⚫WaterAid

External evaluation of WaterAid's DFID Programme Partnership Arrangement Funding 2011–2016
Synopsis and management response summary

1. Introduction

In 2015/16, WaterAid conducted an external evaluation of its five-year Programme Partnership Arrangement (PPA) with Department for International Development (DFID). This covered the period March 2011 to April 2016 and was conducted by IOD PARC (evaluation team of 2), with support from five independent associates in focus countries, WaterAid country programmes (CP) and staff from WaterAid's Programme Support Unit (PSU). The full evaluation report is an internal document for WaterAid, which is being used to reflect on past decisions and progress made, as well as to inform future thinking and planning. The full report contains more detailed analysis of the context and findings as well as providing specific country level examples. The recommendations from the full report will form the basis of an internal Management Response, which will be developed in late 2016.

This synopsis presents an accessible summary of the findings and conclusions that can be used to support learning. Apart from this introduction section and WaterAid's management response in section 5, the text in each of the sections that follow is taken directly from the detailed external evaluation report, with the evaluation team's findings and conclusions presented unedited and in full.

a. Scope of evaluation

WaterAid does not earmark PPA funding to any specific activities, regions, or country programmes (CPs) but uses it as unrestricted funding that contributes towards their overall strategic goals. While PPA funding is used to support all of WaterAid's activities the scope of this evaluation was tighter, considering the areas of: influencing, rights based approach (RBA), Healthy Start, partnerships and adaptive programming. It did not assess other strands of direct programming, influencing or support functions (finance, fundraising etc). It looked in more detail at 5 out of 37 country programmes (Burkina Faso, Malawi, India, Pakistan and Tanzania). As such, this evaluation provides a closer look at a slice of WaterAid's work, as requested in the Terms of Reference (ToR). These areas are not necessarily representative of the whole portfolio of WaterAid's work areas or country experiences.

b. Objectives of Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to reflect on the progress achieved during the period 2011-2016 and to consider progress in adaptive programming and partnerships to support future work in these two areas. The objectives of the evaluation were:

1. To assess the extent to which WaterAid has delivered against the three outcome indicators in the PPA logframe:
   o Capacity for collective action by civil society and non-sector actors to campaign for the rights of the poor to WASH
   o Global and national influencing is contributing to more people potentially having access to water and sanitation
   o WASH is recognised as an essential element of Health in national development frameworks, sector policies and programmes
2. To assess the extent to which internal programme tools have led to adaptive programming
3. To assess the extent that WaterAid partners' capacity has been increased and the extent to which the relationship between partners and WaterAid changed following investment in a Partnership Training Programme and the 2014 Keystone Survey

c. Limitations and Bias

It is important when considering the findings, conclusions and recommendations to bear in mind that this evaluation primarily looks at a small number of focus areas drawn from the entirety of WaterAid's work. Another important caveat is that 2015/16 is a year of transition for WaterAid with new country strategy papers (CSPs) and for the first time the development of country programme operational plans (CPOPs) and regional operational plans. While these documents have been analysed to illustrate changes in approach, these changes come at the very end of the PPA period.

2. WaterAid PPA Funding Context 2011-2016

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, WaterAid reported significant advancements against the 2009-2015 Global Strategy's four aims.

For four years the PPA supported the 2009-2015 Global Strategy's ambition to enable a further 25 million people to have access to basic services as a direct result of WaterAid's work, and to reach an additional 100 million people through their influencing work. The two year PPA extension period (2013-16) overlapped with the completion of 2009-2015 WaterAid Global Strategy and an internal period of strategising which culminated in the current Global Strategy aiming to secure universal access to WASH by 2030. The scope of this evaluation therefore sits clearly in the previous Global Strategy and subsequent shift of focus into the new Global Strategy.

The current Global Strategy, '*Everyone Everywhere 2030'* recognises that such a universal aim requires transformational change in the sector and that WaterAid cannot deliver this alone. One of the critical shifts in the current Global Strategy is to invest more heavily in leveraging and influencing decision makers to help make this change.

3. Main findings and conclusions

3.1 Enquiry One – Outcome Indicator One

This looks for evidence of *increased capacity for collective action by civil society and non-sector actors to campaign effectively for the rights of the poor to WASH.* As such, the Evaluation team included evidence that adopted an explicit Rights Based Approach (RBA) under this outcome indicator.

WaterAid has made a systematic effort to internalise the rights based approach (RBA) through the Rights Based Approach Action Learning initiative across 2 CPs per region. This cross-regional initiative builds on the outcomes of the Global Transparency Fund (GTF) programme and aims to support WaterAid staff in identifying and applying the principles and aspirations of RBA into programmes and build confidence within programme teams to move from a needs-based approach to a RBA. The intent is to upscale the use of RBA as a tool to build the voices of communities and hold duty bearers to account. In the current global strategy there is a special emphasis on rights and the use of RBA. It appears to be more ambitious than before because WaterAid realises it cannot reach everyone everywhere without being more purposeful about its advocacy and influencing. In the last couple of years WaterAid's advocacy and influencing work has gained greater profile (such as the post-2015 WASH goal) and it has become more confident about leveraging other resources to reach the ambitious targets.

In the main, all three enquiry streams provided evidence of progress. Countries may or may not have followed a RBA; therefore the majority of evidence comes from pockets of work, predominantly the RBA pilot countries (follow on from the DFID funded GTF). The literature assessments however failed to provide evidence of the main factors hindering/supporting capacity improvements. Capacity is currently not tracked. There could be various reasons for this including: the purpose of the annual reports and country programme evaluations does not require such a narrative or that this information is held in other Senior Management Team processes. To explore the sustainability and factors affecting capacity improvements the evaluation relied on additional documentary review, interviews and focus group data.

3.1.a Findings

- There are positive examples of where WaterAid has informed and assisted civil society and non-state sector actors' capacity to campaign for the rights of the poor to access WASH.
- Current reporting systems at the global and regional level do not systematically baseline, monitor/ track and capture information on capacity over time which makes it difficult to ascertain the impact of a RBA on increased access to WASH by assisting civil society and other actors.
- Drawing on findings from the partnerships section it is unclear to what extent the capacity building of partners for effective campaigning can be attributed to WaterAid.
- There is evidence that strategic thinking (focus on sector strengthening and sector monitoring) and involvement with regional and global platforms has built campaigning momentum.
- There has been a positive shift in the design and planning of WaterAid's work including greater national and regional contextual understanding.
- The regional structure through its interface role appears to be enabling improvements.
- Teams that work together with fewer barriers to communication are able to have a greater impact. Currently, strong capacity appears to rely on individuals or individual relationships rather than institutionalised ways of working.
- Strategy and/or approaches need to be translated/ operationalised into actionable programme design and joint departmental objectives.
- Regional roles are carrying a lot through a conflation of management and leadership responsibilities.

3.1.b Conclusions

There are many positive examples of WaterAid informing and assisting through its campaigns the rights of the poor to WASH. However the current regional and global reporting processes do not systematically baseline and track changes over time. It is therefore difficult to ascertain impact. The regional structure is embedded and has begun enabling sustainable improvements through its interface role. However these improvements need to be the results of institutionalised processes to be sustainable. Currently there is an over-reliance on individuals whose workloads cover both management and leadership tasks.

3.2 Enquiry Two –Outcome Indicator Two

This looks for evidence of *global and national influencing work contributing to more people potentially having access to water and sanitation*. Influencing is one of five key operational approaches chosen to deliver the four global strategic aims. It is understood as WaterAid's ability 'to influence governments, service providers and institutions to prioritise effective and affordable delivery of safe water, sanitation and hygiene'. It sits alongside partnerships, sustainability, capacity development and disaster resilience as a means of delivery. This is a shift from the previous strategy which pinned high expectations on influencing as a type of programming. The Global

Strategy is intended to be more nuanced, providing a global theory of change and core objectives as a broad canvas for CPs to set into their national context.

3.2.a Findings

- There is an established process for selecting evidence for the PPA and a system aligned with the previous global strategy for collecting data against the strategic performance indicators.
- There is the greatest amount of positive evidence of change available against this outcome indicator but the quality and import of this evidence is ambiguous.
- There is currently no process which tracks / monitors qualitative changes in access to WASH as contributed to by WaterAid's global, regional and national influencing work.
- The Annual Reports provide a lot of evidence of influencing work however it is unclear whether or not these results are externally (and internally) validated. Without this process, the strength of the evidence, its robustness and objectivity will be challenged.
- Globally WaterAid invested in campaigning for a single SDG on WASH and designing its new advocacy priority known as Healthy Start.
- Structures such as the Global Advocacy Executive and the convening role of the Campaigns Team are working well to enable and operationalise new investments.
- WaterAid also continued to support regional platforms to align their work and monitor sector performance.
- At the national level it is difficult to discern what the 'key' activities in influencing were because there is no tracking of change over time and there appears to be no system for creating this picture of influencing at the regional or global level.
- There is an established process for aggregating evidence against outcome 2 for PPA reporting. However there appears to be a lack of consistency about what is considered significant influencing evidence internally (which validates the earlier finding about the ambiguity of evidence for outcome 2).
- While there is no final published theory of change that underpins the current Global Strategy, substantial time has been dedicated to this. However, there remains a lack of clarity in how the Policy Campaigns Department (PCD) believe change happens. A theory of change which will facilitate agreement on how national, regional and global influencing strategies align.

3.2.b Conclusions

There is the greatest amount of positive evidence of change against this indicator but the quality and import of this evidence is ambiguous. It is unclear how this evidence fits into WaterAid's global theory of change and therefore where and how it contributes to greater WASH access. Good work has been done where connections exist between PCD, International Programmes Department (IPD), PSU and CPs however these connections are not institutionalised. However, the work on the post-2015 global goal and now on Healthy Start are providing early results (new approach to planning etc.) of what greater collaboration and operationalisation can achieve.

There is need for greater collaboration and cross-departmental ownership of problems. Further critical areas for attention are the monitoring and evaluation of influencing work (namely the baselining, tracking and reporting) which require attention before WaterAid will be able to tell a longitudinal, robust and objective story.

3.3 Enquiry Three – Outcome Indicator Three

This looks for *evidence of WASH being recognised as an essential element of Health in national development frameworks, sector policies and programmes*. There is much less evidence against outcome indicator 3 across all enquiry streams and the evidence presented is not of the same quality (in general the types of changes are more at the output level). A potential reason for the lack of data could be that WASH in health has been less of a priority in programme design until it became the recent global advocacy priority – Healthy Start. It appears from interviews that there was a risk-averse culture to seeking out partners beyond WASH. However, the current global strategy and Healthy Start process has given time to jointly agreeing messages and building confidence that WaterAid does have something to say to the health sector.

3.3.a Findings

- The lack of a baseline or agreement on what sustainable looks like, i.e. target number of countries remaining at a level over time, means the evaluation team is limited in what it can say.
- WaterAid could learn from how Healthy Start has been designed and delivered with CPs (including the timing of when this new focus was introduced).
- From the small evaluation sample it appears that there is growing confidence in how to design a Healthy Start programme but this requires ongoing monitoring and support to ensure it is consolidated.
- WASH in health has always been important to WaterAid but it was not a global priority until the current global strategy.
- Limited technical capacity at the CP level in 'WASH in health' has deterred progress in programmes and advocacy.
- The culture of 'adding on' new technical components is a barrier. It appears that approach adopted by Healthy Start of turning theoretical concept into practical, accessible components for CPs is working.
- Drawing on the findings from the Partnership section, it is important to begin systematically tracking and monitoring the capacity of partners, as well as types of partnerships held by the CPs.
- Similarly the tracking systems for monitoring changes in influencing must be secured to ensure that change at the national, regional and global level is visible.
- It is too early for the positive momentum of WASH for child health to be visible in country results. However the changes in approach, partnership, upskilling and general interest indicates that results will follow.

www.wateraid.org   wateraid@wateraid.org

47-49 Durham Street, London SE11 5JD   020 7793 4500

WaterAid is a registered charity: Australia: ABN 99 700 687 141. Canada: 119288934 RR0001. India: U85100DL2010NPL200169. Sweden: Org.nr: 802426-1268, PG: 90 01 62-9, BG: 900-1629.
UK: 288701 (England and Wales) and SC039479 (Scotland). US: WaterAid America is a 501(c) (3) non-profit organization

6

3.3.b Conclusions

There is the least amount of evidence available against this indicator. However, the current global strategy and the focus on Healthy Start have contributed to jointly agreeing messages and building confidence that WaterAid does have something to say to the health sector. A general movement supported by PCD to develop an organisation wide understanding of what constitutes progress in WASH through health is evident in new CSPs and CPOPs. This process is sustained by a collaborative way of working between London, regional teams and commitment from Country Representatives. It is therefore reasonable to expect that there will be improved progress within CPs on WASH and health within the current strategy period. However WaterAid needs to ensure that the systems and processes for tracking changes are carefully established, and that there is sufficient capacity to embed health aspects in WaterAid's ongoing work, both in terms of advocacy and broader programming work including service delivery.

3.4 Enquiry Four – Adaptive Programming

This was to establish the *extent to which internal programme tools have led to adaptive programming*. There is currently no agreed definition of adaptive programming but it is understood as the process by which CPs apply knowledge and learning in a systematic way to refine their programmes. The PSU working with key stakeholders from IPD, PCD and Programme Funding Unit (PFU) and representatives from all CPs, have been developing the concept of adaptive programming since 2013. However the current strategy concretises key shifts from the old global strategy through setting out explicitly (through CPOPs and regional plans) how change will happen in terms of design and resourcing of programmes.

3.4.a Findings

- There is currently no agreed definition of adaptive programming. It is also unclear how adaptive programming is linked to/ or not the programmatic approach.
- There is some evidence of reflective practice from the literature assessments of this evaluation. In particular, the new CSPs and CPOPs demonstrate greater learning.
- Current and upcoming changes in Programme Monitoring Evaluation and Reporting (PMER) in WaterAid more generally will demand greater learning and adaptation.
- This evaluation did not include looking at country level systems however from interviews, FGDs and annual reports it appears that there is no tracking of stories over time, which means programming learning is hard to gauge.
- Evaluative evidence suggests Post Implementation Monitoring Surveys (PIMS) has contributed to CPs holding a more nuanced understanding of change leading to sector strengthening.
- However, the application of learning appears to be more holistic than systematic as PIMS was rarely mentioned across enquiry streams.
- The expectations and process for how CPs apply learning is unclear. Equally there are currently no systems for tracking stories over time.
- Therefore CSPs do refer to CPEs but there are limited examples of systematic learning post CPE in annual reports.
- The rolling out of the new Programme Management Information System (Project Center) is critical to organisational effectiveness and accountability. It will fill a major gap.
- Innovative tools such as WASHwatch and waterpoint mapping remain relevant and important to the sector. However there is limited evidence due to the scope of this evaluation of their use.
- mWater is a new innovative platform and an important step forward in consolidating, sharing and reporting on data.
- PMER guidance is out of date and requires refreshing to ensure critical tools such as CPEs and PIMS are understood and used as strategic tools for learning.
- New planning processes at CP level, as set out earlier, are supporting CPs to set out a more contextualised approach to programming and demonstrate a more nuanced understanding of sustainability.

3.4.b Conclusions

Evidence from this evaluation suggests that learning from experience and then the application, that there is a discernible shift in WaterAid's understanding of sustainability to which PIMS has been a contributing factor. Planned improvements such as Project Center, centralising data collection on the mWater platform and a system to support tracking (PMIS) could mean that there is a much more systematic approach round the corner. This must be accompanied by guidance and a practical approach to operationalising findings.

3.5 Enquiry Five – Partnership

This was to establish the ext*ent that WaterAid partners' capacity has been increased and the extent to which the relationship between partners and WaterAid changed following investment in a Partnership Training Programme and the 2014 Keystone Survey*.

Working in partnerships is core to the Global Strategy 2015 - 2020, with collaboration as one of the WaterAid's six core values. There is recognition that partnerships are essential for the successful delivery of sustainable and equitable programmes and developing effective linkages with other sectors; and, necessary to build capacity and sustainability in the WASH sector and strengthen civil society's ability to hold governments to account for delivering WASH. There has been a return to a more equal based partnership approach, away from what had become a somewhat contractually based arrangement over the previous two strategic periods. There is now a corporate recognition that developing a partnership process requires time, attention and a range of skills. This is a shift from the previous Global Strategy which committed to working with partners to deliver its ambitious reach, but it did not present 'how' partnership was at the forefront of the approach. The intention to shift from a contractual approach to a more strategic approach to partnership is also laid out in the Discussion Paper: Partnership for Transformational Change. WaterAid is aiming for a consistent approach to partnership across the organisation in recognition that all of WaterAid's work is through partners. WaterAid has thus re-established their collective understanding of their core partnership principles.

3.5.a Findings

- There is evidence that the way partnerships are viewed by WA staff has improved at country, corporate and individual staff level over the PPA period.
- It is not possible to attribute the adoption of an improved approach to partnerships to the training. However, it can be surmised that the training plus the other corporate initiatives (i.e. seen as a more holistic capacity development initiative) will have contributed to a better understanding of partnership and improved practice.
- CP Strategies have reflected on the partnership learning to different degrees with some evidence of good practice, and a clear articulation of a strategic approach to partnership and reflecting the partnership language.
- Partnership language has been taken up by other WA departments including finance and the strategic partnerships team. The extent to which this goes beyond staff who have had contact with PSU through training and support is not clear and was not tested.
- A barrier to integration is considering Partnership as an 'add-on'.
- WaterAid could consider in more detail how it tracks partnership progress, partnership portfolios and how best to invest in integration.

3.5.b Conclusions

There appears to be solid strategic thinking and partnering at the global level, a 'new' partnership approach at the regional level and a reinvigorated approach to partnership emerging at the country level - work has been done on partnership at all levels. This has been supported by three key factors. Firstly, the build up to and process of agreeing the current Global Strategy has definitely secured a 'different focus' on partnerships and how to achieve everyone, everywhere. Secondly, the embedding of the programmatic approach which requires partners with a spectrum of technical abilities has also had a role to play. And thirdly, the importance of the regional perspective within the global strategy means WaterAid needs to be visible. However without further work on tracking capacity development it will be difficult to understand the contribution WaterAid has made to partners.

4. Recommendations

The terms of reference asked the evaluation team to come up with its top recommendations. The evaluation team reflected on the conclusions drawn from across all five areas assessed during this process as well as the chapter specific recommendations. Below are, in priority order, the top five recommendations for senior management in the UK, and are specific to WaterAid UK.

1. Develop a global advocacy theory of change

This evaluation has demonstrated that there is the greatest amount of positive evidence of change available against influencing work (outcome indicator 2) but that the quality and import of this evidence is ambiguous. It has found that there is also a conflation of evidence against outcome 1 and outcome 2 indicators. There are several potential reasons for this including: confusion over what constitutes rights-based evidence and a rights-based approach (RBA) and the interdependence of 'demand side' empowerment of communities and the increasing accountability of government 'supply side'. The lack of agreement about how change happens however results in all evidence of influencing and advocacy at the national and district level becoming evidence of a RBA.

While theories of change now exist at the country level, it is unclear how these results contribute to a global advocacy picture. Over the last 2 years, WaterAid has developed its current Global Strategy. This Strategy is the result of many implicit and understood theory or theories of change which have been deconstructed and reconstructed. However, a gap remains; an agreed picture of how change happens for advocacy. Given the amount of evidence that was available to the previous Global Strategy around influencing (evidenced in part by this evaluation), it is important now to decide about what type of change matters, when and why. Such a theory would set out a bigger picture that could direct regions and CPs in what to look for and report on.

Furthermore, the lack of an agreed global theory could be contributing to the lack of demand for monitoring and the scepticism about its import in PCD. If the regional and national capacity is built to make reporting more rigorous then the PCD structure

also needs to reflect this in a proportionate way. Arguably a theory is required to improve clarity on what contributions matter and how to achieve greater WASH results. In the end, this process may also end up building agreement on WaterAid's RBA (i.e. to what extent does WaterAid UK push a RBA in its work?)

2. Operationalise a WaterAid approach to rights-based work

The Evaluation team have begun to unpick the evidence provided against outcome indicator 1 as a start to this process. On the whole, there appear to be three categories/preferences emerging from the interviews and FGDs.

First, there is the preference for a top-down approach which focuses on engaging international structures with national structures. The objectives of such work are to achieve better national monitoring systems, political leadership attuned to technocratic challenges and creating the necessary conditions for greater access to WASH. For this approach, the 'collective voice' is the desired outcome.

The second preference is to present evidence from the point of service delivery – what could be called the community perspective. The objectives of such programmes are for rights claimants to determine their own development pathway. This approach is easier to qualify in terms of numbers of people but it can be a challenge to do this and at the same time engage with the national debate.

The third and final preference is for using RBA as another tool rather than as an approach or a development philosophy. For this perspective the evidence focuses on being responsive to inequalities and starting to move away from a needs-based perspective.

The conclusion is that there is no overall preference emerging from the evaluation evidence. However the tension between the first two preferences could undermine sustainability and the success of future collaborations. In the end, the big question that remains is whether the mix of these three preferences together will drive the best approach and the 'right' impact. A global advocacy theory of change process would create space to discuss these differences and agree how change happens.

3. Promote greater collaboration between London based teams, regional teams and CPs

The lack of collaboration between teams appears in contrast to the successful collaboration on post-2015 and the ongoing early collaborations on Healthy Start. While pockets of good collaboration exist and have achieved much (e.g. post-2015 work on global goals), these have been largely based on individual relationships. The collective ownership of 'problems' needs to be encouraged to ensure that collaborations (PCD working closely with IPD, CPs and regions) can take off and cross-departmental/team working can become institutionalised. This will result in a more effective translation of the global strategy into actionable programme design that will meet the ambitious targets.

The evaluation team suggests that a suitable next step might be an assessment of the barriers (beyond IPD) to greater effective regional integration into WaterAid's

work. The objective of this exercise would be to achieve greater institutionalisation of working practice between the regions and London.

4. Set up robust global level systems to track change over time

This evaluation did not assess the systems at CP level, or at regional level. It reviewed the process for collecting data for the PPA. Through this review, it became apparent that there is a lack of tracking advocacy change over time to report against a 'bigger' or global picture. Given the ambitions of the current global strategy, the evaluation team felt that it was important to make this recommendation.

One potential avenue to tackling this issue would be to use the roll out of Project Center (PMIS platform) to conduct a review of the process of building a story from CP to regional to global level. This would entail reviewing both the annual reporting and County Programme Evaluation template/terms of reference and process. The annual reports currently provide a lot of evidence of influencing work however it is unclear whether or not these results are externally (and internally) validated. Without this process, the strength of the evidence, its robustness and objectivity will be challenged. Similarly the import of the evidence produced from the Country Programme Evaluations and to what extent lessons are applied is unclear.

In addition to this, it would be important to reflect the changes in partnership working in this process i.e. how do partners contribute to an annual reflection on progress? Reviewing such a template would also allow PSU to create space for including stories about capacity building of partners, CSOs and/or other critical actors. Such a process would set renewed corporate expectations that these documents are part of 'tracking' WaterAid performance over time.

If PSU believe this to be of worth then the evaluation team would strongly recommend that baseline data is collected on all stories too. Furthermore, it will be important to streamline the use of WASHwatch, waterpoint mapping and mWater at CP level.

5. Continue investing in strategic initiatives post-PPA with greater prioritisation

The PPA has enabled WaterAid to invest in strategic activities, new countries, new systems, new tools and new priorities. It is important that this momentum is not lost. The evaluation team think that the work on partnerships, Healthy Start, as well as many others, requires continued support to drive consolidated change.

The new Country Strategy Papers and Country Programme Operational Plans indicate a shift in approach that will be founded on partnerships with existing and new actors. This foundation is supported by capacity development work. The shifts evidenced in this evaluation demonstrate that WaterAid has developed a more nuanced understanding of sustainability; a focus on sector strengthening. Asking country programmes to set strategic priorities for their context is a different approach that will need to time to embed. During this time, different types of tracking can be piloted.

5. WaterAid's management response

Internally WaterAid has developed responses to each of the detailed recommendations, and a summary of the responses to the top five recommendations is presented in the table below. As a context to this, we would like to highlight that learning from the PPA, feedback from DFID, and this evaluation have all been valuable in shaping WaterAid's organisational development as we implement our Global Strategy 2015-2020. Since the evaluation, we have made progress on implementing a number of initiatives in line with, and supporting, our strategic shifts. This includes work on our planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) processes and systems; developing guidance for CPs which articulates our global approach and supports the operationalisation of rights-based approaches; and new cross-departmental thematic working groups to promote collaboration. These initiatives and others are outlined further below.

Recommendation	Summary of WaterAid's response
1. Develop a global advocacy theory of change	**Partially accept**: We believe WaterAid needs a global approach, not a global theory of change. We are developing a joint, global narrative which will create common understanding across the organisation on our approach (including the programmatic approach, sector strengthening and the rights-based approach). This will be created through a package of guidance materials for all, including country programmes (CPs). This global approach will be supported by our strengthened planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) systems and processes, which are discussed further below (see recommendation 4).
2. Operationalise a WaterAid approach to rights-based work	**Accept**: Our organisational starting point is that access to water and sanitation are human rights which are underpinned by Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6. In strategic guidance, we are continually reinforcing the link between sector strengthening and rights-based approaches, emphasising that accountability and strong demand are essential elements for sustainable services that meet the SDG targets. We are also promoting the application of human rights principles across all our work, although we may not always use explicit human rights language. Work is already underway on drafting practical guidelines to support CPs with incorporating the rights-based approach in their plans. This is building on our existing work on equity and inclusion and links to the initiative above to articulate our global approach. We have documented some of our action learning on rights-based approaches and disseminated this at the RWSN conference in December. Concrete examples are key to helping others to operationalise this approach.

Recommendation	Summary of WaterAid's response
	We recognise that this represents a significant shift and it will take time for staff, partners and supporters to move from seeing WaterAid as an organisation that provides services to communities that have been neglected by government to an organisation that helps communities hold government to account for services. This will be a process of doing, learning and reflecting to find out what works in each context. We will support this through learning, knowledge management and capacity development.
3. Promote greater collaboration between London-based teams, regional teams and CPs	**Accept**: This is challenging for large matrixed organisations. We are currently working on bringing together expertise across London-based teams, regional teams and CPs around a set of flagship thematic areas, fostering cross-departmental collaboration. This builds on the success of existing thematic working groups, such as for Healthy Start, our Global Advocacy Priority (GAP). Since the evaluation, we have also made structural changes which aim to support collaboration. For example, we have created a Global Programme and Advocacy Executive to act as the strategic leadership body across WaterAid, bringing together programmes and advocacy colleagues. We have also strengthened the Global Executive (CEOs of WaterAid federation members and UK Directors) where all major global decisions are made. As these changes are implemented and embedded, we recognise the importance of prioritising and systematising their ways of working to ensure that genuine collaboration occurs.
4. Set up robust global-level systems to track change over time	**Accept**: We have prioritised and invested in improving planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) systems and processes across all WaterAid UK CPs. This was an important focus under the PPA and, since this evaluation, the first stage of the rollout of the new systems and processes was a key result under the PPA nine month extension (April-December 2016). The new processes and systems are designed to track and capture all types of outcomes under our new strategy, not just WaterAid's historical focus on directly delivering WASH services, and advocacy staff have been involved throughout the process. The new processes are structured around three cycles with, for example, CP evaluations and PIMS now built into each CP's strategic cycle and the annual reporting process and templates redesigned as part of a more reflective annual cycle. Closely linked to this we have undertaken targeted work on the

Recommendation	Summary of WaterAid's response
	PMER of advocacy and influencing at the global, regional and CP level. We have developed a global common approach to how advocacy and influencing work will be planned and tracked over time across the global organisation. This will ensure that the benefits of the PMER approach are shared as widely as possible and that our systems for advocacy meet the same standards as those of more traditional service delivery activity. The implementation of this approach will be a focus in 2017/18 and is being supported by selected practical tools which aim to improve the quality of analysis, evidence and documentation. In addition, we intend to develop a small set of global indicators and markers of success at the strategy level which will tell one part of the global story of change over time.
5. Continue investing in strategic initiatives post-PPA with greater prioritisation	**Accept**: In an era of more constrained funding, we have placed a renewed emphasis on prioritisation. The UK Business Plan for each year identifies the top priorities for the organisation and we have focused on identifying those early to ensure they are resourced as part of the planning process. Performance against these will be measured on a regular basis. Complementing this pan-organisational work, as outlined above, we have defined a small number of flagship themes which will form the core of our programme work and the focus for funding. While there continues to be momentum behind key initiatives such as Healthy Start and the work on partnerships, investing in strategic initiatives will be more challenging in the current and expected climate. Maintaining strategic prioritisation across a complex organisation is hard, and will be much harder without sources of funding, like the PPA, that allow the organisation to support the overall strategy, not just specific grants. We should not underestimate the effort it will take to maintain momentum and ensure we continue to invest strategically in strengthening the organisation.