

# Sub-national WASH Sector Sustainability Analysis Tool

Strengthening WASH Systems for Sustainable Service at Sub-national Level



Building Block	Weak	Medium	Strengthening	Desired – all actors using sub-national sector systems
<p><b>Gender and Social Inclusion</b></p>	Interventions are reinforcing gender stereotypes in WASH activities and/or putting women and girls at risk through lack of consultations with women and girls and lack of understanding on provincial context of gender equality	Women are physically represented in decision-making activities and sex and age disaggregated data (SAAD) is a requirement for programmatic interventions for all institutional arrangements	Women are actively involved in decision-making activities, and sex and age disaggregated data (SAAD) is a requirement for all institutional arrangements including analysis	Women are in leadership positions involving decision-making responsibilities for WASH services
<p><b>Sector Coordination and integration</b></p>	PTWG exists on paper but inactive District WASH committees do not exist CCWC exists but does not prioritise WASH	PTWG meet irregularly but limited ongoing commitment and department representatives are not consistent District WASH committee exists on paper but limited activity and engagement by commune and district authorities.	PTWG meet regularly and is skilfully led by secretariat District WASH committee meets regularly. Information sharing is good between actors within PTWG and District WASH committee but the two groups don't share	Agencies aligned behind comprehensive government-led strategy and there is strong communication flows between governmental levels
<p><b>Strategic planning</b></p>	PAP exists but is not well known or understood Districts do not have a WASH plan or targets	PAP is known by sector actors. PAP focuses on extending services but not clear plan to sustain services Districts have a plan for WASH but it is not well integrated into district and commune planning process	Government-led PAP and district plans are in place and all relevant departments, NGOs and private sector know about it. The WASH plans are partly integrated with district and commune investment and development planning	Province and district have a realistic plan to deliver sustained universal access, which is supported by non-government actors and by stated actors
<p><b>Financing</b></p>	Finance for WASH is mostly from MRD/PDRD and NGOs. Some funding is available through MOI but budget and acquittal process is unclear. Funding does not follow any government strategic plan.	Decentralised funding is available through relevant national government and some communes and districts allocate funding to WASH. Financing only for new infrastructure (not for operations and maintenance)	PDRD, Districts, communes and other actors allocate spending aligned with district WASH plan. Lifecycle costs are known and documented but only budgeted by private service providers.	Full fiscal decentralization, external support agencies channel funds through District accounts ("On Treasury"). Lifecycle costs matched to sources of finance.
<p><b>Institutional</b></p>	Roles and responsibilities for WASH exist at provincial level but are unclear or well known. Decentralisation, where it has happened, has confused roles at the district and commune levels.	Roles and responsibilities for WASH are understood by relevant government staff but not often followed, usually due to inadequate capacity. There are no performance plans or reviews. Decentralisation, where it has happened, has clarified roles and led to greater WASH involvement at district and commune levels.	Roles and responsibilities are clearly understood and regularly updated. There is some form of performance monitoring and identification of capacity needs but no plan to build capacity.	All necessary institutions and capacities are in place with clear roles and responsibilities eg regulator, health, education, HR, IT systems, core competency and qualifications.
<p><b>Accountability and regulation</b></p>	There are no accountability feedback mechanisms (ISAF) for WASH.	There are no accountability feedback mechanisms (ISAF) for WASH.	Accountability feedback mechanisms such as ISAF mention WASH in institutions but don't include community WASH.	Full accountability to citizens through ISAF.
<p><b>Service delivery and behaviour change</b></p>	Fragmented project interventions, multiple missions, and reporting systems. No post implementation support.	District authorities and agencies mainly focused on extending coverage. Some NGOs and private sector coordinate with government but not yet aligned with PAP. Some areas do not have any active service providers. Standards/guidelines for service delivery exist but are not always followed. Weak post implementation support (e.g. water supply maintenance or latrine emptying).	All actors in the province are working towards achieving the PAP targets. New actors consult with PTWG and districts to avoid duplicating programs and clashing approaches. Service delivery considers the most marginalised. There is some post implementation support (e.g. water supply maintenance or latrine emptying).	Provincial and district authorities are leading government, private sector and NGOs to expand quality services to all people in line with their strategic plans. Service providers from government and private sector are providing timely post-implementation service support.
<p><b>Monitoring</b></p>	Fragmented and duplicative monitoring processes, usually based on donor requirements. No MIS.	Some harmonisation of monitoring indicators and systems. Not all actors share data. No plan for monitoring from village through to province. Government plan includes targets but many indicators still lack clear monitoring processes.	Government-owned MIS aligning with PAP exists but is not regularly updated. Many actors align with government indicators but some WASH programs are still not reported through district or PDRD.	Government owned, regularly updated monitoring process feeding into strategic planning.
<p><b>Environment and Water Resources</b></p>	No water resource protection or management policies exist. No understanding of threats to water resources.	Water resource protection and management policies exist but are not implemented. Threats to water resources are poorly understood. No monitoring of water resources.	Water resource protection and management policies exist but are poorly implemented. Threats to water resources are well understood but not responded to in plans. Monitoring is weak.	Water resource protection and management policies are implemented and there is coordinated management across sectors. Threats to water resources are monitored and inform resilience planning.