

**United States Remarks for the
UNICEF Executive Board Annual Session
June 1-4, 2021**

Item 8b: Global evaluation of WASH programming in protracted crises 2014-19

We welcome the evaluation of UNICEF WASH programming in protracted crises, and we note that this is UNICEF's first evaluation specific to protracted crises. We encourage UNICEF to continue these strategic evaluations in other service areas.

We commend UNICEF for the strong performance results in partnership, normative frameworks, and sectoral standards. We also wish to recognize the recent initiatives in global level thought leadership demonstrated in the Water Under Fire report series and Global WASH Cluster contributions to the WASH Sector Roadmap for 2020-2025.

We note with concern the challenges raised related to: (1) UNICEF's failure to ensure the involvement of vulnerable groups in the design, delivery and usability of services; (2) insufficient investment in staffing, including "double-hatting" of program and cluster coordination staff; and (3) the lack of evidence that UNICEF WASH-supported interventions ensured the safety of users or that programs took measures to ensure that users felt safe using WASH services.

We thank UNICEF for its management response and ask for an update to the Executive Board on the progress of the implementation of the action plan included in the management response. We expect this to be in alignment to the implementation of the recommendations of UNICEF's Humanitarian Review.

- Recalling the recommendations from the Humanitarian Review, we ask that the action plan place increased emphasis on engaging and supporting local partners with expertise in both humanitarian and development approaches to address areas of limited and mixed performance and strengthen humanitarian-development coherence.

We look forward to seeing UNICEF's increased strategic alignment linking humanitarian and development programming approaches and expect to see greater emphasis on the intended outcomes of WASH programming in protracted crises addressed as a matter of urgency.

Finally, the evaluation finds an overemphasis on service delivery, with a lack of equity and quality commitments and failure to consistently perform post-intervention monitoring.

How will the findings of this evaluation be reflected in the new strategic results framework as it is heavily focused on service delivery in humanitarian contexts?