Global evaluation of UNICEF water, sanitation and hygiene programming in protracted crises, 2014–2019

Fabio Sabatini Chief, Evaluation Office

UNICEF Executive Board 2021 annual session (1-4 June 2021) Item 8: Evaluation reports and management responses Reference document: E/ICEF/2021/20



Background, purpose and design

Children in extremely fragile contexts are 8 times worse off in WASH indicators than their counterparts in non-crisis contexts. The average crisis now lasts more than 9 years.

The evaluation aimed to demonstrate accountability and learning on how has UNICEF responded to increasing WASH needs in some of the most challenging contexts.



Evaluation questions examined:

- Quality, equity and inclusion
- Leadership and coordination roles
- Results monitoring and reporting
- Capacity to implement timely and effective response
- Linkages of WASH humanitarian action with development objectives

Methods:

- Extensive document review (600+ documents)
- 4 case studies: Cameroon, Lebanon, Somaliland, South Sudan
- 2 thematic case studies: WASH action in public health crises and WASH in urban crisis settings
- Online survey and key informant interviews of UNICEF staff and partners, including NGOs, CBOs

Evaluation Findings

What works well in WiPC

- ✓ UNICEF met targets for water supply; number of water beneficiaries doubled from 2014-2018
- ✓ WASH rightly positioned within a public health context.
- ✓ Extensive data on WASH outputs
- ✓ Significant emphasis and understanding of norms and standards for service provision and coverage.
- ✓ Partnerships are a core strength, particularly with government and local authorities
- ✓ Global WASH Cluster regarded as the best expression of UNICEF leadership for WiPC
- ✓ Operational sector or cluster coordination is strong.
- ✓ Urban WASH framework builds on core strengths: government relationships, convening power
- ✓ Ambitious UNICEF agenda in linking humanitarian and development (LHD) programming
- ✓ Highly capable WASH staff in these contexts; surge rosters best filled of any sector



What needs improving in WiPC

- × No **institutional definition** of protracted crises or clear trigger for different ways of working; siloed humanitarian and development perspectives
- × Wider changes in lives expected from WiPC action not clearly articulated
- x Lack of suitable data on outcomes impeding a true understanding of programme effectiveness
- Unequal priority given to equity and quality standards
- WiPC partnership not driven by a long-term view or localization strategy
- × UNICEF is widely considered to have lost ground in terms of thought leadership on WiPC
- × Need for stronger cluster leadership on **longer-term approaches**; "provider of last resort" role entails risks
- × Lack of appropriate expertise/processes for large-scale **urban WASH** infrastructure projects
- × Significant gap between what is happening on the ground and what is required by the **new LHD procedure**
- Country office WASH sections in protracted crises stretched to capacity just to ensure basic WASH services; little bandwidth to implement required changes



Recommendations

- R 1 Develop an **organizational definition** across UNICEF (not only WASH) to trigger different ways of working
- **R 2** Ensure an equal focus on water and **sanitation/hygiene**.
- R 3 Establish a clear understanding of **intended changes** of WiPC
- R 4 Improve collection and use of data for WiPC
- **R 5 –** Ensure **quality and equity** given the same weight as coverage.
- R 6 Enhance current **partnerships** models to embody all aspects of the UNICEF commitment to localization
- R 7 Build on current efforts to reclaim UNICEF thought leadership for WiPC
- R 8 Strengthen UNICEF accountability as cluster lead agency for WASH
- R 9 Focus WASH work in **urban settings** on systems strengthening
- R10 Ensure COs are fully aware of how to meet LHD commitments
- R11 Provide adequate support to country offices to meet UNICEF ambitious LHD agenda



Thank you.

