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Why this synthesis is important

• UNICEF spends a lot on WASH: $868 million in 2015
• 35% of the spending is for WASH in emergencies; 39% is for rural water supply/sanitation and hygiene/WASH in schools; 26% is for ‘general’ WASH

• WASH is an SDG priority. The SDG seeks “availability and sustainable management”, “universal and equitable access”, and to pay “special attention to the needs of … those in vulnerable situations”

• Equity, scalability, and sustainability are immediate and future concerns of UNICEF’s WASH programme
Objective of the Evaluation Synthesis

• To inform the development of the next UNICEF WASH strategy as it considers how to achieve these three cross-cutting objectives:
  
  ❖ **Equity**: That the services produced by the WASH programme shall benefit vulnerable or marginalized groups, and thereby reduce inequalities between them and more favoured populations.

  ❖ **Scalability**: That the programmes have expanded from the limited initial scale to reach all feasible communities and populations still lacking services.

  ❖ **Sustainability**: That the programme outputs, outcomes and impacts persist after the withdrawal of all forms of assistance from the external development agency.
Methodology / Limitations

• **Source material**: 64 evaluations completed by UNICEF country offices between 2008-2015, plus 10 sustainability checks conducted 1 or more years after the end of a WASH project

• **Density**: 78% of the items had relevant material on Scalability; 91% on Equity; and 100% on Sustainability

• **Key limitations**: higher income regions are under-represented in the evidence base; there are no standardized approaches to look at these themes
1. EQUITY
   - WASH equity and the programme cycle
   - WASH equity by demographic group
   - WASH equity by sub-sector

2. SCALABILITY
   - Models of going to scale
   - Determinants of going to scale
   - Going to scale by sub-sector

3. SUSTAINABILITY
   - Models of sustainability
   - Determinants of sustainability
   - Sustainability by sub-sector

CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS
WASH equity summation

WASH needs generally correlate with equity interests

Only 25% of the programs displayed a well-conceived, equity-focused geographical targeting strategy

Program attention is greatest to females and the poor, especially in technical design and in management

Women report notable satisfaction with all 3 WASH interventions

Evidence of impact is rare except for effect on women and girls. Wealth, age, disability etc are rarely examined

There is little to nil evidence of any impact on girls’ education outcomes [enrolment, absenteeism, repetition and dropping out, academic success]
Going to scale summation

- WASH programming spreads through spontaneous diffusion; organized replication; and institutionalized uptake. Both replication and uptake are in wide use.

- No UNICEF-wide, sector-wide or national standards or benchmarks were ever used to judge if a program had reached significant or optimal scale.

- 8 determinants repeatedly appeared as critical factors in going to scale.

- In almost all settings there are one or more technically effective approaches that can be applied at scale.

- Equity and scalability can conflict: particularly around the issue of subsidies or when rehabilitation works divert available funds from expansion.

- Specific actions can operationalize the policy commitment, e.g. developing technical standards across all partners. However, policy alignment is often weak.
Sustainability summation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 elements are always used to judge sustainability: presence and functionality; usage; usage across ‘generations’; operation and maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 variable factors may also be present: the particular behaviors sought; acceptable ‘slippage’ over time; financial and technical independence expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As with going to scale, there are 8 critical factors in achieving sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of programme design and implementation was a common weakness: insufficient concentration, weak links with Health, and infrastructure quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The poor quality of self-built latrines was commonly noted. All income levels are generally unwilling to upgrade latrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building sustainability expectations from the start has useful long term effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall conclusions

Many problems originate in and are preventable in the design phase; most problems can be anticipated.

The conceptual underpinnings are weak in several instances, but can benefit from making explicit the implicit models already identified through ‘learning-by-doing’.

Trade-offs among objectives are unavoidable as long as there are resource limitations.

WASH interventions are achieving some but not all desired social goals.

Sanitation and hygiene is the sub-sector that best reaches equity, scalability, and sustainability objectives.

Significant knowledge gaps remain.
Recommendations

1. DEVELOP THE EVIDENCE BASE—
   • [Examples] Willingness to pay and optimal tariff setting
   • Effective handwashing promotion strategies
   • Risk mitigation for factors beyond program control

2. BETTER UNDERSTAND THEORIES OF CHANGE—
   • [Examples] The role of WASH in schools in girls education
   • Why households resist/accept to improve initial latrines
   • Social benefit of participation in a community WASH body

3. IMPROVE PROGRAM DESIGN and RESULTS FRAMEWORKS
   • [Examples] Examine equity within the Situation Analysis
   • Improve outcome and enabling environment indicators
   • Plan for post-project behavioral reinforcement
For more information, please contact:
Samuel Bickel or Jeremie Toubkiss
UNICEF-NY Evaluation Office
sbickel@unicef.org;
jtoubkiss@unicef.org

The comprehensive document on which this report is based is available at

United Nations Children’s Fund
3 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: 212-326-7000
www.unicef.org

© United Nations Children’s Fund
August 2016