suspended (dd/mm/yyyy)
- f. What were the consequences?

For all programmes, you should make a judgement on what role, if any, the Partnership Principles should play in the management and monitoring of the programme going forward. This applies even if when the BC was approved for this programme the PPs were not intended to play a role. Your decision may depend on the extent to which the delivery mechanism used by the programme works with the partner government and uses their systems.

H: Monitoring and Evaluation

Evidence and evaluation

Changes in evidence and implications for the programme

Where an evaluation is planned what progress has been made

How is the Theory of Change and the assumptions used in the programme design working out in practice in this programme? Are modifications to the programme design required?

Is there any new evidence available which challenges the programme design or rationale? How does the evidence from the implementation of this programme contribute to the wider evidence base? How is evidence disaggregated by sex and age, and by other variables?

Where an evaluation is planned set out what progress has been made.

Monitoring process throughout the review period.

Direct feedback you have had from stakeholders, including beneficiaries

Monitoring activities throughout review period (field visits, reviews, engagement etc)

The Annual Review process