

GLOBAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS FOR SDG6



Commissioned by
End Water Poverty & Partners

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Foreword	6
Executive summary	9
<i>Key findings from country studies</i>	11
<i>Challenges reported by country studies</i>	12
<i>Opportunities reported by country studies</i>	12
<i>Recommendations for governments</i>	13
<i>Recommendations for CSOs</i>	13
<i>Recommendations for development partners</i>	14
<i>Recommendations for United Nations agencies</i>	14

4.

Findings on national accountability mechanisms, platforms or systems in place for holding governments accountable towards SDG6

4.1 Accountability mechanisms for the individual targets of SDG6	46
4.2 Different types of accountability mechanisms	49

7.

Recommendations generated by country studies

7.1 For Government	120
7.2 For CSOs and NGOs	122
7.3 For Development Partners	123

1.

Introduction

1.1 Purpose and outcomes of the study	16
1.2 Accountability mechanisms – definition	16
1.3 The High Level Political Forum voluntary national reviews	19
1.4 Methodology and sample	19
1.5 Outline of the study	24

5.

Good practices and means of participation in accountability mechanisms

5.1 The means of participation in accountability mechanisms	73
5.2 What are the positive results of these accountability mechanisms?	75

8.

Conclusion

125

Acknowledgements

Reviewers

Al-hassan Adam, End Water Poverty;
 Yemisi Akpa, Nigeria;
 Bari, Maldives;
 Heloise Chicou, End Water Poverty/ Sanitation and Water for All;
 John Garrett, WaterAid;
 Oli Henman, Action for Sustainable Development;
 Ceridwen Johnson, WSSCC;
 Stuart Kempster, WaterAid;
 Wilhelmina Malima, WSSCC;
 Sandra Metayer, Coalition Eau;
 Hannah Nuemeyer, WASH United;
 Essokl'nam Pedessi, Jeunes Verts Togo;
 Nathalie Seguin Tovar, Freshwater Action Network Mexico;
 Ibrahima Sory, SYLLA – Carbone Guinée;
 and Erma Uytewaal, Watershed Programme

Copy edited by

Tom Burgess

Published by

Coalition Eau, End Water Poverty,
 Watershed Programme,
 Water Supply and Sanitation
 Collaborative Council and with the
 support of Sanitation and Water for All

Layout by

Kiana Alavi, Jade Jeffries,
 Dechan Dalrymple, David Trouba,
 Edith Guiochon, Vera van der Grift
 Jerry de Mars,

Authors

Laura van de Lande
 and Catarina Fonseca,
 IRC WASH
 and Watershed programme

Quote as

Van de Lande, L. & Fonseca, C. 2018.
 Global Review of National
 Accountability Mechanism for SDG6.
 London: End Water Poverty.

Country consultants

Afghanistan	Azizurrahman Rafiee	Maldives	Rashid Bari
Bangladesh	Amitabha Bhattacharjee	Mexico	Natalie Seguin
Benin	Arnaud ADJAGODO	Nepal	Dhruba Karki and Anil Sthapit
Buthan	Phurpa Thinley	Netherlands	Sara Bori
Burkina Faso	Sylvestre Tiemtoré	Niger	Zabeirou Yacouba
Cameroon	Beaudelin NGUEGANG	Nigeria	Rashid Bari
Costa Rica	Vanessa Dubois	Pakistan (FANSA)	Rashid Mahmood
Guinee Conakry	Ibrahima Sory Sylla	Senegal	Mbaye Niang
Ghana	Hamza Mahama	Sri Lanka	Ananda Jayaweera
France	Sandra Metayer	Tanzania	Wilhemina Malima
Honduras	Omar Nuñez	Togo	Esso-kl'nam Pedessi
India	Saroj Tucker	Bhutan	Phurpa Thinley
Kenya	Francis Wadegu	Maldives	Mohammad Rashid Bari
Mali	Assad Ibrahim Tolo		

We would like to thank all participating organisations who took part in this research.





Foreword

It is a great privilege to write the foreword to this ground-breaking review of national accountability mechanisms for Sustainable Development Goal6 (SDG6).

Effective governance is critical for fulfilling the human right to water and sanitation for everyone in society. Indeed, the African Ministers Council on Water's (AMCOW) new strategy emphasises the need for strengthening sector governance mechanisms. In line with our mandate and mission, we will continue to provide the needed political leadership and direction for the sector as well as advocate for reinforcing fiduciary mechanisms to achieve more accountability, transparency, participation and value for money. This report will play an important role towards achieving this mission in Africa and the rest of the world.

The approach taken by the research team is refreshing. The adoption of exploratory methods of research allowed for open minded and bold findings. Furthermore, the report embodies the SDG call for the involvement of a cross section of key stakeholders in a fair and balanced manner in achieving the SDGs, including other regional commitments and targets, as well as reporting on and monitoring their progress. The global spread of the countries involved in the research provides a balanced representation of the global situation.

With regards to the recommendations, I would like to emphasise that all major stakeholders from government, intergovernmental organisations and United Nations agencies, donors and civil society have something to take home. To share one such example, national governments have been urged to "take the lead in ensuring transparent allocation of roles and responsibilities for data collection, monitoring and reporting on the implementation of commitments and progress on all SDG6 targets." In my opinion, this is one of the most fundamental roles that a country must play. As such, this aspect must fast tracked and properly resourced for it to be successful.

It is great to see so many global, regional and national civil society networks and organisations joining forces to produce this illuminating report, which will provide substantial evidence to support us to attain the SDGs. This kind of collective effort should be encouraged and I hope that we can build on this momentum to fulfil the 2030 agenda.

I am looking forward to seeing the evidence and messages from the report being discussed in policy fora. From our side, I will be drawing upon some of its recommendation to improve the sector in Africa because they are critical to accelerating progress towards achieving the SDGs.

**Dr Canisius Kanangire,
Executive Secretary
African Ministers Council on Water (AMCOW)**

Executive Summary

Executive Summary

It has been almost three years since the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including SDG6: “Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all by 2030”. According to WHO/UNICEF 2017, it is estimated that 30% of people worldwide, or 2.1 billion, still lack access to safe, readily available water at home, and 60%, or 4.5 billion, lack safely managed sanitation.

In a majority of low and middle income countries, progress is too slow to reach SDG6 by 2030 and there are decreasing trends in at least 20 countries.

Governments are accountable for their formal commitments under SDG6 and have committed to engage in systematic follow-up and review of implementation. Furthermore, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development envisions “a world where we reaffirm our commitments regarding the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation and where there is improved hygiene”¹.

Accountability means that those who are responsible, accept responsibility for their actions and omissions, and accept that they are called upon to give an account of why and how they have acted or failed to act, and adjust their policies and actions accordingly.²

Effective accountability mechanisms are considered transparent, engage a diversity of stakeholders, facilitate and encourage critical reflection on progress, and are responsive to issues addressed by stakeholders. More than just seeking to correct past wrongs, accountability mechanisms are forward-looking, seeking to influence government actions in the future, making them more responsive to the SDG6 targets and the needs of citizens.

Standards for institutionalised participation of civil society at the international and national voluntary review processes for SDG6 have never been set.



copyright: WSSCC

¹ A/RES/70/1, 21 October 2015, preamble + para. 7, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>

² See section 1.2.



copyright: WSSCC

At the international level, the UN High Level Political Forum (HLPF) has a central role in reviewing progress towards achieving the SDGs. The 2030 Agenda, however, provides little detail on the HLPF accountability structure. The accountability mechanisms for international SDG commitments are of a voluntary nature, without guidelines, and are viewed by many as non-transparent, unfit for purpose tick-box exercises.

At the national level, every country has its own set of institutional structures and mechanisms to implement and report on the achievement of SDG6 targets. This study has investigated the nature of the existing accountability mechanisms at national level, challenges and opportunities.

Participating countries

Africa (12)	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana, Guinea-Conakry, Kenya, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Togo
South Asia (8)	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
Latin America (3)	Costa Rica, Honduras, Mexico
Europe (2)	France, Netherlands

Participating organisations

Afghan Civil society Forum-organisation (ACSFo)	Jeunes Verts Togo
Alliance pour la Maitrise de l'Eau et de l'Energie (AME)	Kenya Water for Health Organisation
Asociación Regional Centroamericana para el Agua y el Ambiente	LNW Consulting/Bhutan Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Programme
CCOAD-Niger	Modern Architects for Rural India
Centre for Environmental Justice	NGO Forum for Urban Water and Sanitation
CN-CIEPA/Wash -Mali	ONG Carbone Guinée
Coalition Eau	Partenariat National de l'Eau du Benin (PNE-Bénin)
Coalition of Non Governmental Organisations in the Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS)	Punjab Urban Resource Centre
Conseil des Organisations Non Gouvernementales d'Appui Développement (CONCAD)	Sanitation and Water Action (SAWA)
Development Organisation of the Rural Poor (Dorp)	Sécrétariat Permanent des Organisations Non Gouvernementales (SPONG)
Freshwater Action Network Mexico (FANMEX)	WaterCare
IRC-WASH	Women Environmental Programme

Key findings from the country studies^{3,4}

In most countries, accountability mechanisms for SDG6 are not available. When reported, accountability mechanisms have been mentioned as not effective, and are limited mostly to some indicators of targets 6.1 and 6.2.

Hardly any of the countries report clear responsibilities for SDG6 specifically. Overall, responsibilities for the SDGs are allocated among various ministries, often chaired by high-level officials. Accountability is hindered by a lack of adequate monitoring and reporting on SDG6, including limited progress on implementation of commitments on targets.

Responsibilities for reporting on SDG6 related targets are unclear and scattered among different departments, or responsibilities are not identified or allocated at all. When mentioned, accountability mechanisms in country studies are available only for some indicators of targets 6.1 and 6.2.

Most of the accountability mechanisms and tools brought forward in the country studies are standalone events and not part of a systematic structured approach to accountability. Some countries are preparing for the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in July 2018, but over half of the country studies have reported not to be aware of their government preparing for a Voluntary National Review on SDG6 progress.

Few country studies mentioned the use of accountability tools such as third party validation, complaint, grievance and enforcement mechanisms or other existing human rights mechanisms.⁵

A few countries have indicated that joint sector reviews perform as an effective accountability mechanism, others refer to accountability through regulatory and democratic systems using parliamentary reviews. Some countries reported that decentralised mechanisms can be particularly effective avenues to influence and hold government accountable: social audits, open budget sessions, budget tracking and creation of basin committees.

Some of the country studies have referred to networks of civil society organisations (CSOs) as a means to more effectively

hold their governments accountable. A few country studies have indicated that shadow reporting by civil society constitutes an effective accountability mechanism.

Few countries mention the role of media in raising public awareness and only two countries mention the role of the private sector in holding the government accountable.

Many country studies refer to a lack of awareness, knowledge and capacity among CSOs on what monitoring implementation of SDG6 actually means. Additionally in some countries, among CSOs, there is confusion and a lack of coordination about roles, responsibilities and mandates regarding SDG6. In some countries, stakeholders reported a failure to be transparent, share information and to adequately represent voices from grassroots levels.

Accountability overall is hindered by a lack of adequate monitoring and reporting on SDG6, limited progress on implementation of commitments and limited opportunity for CSOs to contribute to monitoring SDG6 and to submit independent reviews.

Most countries in the study reported that they are still in the initial stages of developing a systematic process for monitoring and review that generates evidence on sector progress towards SDG6 and allows for multi-stakeholder involvement. Global monitoring instruments are often used for tracking progress towards SDG6 at national level. Some European countries have their own binding SDG accountability and reporting mechanisms.

In most surveyed countries, data is incomplete, inadequate and not disaggregated enough to allow for tracking progress on reaching the most marginalised groups (i.e. the poorest, indigenous groups, refugees and the elderly).

Some countries are still developing and mapping SDG6 baselines, indicators and targets and are in the process of developing new systems for data collection.

³ The same methodology was applied in all the participating countries and it explored the existence and functioning of national accountability mechanisms for all targets of SDG6. Findings collected from submitted country reports however showed a focus on WASH targets (e.g. 6.1 and 6.2) with little references to other targets of SDG6.

⁴ This study took place between September 2017 and March 2018 and involved stakeholders including government (national level), government (municipal, provincial, regional or district level), local civil society organisations (CSOs), local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), development partners or UN agencies,

research or education institutions, international NGOs or think-tanks, foundations, and others. The study focused on 25 countries (low, middle and high income) across Asia, Africa and Latin America. There are also two European countries

⁵ Mechanisms may include national human rights institutions or commissions, ombudspersons, complaint mechanisms at regulatory bodies and submission of shadow reports under international monitoring mechanisms including the Universal Periodic Review and special procedures of the Human Rights Council.

Challenges reported by country studies

There are many challenges with the few existing, reported accountability mechanisms. At present, accountability mechanisms are not systematic, regular, inclusive and meaningful - and considered far from effective to hold governments accountable to their SDG6 commitments.

Challenges reported by country studies regarding the functioning and effectiveness of accountability mechanisms include the lack of a legal basis for existing mechanisms, the irregularity of the accountability processes and the limited extent of follow-up of outcomes from such processes. Country studies have indicated that governments' commitments on SDG6 remain a topic at the national level only, and are not being implemented and monitored at the local level.

Country studies have reported barriers to meaningful participation: CSOs and other organisations such as academia, private sector or the media are not invited to key meetings, relevant information for participation is not shared or is hard to find, there are unequal opportunities to participate in accountability mechanisms and in a few countries the space for engagement between governments and CSOs is limited.

Government-level challenges include lack of coordination and unclear allocation of roles and responsibilities, lack of interest and political commitments for SDG6 and not ensuring that there is enough diversity of stakeholders and representation of women and marginalised groups.

Many country studies refer to a lack of awareness, knowledge and capacity among CSOs on what monitoring implementation of SDG6 actually means. Additionally in some countries, among CSOs, there is lack of coordination and confusion about roles, responsibilities and mandates regarding SDG6. CSO-level challenges include also a failure to be transparent, share information and to adequately represent voices from grassroots levels.

A major challenge often referred to by many countries is that financing and budget allocations are often insufficient for the well-functioning of accountability mechanisms, and CSOs struggle to fundraise and remain independent to effectively hold governments accountable to SDG6.

Opportunities reported by country studies

Almost all CSOs and government officials consulted agreed that participation in accountability mechanisms for SDG6 have a positive impact when carried out in an effective, meaningful way.

Country studies indicated that multi-stakeholder participation in accountability mechanisms strengthens partnerships, improves coordination of actions and leads to more clarity on roles and responsibilities among stakeholders. The role of traditional media is often mentioned as an important and powerful accountability accelerator, as it can be used to create awareness and to put public pressure on the government to take responsibilities for its decisions with regard to water and sanitation.

Country studies indicate that participatory accountability mechanisms have the potential to increase political attention and funding for SDG6. Moreover, it leads to capacity building within government for implementation of SDG6. Participation in accountability mechanisms can also lead to better and more effective ways for the collection of data and monitoring practices, which can successfully influence government policies, and an increased attention on marginalised areas, grassroots communities, and vulnerable groups.





Recommendations for governments

Governments are accountable for their formal commitments under SDG6 and must realise the human rights to water and sanitation. Investing in effective national accountability mechanisms will support progress towards Agenda 2030 ambitions.

1. Take the lead

Ensure transparent allocation of roles and responsibilities for disaggregated data collection, monitoring and reporting on the implementation of commitments and progress on all SDG6 targets. Make sure the review on sector progress towards SDG6 is systematically done.

2. Make it happen

Develop official accountability mechanisms at national and local level that allow meaningful consultation of all stakeholders on a regular basis. Invest in citizens' engagement and the necessary capacity building and knowledge sharing initiatives. Make sure that there are mechanisms for enforcement of decisions

3. Be inclusive

Make sure accountability mechanisms for SDG6 targets include all stakeholders and ensure the representation of excluded/marginalised groups.



Recommendations for CSOs

Civil society, WASH sector organisations and human rights organisations seem to work alongside each other without profiting from each other's expertise. The processes of change required to reach SDG6 takes time and no single organisation can succeed alone. Connect with others and strategise together.

1. Pull together

Build capacity and create awareness of SDG6 targets and corresponding national commitments and policies. Create strong partnerships among CSOs, increase the coordination and communication among all stakeholders to join and support existing platforms and networks for holding the government accountable for their commitments.

2. Build a stronger voice

Actively involve grassroots and marginalised groups to understand their needs and challenges. Include their voice in advocacy and in consultations with government. Document the evidence and share this often unwritten knowledge.

3. Be accountable

Accountability starts with your organisation and network. Be accountable to your constituency – not just to your donors – and actively seek feedback on your activities to hold governments accountable to SDG6.



copyright: WSSCC



Recommendations for development partners

Financing water governance is as important as financing infrastructure. CSOs have a key role to play in holding governments accountable on progress towards SDG6.

1. Finance good governance

Donors should continue to support the aid effectiveness agenda and work within government frameworks and priorities. Engage with governments on national sector development strategies and plans, particularly on the need for national accountability mechanisms and strengthening CSOs' role within them.

2. Beyond one-off multi-stakeholder workshops

Support governments and CSOs with the technical and financial means to establish formal, regular and inclusive multi-stakeholder accountability mechanisms for the implementation of SDG6. One-off irregular sector events remain relevant, but are not effective accountability mechanisms.

3. Be accountable for "leaving no one behind"

Increase accountability on the use of your own funds that contribute to the achievement of SDG6. Make sure that the monitoring and reporting on the spending of your funds have disaggregated data on progress towards reaching the most marginalised people, who traditionally have no voice in the implementation of SDG6.

This study was led by CSOs in 25 countries under the umbrella of End Water Poverty, Watershed Consortium, Coalition Eau and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC). The study took place between October 2017 and March 2018.

The process and the results of the study aim to strengthen CSOs' capacity to advocate for improved accountability mechanisms and for their involvement in decision-making and follow-up actions around progress towards SDG6. This study has facilitated - and in many instances started - a much-needed conversation in-country between governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.



Recommendation for United Nations agencies

There need to be well-defined opportunities for effective engagement of CSOs in review mechanisms.

- ☀ The HLPF needs to recognise the role of CSOs in SDG6 and to adopt recommendations and guidelines for national governments to establish and use national accountability mechanisms for reporting on SDG6. It is expected that governments will then involve CSOs in relevant processes.
- ☀ Recognise the important role that CSOs play in assisting with effective SDG implementation, as well as providing reliable information on progress for marginalised and vulnerable persons on the ground.



At the international level, the aim of the study is to inform the development of accountability mechanisms within the HLPF.

The results of the study are based on more than 1,000 surveys, interviews and validation meetings with stakeholders working on water resources, drinking water and sanitation in 25 countries. Stakeholders who participated voluntarily in this study include governments (national and decentralised), CSOs, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), development partners, UN agencies, research and education institutions, and think-tanks. The private sector and trades unions representation in the study has been limited.

1



Introduction



1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose and outcomes of the study

This study took place between October 2017 and March 2018 and was led by CSOs in 25 countries under the umbrella of End Water Poverty, Watershed Consortium, Coalition Eau and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC). Organisations agreed to conduct an in-depth inclusive analysis on country-level accountability mechanisms towards SDG6 on clean water and sanitation implementation and produce a comprehensive report, assessing their strengths, limitations and effectiveness.

The outcomes of this study include enhanced insights on the existing in-country mechanisms and their functioning for SDG6, resulting in tools for CSOs to find more or better ways to hold their government accountable for reaching SDG6 targets and meaningful reporting on progress.

It identifies positive experiences of participating in existing accountability mechanisms, as well as the greatest gaps and challenges currently observed in the functioning of accountability mechanisms, from the perspective of

governments, civil society and other stakeholders. The process and the results of the study therefore aim to strengthen CSOs' capacities to advocate for improved accountability mechanisms and their involvement in decision-making and follow-up actions.

This study facilitated a much needed conversation in-country between national governments and other relevant stakeholders – and the study is entirely based upon findings collected from a combination of governmental and non-state actors at different levels.

CSOs, including the organisations that initiated this study, will be better positioned to influence, with evidence, the international debate on strengthening international, national and local accountability mechanisms and the role of CSOs in it. Governments in turn may be more aware of what is currently working well and what needs to be urgently addressed for CSOs to hold governments accountable for implementation and progress.

1.2 Accountability mechanisms – definition

References to 'accountability' are common, but it often proves difficult to pin down its actual meaning. The definition of accountability differs across branches and disciplines. Mostly however, accountability refers to the obligation of relevant authorities to take responsibility for their commitments and actions, be answerable to the people affected by these, and be subject to a thorough monitoring process and to some form of enforceable measures if progress is lacking.⁶ In other words; accountability means those who are responsible accept responsibility for their actions and omissions and accept that they are called upon to give an account of why and how they have acted or failed to act, and adjust their policies and actions accordingly.

More than just seeking to correct past wrongs, accountability is forward-looking, seeking to influence government actions in the future. For the commitments made under the Sustainable Development Agenda this means that accountability is aimed at making government actions more responsive to the SDG6 targets and the needs of citizens. This report therefore explores

the mechanisms available for CSOs to hold the government accountable for the commitments made under SDG6.

National accountability mechanisms come in many shapes and forms. Every country has its own set of institutional structures and mechanisms to implement, keep track of, and ensure accountability for the achievement of water and sanitation targets. This study seeks to identify which national accountability mechanisms are put in place and used by CSOs to hold governments accountable for progress under SDG6.

In this study 'effective accountability mechanisms' are considered to be mechanisms that are transparent, engage stakeholders, facilitate and encourage critical reflection on progress and lesson learning and are respondent to issues addressed by stakeholders. The results of accountability mechanisms must be made publicly available in progress reports, and information must be easily accessible to everyone. Governments follow up the results from these progress reports in a structural manner.⁷

⁶ See CESR and OHCHR, Who Will Be Accountable? p. 10. <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/WhoWillBeAccountable.pdf>



copyright: Economic and Social Rights Centre - Hakijamii

BOX 1 Accountability and access to water and sanitation: the human rights and the SDG framework

The most remarkable difference between access to water and sanitation in the human rights framework compared to the goals and targets related to water and sanitation in the SDG framework is based on the legal nature of the former and the political nature of the latter. The human rights framework consists of legal obligations, enforceable in front of courts and other judicial mechanisms, whereas the Sustainable Development Agenda is based on political commitments. The former consist of laws and principles, whereas the latter consists of targets to be reached.

Accountability is one of the pillars of human rights – it is a key principle that explains who is accountable (the government as primary duty-bearer) to whom (the citizens as rights-holders) and for what (human rights to water and sanitation). By now, all United Nations Member States have recognised the human rights to water and sanitation (linked though separate rights) by supporting one or more international documents, such as treaties, resolutions or declarations.⁷ This means that the rights to water and sanitation are enforceable: moving access to water and sanitation from a matter of charity into a legal obligation.

The commitments of the SDG framework are political but they have been agreed at the highest level, and it is therefore not an 'optional extra' for states.⁸

At the national levels, governments need to translate the SDG commitments into practical plans and policies and provide political direction. They must further be accountable for this towards their citizens and provide for effective and meaningful means for individuals and civil society to scrutinise progress and influence decisions.

The SDGs are not legally binding, so accountability is not exercised in a similar way as in the human rights framework. However, there may be ways to hold governments to account within national and international judicial and quasi-judicial mechanisms, particularly where the targets overlap with international human rights or national legal guarantees.

Various human rights mechanisms exist that collect large amounts of information and issue recommendations on many targets of SDG6. These mechanisms include the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the treaty bodies, and special procedures, that collect information that could be fed into SDG reporting. Also, at the national level there are human rights institutions and ombudspersons of which resources and capacities may prove to be useful for accountability purposes under the SDG6.

⁷ Legal basis of the human right to water and sanitation: Art. 11, para.1 & 12(1) the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, 1966 / article 6(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966 (ICCPR), Article 3 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Convention on the elimination of discrimination against women (1979), the Convention on the rights of the child (1989), the General Comment on the right to water (2002), the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities (2006) explicitly refer to the rights. All resolutions in

which states recognise the human rights to water and sanitation deriving from the above treaties can be accessed here: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/WaterAndSanitation/SRWater/Pages/Resolutions.aspx>

⁸ T. German and J. Randall, Delivering Results to Leave No One Behind: A discussion paper for the Results Community OECD Workshop, September 2017: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/results-development/docs/leave-no-one-behind-results-workshop-oct-2017.pdf>



copyright: Economic and Social Rights Centre - Hakijamii

“Follow-up and review” under the Sustainable Development Agenda

States are often reluctant to commit to strong accountability mechanisms for political commitments. Negotiations about accountability mechanisms at the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were tense, and eventually led to the use of “follow-up and review” instead of the phrase “monitoring and accountability” in its outcome document.⁹

The accountability mechanisms for international commitments are of a voluntary nature, and viewed by many as not transparent, unfit for purpose tick-box exercises, overbearing and in some cases competitive amongst themselves, leading to duplication of work.

Several initiatives in the water and sanitation sector encourage the setting up of global, regional and national accountability mechanisms to oversee the implementation of international political commitments, including the WHO/UNICEF Joint Sector Programme, the Country Status Overview papers, Joint Sector Reviews, Sanitation and Water For All Partnership, National Compacts and the Voluntary National Reviews at the United Nations HLPF.

⁹K. Donald and S. Way, Accountability for the Sustainable Development Goals: A Lost Opportunity? Ethics & International Affairs, 30, no. 2 (2016), p. 205.

1.3 The HLPF voluntary national reviews

Each year, the HLPF, as the main United Nations platform on sustainable development, has a central role in reviewing progress towards achieving the SDGs. Its voluntary national reviews (VNRs) aim to facilitate the sharing of experiences, including successes, challenges and lessons learned. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development however provides little detail on the HLPF accountability structure. Although states acknowledge the role of CSOs in the implementation of the Agenda,¹⁰ promote civil society partnerships¹¹, and state that follow-up and review processes shall be “open, inclusive, participatory and transparent for all people and will support reporting by all relevant stakeholders”¹², there are no concrete procedures outlined for monitoring and reporting by civil society, and there is no official procedure for an assessment of a state’s performance to be taken into account.¹³ Due to this voluntary nature of reviews as well as their sole reliance on governments’ reporting – without review by civil society – the 2015 outcome document raises questions in terms of accountability.

The 2016 HLPF session’s Ministerial Declaration did address the importance of participatory and inclusive implementation, follow-up and review. Although acknowledging the primary responsibilities of governments in this regard, the declaration also acknowledges the contribution of relevant stakeholders such as civil society, academia and philanthropic organisations. It states that “their participation supports accountability to our citizens”.¹⁴

The most recent 2017 Ministerial Declaration emphasises the need to communicate the SDGs at all levels for the purpose of effective implementation and accountability.¹⁵ Nevertheless, standards for institutionalised participation of civil society at the review processes have never been set. There are no concrete modalities set out for independent civil society monitoring, data collection, and progress assessment and reporting.

Civil society participation in accountability mechanisms

The lack of strong accountability guidelines for review and participation of civil society at the HLPF makes it even more critical for CSOs to use national level accountability mechanisms. Civil society plays a crucial role in verifying and validating governments’ monitoring outcomes, but also in generating data themselves through innovative ways.¹⁶ This better reflects the needs and challenges faced by people who are often excluded from government reviews. It also provides for alternative data on water, wastewater and ecosystem resources, which reflects realities faced by people on the ground. Gathering evidence through monitoring can moreover be used to influence the political agenda, steering development priorities aiming to close the development gap between areas and groups of people, and fast-tracked for those furthest behind.¹⁷

1.4 Methodology and sample

This study took place between September 2017 and March 2018 and involved stakeholders including governments (national and decentralised), CSOs, NGOs, development partners, UN agencies, research and education institutions, think-tanks, foundations and others.

The study focused on 25 countries (low, middle and high income) across Asia, Africa and Latin America. There are also two European countries. This report does not capture all the findings from each individual country study. The individual country studies are made available online only.

¹⁰ UN General Assembly, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, A/RES/70/1, 21 October 2015: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E, para. 41.

¹¹ Ibid para. 17.17

¹² Ibid para. 74 d.

¹³ Ibid para.74.a.

¹⁴ http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/HLS/2016/1&Lang=E E/HLS/2016/1, 29 July 2016, para 15.

¹⁵ E/2017/L.29–E/HLPF/2017/L.2, 14 July 2017, Para .28


¹⁶ See for examples: Roaf, de Albuquerque, On the right track – good practices in realising the rights to water and sanitation, pages 190–191.

¹⁷ Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah, Secretary General of CIVICUS, the global civil society alliance, Toward an Accountability Revolution? Citizen Participation and the SDGs, p. 8–9: www.action4sd.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/TowardAnAccountabilityRevolution.CitizenParticipationAndTheSDGs.pdf

Participating countries

For each country participating in this study, a local organisation has been identified to implement the methodology. The same methodology was applied, which consisted of general

questions related to the existence and functioning of national accountability mechanisms for all targets of SDG6.



In-country data collection and analysis was based upon:

1. Consultation of existing databases and reports (secondary sources).
2. Identification of stakeholder representatives consisting of representatives of government at national, municipal, provincial, regional or district level, local CSOs and NGOs, international NGOs and think-tanks, development or funding partners (UN Agencies, development banks, bilateral, multilateral organisations, foundations), research and education institutions, multi-stakeholder organisation agencies (WWC, SWA, etc).
3. A questionnaire (online survey) applied to selected stakeholder representatives. A total of 21 countries have more than 20 respondents to the online questionnaires. Only these were used for the analysis in Figures 1 to 4.
4. In-depth interviews with representatives of selected stakeholders (including government and other relevant actors).
5. Formulation of a two-pager document summarising the findings.
6. A focus group meeting with relevant stakeholders was conducted in each country for validation of results country to validate and further assess the preliminary as synthesise in the draft two pager.
7. Finally, an in-depth report was formulated by the focal points containing all findings and conclusions and recommendations.



Figure 1. Respondents per region (online questionnaires)**Figure 2. Respondents per type of organisation (online questionnaires)**

Figure 3. Respondents per scope of work of the organisation or institution (online questionnaire)





Figure 4. Respondents per main role of the organisation or institution as it relates to SDG6 (online questionnaire)



Overall, more than 1,000 people were consulted (Table 1). The study team tried to guarantee diversity and representation of stakeholders to be consulted for the study. In some countries it was not possible to collect online surveys from a minimum

of 30 stakeholders but these were complemented by the in-depth individual interviews instead, guaranteeing diversity and relevance. The sample allows the reader to access the strengths and weaknesses of the data presented.

Table 1. Total number of respondents per country

Country	Online questionnaire	In-depth interview	Focus group discussion	Total
Afghanistan	11	16	14	41
Bangladesh	30	9	16	55
Benin	21	3	10	34
Bhutan	10	6	8	24
Burkina	20	5	18	43
Cameroon	27	7	9	43
Costa Rica	8	21	36	65
France	19	10	11	40
Ghana	29	3	20	52
Guinea-Conakry	5	0	27	32
Honduras	15	5	20	40
India	32	11	15	58
Kenya	31	5	12	48
Maldives	18	15	21	54
Mali	22	9	15	46
Mexico	18	6	8	32
Nepal	16	10	9	35
Netherlands	32	13	14	59
Niger	27	9	43	79
Nigeria	27	7	21	55
Pakistan	31	5	16	52
Senegal	14	4	10	28
Sri Lanka	22	10	26	58
Tanzania	22	12	19	53
Togo	47	7	18	72
Total	554	208	436	1198

1.5 Outline of the study

This report starts with the findings on responsibilities for SDG6 implementation and monitoring (section 2). This includes a section on how responsibilities for SDG6 are allocated at the level of government and their preparation for review at the HLPF. Section 3 addresses the data sources used by governments for monitoring and reporting on SDGs and specifically SDG6. It presents findings on 'tracking who is left behind' as well as the third party validation of data on SDG6. Section 4 reflects on the findings of national accountability mechanisms, platforms or systems in place for holding governments accountable towards SDG6. This section examines the mechanisms available for the individual targets of SDG6 and outlines the different types of accountability mechanisms, both initiated by the government and CSOs. Section 5 explores good practices and means of participation in accountability mechanisms.

Section 6 collects common challenges with regard to accountability mechanisms. It starts with findings on biggest gaps and greatest challenges, at the level of both government and CSOs, and towards the functioning of mechanisms, the barriers to participation, the lack of good implementation and monitoring practices and adequate financial resources. Section 7 offers an overview of the recommendations that have been collected from all the country studies. Section concludes the study with main findings and recommendations.

The second part of the report compiles all the country two-page summaries from the country studies.



copyright: Economic and Social Rights Centre - Hakijamii

2

Findings on responsibilities for SDG6 implementation and monitoring

2. Findings on responsibilities for SDG6 implementation and monitoring

Key findings from this section

- ⚙ In most countries, responsibilities for implementation and monitoring of SDG6 are allocated at a high level, across more than one ministry.
- ⚙ Some countries are still in the process of defining and establishing clear processes and responsibility to report on SDGs.
- ⚙ Some European countries mention other accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙ Half of the country studies have reported not to be aware of their government preparing for a VNR on SDG6 progress.

2.1 Responsibilities for SDG6 at the level of government

Most country reports in this study have indicated that responsibilities for SDG6 implementation, monitoring and reporting are allocated across a range of different ministries, through the establishment of parliamentary committees, or dedicated independent bodies.

Responsibilities for implementation, monitoring and reporting of SDG6 are allocated at a high level in government across more than one ministry.

Both country study reports and respondents to online surveys point to governmental ministries tasked with

the implementation and monitoring of SDG6. Examples include ministries of Climate, Economy, Health, Education, Environment and Energy, among others.

Some of the reviewed governments have dedicated a special department within a ministry tasked with monitoring and reporting on the implementation of SDG6, and in a number of countries independent institutions or committees are appointed and tasked with reporting on SDG6. These are often chaired by high-level officials.



copyright: Afghanistan Civil Society Forum Organisation

In Afghanistan, the Ministry of Economy (MoEc) is charged by the government to coordinate, assess, monitor and report the SDGs progress to the HLPF meeting through a specific coordination mechanism.

In Bangladesh, The General Economic Division (GED) is the focal point of HLPF reporting. The Division also performs as the Secretariat of the SDG Coordination Cell (responsible for monitoring national progress on SDGs) formed under the Prime Minister's Office (PMO).

In Benin, "the country introduced a coordination, monitoring and evaluation mechanism. Its purpose is to ensure that the priority targets in the SDGs are embedded into Benin's national and/or sectoral planning framework, and then to report on Benin's progress in implementing the SDGs. This mechanism comprises two bodies: the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee. [...] The Steering Committee is chaired by the Minister of State for Planning and Development. The committee's role is to monitor actions to implement the SDGs, as stipulated by the DGCS-ODD, at the national level and the sectoral ministry level."

In Costa Rica, for SDGs generally, the "High-Level Council of the SDGs" is established at the national level, which comprises the President of the Republic (who presides over the council), the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of National Planning and Economic Policy and MINAE. The Council is supported by the Advisory Committee and a Technical Secretariat with responsibilities for implementing and monitoring all SDGs, including SDG6.

In France, "The Interministerial Delegate for Sustainable Development coordinates the national implementation component of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in France, in connection with all the ministries. The delegate leads an interministerial steering committee: pilot and associated ministries have been identified for each of the SDGs. The Ministry for Ecological and Inclusive Transition (Ministère de la Transition Ecologique et Solidaire – MTES) is the pilot for the SDG6."

In Ghana, the state has set up an office within the Presidency to track and monitor the SDG targets. The

President of Ghana has also been named as a Co-Chair of the UN Secretary-General's Eminent Group of Advocates on SDGs.

In Guinea-Conakry, the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MPCI) is responsible for development policies and for coordinating the SDGs.

In Honduras, "the governance system for the implementation of the United Nations' 2030 Agenda is spearheaded by the General Coordination Secretariat of the Government (SCGG)".

In India, a special body has been set up, which functions as the nodal agency and driver for SDG implementation. The 'National Institute for Transformative India Aayog (NITI Aayog)' is set up as a think-tank and provides directorial and policy inputs to the government, as well as relevant technical advice to the central- and state-governments.

In Maldives, there is "the SDG coordination structure – National Ministerial Coordination Committee (NMCC) – overseeing the implementation of SDGs in the country and has authority to make the final policy decisions. The NMCC is chaired by the MEE. The NMCC consists of cabinet members." "Government of Maldives has established a SDG Department in the Ministry of Environment and Energy resourced with five staff [...] The roles of this department being implementation, monitoring and reporting on the implementation process."

In Mali, a ministry has been set up to deal with the SDG framework, and particular with SDG6: the Ministry of the Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development (MEADD). And "the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD) has been strengthened to give added impetus to the government's actions through this department. This agency is a technical and operational mechanism, designed to support all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the SDGs."

In Mexico, a special body for the follow up of SDGs was created (CTEODS) and is chaired by the President's Office, with its technical secretariat held by the

National Institute for Statistics and Geography (INEGI) and its administrative secretariat by the National Population Council (CONAPO). Its 26 members are all ministries and some other government agencies. In terms of SDG6, the CTEODS identified and assigned State Coordinating Units (UECs) for each SDG, the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) being the UEC with responsibility for SDG6. The process of producing the progress report for SDG6 is the responsibility of the President's Office, together with the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT).

In Nepal, three high-level committees have been formulated to help the implementation of the SDGs in Nepal. A steering committee is chaired by the Prime Minister; a coordination committee is chaired by the Vice Chairman of the National Planning Commission (NPC) and nine thematic committees headed by NPC Members. The NPC is an advisory body of the government of Nepal, tasked with overall planning and progress reporting of the SDGs and serves as a central agency for monitoring and evaluating development plans, policies and programmes.

In Niger, "the Ministry of Water and Sanitation (MHA) developed the Water, Hygiene and Sanitation Sector Programme (PROSEHA 2016-2030) to address SDG6 relating to water and sanitation. Adopted by the government on 9 May 2017, PROSEHA comprises five sub-programmes covering all the SDG6 targets." "The Ministry of Water and Sanitation (MHA)'s Directorate of Research and Programming and Directorate of Statistics are tasked with monitoring progress towards SDG6 and reporting to the UN."

In Nigeria, reporting on the SDG6 is done by SDG Desk Officers stationed in Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) who collate all interventions done in their various MDAs and report it through a SDG National Reporting Framework developed and domiciled in the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs).

In Pakistan, the Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform, government of Pakistan is responsible for overall reporting on SDGs to the HLPF. Pakistan Bureau of Statistics has been assigned the task to prepare country level data. Ministry of Climate Change, government of Pakistan is the technical/line ministry responsible for reporting on SDG6.

In Sri Lanka, the Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply is the subject ministry for SDG6. The Ministry of SDWL will be the national focal agency coordinating and facilitating the commitments towards implementing the national commitments to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs.

In Tanzania, The Ministry of Finance and Planning (MoFP) had prepared four frameworks for implementation of the SDGs namely: the research agenda, localization, SDG communication and dissemination strategy and a framework on monitoring and evaluation. The MoFP is responsible for domestication of SDGs.

In Togo, "the Ministry of Development Planning together with the Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water will be responsible for drawing up Togo's report on SDG6 for the HLPF."

Some countries are still in the process of defining and establishing clear processes and responsibility to report on SDGs.

In Bangladesh, the government is in discussion on how to establish a process for reporting on SDG6, apart from the already established process to report on overall SDGs – which was followed during the preparation of the VNR report of Bangladesh by GED in 2017.

Bhutan is "still in the process of defining and establishing clear processes and responsibility to report on SDGs."

In Honduras, “the prioritisation process and the setting of criteria for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda has been undertaken by the Secretariat, using legislative decree 286-2009, which sets out the country vision and the national plan as a basis. The prioritisation process takes into consideration 10 goals (SDGs 1 to 5 and 8, 9, 15 and 16), 50 targets and 66 indicators. [...] This sidelines SDG6, which will require political will and efforts on the part of the National Drinking Water and Sanitation Council (CONASA) in order to be implemented.” And “the governance system for the implementation of the United Nations’ 2030 Agenda is spearheaded by the General Coordination Secretariat of the Government (SCGG), with the aim being that all the levels of

central government (sector-wide cabinets, secretariats of state, centralised and decentralised institutions) assume their respective responsibilities in order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).”

In Tanzania, although the Ministry of Finance and Planning is responsible for taking the lead in reporting for SDGs after getting input from the sectors, there is no institutional set-up under the Ministry to coordinate reporting to date. Thus, the Poverty Reduction Division is responsible for this just because it has been for MDGs.

Some European countries mention other accountability mechanisms.

In France, “very thorough reporting is already conducted by the government as part of its public water policies (for example, in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive). For the government, these are priority accountability frameworks, which can even be binding (unlike the SDGs which are a voluntary commitment). A lot of data on water is collected via multiple channels, and most are open data. However, these data, sometimes incomplete, are not accessible on a single platform.”

In the Netherlands, “accountability is well organised around national water policies, the EU Water Framework Directive, Kaderrichtlijn Water and through different water boards and private sector companies: such as VEWIN for drinking water, the Dutch Water Authorities - Unie van Waterschappen (UVW) - for water quality and IWRM plus Rioned for sewerage. There is either low awareness of SDG6 mechanisms for national progress, or when participation is facilitated, mechanisms around SDG6 are seen as having little added value above existing water sector processes.”

2.2 Preparation for review at the HLPF

As part of the follow-up and review mechanisms, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development encourages member states to “conduct regular and inclusive reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels, which are country-led and country-driven”. These VNRs are expected to serve as a basis for the regular reviews by the HLPF. As stipulated in paragraph 84 of the 2030 Agenda, regular reviews by the HLPF are to be voluntary, state-led, undertaken by both developed and developing countries, and involve multiple stakeholders, including CSOs.

About half of the country studies have reported not to be aware of their government preparing for a VNR on SDG6 progress.

From all the countries involved in this study, there are eight national governments that have stated they will submit a report to the HLPF in July 2018 (see next section). Half the country studies conclude – after extended review and through in-depth interviews and focal group discussions – that they are not aware of their government preparing for a review on SDG or specifically SDG6. The online surveys match this finding with 57% of respondents not being aware of government plans and preparations.

In Afghanistan, “most of the sectoral ministries and subsectors staff including the local authorities as well as NGO implementing partners are not fully aware of UN HPLF reporting process.”

Bangladesh “has not yet made any decision on reporting to HLPF in 2018 regarding progress on SDG6.”

In Bhutan, KII and FGD discussions with key relevant government officials revealed that Bhutan has not yet made any decision on reporting to HLPF in 2018 regarding progress of SDG6. This need to be further discussed with the lead WASH agency in Bhutan namely PHED, MoH and MoWHS.

In Cameroon, at the current stage of the study, it is difficult to say with certainty whether Cameroon is currently preparing a report. An information request sent to Ministry of Water Resources and Energy (MINEE) at the start of this study has yet to elicit a response. Similarly, none of the actors who were surveyed, not even a UN agency, could say with certainty whether the government was organising activities in the context of the upcoming HLPF.

In Costa Rica, “as for the report to be submitted in June 2018 at the HLPF, there is a lack of clarity around the process for creating the report.”

In India, “having presented its VNR to the HLPF in 2017 on seven goals (Goals 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 14 and 17),

India does not intend to participate in the 2018 HLPF; hence no VNR is being prepared.”

In Kenya, in addition to the launch of the SDGs, the Ministry of Water and Irrigation has mapped out all SDG6 targets and indicators against the mandates of the various institutions and assigned goals and targets accordingly.

In Maldives, “according to the latest information from the SDG division, Maldives will be participating in the HLPF 2018 but will not be officially submitting a VNR at the HLPF.”

In Nepal, the “government hasn’t yet made any decision to report to the HLPF in 2018.”

In the Netherlands, “a 2018 report is in the making, but the Netherlands is not handing in a VNR to the forum this year. National government and ministries present their reports on Accountability Day (3rd Wednesday of May) to Parliament and reports are subsequently openly available on the government’s website.” And “the Netherlands is contributing to and funding the 2018 SDG6 synthesis report, initiated by UN-Water. This report includes a reflection on the Netherlands and provides recommendations to the HLPF.”

The report of Pakistan has stated that “the Ministry has not yet received any format/directions for reporting to HLPF2018.”



Some of the country studies do make reference to activities of their governments related to review at the HLPF.

Afghanistan	"In 2018, the review will be conducted on SDG6 (among other SDGs) and the government is committed to submitting the progress report. However, the current move and mode of the government in coordination and inclusion of the private sector and CSOs might not lead the process to a better success."
France	France submitted a VNR in 2016. The next VNR is scheduled for the 2019 HLPF. In 2017 and 2018, France submitted an annual progress report.
Ghana	The government is expected to prepare and submit SDG status reports annually. Ghana participated in the HLPF held in New York in July 2017. The country will similarly participate and has commenced work with development of the SDG baselines in this vein. Even though Ghana is participating at the HLPF, the state would not be reporting this year because there is no available data to do so. The NDPC has created a matrix for Ghana SDGs Report Monitoring Framework which provides the baseline and progress on updates and responsible agencies and ministries on specific SDGs.
Guinea-Conakry	Guinea-Conakry is one of the countries due to present its VNR at the HLPF under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in July 2018. This represents an opportunity for Guinea-Conakry, which also has to provide a mid-term review of its Economic and Social Development Plan (PNDES 2016–2020) in 2018.
Kenya	Kenya was chosen by UN-Water for the baseline pilot voluntary reporting on SDG6 that is to be submitted in 2017 as part of the preparation for the HLPF reporting in 2018. Kenya collected data on the SDG indicators and held validation workshops with stakeholders as part of the reporting process. A final Kenya pilot progress report on SDG6 using the new updated methodologies adopted by UN Agencies was done and submitted to UN Agencies and AMCOW in November 2017.
Mali	"Mali has also committed to present a VNR at the HLPF in July 2018, for which preparations are under way."

Mexico	<p>“The process of producing the progress report for SDG6 in Mexico, to be presented to the HLPF in July 2018, is the responsibility of the President’s Office, together with the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), which in turn coordinates with the National Water Commission (CONAGUA), custodian agency of all SDG6 targets.”</p>
Niger	<p>“Niger is one of the countries that will report on progress towards SDG6 at the HLPF in July 2018. The country intends to set up a committee comprising representatives from all stakeholder groups, as it did for the high-level meetings for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).”</p>
Senegal	<p>“The pace of progress did not pick up until late 2017, when the government signed up to the VNR process ahead of the HLPF in 2018.”</p>
Tanzania	<p>“According to this study, and the progress made by the government of Tanzania at the time of this study, there is a dilemma that the government will be able to prepare a report for the HLPF in 2018.” But also: “Out of 12 interviewed organisations only respondents from NBS, NIMR and the Poverty Eradication Division of the Ministry of Finance and Planning were aware of plans or ongoing preparations in Tanzania for reporting on progress towards SDG6 to the HLPF in 2018. However, the reasons might be attributed to the fact that the Ministry responsible for foreign affairs had not yet informed all of the respective ministries on the meeting. Nevertheless, the activities which reflect reporting for SDG6 are progressing.”</p>
Togo	<p>“The Ministry of Development Planning together with the Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water will be responsible for drawing up Togo’s report on SDG6 for the UN HLPF. Last year (2017) at the HLPF, Togo submitted a voluntary national review on SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 and 14. In 2018, Togo plans to submit another review which will consider its SDG6 progress. According to information from the responsible institutions, the process of drafting the report or the review that Togo will present to the HLPF is yet to begin.” “The results show that the report on SDG6 to be presented at the HLPF is being drawn up by the Ministry of Planning in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water. These ministries will base their work on data provided by technical and financial partners, departments for water and NGOs or CSO networks working in the water and sanitation sector. The report will be shared with stakeholders in the sector so that it can be amended prior to being presented at the HLPF.”</p>

3

Findings on data for monitoring and reporting on SDG6

3. Findings on data for monitoring and reporting on SDG6

Key findings from this section

- ⚙️ Global monitoring instruments are being used for national reporting purposes, in the absence of or complementing, data collected in-country.
- ⚙️ There are few countries with special departments, independent bodies or committees tasked with SDG6 monitoring and reporting purposes.
- ⚙️ Half the countries have just finalised or are still developing and mapping SDG6 baselines, indicators and targets.
- ⚙️ Countries are not collecting data that allows tracking progress on those being left behind, even though it is recognised as a priority in some countries
- ⚙️ Some country studies state that stakeholders are able to verify government reporting on SDG6 progress, or play a role in data collection and results monitoring for SDG6.
- ⚙️ In many countries, there are no procedures in place that guarantee third party validation of data.



copyright: IRSP Pakistan



copyright: FANSA Nepal

3.1 Data sources for SDG6 monitoring

Monitoring SDG6 involves a wide range of stakeholders across different sectors and levels of government. To enable a comprehensive assessment and analysis of the state of water resources and access to water and sanitation, one of the key objectives to effective monitoring is to collate all the information collected by different stakeholders, across various sectors.¹⁸

Global monitoring instruments are being used for national reporting purposes, in the absence of or complementing, data collected in country

In Afghanistan, the MoEc used the secondary data (CSO, line ministries, World Bank and UN agencies) for VNR report preparation. The government official's representatives in the study emphasise that other reports regarding SDGs will be formulated through the same process.

In Kenya, the Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) country data are intended to inform senior staff in country governments and donor organisations that are in a position to advise their ministers and most senior decision-makers. It is a useful resource for stakeholders involved in sanitation and drinking water projects and programmes.

In Nepal, in the current reporting process, various data sources are being used: national survey reports i.e. National Living Standard Survey, Nepal Demographic Health Survey, Annual Report of Health Department, current publications of UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) of the government.

In Pakistan, a monitoring and reporting tool for SDG targets 6.1 and 6.3 is prepared by WHO and is being tested by the Ministry of Climate Change to use it in future. And "in 2016, MoCC in collaboration with sector partners especially UNICEF engaged Pakistan Bureau of Statistics to review national data needs to monitor the SDGs with the technical assistance of JMP team as a part of SDG localisation. The existing questionnaires of all three household surveys are being aligned with the needs of SDGs and JMP reporting requirements for uniformity, consistency and cost effectiveness."

In Sri Lanka, "a regional workshop was conducted by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for SDGs in May 2017 and requested the countries in the region to establish the baseline for SDGs. A report was prepared to update the status on basis of projections and taking into account the increased access of pipe water connections provided by NWSDB and others. This was shared with key stakeholders as the baseline for SDGs."

¹⁸ Integrated Monitoring Guide for SDG6 targets and indicators, 19 July 2016

There are few countries with special departments, independent bodies or committees tasked with SDG6 monitoring and reporting purposes.

In Bangladesh, “an inter-ministerial SDGs Implementation and Monitoring committee has been formed by the government.”

In Benin, “the country introduced a coordination, monitoring and evaluation mechanism. Its purpose is to ensure that the priority targets in the SDGs are embedded into Benin’s national and/or sectoral planning framework, and then to report on Benin’s progress in implementing the SDGs. This mechanism comprises two bodies: the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee.”

In Guinea-Conakry, “a mechanism has been established for monitoring and evaluating the PNDES: the institutional monitoring and evaluation mechanism (IMEM). The main aim of the IMEM is to formalise and facilitate dialogue with all stakeholders on the performance of the PNDES development actions, in accordance with the plan’s guiding principles.”

In France, “the National Council for Statistical Information (Conseil national de l’information statistique – CNIS) formed an ad hoc working group that carries out statistical monitoring and sets new indicators. This group seeks to advance the French statistical system in line with the 2030 Agenda.” “An Inter-Assembly Parliamentary Working Group on the SDGs will also be created. The role and mode of operation of this working group have not yet been clearly established. It will concern the monitoring of all of the SDGs.”

“Ghana has set up an office within the Presidency to track and monitor the SDG targets.”

In Honduras, “the high-level commission is the official monitoring and decision-making forum for 2030 Agenda implementation via public policy, plans, strategies, programmes and projects. The commission is made up of entities from central government, local government, CSOs, the private sector and workers’ organisations (trade unions).”

In Kenya, a National Steering Committee (NSC) was formed incorporating government ministries, bilateral-

multilateral agencies, local and international NGOs, CSOs and the private sector. The NSC has established an intersectoral monitoring team with technical teams for each target/indicator. The main purpose of the NSC on SDG6 is to collect and make available data and metadata for the purpose of global reporting. Kenya collected data on the SDG indicators and held validation workshop with stakeholders as part of the reporting process. “The Committee has reviewed SDG6 monitoring methodologies, collected baseline data and finalised on the initial Kenya pilot progress report on SDG6 shared with UN-Water and AMCOW in November 2017.”

In Maldives, “the SDGs Division of the MEE oversees the implementation of the SDGs. The SDGs Division, under this ministry is the lead agency for SDGs coordination. The Division is mandated to coordinate, monitor and report the implementation process of SDGs in Maldives.”

In Mali, “in addition to these institutional arrangements for implementing and monitoring the SDGs, the National Assembly of Mali adopted a resolution on monitoring the SDGs following a vote in November 2015. It then set up an SDG monitoring committee.”

In Mexico, the Technical Committee for SDGs (CTEODS) identified and assigned State Coordinating Units (UECs) for each SDG. These UECs have undertaken a country progress assessment, to identify available data, main challenges and emblematic actions, to then propose national targets for the corresponding SDG. As part of the assessment, in terms of developing the strategy for SDG6 in particular, CONAGUA has conducted a review of the availability of information, algorithms, data disaggregation and sources of information on water and sanitation in relation to the SDG6 indicators. The result of this review has not been made public.

In Nepal, there is a National Monitoring and Information Program (NMIP) unit under the Department of Water and Sewerage, Ministry of Water and Sanitation for collecting and analysing progress data regarding water and sanitation and a system to compile data on annual basis.

In Sri Lanka, “the key institutions involved in the national monitoring of performance of the MDGs were the National Planning Department, Department of Census and Statistics and the UNDP. The same arrangement will continue with the SDG as well as with the reporting required to the parliamentary select committee, UN Agency Working group and

the Ministry of Sustainable Development. Since the next National Census will be conducted in 2021, the data and information on informal water and sanitation services, particularly the population using protected wells, unprotected wells, tube wells and other sources, will not be available until 2021.”



copyright: FANSA Nepal



copyright: FANSA Nepal

3.2 Development of indicators and monitoring systems

The Sustainable Development Agenda requires a new set of indicators and enhanced ways for monitoring progress, due to its new targets, and focus on 'leaving no-one behind'. Some of the country studies indicated that their governments (sometimes in consultation with different stakeholders) are conducting a gap-analysis to examine what data is currently covered by monitoring and reporting mechanisms and which new indicators with corresponding data collection mechanisms are needed to fill the data gap and bring monitoring more in line with the SDG Agenda.

Half the countries have just finalised or are still developing and mapping SDG6 baselines, indicators and targets

Half of the country studies reported that governments are in the process of developing new monitoring systems tasked with monitoring the SDGs, some countries mention the development of a new monitoring system for SDG6 specifically and for data collection. Sometimes, these mechanisms are based upon new technologies for monitoring, and based on new sets of indicators.

In Afghanistan, "the nationalisation process of the SDG targets and indicators started in 2016. The ambitious global targets and indicators have been critically reviewed by different stakeholders in the country with realisation of national context and circumstances. The global ambitious targets and indicators have been refined and nationalised with great efforts of different stakeholders in the country. The national consultation process reshaped the global targets and indicators into 125 national targets and 190 national indicators."

In Bangladesh, the government is preparing a macro-level data repository system (SDGs Tracker) to facilitate the results based monitoring system within government. A data gap analysis for monitoring SDGs has also been conducted, which identified that data for only 70 indicators is readily available (out of 232) in the existing data generating system of Bangladesh.

In Bhutan, "the Bhutan WASH (B-WASH) cluster (national multi-sectoral platform) led by the rotating secretariat (MoH) has initiated the process to establish the baselines for SDG6. "The Health Focal Point should consider an SDGs mapping exercise at national scale and the identification of relevant line agencies for SDG6 and the reporting frequency and accountability at national and regional fora like SACOSAN." "The concerned line agencies are expected to use JMP definitions and indicators will be adapted and integrated into the existing data collection tools and MIS". "Currently, two line ministries, namely Ministry of Work and Human Settlement (MoWHS) and Ministry of Health (MoH), have aligned the WASH SDG indicators into the National Key Result Area (NKRA) for the 12th FYP from 2018-2023 to have reliable baseline data for WASH to monitor the progress and report."

In Burkina Faso, "to improve identification of priority or catalyst targets and establish SDG mapping, Burkina

Faso received UN support to implement the Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) tool developed by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG). Following this, work was done to establish the indicators and their metadata. This enabled the usual indicators of the sector ministries to be identified in line with the SDG targets and objectives. A total of 275 potential indicators were identified for 169 targets. The aim of this stage was to establish a framework for monitoring the results of SDG implementation globally.”

In Cameroon, the government, with support from UNICEF and other actors, is currently developing specific indicators for water and sanitation in line with SDG6.

In Costa Rica, “national targets will be established by sectoral secretariats, which must be able to first verify whether current planning instruments contain pre-established targets that coincide with those of the SDGs in the long term, as well as organise inter-sector workshops in which participants will discuss and approve or give feedback on sectoral target proposals and define the roles of those responsible for achieving each target. In this respect, MINAE plans to establish a Platform for Water as a multisectoral forum for defining and coordinating the implementation of public policies and, therefore, for defining the SDG6 targets.”

In France, “the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques – INSEE) and the National Council for Statistical Information (Conseil national de l’information statistique – CNIS) formed an ad hoc working group that carries out statistical monitoring and sets new indicators. This group seeks to advance the French statistical system in line with the 2030 Agenda.”

Honduras “is working to establish a baseline for monitoring and assessing progress towards implementing SDG6 at the national level and to set other compliance indicators.” And “in the case of the management by results platform that has been used in the last six years, it has not been adapted to SDG6, however, it is expected that from 2019 the National ODS Agenda will be included in the platform, for which

political will is also required for the full adoption of the SDG6 and not just a part of it.”

In India, “the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI) has developed draft indicators for all SDGs, including for the targets of SDG6, which are yet to be finalised.” “Once national indicators are final, the Development Monitoring Cell of NITI Aayog plans to undertake outcome monitoring of SDGs and an SDG indicator dashboard is being established by MoSPI.”

In Maldives, a Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) conducted in 2017 with the support of UNDP, will identify the national priorities. Similarly, the SDGs Division and NBS are undertaking an exercise with stakeholders to identify data gaps and mechanisms to address those. An SDG monitoring framework is planned for 2018/2019.

In Mexico, the Pan-American Health Organisation and World Health Organisation (PAHO/WHO) have worked with the National Commission of Water (CONAGUA) and the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) to produce a baseline for some indicators, namely 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.1, for which PAHO/WHO are the international custodians. The outcomes of the workshop held in May 2017 have not yet been made public as there is no consensus yet between the statistics (INEGI) and water (CONAGUA) agencies on how to fill the gaps in annual information sources (national household survey) or on how to modify the survey to be able to effectively monitor the SDG6 indicators. However, agreements have been reached within CONAGUA and INEGI around the WASH concept (improved clean water, improved sanitation and hygiene) and the need to adapt the measuring mechanisms – for the first three targets – to cover the new criteria required by SDG6.

In Nigeria, “the OSSAP-SDG office has also developed guidelines for internal review of national performance of the 2030 Agenda which is expected to provide direction on availability of baseline data by the NBS for measurement of the targets and indicators relevant to each goal.”

“Sri Lanka will continue with the global monitoring protocol for WASH as engaged during the MDG period with JMP and GLAAS. The Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply has taken steps to form a working group representing key government agencies, development partners and CSOs to prepare national indicators and milestones for the 2021 census and update on sector performance for global monitoring and reporting.” “As the subject specific institution for WASH goals, the Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply would like to establish an inter-agency sector group to work on the indicators for SDG Goal 6 targets 6.1-6.6. These indicators will be used in the next national census to be conducted by the Department of Census and Statistics.”

In Tanzania, the process of domestication of SDG6 and its targets is ongoing together with other SDGs. At the time of this study, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) is done with mapping of all SDG indicators into the FYDP II, data gaps have been identified and are ready for high-level data validation and multi-sectoral engagement. The NBS had prepared an SDGs Road Map; in the process, the data ecosystem in Tanzania had been reviewed, the SDGs indicators linked with the FYDP II, the national data gap assessed. The mapping and domestication of SDGs indicators has been done and high-level data validation and multi-stakeholders engagement is ongoing to strengthen routine data collection systems to fill the data gaps from the surveys. The baseline report on SDG has been prepared and is now being processed for the SDG Annual Report.



copyright: IRC WASH

3.3 Tracking who is being left behind

The 2030 Agenda emphasizes that “no one should be left behind”; therefore, to monitor progress in this regard, data should be disaggregated by a number of socioeconomic classifications. For monitoring progress in achieving the targets of SDG6, it is important that the data can be disaggregated to indicate where, when, how and at whom to target interventions.

Countries are not collecting data that allows tracking progress on those being left behind, even though it is recognised as a priority in some countries.

In Afghanistan, data is often incomplete and of variable quality with reliance on periodic household surveys. As the quality, completeness and timeliness of facility data improves, the gap between routine and survey data is likely to narrow. Data collection often excludes populations and disaggregation of data remains limited.

inform the degree of persisting discrimination. Public consultations and community-based monitoring systems need to be constituted to ensure last-mile inclusion of the marginalised.

In Bangladesh, data for another 108 indicators can be generated by modifying existing census (from aggregation to disaggregation), survey, MIS, etc. On the basis of SDGs data gap analysis, a monitoring and evaluation framework of the SDGs is in the process of development through a series of consultations with all government and non-government stakeholders.

The Kenya country study concludes that “accountability should be informed by subnational reviews that consider data disaggregated by equity concerns. The review should consider data from the widest range of sources including all the 47 counties and should ideally include independent review.” Human Rights bodies such as KNCHR, Transparency International have participated in the developing of the framework for monitoring SDG6 on human rights perspective. The steering committee has been able to incorporate recommendations from such bodies in the reporting of SDG6.

In Honduras, the country study responds to the question of whether it is measuring who is currently left behind “This is one of the biggest challenges for the country. [...] There is no data, no indicators.”

In Mexico, “there are no existing mechanisms to collect information on community water management. There is some information on how these community water management systems are organised and how many people are involved in the committees, but no specific data. The country’s unconventional systems, used by the communities in most vulnerable circumstances, are not duly accounted for.”

In India, the indicator framework was placed in the public domain in March 2017 for wider consultation. CSOs provided collated feedback on 7 April 2017 after a thorough review. Major suggestions centred around inclusion of marginalised groups and the use of disaggregated data to set priorities. Although there is real-time update of the MIS at the national level, it does not reflect disaggregated data for marginalised communities or data based on age, gender, caste, disability, etc. Disaggregated data, though available, is not analysed for decision-making purposes or prioritisation. The MIS reflects only numbers and there are no qualitative studies; data is not enough to

In Nepal, “mostly data covers physical progress only, which is inadequate in the context of newer smart technical options and the broad requirements envisioned by the SDGs”.

3.4 Third party validation of data on SDG6

Some country studies state that stakeholders are able to verify government reporting on SDG6 progress, or play a role in data collection and results monitoring for SDG6.

In Bangladesh, the draft 2017 VNR was shared with all relevant stakeholders, including CSOs, NGOs, private sector, development partners, academia and media. It was made available online, allowing citizens to review and comment on the draft. Next to that, the government reportedly consulted various groups of people in its reporting process, including students, youth organisations, and several citizens from marginalised segments of the society, among others. The government has stated that it will aim for a similar approach in processes for future reports.

In Kenya, the sub-committees of the National Steering Committee on SDG6 are responsible for monitoring and reporting on each of the six indicators. The Committee has 56 members from government institutions, academic institutions, NGOs, bilateral-multilateral agencies, CSOs and the private sector. In Kenya, through development partners, Kenya has had citizens' report cards in the areas of water access and sanitation services. This is a type of information campaign that provides information about service performance of providers sometimes in the form of a ranking of providers. CSOs have also used scorecards in Kenya. A quantitative survey of citizen satisfaction with public services that includes a facilitated meeting between providers and beneficiaries has been set up to discuss results and agree on follow up actions.

In Maldives, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), is collecting available data and also initiating identification of national priorities through consultations with implementing agencies, civil society and the private sector.

In the Netherlands, "the annual SDG report that goes to parliament has a multi-stakeholder approach, is written by government with the input of municipalities, CSOs, academia, private sector and youth." And, "in

writing the UN-Water SDG6 synthesis report, for most national targets, existing mechanisms were used. For 6.5 a questionnaire was sent around through Stuurgroep Water but response was minimal."

In Niger, "there is no framework for CSOs to monitor and evaluate commitments and recommendations. CSOs are unable to ascertain whether these commitments, resolutions and recommendations have been upheld because progress towards targets and indicators is monitored by the government."

In Nigeria, the process of reporting on SDG6 also incorporates activities from CSOs, organised private sector and academia through the various coordination umbrella committees who also feed into the SDG National Reporting Framework.

In Senegal, "the voluntary national review for the HLPF is managed through the CASE, which is extended to encompass civil society (various sections), researchers and sector stakeholders (technical ministries)."

In Togo, "for the purpose of drawing up Togo's report for the HLPF, governmental institutions will gather information using data collected by the departments of statistics and the technical and financial partners (TFPs), as well as data from reports by departments of water, among others. A large workshop open to the main stakeholders will also be organised and they will be involved in developing information-gathering questionnaires. The government will also hold consultations with other stakeholders from the water and sanitation sector to prepare the report for the HLPF."

In many countries, there are no procedures in place that guarantee third party validation of data.

In Afghanistan, the absence of independent monitoring potentially undermines the credibility and legitimacy of the processes.

—

In India, the third party verification process for data is neither transparent nor regular. In India, the 2017 VNR was prepared in a far less participatory manner, and the report was made online available only a few days before the HLPF review.

—

The Kenya country study concludes: "Review should consider data from the widest range of sources including all the 47 counties and should ideally include independent review."

—

Maldives "submitted a VNR in 2017 to the HLPF for SDGs and plans to report on SDG6 in 2018. None of the CSO respondents of this survey are aware of the process of reporting. Neither have they seen the previous report yet!"

—

In Mexico, "although the coordinating platform of Mexican CSOs for the 2030 Agenda (CSOMex2030) asked to be effectively involved in the elaboration of the country report to be presented at the HLPF in July 2018 – a request made to both the President's Office and the General Directorate for CSO Coordination within the Foreign Office – sources interviewed stated that there is currently no intention to consult non-state actors in the production of this specific report on SDG6."

—

In Nepal, "the format of the programme for collecting and analysing progress data regarding water and sanitation and the system to compile data on an annual basis does not cover the effort made from other actors".

—

In the Netherlands, the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) report is based on a multi-stakeholder approach, but for SDG6, existing CBS and Rijkswaterstaat data was used. No third party validation of data was arranged by CBS. "In September 2017, the National Auditor General prepared a report on how the Netherlands is institutionally organised for taking on and reporting on the SDGs in general. Here, the importance of involving data provided by relevant stakeholders of civil society in monitoring processes and to realise public participation in accountability mechanisms was emphasised." "As far as public participation is concerned, the National Auditor General advises placing attention on improvement, because of the need of joint action from the public and private sectors for reaching the goals."

—

In Pakistan, there are no forums to discuss data results in the reports from the Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurements (PSLM) and Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MCIS).

In Tanzania, "despite the fact that the government had been effective in accountability in recent years there is a need to include the impartial systems during evaluation for sustainability. In most cases, it is complicated and hard to evaluate your own activities without an outsider."

—

4

**Findings on national
accountability mechanisms,
platforms or systems in place
for holding governments
accountable towards SDG6**

4. Findings on national accountability mechanisms, platforms or systems in place for holding governments accountable towards SDG6

Key findings from this section

- ⚙ Many country studies indicate that accountability mechanisms for SDG6 specifically are not available or are unknown.
- ⚙ Accountability mechanisms mentioned are used for SDG6 generally – or for national plans and policies that (indirectly) implement commitments to Agenda 2030, not for each of the SDG6 targets.
- ⚙ Mechanisms and tools brought forward in the country studies lack the criteria required to be considered effective accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙ A few countries have indicated that 'joint sector reviews' (JSRs) perform as an effective accountability mechanism, others refer to accountability through regulatory and democratic systems using parliamentary reviews.
- ⚙ Some countries reported that particularly decentralised mechanisms can be effective avenues to influence and hold government accountable: social audits, open budget sessions, budget tracking and creation of basin committees.
- ⚙ Few countries indicate complaint, grievance and enforcement mechanisms and few countries mentioned human rights mechanisms to hold government accountable for SDG6.
- ⚙ Some of the country studies have referred to networks of CSOs as a means to more effectively hold their governments accountable.
- ⚙ A few country studies have indicated that shadow reporting by civil society constitutes an effective accountability mechanism.
- ⚙ Few countries mention the role of the media in raising public awareness and only two countries mention the role of the private sector in holding the government accountable.

4.1 Accountability mechanisms for the individual targets of SDG6

Many country studies indicate that accountability mechanisms for SDG6 specifically are not available or are unknown.

(Country studies however do outline mechanisms and tools that can be used for holding government actors accountable for SDG6 – outlined in the next section).

In Bangladesh, “there is no systematic accountability mechanism in place for WASH”.

concept yet.” “There are no known activities being carried out for formation of accountability frameworks and mechanisms for government accountability to CSOs on progress of SDG6.”

In Bhutan, “there is no accountability mechanism in place. There are few platforms through government agency initiatives to raise concerns and issues with regards to SDG6.”

In Mexico, “significant lack of political will to establish effective and inclusive participation mechanisms both for implementation (developing strategies) and accountability.” “It became evident in the study that the accountability mechanisms specific to SDG6 are still being developed. The government has focused on creating coordinating structures and a national strategy in which neither an effective nor inclusive mechanism for non-state actor involvement has been established.” Nevertheless, “several information systems and accountability mechanisms have been mentioned in the study; while these are mechanisms, systems or platforms that report water or environmental data, they may not necessarily correspond directly to the criteria for the indicators that need to be reported for SDG6. They may, however, be able to contribute to the specific accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems to put in place for the SDG6 indicators.

In Costa Rica, “in relation to SDG6, there is no official platform or [accountability] mechanism by which civil society can participate, despite the fact that Costa Rica is a country with a participatory democracy.”

In Guinea, “there is currently very poor CSO participation [in accountability mechanisms], due to the lack of a framework for consultation between the stakeholders (public authorities, CSOs, TFPs, the private sector and communities)”.

In India, “with no formal review mechanisms, civil society has initiated an annual review of the progress on SDGs under the banner of Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, a loose CSO coalition, engaged in holding government to account to the electoral promises since 2006.”

In the Netherlands, “it is important to clarify that, there are no systematic SDG6 mechanism in place. Most mechanisms are connected to pre-existing frameworks” and “connected to established expertise of the Netherlands in water management, there is a general opinion that the country already does well on most targets of SDG6 and its accountability mechanisms are well organised around its existing national water policies.” “At least 30% of the approached CSOs and private organisations (national and international) did not fill out the survey for this study because they expressed from the beginning to not know or not be part of any existing mechanisms. From the organisations – mainly international – that did participate, over 50% also expressed not to be aware or to be part of an accountability mechanism for SDG6 specifically.”

In France, with regards to available accountability mechanisms, “other mechanisms are in the process of being set up.”

In Maldives, “even though there is no official capacity in which CSOs could participate to hold the government accountable on accountability for progress on SDG6 implementation, there is also room for CSO to improve their participation in government projects in all sectors of the SDGs.” And: “...there is no mechanism or even the concept of CSO mechanism to hold government accountable. The bottom up approach is an unfamiliar



copyright: Water Integrity Maldives

In Sri Lanka, “the government’s accountability is demonstrated in many ways through the commitment to global monitoring, active involvement with international partnerships such as SWA, regional partnership in the South Asian Conference on Sanitation (SACOSAN) and leadership on national platforms where an all-inclusive approach is followed. There are no references to national accountability mechanisms. As for “government accountability ensured by partnership with civil society, these arrangements are not comparable with arrangements in developed countries where CSO are always considered as partners of development in the WASH sector. In Sri Lanka, “rather than accountability it is a mutual agreement who does what where and when. CSO are a dependable force during emergencies in resource mobilization and emergency relief.”

In Senegal, “for mechanisms at the government level, the shortcomings are as follows: the vast majority of national stakeholders, including CSOs, are unaware of

the existence of such mechanisms, and even more so of the corresponding preparatory work.”

In Togo, “some organisations in the sector are not even aware that mechanisms through which the government is accountable to stakeholders exist. The following responses confirm this assertion: ‘The mechanism does not exist or is not widely known about – we have no information about these mechanisms if they do exist’; ‘There are no mechanisms in place for reporting on progress in the sector at the moment. These mechanisms will be established by the NDP being developed’; ‘No communication about workshops – we are not aware of any mechanism’. And, ‘there are very few accounts of positive experiences of CSO participation in the national accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems in Togo. This can be explained by the fact that, according to some, the mechanisms do not exist or are not operational’.”

Accountability mechanisms mentioned are used for SDG6 generally – or for national plans and policies that implement commitments to Agenda 2030, not for each of the SDG6 targets.

Survey respondents have indicated that such mechanisms are mostly available for the targets and indicators for 6.1. on drinking water and 6.2. on sanitation and hygiene. Most country studies only refer to SDG6 or the SDG Agenda in their research on accountability mechanisms. The country

studies that have included references to accountability mechanisms for individual targets of SDG6 include Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan and Togo.

In Bangladesh, the National Forum for Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation—DWSS (Target 6.1 and 6.2), the National Sanitation Task Force (Target 6.2) and the National Policy Review Committee (theoretically, related to target no. 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4) are the forums under Local Government Division (LGD), where the government shares progress on relevant issues and the CSOs get scope to raise concerns. At local level, the opportunity for engagement exists in current local government processes like open budget sessions. However, these local platforms are rarely used for discussions around sector progress (when this happens, they cover mainly target 6.1 and 6.2).

In Benin, “the findings of the survey carried out under this study indicate that there are accountability systems in Benin through which actors in the sector can hold the government to account in implementing SDG6. Of the actors surveyed, almost 38.1% felt that these mechanisms enable the government to report all the targets. This point of view is not shared by all the actors surveyed: some feel that the mechanisms do enable the government to report, but only for some targets.”

In India, the government’s accountability mechanisms include a combination of in-built monitoring systems of its flagship programmes, and progress reports and periodic surveys undertaken by various agencies. These flagship programmes include: the National Rural Drinking Water Programme (contributing to 6.1 and 6.3b) and the Swachh Bharat Mission (contributing to 6.2). They are implemented by the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation and the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD) in rural and urban areas, respectively; and the Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee

Yojna (PMKSY; 6.4) implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation.

In the Netherlands, “CSOs and private sector organisations either did not know any mechanisms or only a few of which most were connected to targets 6.1 and 6.2.”

In Pakistan, “there were 13 targets of WASH similar to the one in SDGs already part of the survey. Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MICS) is another accountability mechanism which helps in holding the government accountable towards SDG6. Target 6.1, 6.2 and 1.4 have been adopted by MICS on the recommendation of Working Group on WASH. A monitoring/reporting tool for targets 6.1 and 6.3 prepared by WHO is being tested and localised by the Ministry of Climate Change to use it in future.”

In Togo, “the Togolese Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water organises these meetings every year. They are held on World Water Day and bring together several stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector. The objective is to share information on the development of the indicators with the various stakeholders in the sector. All the SDG6 targets are discussed at workshops, with a focus on targets 6.1 and 6.2 and 1.2.” “CSOs in the water and sanitation sector have created the Basic Sanitation Collaborative Council in Togo (CCABT) to consult with each other and work collaboratively at all times. The CCABT is a mechanism that brings together stakeholders from the water and sanitation sector. This mechanism specifically covers sanitation in Togo as this sector is marginalised.”

The results of the online questionnaires show the same results as the country reports (Figure 5). The results are similar when the analysis is done per region.

Figure 5. Are you aware of any efforts of your government to keep track on progress made in the implementation of SDG6?




Table 2. Does your government provide account to sector stakeholders on progress towards the targets of SDG6?

SDG6 target	I don't know	No	Yes
6.1.1 on drinking water	19%	12%	69%
6.2.1 on sanitation and hygiene	19%	12%	69%
6.3.1 on wastewater treatment	39%	27%	34%
6.3.2 on ambient water quality	39%	23%	38%
6.4.1 on water use efficiency	40%	27%	33%
6.4.2 on water stress	46%	25%	29%
6.5.1 on integrated water resources management	32%	20%	48%
6.5.2 on transboundary cooperation	48%	23%	30%
6.6.1 on water-related ecosystems	46%	24%	30%
6.a.1 on international cooperation	39%	19%	42%
6.b.1 on stakeholder participation	34%	20%	46%

Source: Online surveys

4.2 Different types of accountability mechanisms

Accountability mechanisms brought forward in the countries studies include government-led ones and tools initiated by CSOs. Many lack the criteria required to be considered effective accountability mechanisms

Results from online surveys show that most respondents are aware of “accountability mechanisms” through which sector actors can hold the government accountable for

implementation of the SDG6 (Figure 6). Country studies have been able to elaborate a multitude of mechanisms and tools that are being used to hold the government accountable towards SDG6 (Figure 7).

This section will start with outlining mechanisms established by the government, followed by mechanisms established by CSOs themselves.

Figure 6. Are you aware of any efforts of your government to keep track on progress made in the implementation of SDG6?




Figure 7. Can you name any national mechanisms through which sector actors can hold the government accountable for implementation of SDG6?




Table 3. Top three accountability mechanisms for SDG6 mentioned by respondents of the online questionnaire, breakdown per region.

Top 3 accountability mechanisms	Asia	Latin America	East Africa	Europe
Gov - monitoring mechanisms	34%	17%	39%	-
Gov - events, national meetings	15%	28%	-	24%
Gov - independent committees	20%	35%	11%	16%
Gov - joint sector reviews	-	-	-	21%
Gov - democratic systems	-	-	33%	-

Source: Online surveys

A. Accountability mechanisms established by the government

- ⚙️ Events organised by the government, involving non-state stakeholders, including working groups and meetings, national level conferences and joint sector reviews.
- ⚙️ Committees or independent bodies tasked with the responsibility for the implementation and/or monitoring of SDG6 – consisting of different stakeholders, or with close consultation of different stakeholders.
- ⚙️ Monitoring mechanisms established by the government are indicated to serve as a platform for civil society to provide input and validate existing data.
- ⚙️ Accountability through regulatory and democratic systems.
- ⚙️ Decentralised mechanisms as an avenue to influence and hold local government accountable for policies and commitments related to SDG6.
- ⚙️ Complaint, grievance and enforcement mechanisms.
- ⚙️ Human rights mechanisms.

1. Events organised by the government, involving non-state stakeholders

Almost all of the countries in this study have referred to these types of accountability mechanisms. They have different names across countries but can be grouped together as they all share one similar characteristic: they are events in which sector stakeholders – both governmental and non-governmental – are brought together to discuss progress, policy or action plans, exchange information as well as knowledge and insights.

Working groups and meetings

These multi stakeholder forums serve as consultative and participatory platforms to guide policy-making and planning and direct governmental priority setting and investment flows. At the same time, they can be used to lobby or advocate for certain issues, and hold government accountable for targets of SDG6.

In Afghanistan, regular monthly WASH coordination meetings in MRRD, MoPH, MUDH, MoE and MoEc are being held. The invitees include government ministries/entities, NGO partners, UN agencies and SDG6 international stakeholders.

In Benin, “the Water and Sanitation Sector Group (GSEA) is a national forum bringing together government institutions, technical and financial partners (TFPs) from all bilateral and multilateral cooperation and agencies, the ANCB, international NGOs and some national CSOs working in the water sector in Benin. It meets four times a year to discuss activities undertaken and sector-specific issues, including the implementation of improvements for the sector recommended in the Annual Review.”

In Bhutan, B-WASH cluster meetings are held annually. B-WASH cluster has a biennial rotating secretariat. It has a Technical Working Group (TWG) with representatives from different stakeholders. The

TWG coordinates and organises smaller and regular meetings to update progress and discuss issues as and when required.

In Burkina Faso, “the Regional Dialogue Frameworks (CRDs) are the regional consultation frameworks, widened to include the communes. The CRDs include representatives from the decentralised bodies, local authorities, the private sector, regional civil society, etc. They are chaired by the Governor, with the President of the Regional Council as vice-chair. The CRDs can be organised into thematic committees. The CRDs supervise implementation of the Local Development Plans. Their aim is to produce data on the implementation of local actions and feed into the PNDES performance report through a dialogue process that includes all stakeholders.” “The CSD-EEA relates to the Water, Environment and Sanitation planning sector, one of the 14 planning sectors selected by the PNDES in the context of implementing the presidential programme. The actions and performance of this sector are carefully analysed and validated by the CSD-EEA

before being forwarded to the Permanent Secretariat of the PNDES, which consolidates the information at the national level. This framework offers CSOs the possibility of commenting on the sector's performance. CSO participation in the six-monthly sector reviews is formally enshrined within this framework." "The NWP National Steering Committee (CNP/NWP), unlike the CSD-EEA, is specific to the water and sanitation sector. The role of this committee is to examine the performance reports produced by the five operational programmes prior to their consolidation by the CSD."

In Cameroon, the WASH framework constitutes the main platform for actors in the water sector. It was put in place in 2009 and by law in 2011 with the creation of a national committee to launch and monitor the WASH initiative. Every quarter, a national three-day meeting is organised with all stakeholders from the water sector — the state, technical and financial partners, and CSOs — with the same set-up planned at the regional level. The agenda is set based on mutual agreement among the main stakeholders. This consultation and advocacy framework enables all stakeholders to discuss, evaluate the existing level of commitment and capitalise on new approaches to water and sanitation. "All actors therefore have the same room for manoeuvre, and this is afforded depending on the relevance of the opinions they put forward, independent of any particular affiliations."

In Costa Rica, "with regard to the accountability platform, the governance system has created the National Forum on SDGs as a mechanism for government accountability to its citizens." "Representatives of the branches of government, public institutions, civil society, the private sector, international organisations and local government participate in the National Forum on SDGs once a year."

In France, "in 2017 and 2018, the country submitted an annual progress report. These reports are discussed with civil society during consultation workshops on SDGs, organised by MTES and published on an interactive digital platform. France has set up mechanisms for mobilising civil society, considering that the SDGs are a shared responsibility among stakeholders and citizens. These main mechanisms are the SDG consultation workshops and awareness raising tools (MOOC, newsletter, hackathons etc.)" Another accountability mechanism includes "a participatory digital platform called Sandbox, which was launched in advance of this consultation workshop. Led by the MTES team, this platform aims to initiate joint development of and

reflection on the annual progress report. This digital forum is open to stakeholders and enables them to react in real time, contribute to the content of the reports, ensure monitoring of the SDGs and share information. Anyone with an active and validated account on the platform can make comments on the working draft of the progress report."

In India, multi-stakeholder meetings/consultations are organised by the line departments involving sector actors from central and state implementing agencies: government officials, bilateral organisations, academia, think-tanks, researchers, international NGOs and CSOs, and private organisations.

In Mali, "the water and sanitation sector has set up an annual forum known as the Dialogue between Water and Sanitation Stakeholders that focuses on the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals) as part of the implementation of PROSEA (Water and Sanitation Sector Programme). This platform was launched by both departments in charge of water and sanitation issues and was organised by the Planning Unit for Water and Sanitation Statistics working with the Water and Sanitation Departments, in a partnership with WASH civil society organisations and technical and financial partners. It offers stakeholders the opportunity to avoid complacency and take stock of the sector. It is up to each stakeholder to set out the successes, shortcomings, challenges, difficulties and prospects. The sharing of this information and the annual review allows WASH civil society to challenge the state on what has not worked and to suggest improvements for the coming year." And another meeting cited as an accountability mechanism: "The high-level meeting between WASH civil society and the two departments responsible for water and sanitation. As part of the implementation of PROSEA, civil society in the water and sanitation sector set up a dialogue forum that lasted several years to evaluate the roadmap on the status of implementation of the recommendations in the sectoral reviews. These meetings have so far enabled civil society organisations to question the Ministry or its representative directly on shortcomings observed in the implementation of certain recommendations made during the annual reviews."

In Mexico, "the National Council for the 2030 Agenda was established in April 2017 (comprising the 18 Secretaries of State) with a mandate that includes validating the National Strategy for the 2030 Agenda. Its founding decree notes that representatives from civil society, the private sector and academia will

be invited to attend meetings but will not have a vote.” “Civil society is not included in any effective participatory methodology to elaborate implementation or monitoring strategies for the 2030 Agenda. Civil society’s consultation on the National Strategy for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda has been limited to participation in the regional dialogues.” Furthermore, “there has never been any consultation on how these dialogues could be organised to effectively contribute with information and methodology to the national strategy, as repeatedly been requested (by civil society organisations)”.

—

In the Netherlands, “the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) supported the establishment of a voluntary platform for joint action on the SDGs, including SDG6.” And “another mechanism for holding government accountable is the Overlegorgaan Infrastructuur en Milieu (OIM), also a consultative platform of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water (MoI) for a wider group of stakeholders, CSOs included. Influencing and advising government is facilitated through regular events where platform participants can suggest themes for discussion.” “A number of online platforms and events exist as well which can be regarded as an SDG6 accountability mechanism. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs supported the establishment of the SDG Charter - website and occasional events - a platform for multi stakeholder joint action on the SDGs, including SDG6. In 2017, the Charter, in collaboration with government, organised an event where academia, municipal and CSO networks were invited to discuss the status of progress on the SDGs.”

—

In Senegal, the country study pointed to the following accountability mechanisms; civil society stakeholders in all their diversity are invited to participate in the Joint Annual Review (JAR) on public policy (all policy areas) via the CASE, giving them an opportunity to attend the report presentation meetings and make

their opinions heard; Ministry of Water and Sanitation (MHA) invites sector civil society stakeholders to participate in the water and sanitation JAR, organised by the PEPAM Unit, in order to monitor progress in the sector.” “Occasionally, the MHA’s technical directorates and national agencies (such as the Directorate of Sanitation) hold strategy meetings and invite NGOs along to these meetings. One such example was the workshop on the new rural sanitation development strategy. These meetings give NGOs and CSOs a chance to have an input into the content of strategy documents. The Directorate of Sanitation also plans to set up a coordination platform with NGOs in the near future. The platform could also provide a basis for advocacy.”

—

In Tanzania, the five Technical Working Groups (TWG) under the Water Sector Development Programme (WSDP) are made up of sector stakeholders including DP, CSOs, the private sector and the government (ministries responsible for water, education, health, and local government).

—

In Togo, an institutional mechanism for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating development policies (DIPD) is the framework for cooperation between stakeholders in the water, sanitation and hygiene sector [...]. The Regional Water Departments, supported by the Hygiene and Sanitation Services, are in charge of organisation. The meetings are attended by the members of CSOs that are involved and representatives from the communities’ facilities management networks. These meetings are held twice a year and aim to promote synergy between all the stakeholders’ activities to avoid duplication. During the meetings, all the stakeholders are informed of the activities being carried out in the field and recommendations are made.

National conferences and conventions

The governments of a number of countries in this study have organised sector conferences – bringing together expertise and stakeholders across the country to share best practices

and insights. The government can also use these larger sector meetings to launch new ideas, or release information on progress.

In Burkina Faso, “the National Water and Sanitation Forum (FNEA) is an advocacy and sharing event held every three years prior to the Global Water Forum. It brings together all water sector actors and enables advocacy, lobbying and awareness raising actions to be conducted on the issue of water and sanitation. Promoted by civil society, particularly the NGO Eau Vive Internationale, it is in the process of being formally institutionalised with the support of civil society actors.”

In France, “in 2018, a consultation day on the staging and launching point for the preparation of the French roadmap was organised on March 27 by the CGDD. In attendance were civil society actors (250 participants), the Secretary of State to the Minister for Ecological and Inclusive Transition, the Interministerial Delegate and Commissioner-General for Sustainable Development, and representatives of the Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs and of the Minister for Ecological and Inclusive Transition. This day had two objectives: to raise the contributions of civil society vis-à-vis the reporting to the HLPF 2018, and to allow an initial collaboration by reflecting on the SDG implementation roadmap.”

In Ghana, the Mole Conference is used to influence the sector and advocate for social changes.

In Kenya, the Annual Water Conference week convened by the Ministry of Water brings together all water actors in Kenya for review of progress and challenges in the water sector.

In Mali, “in recent years, the water and sanitation sector has benefited from the organisation of a series of national forums. For example, Mali organised a national water forum as part of its participation in the World Water Forum held in Marseille in 2012. This was repeated in 2014 and other forums were organised on topics such as basic social services, equity and inclusion in relation to water and sanitation.” Also, “the Democratic Forum (EID) Mali organises a national forum to question the government on 10 December each year. This is an open forum offered to those who

would not otherwise have a voice, allowing them to express their complaints about cases where rights have been breached in a range of social, economic, legal, land-related and administrative areas, among others. Civil society in the WASH sector – which is a member of the organisation and monitoring committee by right – has used its influence to raise questions about water and sanitation. Numerous recommendations by the forum panel have supported the right to access water and sanitation, and some major government decisions have been taken following questions presented at the forum.”

In Mexico, “the invitations from government to participate in forums and consultations were also mentioned as an accountability mechanism; however, matters discussed during these events generally do not make it beyond this point. Sometimes they are noted in the minutes, but it has been very difficult to get civil society recommendations included in the final documents.”

In Pakistan, the Pakistan Conference on Sanitation (PAKOSAN) at the federal level brings together provincial governments to meet biannually to report and share progress on SDGs.

In Senegal “dialogues and consultation forums” are listed as accountability mechanisms. “The forums provide an opportunity to address practical questions around access to drinking water and sanitation. They take a variety of forms, such as citizens’ platforms and citizens’ meetings (e.g. periodic meetings between Sénégalaise Des Eaux (Water Senegal – SDE) and consumer organisations).”

In Togo, “the National Water and Sanitation Forum (FNEA) is a periodic meeting that brings together stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector to report on activities and progress in the sector. It is held every three years. Its primary aim is to establish a framework for dialogue, expertise and information sharing, and conciliation that brings together stakeholders working in the water and sanitation sector. Governmental institutions are stakeholders

who lead the organisation and its meetings and define the agenda. The FNEA enables stakeholders to discuss progress in the sector and to challenge and

make recommendations to the government and leads to recommendations and roadmaps being drawn up. All SDG6 targets are considered.”

International conferences, dedicated days, dialogues

These political gatherings, bringing together representatives from different governments and civil society representatives, serve to influence global, regional and national water and sanitation targets, political commitments and investments, and improve sectoral performances. The establishment

of special sectoral days like World Water Day are sometimes mentioned in country reports as special opportunities to hold government to account and bring the issues on the agenda.

In Cameroon, events such as World Water Day, World Toilet Day and Global Handwashing Day serve as an opportunity for decentralised services to provide information for and raise awareness among other actors.

alongside international scientific organisations, donors and researchers. The programme includes an update on progress towards the SDGs and on implementation of the country’s recommendations and commitments from the previous AfricaSan session, and delegates share global and national experiences and participate in B2B-style meetings to advocate for funding or technical assistance. Like the SWA High-Level Meeting, each country comes away from the AfricaSan conference with a set of recommendations and commitments.”

In Kenya, during World Water Days, World Toilet Days, Global Handwashing Days, WASH experts always give account on progress made in the country, challenges and opportunities to address the gaps in attaining access to safe water and adequate sanitation by all.

“Niger’s National Water Day, organised by the Water Solidarity Programme (pS-Eau) takes place annually in Lyon, France, with a large Nigerien delegation in attendance (members of parliament, mayors, government representatives, private sector, CSOs) alongside the French contingent (elected representatives, NGOs and decentralised cooperation). Delegates present and discuss the state of play in the water and sanitation sector, which gives rise to an advocacy session to mobilise funding and technical assistance.” “At AfricaSan, a large Nigerien delegation (comprising government, TFP and CSO representatives) normally attends the conference,

In Pakistan, SACOSAN serves as a platform for action planning and target setting. “SACOSAN and SWA being biannual processes have the greater potential for effective participation of CSOs.” “The Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water organises these meetings every year. They are held on World Water Day and bring together several stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector. The objective is to share information on the development of the indicators with the various stakeholders in the sector. All the SDG6 targets are discussed at workshops, with a focus on targets 6.1 and 6.2.”

Joint Sector Reviews

Some countries indicated that 'joint sector reviews' (JSRs) perform as an effective accountability mechanism. A JSR refers to a periodic assessment of water, sanitation and hygiene performances by sector stakeholders, including the (national, local or regional) government, development partners and civil society. The JSR processes can take place in various ways, and may include quarterly, half-yearly or

annual meetings. It brings together a variety of WASH stakeholders to discuss, review and monitor progress, and policies and plans. These platforms serve to include voices from different stakeholders, and provide for a transparent overview of resources, action plans, priorities, and contribute towards analysis of gaps and corresponding proposals for reforms.

In Benin, "since 2003, use of the programmatic approach in the water sector has led to the establishment of a JSR, which enables performance in the sector to be monitored and assessed." "The Ministry of Health has a Steering Committee for Projects and Programmes on Hygiene and Sanitation where the coordinators report on the implementation of their activities. This committee brings together the Public Administration of the Hygiene and Sanitation sub-sector, CSOs, the Technical and Financial Partners involved in the HA sub-sector as well as the Project Coordinators and Sub-Sector Development Programme."

by the Prime Minister or his representative. At the end of the meeting, a general report is drafted, accompanied by the resolutions and recommendations from the review, and the commitments made by the government and TFPs. These recommendations and commitments are subsequently reviewed at government-TFP consultation framework meetings, and a progress update is given at the next sector review meeting."

In Niger, "the annual review covers all SDG6 targets and extends to the entire water and sanitation sector. A committee comprising representatives of the government, technical and financial partners (TFPs) (donors) and NGOs prepares for the review meeting. This includes a presentation of the annual activity report (including the financial component) and the report on the indicators. All participants are given an opportunity to critique the presentations. All stakeholders, in their respective capacities – ministries involved in the sector, TFPs, civil society organisations (CSOs), local authorities and the private sector – present their concerns regarding their activities. The review also includes a political dialogue between the government (relevant ministries) and TFPs, chaired

In Pakistan, as an accountability mechanism, from 2017 onwards, the government has initiated joint sector reviews in all the provinces for target setting of SDG6.

In Tanzania, the Joint Water Sector Review (JWSR) meeting and other formal and informal mechanisms enable the sector actors to engage with the government on sector progress. Actors meet and review the progress of the sector and try to figure out what is going smoothly or otherwise and why. The mechanisms were reported to be effective in holding the government accountable, because viable opinions, comments, recommendations and challenges are accepted in the course of project implementation.



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

2. Committees or independent bodies tasked with the responsibility for the implementation and/or monitoring of SDG6 – consisting of different stakeholders, or with close consultation of different stakeholders

Country reports have indicated that the establishment of independent bodies that serve to monitor and advise the government on SDG progress can serve as accountability

mechanisms– due to their composition and independent nature.

In Burkina Faso, “the National Steering Committee for the PNDES (CNP/PNDES) is a high-level body for monitoring the country’s national development policy. The committee includes representatives from the government, local authorities, the private sector, civil society and TFPs. The aim of this consultation and accountability forum is: (i) to supervise global implementation of the PNDES using monitoring and evaluation tools produced for this purpose; (ii) to give direction to the sector and regional actors in their work and produce the necessary tools to assess their impact; (iii) to decide on the implementation of the general or specific studies necessary to refine their direction; and (iv) to ensure good implementation of the PNDES monitoring and evaluation process as a whole. In short, it is the government mechanism established to monitor and measure national progress in the PNDES and related SDGs. It is chaired by the Prime Minister and meets every six months to assess the PNDES’ implementation performance. All the plan’s indicators are reviewed, including those relating to water and sanitation. The formal composition of this framework includes CSOs represented by a troika of three broad umbrella organisations: SPONG, the National CSO Council and the Centre for Civic Analysis of Public Policies (CDCAP). These umbrella organisations have a mandate to speak in this body on behalf of civil society.” “The operational programme steering committees are bodies aimed at providing close coordination, monitoring and guidance of programme implementation. They provide quality assurance of the assessment or programme documents before they are forwarded to the CNP/NWP. The umbrella CSOs are recognised as members of these committees.”

In France, “a high-level steering committee involving civil society is being structured to coordinate the development and follow-up of a SDG implementation roadmap for France.” And “different mechanisms for consultation and stakeholder participation exist on every levels of the organisation of water management in France (both for water resources and water and sanitation services): national (National Water Committee); water basins (Basin Committees); local (Local Authorities, Local Water Commissions, Local Public Services Advisory Commissions).”

In Honduras, “at the sub-regional level there are two figures, the Basin Councils, which include, among others, two representatives of water users (who will not necessarily be users of drinking water services), two representatives of environmental organisations and two representatives of Boards Water Systems Administrators; and the Regional Development Councils whose composition includes 10 representatives of citizens (from different municipalities and villages) and five representatives of non-governmental organisations.”

In Kenya, the National Steering Committee on SDG6 is convened by the Ministry of Water and Irrigation to coordinate and oversee reporting on SDG6. It has sub-committees responsible for monitoring and reporting on each of the six indicators. The Committee has 56 members from government institutions, academic institutions, NGOs, bilateral-multilateral agencies, CSOs and the private sector.

In Mali, the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD) encourages relationships between the various national stakeholders in terms of implementing the SDGs generally, and specifically on environmental issues. Through its mandate, the AEDD represents a focal point for actions intended to mobilise more funding, based on the concerns and needs expressed by communities. It also runs a public information and capacity-building service to help other stakeholders in the environmental sector. The agency's independent status has allowed it to surpass all expectations and it advises that more attention be given to major issues. Its status also allows it to question stakeholders, including public authorities, on the correct implementation of environmental regulations."

In Mexico, "another mechanism mentioned was the Basin Councils, which are intended to involve civil society in the decision making of the basin water; however, the plans and recommendations issued by the basin councils are not taken into consideration by the Basin Organism. It is the latter that decides the plans and allocates the budgets, without taking the users who are part of these basin councils, into account.

In Nepal, WASH Coordination Committees (WASHCC) are the most popular and effective mechanisms for wider sector participation. These committees were structured and established at all top-to-bottom levels; at national, regional, district, village and municipality levels of the country with the aim to create a common platform for all sector actors to inspire and align their joint efforts in achieving national sanitation goals. Concerned government agencies, INGOs, NGOs and CSOs are also members of these platforms.

In Niger, "the National Water and Sanitation Commission (CNEA) is made up of seven institutional panels: government; local authorities; NGOs and associations; private commercial companies; users of the sector; national and regional specialist organisations; and development partners. The CNEA was established in 2006 and is supposed to meet every six months. Unfortunately, over the past five years this commission has become dormant and is not meeting regularly. It may be revived through implementation of the National Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Management (PANGIRE), which the government adopted in May 2017."

In Nigeria, there are meetings held between government and donors, called the government-Technical and Financial Partner (TFP) consultation framework. "The purpose of this framework is to monitor the commitments and recommendations arising from the sector review, to track programme progress and to consult on water and sanitation sector policy and strategy developments included on the agenda. The TFPs have more influence than other stakeholders, most probably because of the funding they provide (often with conditions attached). The government-TFP consultation framework meeting brings together the government (ministries and agencies involved in water and sanitation management) and sector TFPs. The MHA is the lead entity on the government side, while the TFPs form a Technical Donors' Group headed by a rotating lead partner that changes every two years (currently the Luxembourg Development Cooperation agency). The government-TFP consultation framework meets every two months. The agenda is set jointly by the MHA and the sector TFPs' lead partner. The framework is active and meetings are held regularly. Commitments are made and a report is drafted following the meeting."

In Sri Lanka, Special Task Forces comprising specialists are appointed by a national coordination forum on WASH to deal with issues related to policy, institutional and operational aspects

In Togo, "in each administrative region of Togo, WASH stakeholders come together under the framework for cooperation between stakeholders in the WASH sector. The Regional Department of Water (an administrative service decentralised at the regional level that handles the provision of drinking water and water resources management) presides over this committee and the regional hygiene service holds the vice-presidency. The secretariat is often run by civil society and other positions are reserved for stakeholder organisations and institutions. CSOs, the public, parapublic and private sectors, delegates from management committees for community installations, the press and many others participate in these meetings."

3. Monitoring mechanisms established by the government are indicated to serve as a platform for civil society to provide input and validate existing data.

Some countries have referred to practical tools for monitoring as an accountability mechanism. Monitoring mechanisms

established by the government can serve as a platform for civil society to provide input and validate existing data.

In Bangladesh, the PMO has established the SDG Tracker for measuring the achievement in attaining SDGs, which is also a tool for creating better accountability mechanisms, with the main aim to create a data repository for monitoring the implementation of the SDGs and other national development goals, facilitate the tracking of progress against each goal and target through multiple visualisation schemes and improve situation analysis and performance monitoring.

In Cameroon, “the association of communes (urban areas with elected councils) in the Nyon-Ekele divisions has mapped the entire area. This mapping shows the types of hydraulic structures in the area, their condition and how they are being managed (with or without a management committee). The alphanumeric database that emerged from this exercise enables better monitoring and better management of water points.”

In Benin, “the Annual Review of the water and sanitation sector is a flexible framework for coordinating donors, implementing a programmatic approach in the sector, and closely monitoring progress towards SDG6. It involves all the bodies and organisations – the DGEau, the DNSP, the National Water Company of Benin (SONEB), the Consultative Framework of Non-State Actors of the water and sanitation sector (CANEA) and the ANCB – preparing and submitting activity reports to the organising committee chaired by the Ministry of Water. By its nature, the Review brings together all actors from the water sector, including the private sector. It is endorsed by a memorandum, jointly signed by the Minister for Water, the Minister for Health and the lead partner among the water sector TFPs.”

In India, the government’s accountability mechanisms incorporate real-time MIS and in-person monitoring through surveys and visits. These mechanisms include: online data for various flagship programmes – the site provides real-time data on access to water and water quality in rural habitations. The SBM-G dashboard displays real-time data on the number of household toilets constructed, and open defecation-free (ODF) status of states, districts and villages. SBM urban dashboard provides data on household, community and public toilets constructed and on solid waste management in cities. Verification of self-declared ODF status of a village is done through cross verification by another gram panchayat and then by a third party. A Swachhta Sangraha knowledge management portal has been created to share good practices, guidelines and success stories from the states on various sanitation-related issues, including monitoring and evaluation.¹⁹

Also in Benin, the integrity assessment tool has been mentioned as “an initiative designed to ensure that the principles of transparency, accountability and participation were embedded in the performance of administrative functions and the delivery of water-related services. The project was run in the commune of Sakété. It provided a framework for reporting, both on the delivery of drinking water services and on citizens’ assessment of the quality of these services, focusing on weaknesses in transparency, accountability and participation. The project resulted in an action plan for improvements to drinking water services. Recommendations and actions included: improving the commune’s monitoring of farmers’ contracts, holding thematic reporting sessions on water issues, and strengthening collaboration between the WUA and the commune.”

In Niger, “the government action monitoring report, published quarterly and at the end of each year, is based on information gathered from regional and departmental technical units, and is modelled on the PROSEHA logframe template.”

In Pakistan, the Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MICS) serves as an accountability mechanism that helps to hold the government accountable on SDG6.

¹⁹ For quarterly reviews of SAP implementation, a portal has been created at www.swachhtaactionplan.com



copyright: PNE -Benin

4. Accountability through regulatory and democratic systems including parliamentary reviews

Some country studies referred to political accountability: the functioning of a democratic system, in which civil society's concerns are taken up by parliament through, for example, parliamentary reviews or questions. Administrative

accountability is also mentioned as a mechanism to hold government to account for progress on national policies implementing SDG6.

In Benin, existing accountability mechanisms for SDG6 include "petitions from CSOs and government challenges from deputies."

In Burkina Faso, "the CNEau is a consultative body established by the government with the aim of examining all regulatory texts for the water and sanitation sector prior to their adoption by the government. It comprises all water actors (state, local authorities, private sector, users, civil society). The CASEM/EA is an administrative steering body for the ministerial departments. It convenes twice a year to examine and validate programmes, results and the performance of the ministries' activities. For the Ministry of Water and Sanitation, invitations are sometimes sent to one or two civil society representatives who participate in this body as observers."

France, apart from the SDGs, has a set of accountability mechanisms linked to its public water policies.

First, there are the mechanisms which concern all public policies, in particular the parliamentary control (draft finance bill, voting on laws) and the evaluation of public policies by the Court of Auditors. A national accountability mechanism for SDG6 furthermore includes "the Inter-Assembly Parliamentary Working Group on the SDGs and the forthcoming Inter-Assembly Parliamentary Working Group on the SDGs. The role and mode of operation of this working group have not yet been clearly established. It will concern the monitoring of all of the SDGs. The President of the Commission for Sustainable Development and Land Planning of the National Assembly wants the assessment of the French budget to be analysed in the light of the SDGs in particular." Furthermore, "France has a package of accountability mechanisms linked to its public policies on water. While they do not have a specific SDG focus, these institutional mechanisms make it possible to scrutinise public policies, including those relating to water and sanitation, which contribute to the achievement of SDG6."

In Maldives, “the multi-party parliamentary democratic model influences the governance process though the parliamentary monitoring and accountability process and can be harnessed for SDG6 monitoring to create an enabling environment comprising of legal measures, government, and citizens’ engagement with civil society actors such as Transparency Maldives.” “Citizens also have the opportunity to raise complaints through the political process, starting with the local council or parliament representatives.”

In Mexico, “a parliamentarians’ working group was created to follow up the SDGs; their mandate is to legislate, approve budgets, ensure accountability mechanisms, liaise with the electorate and implement periodic reviews on national and subnational progress on the SDGs.”

In the Netherlands, “the main institutions for national SDG6 monitoring are CBS and the SDG6 monitoring unit of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management (IenW). The annual SDG report for Parliament is so far the main accountability mechanism for progress on SDG6, which is a participatory process with a multi-stakeholder approach. The general report is written by the government with the input of municipalities, CSOs, academia, private sector and youth organisations. For national progress on SDG6, the report is based on CBS and Rijkswaterstaat data.” The country study also mentions the existence of participatory mechanisms within water authorities. “Participation mechanisms within regional water authorities are arranged through its governing structure which includes cooperation with provinces, municipalities and NGOs (residents’ organisations, farmers, businesses, managers of nature reserves, drinking water companies).”

In Niger, “through the WASH Parliamentary Network (REPEHA), members of parliament from across the political spectrum work together to promote drinking

water, hygiene and sanitation. Given that the National Assembly passes laws and votes on the budget, we hope the network will be able to influence government policy. The network plans to devote an entire day of parliamentary business to water and sanitation in Niger in April this year.”

In Nigeria, “the National Assembly as a national accountability mechanism has set up committees with an oversight function of the broad implementation of SDGs and agencies responsible for its implementation as well as budget appropriation.” “The CSOs can use reports from their monitoring outings as advocacy tools to the National Assembly demanding accountability on identified implementation gaps.”

In Senegal, one of the accountability mechanisms includes the “parliament: during plenary sessions, members of parliament can put oral questions to the government on matters of national importance (during government-led sessions or the annual budget debate and vote).”

In Tanzania, one of the accountability mechanisms is “the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO). The PMO is an overall supervisor of all government activities. CSOs and communities are able to create a case and report directly to the PMO, in case there are gaps in implementation. By law, the Local Government Authorities and Regional Secretariats are administratively answerable to the PMO and technically answerable to the MOWI. In case of poor technical performance, the MOWI takes action, whereas the PMO takes action for poor administrative performance, for instance when government procurement procedures are not properly followed.”

5. Decentralised accountability mechanisms: consultations and open budget sessions

Some countries reported on decentralised mechanisms as an avenue to influence and hold local government accountable

for policies and commitments related to SDG6.

In Bangladesh, there is opportunity for engagement with the local government through open budget sessions. These platforms are however not used to discuss SDG progress directly. CSOs try multiple channels to both involve the government and enhance its accountability, including through raising questions in local government forums.

In Benin, “at the local level, there is the Water and Sanitation Sector Community Forum (CCEA). This brings actors from the sector together to help the commune authorities and administration to coordinate the actions of all those working in water and sanitation in the commune, and to overcome any challenges that may be impeding development of the sector. There are also thematic reporting sessions for water and sanitation, to record progress achieved in implementing the SDG.”

In Cameroon, at the regional level, there is a consultation framework that brings together mayors, CSOs, parliamentarians and decentralised services every six months. It also includes an ‘independent observation’ component. Within this framework, CSOs are free to critique actions and decisions that are taken.

In France, “different mechanisms for consultation and stakeholder participation exist on every level of the organisation of water management in France (both for water resources and water and sanitation services): national (National Water Committee); water basins (Basin Committees); local (Local Authorities, Local Water Commissions, Local Public Services Advisory Commissions.”

In Ghana, “one other important area CSOs are able to hold government accountable is through budget tracking of District Assemblies (Local Authority). This is done through Assemblies’ medium term plans, composite budgeting and actual expenditure tracking on WASH interventions.”

In Kenya, “public meetings, convened by a government administrator (chief) to discuss development issues and other matters of interest to local residents. During such meetings, citizens take the opportunity to air their views on various matters of concern, ranging from development to security; water and sanitation provision is always discussed. Such meetings are attended by CSOs and local implementation partners.”

In Niger, the MHA arranges a forum with local authorities once a year to demonstrate accountability for its activities to local authorities. This is an extremely important framework, as the participants are elected community representatives. The MHA provides an update on progress in the water and sanitation sector and outlines future programming. The discussions are a chance for local authority representatives to learn about their role as the contracting authority for public water and sanitation services, and to raise their concerns on this issue.” And the “departmental and communal consultation framework: some departments and communes have created a consultation framework to discuss the implementation of projects in the local area and to ensure that facilities are evenly distributed across villages.”

In Pakistan, “recently SDG Support Units/Cells have been established at provincial level by the government with the assistance of UNDP to support and monitor provincial line departments for achieving SDG targets. WASH clusters at the provincial level are more organised bodies that can hold the provincial governments accountable.”

In Senegal, local level accountability mechanisms include “dialogue and discussion forums for civil society stakeholders and national directorates/agencies, touching on practical issues around improving people’s living and working conditions.”

In Togo, “accountability mechanisms at the community, village or canton level: communities, villages or cantons appoint people responsible for managing water resources and equipment. These

village borehole management committees represent the communities when dealing with the public administration, manage the infrastructure and feed the information provided by the prefectural or regional department of water and sanitation services back to the village. They also present the community's water-related grievances and needs to the administration.

The meetings are held following an invitation from the president of the Water Resources Management Committee set up in the community. They are held according to the needs or requirements at the time and are open to everyone.”



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

6. Few countries indicate complaint, grievance and enforcement mechanisms

Accountability means that those who are responsible accept responsibility for their actions and omissions and accept that they should be called upon to give an account of why and how they have acted or failed to act. Effective mechanisms can

be in place, able and capable to review state action, receive complaints, and release (binding) recommendations. Complaint mechanisms can be established through independent bodies, and also exist at the level of service providers.

In Kenya, some grievance action mechanisms are established, including: “various venues established at the policy, programme and project level for collecting feedback, grievances and complaints especially in the Ministry of Health. Independent structures outside government agencies include tribunals, institutions ombudsmen (especially on environmental protection issues), public enquiries, civil society organisations and a variety of sector-specific entities such as labour relations boards. There are also courts legal action mechanisms through the court system, human rights activists going to court for interpretation of the law, seeking government accountability on service delivery.”

In Mali, “the national EID in Mali is an unusual event, which combines a democratic approach and a particular manifestation of it. The forum is held on 10 December every year to commemorate Human Rights Day and is a space for monitoring the country’s overall governance. As its name suggests, it allows citizens

whose rights have been breached – and who have exhausted all the legal avenues available to them – to refer their case to the EID as a last resort in order to safeguard their rights.[...] Civil society stakeholders participate in the selection committee in numerous ways. Stakeholders include organisations involved in defending human rights, women’s organisations and trade unions, among others. The number and diversity of these stakeholders help ensure there is a high-quality selection process covering all types of issues that will be presented at the EID. [...] It is worth noting the change of institutional affiliation, which was achieved thanks to advocacy work carried out by CSOs in the water and sanitation sector. Prior to this, the Ministry of Justice was responsible for organising the EID. In civil society’s view, it was inappropriate for the Ministry of Justice to act as the EID’s judge and jury, as some recommendations were directed at it. Thanks to strong advocacy by CSOs, the task of organising the event was handed over to the Ombudsman’s Office, which is an independent authority.”



copyright: Economic and Social Rights Centre – Hakijamii

7. Few countries use human rights mechanisms to hold government accountable for SDG6

Various human rights mechanisms exist that collect large amounts of information and issue recommendations on many of the SDG6 targets. These mechanisms include the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the treaty bodies, and special procedures that collect information that could be fed into SDG

reporting. Also at the national level there are human rights institutions and ombudsmen of which resources and capacities may prove to be useful for accountability purposes under the SDG6.

The Kenyan country study explains that the “Constitution of Kenya 2010 has placed a human right obligation to ensure every person in Kenya has the right to clean water in adequate quantities and to reasonable standards of sanitation. This therefore calls for key actors in the water and sanitation sector to put in place plans, systems and mechanisms to achieve gradual realisation of universal access to water and sanitation. Accountability to this is key in ensuring that the government institutions, development partners deliver their promise and commitments to the citizens and to achieve the targets of both SDGs and Kenya Vision 2030.” The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) “is an autonomous national institution with the constitutional mandate to monitor, investigate and advise the nation on matters of human rights, including the right to water and sanitation. KNHRC is a member of the national steering committee for SDG6 reporting. Of its own accord, KNHRC carried out monitoring of the realisation of the right to water and sanitation in Kenya.” Therefore this Commission forms a very important avenue for accountability that can hold the government accountable on delivery of the promises on access to water and sanitation especially as per the SDG6 indicators. Also, Kenya CSOs Network (KEWASNET) serves as an accountability mechanism that checks the government’s performance on delivering its promises on rights to access to water and adequate sanitation and compiles the annual CSO sector report.

The Maldives country study recommends that CSOs could utilise national and international conventions in their respective sectors to raise issues in governance and make the public aware of the obstacles and how they could hold the government accountable.

In Mexico, on a parallel track, more than 100 CSOs collectively delivered to the UN Expert committee an alternative report for the periodic review on country progress related to Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR) under the International Covenant on ESCR. “Following the country progress examination under the ICESCR where water and sanitation are included, one of the recommendations is linked to the 2030 Agenda and recommends to include the ICESCR obligations in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and particularly through the inclusion of the obligations in the work of the National Council for the 2030 Agenda, and underlines that SDG implementation would be considerably facilitated if the state establish an independent mechanism to monitor progress and consider the beneficiaries of public programmes as rights holders.”²⁰

In Nigeria, the “National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) is where citizens can register complaints if the CSOs find that the government is falling short of implementation and may not meet the 2030 target.”

²⁰ Final report page 11 and paragraph 73 of the final recommendations that the ESCR committee approved on the 29 March 2018.

B. Accountability mechanisms established by non-state stakeholders

- ⚙️ National events and conferences organised by CSOs.
- ⚙️ Auditing exercises and budget monitoring initiated by CSOs.
- ⚙️ Networks of CSOs as a means to more effectively hold their governments to account for reaching SDG6 targets.
- ⚙️ The role of media in raising public awareness as an accountability tool.
- ⚙️ Shadow reporting practices by CSOs.
- ⚙️ The role of the private sector in holding government to account for SDG6.

1. National events and conferences organised by civil society are being used to share information and lessons learned and building capacity for holding government accountable for the SDG6 commitments

Development agencies, as well as networks of CSOs, organise sector events, inviting colleagues, grassroots organisations, as well as education and research institutions, government

representatives and businesses, for example. These types of gatherings serve to exchange information and learning, and to join forces for advocacy and reviewing purposes.

In Bangladesh, pre-budget consultations organised by CSOs create space where CSOs can convey sector demand from grassroots to policy makers. Participants of these events represent multiple groups including government officials, academia, business sector and media, along with civil society. CSOs try multiple channels to both involve the government and enhance its accountability, including collective advocacy through platforms, such as the Citizen's Platform for SDGs, Bangladesh; through holding policy dialogues, conducting and disseminating policy research, lobbying, orientation to grassroots communities on raising questions in local government forums, etc.

In Kenya, the Inter-agency Coordination Committee (ICC) holds quarterly meetings and annual sanitation conferences convened by the Ministry of Health. These enable stakeholders to share experiences and new technologies in the water and sanitation sector.

In Nigeria, National Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) is a round table conference that brings together WASH stakeholders to deliberate on achieving CLTS in Nigeria. At these meetings, government agencies interact with CSOs and development partners to measure achievements through which the government is held accountable on shortfalls.

In Senegal, "CSOs attend the national SDG progress report presentation workshops: the Council of Non-Governmental Organisations for Development Support (CONGAD) is responsible for organising these workshops, which are attended by a broad base of CSOs."

2. Some of the country studies have referred to networks of civil society organisations as a means to more effectively hold their governments to account for reaching SDG6 targets

These networks may consist of many different organisations, of different sizes and functioning at different levels. Networks usually appoint spokespersons or lead organisations that are tasked to represent the voices of all their members.

Governments tend to meaningfully consult these network organisations as they consist of so many unified stakeholders. CSO networks therefore usually have bigger influencing capacities than smaller, stand-alone CSOs.

In Burkina Faso, “the AEPHA thematic group (GTAEPHA/SPONG) is a platform established by SPONG in the WASH sector. It aims to organise consultations between civil society actors, undertake monitoring and citizen oversight of public action, and make the communities’ voices heard in dialogue and decision-making spaces. It groups together the main NGOs and SPONG members and non-member associations involved in the WASH sector. This platform is recognised as a key sector contact for government, and its members represent SPONG in the national consultation and decision-making bodies.”

In Ghana, the Coalition of NGOs in Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS) platform is used to influence the sector and advocate for social changes.

In Kenya, CSOs are crucial players in any county’s developmental agenda. They play crucial roles socially, economically and politically. Kenya CSO network’s (KEWASNET) accountability mechanism checks the government’s performance on delivering its promised on rights to access to water and adequate sanitation and compiles annual CSO sector report.” “[T]he CSOs have the mandate of monitoring the progress made and are acting as a watchdog to the commitments made by the government and development partners.

The CSOs form part of the data collection, compilation, validation, reviews, presentation and feedback to the larger community in the country.”

In Nigeria, one of the accountability mechanisms is the Network of Water and Sanitation (NEWSAN) – a coalition with representation in all states and is also represented by the National Coordinator in NTGS. They also participate in monitoring and evaluations, conduct advocacy, participate in government activities and also serve as a pressure group on government. “The CSOs as accountability mechanism can hold the government accountable through advocacy, press releases and other forms of engagements if they find that the government is not implementing SDG6 accordingly.”

In Togo, “the Basic Sanitation Collaborative Council in Togo (CCABT) is a mechanism that brings together stakeholders from the water and sanitation sector. This mechanism specifically covers sanitation in Togo, as this sector is marginalised. The aim of the CCABT is to coordinate the activities of the various stakeholders to enhance the basic sanitation sector in Togo. This platform covers target 6.2 of SDG6.”

3. A few country studies have indicated that monitoring government commitments (including shadow reporting) by civil society constitutes an effective accountability mechanism.

Publicly accessible reports written by civil society on the implementation or progress on SDG6 are regarded as important accountability tools. 'Shadow reports' provide an alternative view directed to an oversight or monitoring mechanism in response to the release of government's own

reports. Civil society also initiates research and reports with a thematic focus, to inform and alert the public on pressing issues. This way, people as well as the government are made aware of policy gaps and failures as well as good practices in achieving the targets under SDG6.

In Bangladesh, CSOs try multiple channels to both involve the government and enhance its accountability, including conducting and disseminating policy-focused research.

In Benin, "CSOs participate in the accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems through preparing the civil society shadow report."

In Burkina Faso, "the Fas'Eau Alliance is a group of different organisations (WASH specialists, human rights defenders and media) that promote the right to water and sanitation. This alliance analyses progress made in water and sanitation rights and implements different actions to improve public policies and promote citizen oversight. It is coordinated by IRC, an international NGO of Dutch origin." "The Présimètre is a civil society initiative headed up by the NGO Diakonia. It is intended as a tool for citizen oversight of public commitments and policies. It enables monitoring and analysis of the implementation of the 85 commitments made by the President of Burkina Faso during his 2015 presidential campaign. Through a partnership with WaterAid, this platform is monitoring all the commitments related to water and sanitation made by the President of Burkina Faso in his election campaign. These commitments, in particular the promise of 'zero water drudgery', are listed and then monitored by the whole population through a technical platform that measures performance. This platform enables citizens to comment on the implementation of these commitments according to their own experience by sending comments via the online platform. This tool is combined with a citizen dialogue organised through a monthly interactive remote broadcast with the decision makers. WaterAid supports the Présimètre with the aim of ensuring that water, hygiene and sanitation are taken into account in all components of this monitoring."

In India, not having been given the opportunity to participate in the VNR process, civil society actors

decided to produce their own report on the status of SDG implementation under the banner of 'Wada Na Todo Abhiyan' (WNTA). In India, CSOs carry out their own research and organise dissemination meetings both at state and local levels. Many organisations bring out reports from their independent research on varied issues that help in identification of gaps, successes and challenges in implementation of programmes, and also provide course correction remedies.

The Kenya CSOs Network (KEWASNET) checks the government's performance on delivering its promises on rights to access to water and adequate sanitation and compiles an annual CSO sector report.

In Mexico, the WASH CSO collective drafted a report for the UN Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation for his official visit on May 2017. This report identified gaps, right violations and challenges in realising the HRWS and reflect the complex reality that Mexico has in terms of access to water and sanitation.

In Nigeria, the CSO Advisory Group on SDGs, established by the Office of the Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs), sees CSOs participate in reporting on implementation of SDG6 through which the government is held accountable through shadow reporting by CSOs.

In Pakistan, the preparation and presentation of a 'traffic light' paper on the progress made by national governments on commitments made during the previous SACOSAN proved very successful to hold national governments responsible.

In Senegal, civil society has set up the National Blue Book Committee and other monitoring frameworks for all SDG6-related CSOs. The National Blue Book is used as SDG6 progress monitoring reports.

4. CSOs in some countries are holding governments to account for the budgets that they have decided upon, as well as the priorities they have set using social auditing exercises and budget monitoring

There are various ways for civil society to hold government financially accountable. These include: social audits, in which the accuracy of government financial records is reviewed;

public expenditure tracking exercises; and, tools like 'citizens' report cards', which assess the level of people's satisfaction

In Afghanistan, the national CSOs undertake budget analysis and public expenditure tracking surveys to 'check the money' from central government budgets to service providers. They undertake humanitarian approach analysis and collective advocacy on humanitarian treaties (conventions) and marginalised groups for their rights of access to WASH services.

implementation of the projects. All of this information is then presented to members of parliament within the same framework as the alternative report."

In Cameroon, "the Dynamique Citoyenne (Dynamic Citizen) network used to produce annual alternative reports for decision-makers to facilitate an in-depth budget analysis. When the yearly budget was voted on, the national and global situation was used as a basis for analysis. Owing to the varying budgets allocated to different ministerial departments, a comparison was made between those allocated to the Ministries of Agriculture and Water, for example, and those to certain others that, according to experts, did not require as large a budget. The experts then compared what had been said with what was feasible. The results were presented to the members of the National Assembly, and this put them in a better position to understand the realities and formulate their discussion points." "There is a mechanism known as budget monitoring. Experts establish the list of projects financed by the state budget and focus on certain sectors, such as water or healthcare. Towards the middle of the year, field visits are arranged with a view to comparing what was planned with the reality on the ground. Finally, an analysis is carried out to discern the problems that resulted in partial

In Ghana, there is also budget tracking being done by CSOs and stakeholder platform meetings. "Water and Sanitation for Urban Poor (WSUP) has also engaged a lot of CSOs to track budget and expenditure on sanitation related services in some assemblies as a way of enhancing the supply side of accountability on WASH."

In India, CSOs are involved in budget briefing on SBM urban and rural as a form of accountability initiatives organised by Centre for Policy Research (CPR). They analyse trends of allocation, expenditure against government-reported outputs and outcomes of SBM programme and on the Self-Employment Scheme for Rehabilitation of Manual Scavengers. A study was done on India's SDG indicator framework and on statistical capacity. This study highlighted the challenges and opportunities as well as financial gaps for implementing SDGs.

In Kenya, 'social auditing' is used as an accountability mechanism: a participatory audit in which community members compare stated expenditures or services with actual outputs.



copyright: ARCA



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

5. The role of media in raising public awareness as accountability tool

Survey respondents and country reports highlight the role of social media and other media in raising public awareness

and as a tool for holding government accountable for SDG6 commitments.

In Bangladesh, CSOs try multiple channels to both involve the government and enhance its accountability, including media advocacy; media plays a relatively stronger role in holding the government accountable regarding the entitlements of citizens.

The study in Kenya explains that “there is growing demand that governments, public institutions and officials grant access to information concerning their actions, programmes, commitments and reports on progress.” The media, such as newspaper articles and radio and TV talk shows, has increasingly become a popular way for citizens to bring their concerns to the attention of political leaders and the government both at the local and national level.

In Benin, existing accountability mechanisms for SDG6 include using media to “challenge government.”

In Bhutan, “the media picks up issues and concerns directly and publishes/reports or broadcasts. This grabs a lot of attention from the government/politicians/ministers and the general public.”

In Nigeria, “the WASH Media as an arm of NTGs [National Task Group on Sanitation] are able to hold government accountable by publishing reports of government activities.”

6. The role of private sector in holding the government to account for SDG6 was only mentioned by two countries

In Niger, another accountability mechanism is the “government-private sector consultation framework, still under construction, which is intended to support implementation of the PROSEHA. Like the other consultation frameworks, it will give both sides an opportunity to raise their concerns and help ensure that water and sanitation programmes are implemented in the best way possible. Niger’s private water and sanitation sector is weak and requires support from the government to expand and boost its performance.”

In Nigeria, “the private sector also has a role to play if the government is falling short on implementing policies that can promote their contribution towards SDG6. For instance, in sanitation marketing, there is need for government to provide infrastructure that will support their business to promote sanitation.” If the government falls short they can hold government accountable.

5

Good practices and means of participation in accountability mechanisms

5. Good practices and means of participation in accountability mechanisms

Key findings from this section

- ⚙️ Some countries report on the potential to influence policy decisions and implementation of plans at local level.
- ⚙️ Stakeholders across the researched countries agreed that participation in accountability mechanisms have a great impact when carried out in an effective, meaningful way:
 - ⚙️ Increased political attention with funding for SDG6 and capacity building of government.
 - ⚙️ Improved access to information and transparency on government actions.
 - ⚙️ Increased information and awareness creation among civil society and increased learning and sharing of good practices on implementation of SDG6.
 - ⚙️ Improved monitoring and reporting practices for SDG6.
 - ⚙️ Successfully influencing government policies and priorities.
 - ⚙️ Increased focus on grassroots and marginalised groups.
 - ⚙️ Increased partnerships between stakeholders.
 - ⚙️ Improved coordination of actions and more clarity on roles and responsibilities among stakeholders



copyright: SPONG Burkina Faso

5.1 The means of participation in accountability mechanisms

The means of participation differ across the different types of accountability mechanisms. The majority of the respondents of the online survey participate either regularly or occasionally in the accountability mechanisms (Figure 8). When the analysis is made per region there are two findings that match with the country reports: in The Netherlands and


in France, 49% of respondents do not participate in an accountability mechanism as much of these take place using democratic governmental processes. In Honduras and Mexico, 45% of respondents do not participate in accountability mechanisms because they do not exist or are not functioning adequately.

When the analysis is made per type of organisation, the results include:

- ⚙ Research or education institutions, private sector, foundations and decentralised government bodies are the ones reporting they are least involved in accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙ National governments and development partners or UN agencies report to be the ones mostly participating regularly in accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙ Local NGOs, local CSOs, international NGOs/think-tanks and the media have similar results.

Overall, participation takes place at many different levels, from parliamentary dialogues at the national level and also in smaller meetings between local governments and communities. This section provides more details on how participation is taking place.

Figure 8. Is your institution or organisation part of any of these accountability mechanisms of platforms?





Some countries report on the potential to influence policy decisions and implementation of plans at local level.

In India, there is huge scope for CSOs to participate at the local government level to create awareness on SDGs, build capacity and communicate behaviour change.

In Kenya, the country study reported that for more effective participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms, CSO participation at county level could be strengthened.

In Pakistan, WASH clusters at provincial level are effective platforms where CSOs have the opportunity to hold provincial government departments responsible for their plans.

In Senegal, "at the decentralised level, CSOs have an opportunity to raise practical issues around service access, continuity, quality and coverage with technical staff and local elected representatives who are able to answer their questions and address their concerns to the best of their ability."

In Tanzania, in rural areas, water user committees are answerable to the village government. It was reported that CSOs contributed to this new direction on management of water supply systems at the village level.

5.2 What are the positive results of these accountability mechanisms?

In spite of the barriers that many organisations face in trying to participate in accountability mechanisms (see chapter 6), stakeholders across the researched countries agreed that

participation in accountability mechanisms has a great impact when carried out in an effective, meaningful way.

A. Increased political attention with funding for SDG6 and capacity building of government

Country studies have pointed out that participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms led the government to increase attention on SDG6. It helped to put SDG6 issues on the political agenda and increase corresponding resource allocations.

At the same time, some country reports indicate that engagement of CSOs in accountability mechanisms has great impact on the capacity of government actors to understand and implement SDG responsibilities.

In Bangladesh, participation of the CSOs in the consultation during the formulation of the seventh Five Year Plan of the government contributed to the enhanced attention of the government on issues related to water supply, sanitation and hygiene.

In Nigeria, through the National Council of Water Resources, CSOs are given a template to write memoranda stating issues that need to be addressed by the Council. Through this medium, CSOs can influence which topics are addressed at the meetings and hold government accountable.

In Ghana, positive experiences with CSO participation in accountability mechanisms include that “CSOs have been at the forefront of engaging local government and citizens on budget and planning as well as midterm reviews of local plans and ensuring that WASH infrastructure and services are catered for in budgets and plans.” “CSOs have been doing well in data collection, processing and dissemination and government is always ready to take advice from relevant stakeholders on how to attain goal 6.”

In Sri Lanka, increased resource mobilisation is one of the key positive aspects of CSO participation.

In India, there are positive experiences with CSO participation in supporting capacity building of relevant department officials.

In Tanzania, there is increased understanding and political will on environmental cleanliness in the country; and, the other positive experience was CSOs having contributed to the formation of National Water Development Fund (NWDF).

In Niger, “the national WASH Coalition has lobbied the WSSCC to help Niger meet the GSF eligibility criteria. The WSSCC has conducted a study on the state of sanitation in Niger to determine whether conditions are right for GSF interventions in the country. The outcome of the study was positive and the WSSCC will shortly begin putting together a GSF programme.”

In Togo, “the members of the borehole monitoring committees mobilise funds for other boreholes, for example, the BODJE village mobilised CFAF 1,500,000 in one year”, asserted another person. Existing accountability mechanisms in communities and villages enable stakeholders to manage installations effectively and to mobilise funds to repair or replace defective or broken down equipment.”

B. Improved access to information and transparency on government actions

Country studies indicate that effective accountability mechanisms leads to more information in relation to SDG6, and governments tend to create new ways to disseminate information. Also, participation of CSOs in accountability

mechanisms leads to better insights, and improved access to information on government commitments, policies, plans and progress on SDG6.

In Bangladesh, minutes of the meetings are usually prepared and shared among the participants; in case of important issues, relevant documents are produced and made available publicly through official websites. On the development of the SDG Tracker: "Two major components of SDG Tracker are the SDG Portal and Dashboard: 1) SDG Portal enables policy makers, government agencies, private sector, CSOs, international organisations, academia, researchers and the citizens to track year on year progress against each target and to create required visualisations. 2) SDG Dashboards facilitate individual Ministries/Divisions and Agencies to consolidate available data for each SDGs and compare it visually against performance thresholds. The resulting dashboards highlight areas where a Ministry needs to make the greatest progress towards achieving the goals by 2030."

In Burkina Faso, "CSO involvement in the different consultation mechanisms and platforms has been positive in a number of ways, in particular: the incorporation of a strategic focus on citizen oversight into the Water and Sanitation Sector Governance Programme."

In Ghana, positive experiences of participation in accountability mechanisms are "very good, with information sharing and improved engagement with government institutions."

In India, participation of CSOs leads to government officials increasingly making data available in public domain.

In Kenya, through engaging with the government, CSOs get updated on the sector. The Ministry of Health established the service delivery Inter-agency Coordination Committee (ICC) which also created a CLTS Online reporting platform, where counties report on the open defecation-free status of all villages and

hygiene status within their counties. It is in this forum that questions are asked on reports on WASH to ensure accountability of the actors. "For accountability, any stakeholder with internet access can get access to the public reporting website, view all reported data and information in maps and table formats – after quality control and review, review progress towards targets at national or sub-regional level and even download all reported data."

In Mali, as part of the implementation of the SDGs, in 2016, the government of Mali organised a national workshop, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and working with the other departments, on adopting and prioritising the SDGs. According to the workshop's reports, the national stakeholders were aware of the new guidelines for development, but also of the link between the SDGs and national priorities.

In Mexico, although CSOs have indicated that there are no possibilities for accountability and participation with regard to SDG6, some systems were nonetheless mentioned which, need strengthening. They could contribute to a number of positive aspects of the accountability platforms: the system for requesting information (National Institute for Information Access and Data Protection [INAI]) on the SDGs, which can be used by civil society. The problem is the quality of information for some water variables and how up to date it is, as well as the disengagement among institutions in considering this information confidential; and an online information system available on progress in piped water systems in rural areas through the Apartado Rural (APARURAL) programme (previously PROSSAPYS).

In the Netherlands, positive experiences with national level mechanisms include "the water authorities as a democratic system, existing water policies and transparent national reporting mechanisms around them, the well-arranged communication systems of private water companies and municipalities in case of

enquiries or necessary system repairs are all listed as possibilities for civil society to participate in water-related issues if needed.”

In Pakistan, CSOs were updated on reports and plans, as responsible governmental departments have presented their progress, targets and plans at provincial JSRs.

In Senegal, a positive experience includes that “CSOs are involved in the GEMI implementation process: the NGOs that attended the workshop had their say and learned about the ongoing process.” “Some CSOs have had the opportunity to engage with the PSE/SDG alignment process, [...] The CSOs involved in this process came out better informed about the PSE and the SDGs and understood the linkages between them.”

In Tanzania, it was reported that it is a culture in the sector to share draft reports for comments by other non-government sector actors, such as CSOs, the private sector and development partners; within the government system there is a formal structure of sharing draft reports for the aim of correction and commenting. In this case, the final report is an output of dialogue of different actors in the sector. The CSOs have access to information from the government on

the nature of services, the budgets, funds allocated and projects to be undertaken in the course of improving access to water and sanitation.

In Togo, “by taking part in the meetings, we were able to obtain more information and provide input for the advocacy work. The meetings enable all the stakeholders to have access to accurate information on the amount of equipment that needs to be set up and where to put it. Following the validation of the 2015 Activity Report, the CSOs in the Central Region were given the opportunity to ask questions at the 2016 meeting regarding progress on the implementation of the recommendations and who would be in charge of this.” “Participating in the meetings has enabled us to obtain more information and resources for advocacy work”, asserted one person surveyed. This is clear evidence that during the meetings or workshops held as part of the accountability mechanisms, the CSOs are informed of what is being done. [...] As regards positive experiences of CSO participation in the various national accountability systems, another person stated: ‘The meetings enable all the stakeholders to obtain detailed information on the amount of equipment to install and where it should be installed’. In Togo, this information is contained in databases in each administrative region at the level of the regional departments for water and the regional hygiene services.”



C. Increased information and awareness creation among civil society and increased learning and sharing of good practices on implementation of SDG6

Country studies also indicated that participation helps to inform and create more awareness among people and organisations on the issues regarding SDG6. Many country studies have also

referred to 'learning' and 'sharing good practices' as positive experiences in participatory avenues.

In Afghanistan, with regards to information sharing, participation of CSOs in the water management national consultation workshops in 2016 and 2017 has happened. MEW in 2016 and 2017 invited CSOs, research organisations, NGOs/INGOs, the private sector and scholars in the national consultation workshops on water management to submit their suggestions regarding National Water Management Plan 2016-2020. As for informing and notifying about milestones and achievement on SDG6 targets, there is participation of CSOs and other organisation in the monthly WASH coordination meetings to discuss the achievements and milestones and implementation approaches.

In Benin, "the following have been identified as positive experiences: press briefings or media cafés. At the commune level, the positive experiences include organising the reporting sessions or commune public hearings on water and sanitation themes."

In Bangladesh, research has indicated that "in spite of existing limitations, the consultations (when those take place) can serve as vibrant knowledge sharing events by sharing critical reflection."

In Bhutan, participation has helped raise more awareness and accountability by use of social media and many other informal channels.

In Burkina Faso, positive experiences with participating in accountability mechanisms, include: "the Présimètre, with regular lobbying of ministers, live on national television. This platform has become a window of accountability in relation to the President of Burkina Faso and his government. It is viewed by thousands of web users. The dialogue with the government that forms part of this initiative has become an unmissable event on national television, eagerly awaited by numerous viewers who are able to

interact directly with the authorities. This is a platform that allows citizens to directly lobby the government."

In Ghana, "the existence of national platforms as well as coalitions that presents unique platforms for knowledge sharing, discussions and accountability is a positive experience. The Mole conference and other WASH platforms for example provide a good experience for information sharing, improved engagement with INGOs and government institutions and the government appreciates contributions and concerns raised through meetings and release of communiques. The WASH sector is able to attract vibrant and supportive sector players who are always willing to support. The media in the country is vibrant and a good media participation through the Ghana WASH Journalists Network is able to get attention of sector ministry and other relevant government agencies to respond to queries on the sector."

In India, many participants felt that even though government meetings are not necessarily review meetings, they are a good platform for sharing experiences, good practices, innovations and lessons learnt, and provide an opportunity to interface with the government.

In Kenya, through engaging with the government, CSOs get updated on challenges by government institutions on CSOs involvement and contribution. Thus, participation serves as a peer review mechanism. A lot of information is shared. It provides a platform for key stakeholders to dialogue and chat strategically going forward. Action plans are developed and mechanisms for follow-up developed.

In Maldives, "the Social Media Network which has been created during the workshops needs to be led based on purposeful work plans. However, this is an initial step that needs to be developed further into

CSO networks being independent and self-led on development agenda directed by community based leadership with a clear focus on strategic activities and methods of approach towards participation meaningfully in monitoring and accountability roles for the success of SDG6 by 2030.”

In Senegal, “at the workshops, CSOs learned about the work that had been done to align the SDGs with public policy, to simplify the targets and indicators, to disaggregate the indicators, and to identify official data sources for indicator reporting. As a result, they understood the sheer scale of the work involved and the corresponding resource mobilisation needs. They

now have a clear picture of the respective roles and responsibilities of national stakeholders and TFPs and, as such, are more fully engaged with the process and determined to play a meaningful role.” “CSOs also gained an insight into the SDG6 monitoring mechanism and had an opportunity to talk about the proposed target and indicator reporting methodology. In summary, CSOs learned a lot from this process.”

In Tanzania, the CSOs have access to information from the government, and in this way the CSOs play a significant role because they tend to share this information with the local people in a simplified way.



copyright: Water Integrity Maldives

D. Improved monitoring and reporting practices for SDG6

Country studies indicated that effective accountability mechanisms create better and more effective ways for the collection of data and monitoring results on SDG6. A number of country studies have indicated that civil society participation leads to improved progress monitoring. This is sometimes due

to the fact that civil society puts pressure on governments to inform them of progress (and therefore effective monitoring by the government is required), or due to civil society's own initiatives to collect data themselves for the purpose of progress monitoring.

In Benin, "the following have been identified as positive experiences: development of the civil society shadow WASH report, which enables CSOs to confirm or refute progress and to evaluate governance of the sector and the Annual Review, which enabled the government to revise its approach in calculating the coverage rate for drinking water."

In France, positive experiences regarding participation in these accountability mechanisms includes the "inclusion of CSO recommendations in the national voluntary review for the 2016 HLPF."

In Ghana, positive experiences with CSO participation in accountability mechanisms, include the fact that "CSOs have also constituted platforms to work with government to track progress on SDG6, which is laudable."

In India, the Kerala Institute of Local Administration (KILA) has started training the state's village-level governments to prepare their Gram Panchayat Development Plans (GPDP) in alignment with SDG targets.

Kenya is a member of African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) formed in 2002. Through this platform, a reporting system "Africa Water Sector and Sanitation Monitoring and Reporting (WASSMO) at a glance", a web-based monitoring framework for reporting progress in the water sector at national level, was established, through which Kenya reports annually. Some CSOs are co-conveners of Technical Working Groups (TWGs) that feed into an SDG6 reporting mechanism while others are members of subcommittees for SDG6 indicators under the National Steering Committee, which give them opportunities to effectively engage with the government. The forums

created by line government ministries and departments as listed above give CSOs and stakeholders opportunity to query, improve or contribute to the statistics on water and sanitation access and management of the water catchments and systems in the country.

In the Netherlands, "as far as mechanisms around SDG6 are concerned, the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) is positive about the existing processes around creating SDG6 monitoring systems, such as the development of the monitoring unit of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management - even if the indicators are not all encompassing and there is more to monitor in the Netherlands. The process of setting up this monitoring system through learning events with multiple countries and stakeholders from both government and academia is regularly mentioned as a valuable process for development through shared learning."

In Niger, "inclusion of achievements by NGOs and associations in the MHA's Annual Review: through the NGO report presented to the Sector Review, the CSOs demonstrated that they had made significant investments in the water and sanitation sector. Their investments in sanitation, for example, exceeded those of the traditional donors. The MHA therefore now sends the NGOs report forms and programme sheets to be filled in each year. Their achievements and programmes are thus included."

In Tanzania, "the government cannot provide certain services or undertake activities at once for the whole country. In the water and sanitation sector, NGOs and CSOs have played a great part in data collection, feeding the government with data and information which supplemented the gaps and also design of other areas."

E. Successfully influencing government policies and priorities

Some country studies referred to participatory experiences that lead to adjustments in government policy-making and action. Accountability mechanisms that allow for scrutinising

the effectiveness of policies on SDG6 can lead to policy adjustments or new priorities in policy-making.

In Afghanistan, there is participation of NGOs/INGOs and CSOs in the revision of WASH policy 2016: the WASH policy 2010 has been revised in 2016 to bring in line the WASH services in rural areas. MRRD invited the NGOs, INGOS and CSOs to WASH coordination meetings to know their feedbacks and comments for revision of WASH policy.

In Bangladesh, participating in processes for separate action plans for each of the targets under SDG6 has led to the launching of 'target specific points of prioritised action'.

In Burkina Faso, "CSO involvement in the different consultation mechanisms and platforms has been positive in a number of ways, in particular: the constitutional enshrinement of the right to water and sanitation; and, the prioritisation of water on the agendas of presidential candidates (source of the President's 'Zero water drudgery' commitment)." "Promotion of a service approach through NGOs: the Ministry of Water and Sanitation's technicians have long been limited to providing infrastructure without really considering the actual delivery of services to those for whom the infrastructure is being provided. NGOs and CSOs have had to carry out substantial advocacy work to highlight the issue of actual service delivery and to take all necessary measures to ensure effective service delivery, once the infrastructure has been built. The adoption of a rights-based and service-based approach in policy documents is an illustration of this. Provision of a specific Ministry of Water and Sanitation: Burkina Faso is one of the few countries in West Africa that has a specific Ministry of Water and Sanitation. This is due to lobbying by the sector's NGOs. Influence over the process of drawing up the national strategy for managing water, hygiene and sanitation facilities in rural areas: it offers an illustration of the CSOs' positions on different public policies. Through the workshop to validate the new national strategy for managing water and sanitation facilities proposed by the government, CSOs were able to meet and express their concerns and opposition to the management options chosen, which are not in

line with a rights-based approach. This resulted in the government actors delaying its adoption in order to further reflect and consult. Pressure to prioritise water on the agendas of the presidential candidates (source of the President's 'Zero water drudgery' commitment): During the 2015 electoral campaign, water and sanitation sector CSOs and NGOs organised to raise awareness among the candidates of the issues facing the sector. This resulted in commitments being made by the main candidates, as reflected in the promise of the President-Elect, Rock Mark Christian Kaboré, to ensure zero water drudgery by 2020."

In Cameroon, CSOs have had positive experiences in participating in processes for the formulation of strategies and policies; particularly the role in designing and approving the National Water Policy, the national WASH in Schools strategy, and the national Community-Led Total Sanitation strategy in 2015..

In Ghana, "the government relies on CSOs for advice and CSO-led platforms are used for accountability by government and where government falls short of delivery, CSOs are able to remind it of its commitments, especially through the media."

In India, the participatory process followed by the state of Sikkim was a positive experience for NGO Development Alternatives, which had supported the state government in drafting a bill entitled, Sikkim Well-Being of Generations Bill 2017, based on the SDG framework and consultations with multiple citizen groups. The bill, once enacted, will facilitate participatory review of development plans of each line department.

In Kenya, the government acknowledges, respects and engages with CSOs in a consultative manner since they form part of the accountability mechanism. CSOs participate in the planning, execution and reviews through open sharing and discussions among WASH sector partners with government. Stakeholder

involvement in planning, implementation, monitoring, reviews and evaluation of programmes is well documented in different sectors of water and sanitation in the country. The forums created by line government ministries and departments as listed above give CSOs and stakeholders opportunity to query, improve or contribute to the statistics on water and sanitation access and management of the water catchments and systems in the country.

In Mali, “CSOs in the WASH sector have both expertise and some clear advantages when it comes to working effectively to influence public policies and, more specifically, the implementation of SDG6.”

In Nepal, “the second joint sector review conducted on the year 2014 was so effective to bring attention of government and donor partners on critical issues of the sector such as water quality issues, enhancing water access at household premises, upgrading open defecation-free campaigning towards total sanitation, and led to critical reflection on urban sanitation and faecal sludge management issues etc. The conclusion was documented with 34 points declarations and considered wisely to incorporate and address in sector development plan. Similarly, the thematic working group was a very important mechanism to explore and analyse micro level issues of the sector, develop common consensus for the recommendation and feeding in strategies and plans.”

In the Netherlands, “another mechanism for holding government accountable is the Overlegorgaan Infrastructuur en Milieu (OIM), also a consultative platform of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water

Management (IenW) to facilitate dialogue with a wider group of stakeholders, CSOs included. [...] Platform participants can suggest themes for discussion and the consultations are turned into reports for advisory purposes for policy making. However, this platform has not been used yet for consultation on SDG6.”

In Nigeria, “as the responsibility of the National Assembly is based on making laws and oversight functions, advocacy usually demands laws that make for ease of transparency and accountability in implementing WASH projects. An example is the CSO participation in the open hearing of a bill by the Committee on Water Resource called Water Resources (Establishment, etc.) Bill 2017 and River Basin Development Authority Act (Amendment) Bill 2016, which had a large participation by CSOs.”

In Senegal, “some CSOs have had the opportunity to engage with the PSE/SDG alignment process, thereby ensuring that public policies included in the PSE cover all SDGs and targets.”

In Tanzania, opportunities for CSOs to hold the government accountable include: favourable legal and regulatory framework; freedom of conducting researches and studies; and, the government making use of valid data and information from the CSOs. “Sector policies and strategies in Tanzania influence and are influenced by NGOs’ field practices, the results of which are brought to the national dialogue table. CSOs also influence policy using their international experience, and this also is shared through dialogue and other mechanisms.”



copyright: El Porvenir

F. Increased focus on grassroots and marginalised groups

Sometimes, CSOs were able to increase the government’s priorities and focus on marginalised areas, grassroots

communities, and vulnerable groups, in line with their commitments under SDG6.

In Bangladesh, pre-budget consultation with the government and other stakeholders, creates space for a bottom up approach, from grassroots to policy makers.

In Bhutan, “participation has played an important role in reaching out to the most vulnerable, neglected sections of the society through data, information sharing and raising awareness and issues. It has helped mobilise smaller but more focused targeted interventions. And it calls for the sector agencies to be more inclusive.”

In India, through the WNTA process of developing the Civil Society Report on SDGs for HLPF 2017, a coalition of CSOs (WASH and non-WASH) has been formed to review SDG6. WASH was led by WaterAid India, which conducted a desk review of the action taken so far at the national level, while non-WASH groups reviewed the progress through the lens of ‘leave no-one behind’, gathering information through community consultations with different marginalised groups. This group would continue to monitor the progress on SDG6 in forthcoming years.

In Pakistan, FANSA (a CSO network) effectively raised communities’ issues/concerns and special WASH needs of marginalised groups at SACOSAN.



copyright: FANSA India

G. Increased partnerships between stakeholders

CSOs indicated that partnership between civil society, government and other stakeholders including, for example, service providers, communities, private sectors and

academia is strengthened when stakeholders participate in accountability mechanisms.

In Bangladesh, consultations strengthen partnership between the government and NGOs.

In France, positive experiences regarding participation in these accountability mechanisms include: “good structuring of water stakeholders (French Water Partnership, Coalition Eau (Water Coalition), etc.) that are identified as credible speakers on SDG6 and are being used as communication channels between CSOs and the state”.

In Ghana, “the government intends to include CSOs in the next HLPF which is a good step towards deepening government-CSO collaboration towards achieving set targets.”

In India, participation leads to government officials being more open towards inputs/suggestions by civil society.

In Maldives, “the participants of the country-wide SDG awareness workshops, organised by the national SDG division at Ministry of Environment and Energy, are reported to have participated actively, with enthusiasm, and that there is an electronic social network employed to keep contact with each other in spite of the physical divide between the islands of Maldives.”

In Nepal, the sanitation-social movement is seen as a successful example, “where wider sector actors meet frequently and jointly analyse the context and issues, develop joint action plans and act jointly. This how mutual trust and confidence are built for each other, actions in operational ground are harmonised and amazing results are achieved, including a higher percentage of open defecation-free coverage within a short timeframe.”

In the Netherlands, one of the positive experiences with CSO participation in accountability mechanisms is the “approachability of water experts within government through existing water sector mechanisms (e.g. events, discussions) which results in positive interaction between government and other stakeholders.” “The willingness to focus on SDG17 demonstrates openness to apply a multi-stakeholder approach for annual reporting or through the SDG charter to connect different stakeholders with government.” “The multi-stakeholder approach of national mechanisms, the involvement of national and local water authorities, municipalities, private sector organisations and CSOs is experienced as existent in mechanisms for water sector progress (non SDG).”

In Sri Lanka, positive experiences are the collaborative partnerships for regional and international responses in participation in high-level dialogue.

H. Improved coordination of actions and more clarity on roles and responsibilities among stakeholders

Country studies have indicated that participation in accountability mechanisms has led to an improved coordination among stakeholders and more clarity and awareness of roles

and responsibilities, at both the level of government and civil society.

In Afghanistan, government, UN agencies and implementing partners are better coordinated on the project implementation and milestone deliverables of SDG6 targets. There is furthermore a common standard and coordination on WASH project implementation and approaches from the government side. The GoIRA has tried to increase coordination among NGOs/INGOs and CSOs to decrease the duplication of projects in the implementation area.

In Benin, positive experiences include avoidance of duplication in the construction of installations. "Alongside the public hearings, there is a reporting framework known as the Development Actors' Forum, which was created in 2011. This brings together all actors working in development within the commune of Dogbo. This initiative arose from the need for better coordination between development actions, through a proper framework for discussion that addresses the population's priority needs. The aim of this forum is to facilitate communication between the various actors, in order to provide better support for development actions (basic social services, local governance, etc.). These actors are organised into seven thematic groups, corresponding with the seven specific goals in the Community Development Plan."

In Ghana, the existing framework of the Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Unit is good for coordinating government activities at the national level in terms of the SDGs.

In Kenya, CSOs are challenged by the government institutions on CSOs own involvement and contribution to the WASH sector. This is a form of peer review mechanism.

In Niger, "in the past, little was known about CSOs' interventions and they were often accused of anarchy for breaking the law in project and programme implementation. At one sector review meeting, the NGOs presented a document detailing the scale of their investments in water and sanitation and the important contribution they make to the sector. In fact, the document showed that NGOs invest more in sanitation than traditional donors. This move helped CSOs take their rightful place in the institutional landscape, and the MHA now sends the NGOs report forms and programme sheets to be filled in each year. Their achievements and programmes are thus included."

In Nigeria, through participating in meetings with the OSSAP-SDG office, it provides coordination for all stakeholders to report on SDG6.

In Sri Lanka, key positive aspects of participation are the effective interventions in rural sector avoiding duplication and identification of priorities.

In Togo, at the national level, the accountability mechanisms also offer the benefits of coordinated action. As such, one person surveyed asserted: "the Ministry of the Environment is in the same sectoral committee as the ministry in charge of water and sanitation, so we share all our planning and monitoring activities with this sub-sector." And "the positive experiences in relation to CSO participation in these national accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems in Togo are information sharing between stakeholders, their consultation to avoid duplicating efforts, and the development and monitoring of recommendations."

6

Challenges regarding national level accountability mechanisms for SDG6

6. Challenges regarding national level accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Key findings from this section

- ⚙ Accountability is hindered by a lack of adequate monitoring and reporting on SDG6, including limited progress on implementation of commitments on targets and a limited opportunity for CSOs to contribute to monitoring SDG6 and to submit independent reviews.
- ⚙ Country studies have indicated that the governments' commitments on SDG6 remain a topic at the national level only, and are not being implemented and monitored at the local level.
- ⚙ Challenges are faced with regard to the foundation and functioning of accountability mechanisms, including the lack of a formal legal foundation, the fact that they are not functioning on a regular basis, or not functioning at all.
- ⚙ Many country studies have indicated that there are no mechanisms in place that safeguard the consideration of civil society's contributions to meetings and other participatory events.
- ⚙ Financing and budget allocations are often insufficient for the good functioning of accountability mechanisms; furthermore, CSOs' independence must be guaranteed when funding is allocated.
- ⚙ Barriers to meaningful participation include: CSOs and other organisations are not invited to key meetings, relevant information for participation is not shared or hard to find, there are unequal opportunities to participate in accountability mechanisms and in a few countries the space for engagement between government and CSOs is limited.
- ⚙ Government-level challenges to accountability mechanisms include lack of coordination and unclear allocation of roles and responsibilities, lack of interest and political commitments for SDG6 and not ensuring that there is enough diversity of stakeholders and representation of women and marginalised groups.
- ⚙ Many country studies refer to a lack of awareness, knowledge and capacity among CSOs on what monitoring implementation of SDG6 actually means. Additionally in some countries, among CSOs, there is lack of coordination and confusion about roles, responsibilities and mandates regarding SDG6.
- ⚙ CSO-level challenges include a failure to be transparent, share information and to adequately represent voices from grassroots levels.



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

The main reasons mentioned in the online questionnaires for lack of participation in accountability mechanisms include (paraphrased):

- ⚙ The lack of structured accountability mechanisms
- ⚙ Lack of information on how to participate or even if it is possible to participate, difficulty in understanding the functioning of existing mechanisms and windows for engagement.
- ⚙ The existing mechanisms do not include non-government stakeholders.
- ⚙ There are many meetings and events but we are not invited.
- ⚙ Not part of the role of my organisation to participate in such mechanisms.
- ⚙ We do not participate directly but we support others to participate.
- ⚙ There is discrimination on the type of organisations that participate.

In the answers to the online questionnaire, there is not a clear pattern of reasons per region or per type of organisation. The country studies elaborated further upon a number of ways to improve existing accountability mechanisms, and

also indicated what is currently missing, outlining the biggest gaps and things they would like to see changed. This section details the challenges.

6.1 Lack of effectiveness of accountability mechanisms due to challenges in monitoring and reporting on SDG6

A. Limited progress on implementation of commitments towards the 2030 Agenda and SDG6 specifically

Country studies indicate that their governments are still struggling to implement their commitments from the 2030 Agenda and SDG6 specifically in their national framework of plans, policies and regulations. Monitoring is hindered by

the lack of a baseline, and the indicator system used is often outdated and needs to be adjusted. Progress monitoring is often limited, which in turn forms a barrier to effective accountability mechanisms.

In Afghanistan, there is lack of one single plan for SDG6, as well as a monitoring framework for WASH services at the national level. The study from Afghanistan concluded that there is little awareness of SDGs in Afghanistan at both the level of government and other actors. "It is not only the question of the GoIRA staff member on the capacity to understand and analyse SDG6 and its sphere of need but also lack of a similar understanding among CSOs and the private sector. This area needs to be deepened and better thought through in order to gain the objectives and the benchmarks in both the national plan and the international commitments."

In Benin, "aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing improvement include: ensuring actors are involved in monitoring and work effectively to collect reliable data; the improvement of quality of data published in management reports; and performance measurement vital for core tasks such as planning, decision-making and evaluation. For managers, it is a tool to guide the decision-making process; failing to use it is equivalent to navigating without a map or compass. For the municipal council and citizens, this measurement identifies the key aspects that can best inform their evaluation of the organisation's performance." "The survey carried out among actors in the water sector in Benin identified the aspects where there are currently gaps in holding the government accountable for SDG6. These include, for example, the persistence of bias in the calculation methods of SDG6

target indicators. In response to these limitations, the actors surveyed recommended: introducing SDG monitoring mechanisms at the sectoral level, modelled on the Ministry of Planning DGCS-ODD, which include improving the quality of the CSO shadow report; advocating for the implementation of the priority actions plan resulting from the study on monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in WASH; undertaking appropriate measures to correct any shortcomings or biases in the calculation methods of the SDG6 target indicators."

In Bhutan, "currently, the most common issue identified was the absence of reliable national baseline data for WASH to track the SDG targets. The non-availability of baseline information will seriously impede setting the national targets for safely managed sanitation and handwashing in line with the SDGs. Thus, the two line ministries, namely MoWHS and MoH, have aligned the WASH SDG indicators with the NKRA for the 12th FYP from 2018-2023 to have reliable baseline data for WASH to monitor the progress and report." "A strong national monitoring and reporting requirements and systems (MIS) should also be considered to track SDGs progress henceforth."

In Burkina Faso, "in relation to SDG6, the government chose three targets out of eight and is reporting on their implementation in the context of this national SDG implementation report. The three priority targets

selected for SDG6 are 6.1, 6.2 and 6.5. It therefore appears from this provisional report on the SDGs that the government is not prioritising monitoring of target 6b, which promotes participation and accountability in the area of water and sanitation.”

In Cameroon, the government, with support from UNICEF and other actors, is currently developing specific indicators for water and sanitation in line with SDG6. Defining a reference point for this is a prerequisite to ensuring that all policies are aligned with SDG6.

In France, there is not “a roadmap for implementing the 2030 Agenda. This lack of an action plan does not allow for an effective and clear accountability for France’s actions to implement the SDGs, including the SDG6 targets, nor does it facilitate national ownership of the 2030 Agenda.” Main obstacles include: lack of a strong political leadership on the SDGs and delay in formulating a roadmap for implementing these SDGs. This situation limits civil society involvement and ownership, and creates a lack of clarity on the adequacy or discrepancy between the existing national indicators (used by INSEE) and the SDG6 indicators.” The study recommends the government “implement on a short time frame the commitments made by the government on 8 February 2018; use budget performance indicators in line with the SDGs and refer to the SDGs in the construction of the law; strengthen monitoring and accountability mechanisms: [...] report to the Parliament on the progress made; encourage the integration of an SDG angle in the evaluations by the Court of Auditors; clarify the adequacy or discrepancies between national and SDG indicators; set up a platform for centralising water data and monitoring of the SDGs.””

In Ghana, one barrier identified was “low commitment and an actionable M&E plan for effectively monitoring the targets.” “The absence of a central commitment monitoring mechanism within the sector is something that needs to be looked at. Regular updates from government on progress on targets needs to be done. So far, no detailed inputs have been made into the matrix on SDG6 because of insufficient data.”

In Guinea, “limited collection of and access to WASH data for CSOs/CBOs” is considered a main obstacle for effective participation of CSOs in accountability platforms/mechanisms.

In Honduras, “one of the main deficiencies of the different accountability instruments is the generation of information, which is only biased to data related to access to services, without considering important aspects such as quality and continuity of service. Nor is information generated on specific issues of integrated resource management, such as the quality of surface and underground water bodies, strategic water production areas to conserve, among others. The generation of information is not homogeneous, and although efforts have been made to integrate questions related to SDG6 into the household survey, there are still no concrete results. Therefore, the quality and disaggregation of the data for the measurement of indicators must be improved, as well as the promotion of governance mechanisms at a territorial level and the formation of capacities around SDG6.”

In India, data sets need to be aligned with what is required for tracking the progress of each SDG indicator (e.g. safely managed water or sanitation). Presently, groundwater availability is counted as ‘safely managed water’ without undertaking water quality tests. However, multiple studies show that groundwater is contaminated in many places around the country. Similarly, while the data on total wastewater generated and total capacity of sewage treatment plants and common effluent treatment plants is collected by Central Pollution Control Board, capacity utilisation data is available for only some plants. Therefore, an estimation of the proportion of wastewater treated and wastewater reused is not possible. There are no data sets available for handwashing as none of the surveys collects data on this indicator. With the frequency of large surveys varying from five to 10 years, the data becomes outdated by the time it becomes available in the public domain. The baseline for MIS of MDWS was established in 2013. Although IMIS of MDWS is household-based, it does not take into account new households established after 2013 baseline.

In Mali, “despite the efforts made by both the authorities and CSOs, some significant gaps remain. These include the limited information about or awareness of the SDGs among stakeholders and the lack of proficiency in SDG planning/integration tools.”

Mexico must “improve, verify and update the quality and scope of data on water and sanitation, with a focus on acquiring data for vulnerable communities.” “For now, the Mexican government has focused on creating various institutional structures to facilitate coordination of the 2030 Agenda and the development of a national implementation strategy. There is currently no specific strategy for SDG6 therefore implementation per-se has not yet started, although the reference baseline for the indicators to be measured are in the process of being established.” “In relation to SDG6 data, the only indicator for which there is data in the National Monitoring Platform for SDGs is the first indicator for target 6.3, i.e. indicator 6.3.1 on the “proportion of wastewater safely treated”. For water and sanitation, data disaggregated by state is not available.” “The lack of good-quality data with human right approach was a point that was raised multiple times. There is a need for data to have sufficient coverage, frequency and disaggregation. In marginalised areas, all of these aspects of data collection are inadequate; data on the quality of clean water, and on access to sanitation and hygiene, are particularly difficult to obtain, as the available information does not correspond to the WASH criteria described in SDG6. It is therefore important to adapt the (national) surveys to cover all SDG6 indicators.” “It is important to gather information and data from a rights-based approach, and even to try and re-think national indicators from this perspective.”

In Nepal, there is a quarterly progress review system within the Nepal government mechanism. Different level government officials of the MoDWS participate in this mechanism but the limitation is that the focus of review concentrates only on financial and physical progress. Data is collected by a National Monitoring and Information Program (NMIP) unit under the Department of Water and Sewerage, of the Ministry of Water and Sanitation, however most data covers physical progress only, which is inadequate in the context of newer smart technical options and the target and indicator system under the SDG agenda..

In the Netherlands, “another suggestion for improvement is around the clarity of data and monitoring of SDG6 on a regional level and the potential role of national and international CSOs in providing and translating a larger pool of data, on both national and international levels. This is to fill existing gaps and make content of reporting more encompassing, more quantitative data-based and less descriptive. For instance, in the Netherlands, even though a small country, there are still differences in geography. When it comes to water productivity, an average number cannot be applied to the whole country, local differences exist. [...] However, with the decentralised and democratic system of water authorities and involvement in water issues within the frameworks of national water policies and EU frameworks, there is a doubt from government whether local disaggregation and translation of SDG6 data towards civil society has added value for the Netherlands. A baseline assessment on this topic is lacking at this moment. There is importance and potential for such an assessment, since notwithstanding the relatively good national performance on SDG6, there is progress to be made. 6.1 and 6.2 are reported on as being covered in the Netherlands but there is little known about the exact number of toilets, people left behind - such as people without homes and therefore without access to an own toilet - or progress on handwashing in the country. Also, 6.3 is being focused on as the Netherlands does not comply with either UN or EU standards.”

In Maldives, the country study recommends that there should be more monitoring and data across indicators and sectors, to facilitate learning, and support integrated data analysis and use for policy- and decision-making. Another recommendation is the establishment of “national-level monitoring by target/indicator-specific technical teams, reporting to the SDG6 focal point. The technical teams comprise all relevant stakeholders including academia, NGOs and business can be led by the MEE in charge of implementing the specific target/indicator.”

“Nigeria must develop a smart way of data generation, monitoring, reporting and accountability for results. This requires strengthening national and sub-national capacities for data generation and processing.”



In Sri Lanka, the sector “will continue with the reporting structure and protocols established during MDG period. The latest national-level data on population access to water and sanitation was estimated based on the national census that was conducted in 2012. Since the next National Census will be conducted in 2021, the data and information on the informal water and sanitation, particularly the population using protected wells, unprotected wells, tube wells and other sources, will not be available until 2021.”

Mexico must “improve, verify and update the quality and scope of data on water and sanitation, with a focus on the importance of acquiring data for vulnerable communities.” “For now, the Mexican government has focused on creating various bureaucratic structures to aid coordination of the 2030 Agenda and developing a national strategy geared towards it. There is currently no specific strategy for SDG6 and so implementation

proper has not yet commenced, although the reference baseline for the indicators to be measured is being established.” “In relation to SDG6 data, the only indicator for which there is data is the first indicator for target 6.3, i.e. indicator 6.3.1 on the ‘proportion of wastewater safely treated’. In other words, data disaggregated by state is not available for water and sanitation.” “The lack of good-quality data was a point that was raised multiple times. There is a need for data of sufficient coverage, frequency and detail. In marginalised areas, all of these aspects of data collection are inadequate; data on the quality of clean water, and on access to sanitation and hygiene, are particularly difficult to obtain as the available information does not correspond to the WASH criteria described in SDG6. It is therefore important to adapt the (national) surveys to cover all SDG6 indicators.” “It is important to gather information and data from a rights-based approach, and even to try and re-think national indicators from this perspective.”

B. Limited opportunity for CSOs to contribute to monitoring SDG6 and to submit independent reviews

Some country studies indicate that there is limited opportunity for CSOs to verify or provide data on progress and this forms a barrier to the effectiveness of existing accountability

mechanisms. Very often there are no systematic mechanisms in place to gather data, information or feedback from non-governmental stakeholders.

In Burkina Faso, aspects of accountability mechanisms that need improvement, include: "In supporting the production of alternative CSO reports and their dissemination at all levels, it seems that the reports produced by the government are sometimes challenged by other stakeholders, particularly the local authorities and CSOs. CSOs, in particular, often feel these reports are limited to noting the investments made, without taking into account the quality of the service provided or its effectiveness. It is therefore deemed necessary to collect further data in the pilot zones in order to assess the actual level of implementation and the population's satisfaction with the government's efforts and thus make recommendations for improving public policy implementation."

In Pakistan, there is always limited opportunity for CSOs to participate in accountability mechanisms, and no forums are held to discuss data results in the reports from the Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurements (PSLM) and Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MCIS).

In Mali, "there is currently no adequate mechanism to evaluate the progress made towards implementation. As a result, no useful evaluation has been organised to assess the degree to which the recommendations have been implemented. To improve the evaluation mechanism, a participatory evaluation system should be organised periodically by the various actors, to assess progress and implement corrective actions before the next consultation."

In India, one of the issues that needs to be improved in accountability mechanisms is the institutionalisation of robust indicators and a monitoring framework with a formal provision for participation of civil society. "Public consultations and community-based monitoring systems need to be constituted to ensure last-mile inclusion." Also, there is a lack of adequate levels of independent representative surveys – all large studies

are conducted by government departments and third party verification process is not transparent.

In Mali, "there is currently no adequate mechanism to evaluate the progress made towards implementation. As a result, no useful evaluation has been organised to assess the degree to which the recommendations have been implemented. To improve the evaluation mechanism, a participatory evaluation system should be organised periodically by the various actors, to assess progress and implement corrective actions before the next consultation."

In Senegal, "for government mechanisms spearheaded by the General Directorate for Planning and Economic Policy (DGPPE) improvements could be made in the following areas: as CSOs are not involved in the report preparation process, they have no choice but to accept the reports as published; CSOs are not involved in determining the criteria for who should participate, how many participants there should be, and why; CSOs have no way to challenge the reports because they have already been validated and submitted to the authorities for approval." "The information and data that CSOs provide are considered unofficial or not properly codified for inclusion in national accounts. CSOs are poorly represented at JAR meetings in terms of number and diversity. The format of JAR meetings is not conducive to meaningful discussion and to high-quality input into the reports from CSOs (only one day is set aside for CSOs to come and present their statistics)."

Togo, aspects of existing accountability mechanisms that need to be improved, include setting up an institutional framework that brings together all the main stakeholders (CSOs, communities government, partners) in the sector to monitor progress on the implementation of the SDGs in general and SDG6 in particular.

C. SDG6 implementation, monitoring, reporting and accountability mechanisms are not decentralised

Country studies have indicated that the governments' commitments on SDG6 remain a topic at the national level only, and are not being implemented and monitored at the

local level. This is the same for accountability mechanisms. Participatory meetings are often organised at the central level only.

In Bangladesh, the existing accountability mechanisms are based (mainly) at central level, it is furthermore considered a major gap that local government institutions at grass-roots level do have in-built accountability mechanisms for SDG6 among others, but those are not performing as expected due to insufficient authority, lack of resources and absence of scope for negotiating with the public service providers.

In Benin, "performance measurement is vital for core tasks such as planning, decision-making and evaluation. For managers, it is a tool to guide the decision-making process; failing to use it is equivalent to navigating without a map or compass. For the municipal council and for citizens, this measurement identifies the key aspects that can best inform their evaluation of the organisation's performance. Along the same line, it is necessary to identify the needs for strengthening the capacities of the communal agents to enable them to produce quality reports highlighting the implementation of the SDGs on the municipal territory." "The survey carried out among actors in the water sector in Benin identified the aspects where there are currently gaps in holding the government accountable for SDG6. These include, for example, the lack of training of deconcentrated and decentralised service agents."

In Burkina Faso, aspects that need improvement include the need to "decentralise the accountability mechanisms, as numerous national-level dialogue frameworks are in place. However, at the regional and local levels, dialogue and participation are not as active. Apart from the CRDs, there are very few spaces for consultation and dialogue at the regional level. There is no accountability mechanism at all at the commune level, apart from the isolated initiatives of a number of mayors who – encouraged by some NGOs – are organising accountability days. Measures need to be taken to ensure that the national mechanisms are systematically established in regions, provinces

and communes in order to encourage greater citizen involvement at the grassroots level."

In Cameroon, the WASH platform is supposed to operate at both the national and regional level. While at the national level, coordination is more or less managed, at the regional level, only some regions currently benefit from this initiative."

In India, local government institutions (gram panchayat and urban local bodies) have not formally incorporated SDG targets in their formal, publicly available reporting mechanisms. "Given the federal structure of governance in India, water and sanitation is a state subject and it is policies and action at state and district levels that will ensure the targets for SDG6 are met. Effective implementation of all of the above schemes requires regular monitoring not only at the national level but at state and local levels, too, reviewing the data for course correction and to set priorities."

In Kenya, one of the key areas for improvement of accountability mechanisms is to "strengthen county-based monitoring, reporting and accountability mechanisms since SDG6 indicators are largely devolved in the Kenyan system of governance." The main bottlenecks for effective CSO participation in the accountability mechanism include a lack of engagement outside Nairobi limiting the capacity of individual CSOs to effectively participate in the processes.

In Mexico, the country study recommends increasing "ownership of the Agenda by disseminating its content, particularly the significance and implications of SDG6 locally. The study uncovered many weaknesses, primarily based on a lack of trust in the government



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

and sector institutions due to the lack of reliable, up-to-date and accessible data. In terms of improvement, one needs “to disseminate the content of the Agenda and, particularly, the significance and implications of SDG6 locally; to highlight the importance of vulnerable communities, and include and review the methodologies for obtaining data on these.”

In Pakistan, a lack of planning and monitoring at the district/local level constitutes a major gap.

In Sri Lanka, district level water and sanitation coordination forums need to be strengthened. And “CSOs expressed their concern over the inconsistencies existing at district level where there is no regular participation or institutional arrangement for WASH coordination at district level. This will be taken up at national level and to promote the lead agency at sub-national level to take action.”

In Tanzania, “the current dialogue is only held at the national level, there is a need to design this kind of

dialogue mechanism at the district and other lower levels of the project implementation. There are times when CSOs get into a misunderstanding with the district commissioners and executive directors, dialogue at those levels will mitigate this kind of confusion. Clear guidelines need to be prepared to guide this dialogue and coordination at the sub-national level.”

In Senegal, “the mechanism is centralised and there are no regional committees.” “Citizen dialogue and discussion forums are rarely instigated at the initiative of grassroots stakeholders.” “Decentralised government technical departments participate but have no decision-making power.”

In Togo, “cooperation frameworks set up in the communities are still waiting for decisions to come through from the central level. Togo should proceed with decentralisation in order to delegate power to local leaders. This will enable close monitoring and effective accountability for progress in the communities.”

6.2 Challenges with regard to accountability mechanisms' foundation and functioning

A. Accountability mechanisms do not have a formal legal foundation and/or function on a voluntary basis

Both country studies and respondents to online surveys have concluded that the mechanisms available to hold government to account are not officially or legally established. They feel that without an official legal basis, the government and other

stakeholders do not have sufficient incentives to organise meaningful accountability mechanisms and outcomes of meetings risk not being seriously taken into account.

In Bangladesh, it is considered as a major gap that existing accountability mechanisms at the central level are non-obligatory for the government. It is recommended that formal procedures are established in existing mechanisms. The scope for generating critical reflection and feeding those back into national programming is more limited than it could be, due to absence of any such formal mechanism within these forums.

In Benin, "aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing improvement include formalising the reporting mechanism at the commune level, through regular meetings held at least twice a year." Further, there is a "lack of regular meetings of the major accountability bodies for the water and sanitation sector (Water and Sanitation Sector Group, Annual Review)[and a] lack of functioning alert mechanisms. In response to these limitations, the actors surveyed recommended ensuring that Annual Review and GSEA meetings are held regularly, and monitoring performance."

In Bhutan, the WASH (B-WASH) cluster is a multi-sectoral platform with representatives from various ministries, agencies, CSOs and a development partner [but,] it is not a very formal, nor legally established platform so as to hold any agencies accountable. It provides a forum to discuss and raise concerns from CSOs and others but does not necessarily have legal authority to hold any agencies accountable.

In Mali, "in spite of the efforts made by both the authorities and CSOs, some significant gaps remain. These include: the limited implementation of legislation and the lack of coordinated action taken towards implementing the SDGs."

In Mexico, "the OSCMex2030 coordinating platform managed to include their document entitled Recommendations from the civil society coordinating platform for monitoring the 2030 Agenda in Mexico for Mexico's report to the High-Level Political Forum as an annex to Mexico's first voluntary report in 2016. The body of this document set out the need to: formalise a mechanism for dialogue around the 2030 Agenda between civil society and government, which will enable the design of a national strategy for monitoring, establishing and evaluating the SDGs, as well as developing an ownership strategy, with an emphasis on discriminated groups. Almost two years have passed, and this formal mechanism has not yet come to anything."

The Netherlands mentions that "as a last point for improvement, the voluntary nature of existing mechanisms is important to mention. Whether it concerns VNRs for the UN High Level Political Forum or national mechanisms, participation remains voluntary. Because of this, CSOs that do not have capacity, do not participate. Also, the fact that the HLPF focuses on a certain set of SDGs each year and SDG6 is not a recurring target of the agenda, adds an additional factor of slowing focus on accountability mechanisms for SDG6 to the voluntary nature of mechanisms."

In Senegal, with regards to the parliament as accountability mechanism, "there is no formal M&E process for oral questions – members of parliament simply ask questions to have a clear conscience, with the upcoming elections in mind."



copyright: AME Cameroon

B. Accountability mechanisms are not functioning on a regular basis, or are ineffective

Often, consultations take place on a sporadic basis, with no obligation to involve stakeholders. Stakeholder meetings are

not being organised regularly, leaving participants without opportunity to prepare or organise meaningful contributions.

In Bangladesh, it is considered as a major gap that existing accountability mechanisms at the central level are practised irregularly. Ad hoc consultations initiated by the government take place, where development partners, CSOs, NGOs, private sector, academia, and media are infrequently involved that allows them to learn about and reflect (to some extent) on the situation. The meetings of the platforms like the National Forum for DWSS and the National Sanitation Task Force do take place irregularly and infrequently, resulting in weakened potential to hold the government accountable.

“Although Benin does have accountability frameworks and mechanisms for the water and sanitation sector at the national and local levels, their effectiveness is gradually declining.” “Aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing to be improved: [...] the government and decentralised local authorities must schedule regular reporting into their annual work plan. Actors also need to take better ownership, especially at the local level, of the Annual Review memorandum, while media cafés need to be more systematic.”

In Bhutan, more regular, robust and established platforms to raise issues, concerns, share information, innovation and discuss the progress through existing platforms must be developed. This would help government agencies and CSOs get more active and

efficient. In Bhutan, few platforms to raise concerns and issues with regards to SDG6. These platforms are not formally established and not regular. forms are not formally established and not regular.

In Cameroon, relevant mechanisms are not operational, “for example, the National Water Committee has only held one meeting since its establishment in 2001, meaning it does not function effectively.” “In theory, there is no need to create new mechanisms. Before addressing the aspects that need to be improved, it is essential to first ensure that the existing platforms and mechanisms work. In terms of WASH, the challenge is to properly utilise the platform at the national level and, subsequently, in all regions on a long-term basis.”

“Honduras has been in a state of political tumult since 2009 and citizen participation mechanisms have been greatly criminalised and restricted. The situation recently took a further turn for the worse when the last national elections took place in November 2017.”

In Kenya, one of the major gaps observed with regard to accountability mechanisms is a lack of well-structured participation by the CSOs due to ad-hoc meetings. One of the main recommendations from the Kenya country study is to “have structured regular meetings by the Steering Committee, KEWASNET and

other committees to enable effective engagement of all stakeholders in the processes for ownership.”

In Mali, what needs to be improved is the “temporary nature of the panel. The panel, which is chosen by men and women from the various networks, is formed specially for the day. The panel also includes figures from other countries, who come specifically for the EID on that day. The panel therefore only comes together again for the next event and is thus not involved in monitoring its own recommendations, much less evaluating them. An improvement would be to involve the panel in a long-term monitoring and evaluation mechanism. This would undoubtedly help to improve performance in terms of implementing the recommendations.”

In Mexico, after CSOs finally managed to get an invitation to the SDG Technical Committee meetings to discuss a “general mechanism to organise working sessions with civil society, academia and private sector” around national indicators for measuring the SDGs and their targets, the discussion never took place, and the meetings and working sessions have not been convened since.

In Nepal, accountability mechanisms were functioning effectively in the past, leading up to the new constitution in 2015. Recently however, these mechanisms failed to take place on a regular basis or function very slow and ineffective. In Nepal, all established WASH sector mechanisms are passive at this time in Nepal hence the priority should be given to activate these mechanisms and bring them to effective and regular functioning.

In Niger the “dormancy of some accountability mechanisms” is considered a main gap. “The CNEA is the most broadly representative body and the highest political level in terms of water and sanitation sector management. The following improvements should therefore be made to ensure that the PANGIRE is implemented effectively: hold sessions more regularly.”

In Senegal, “a broad base of stakeholders is involved in reflection and discussion around the Blue Book, but the National Blue Book Committee has remained dormant since the end of the MDGs process due to scarce funding.” Furthermore the JAR meetings are not

held regularly. And, “dialogue and discussion forums tend to disband when the corresponding project comes to an end.” Also, “the Blue Book is not produced every year.”

In Sri Lanka the country study has indicated that the frequency of meetings must be conducted on a more regular and continuous basis.

In the Netherlands, one of the major gaps in accountability mechanism is the “effective involvement of private sector. More criteria from the government are required [for the private sector] to comply with SDGs.”

In Tanzania, it is recommended that “more sessions of dialogue between the CSO and the government is required, especially when there are signs of problems in the sector, instead of waiting during the JWRSR and/or JSM sessions which are either held once or twice per year. This is important because the CSOs at the grassroots can notice some setbacks at the initial stage which can be mitigated easily at that particularly time and place; instead of waiting for joint forum when the problem will be either insignificant or irrelevant, or the big damage had already appeared.”

In Togo, “the national accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems in Togo are for the most part inactive.” “The main bottlenecks or shortcomings in the process to prepare the HLPF report are the absence of a clear timeline shared with partners and the various stakeholders in the sector and the delay in writing the report, as the process is yet to begin.” “The National Water and Sanitation Forum (FNEA) is an important accountability mechanism that is implemented by the Togolese government. However, there is no guarantee that the meetings will be held every three years, as it is not a structured or highly formalised mechanism. As there is no body to oversee its operation, there is no guarantee that it will be organised or that its recommendations will be followed.” “The mechanisms envisaged to facilitate accountability to the various stakeholders are not fully operational. There is no clearly defined schedule for the various meetings. Technical, logistical and financial resources are sometimes lacking.”

C. No meaningful participation of CSOs and lack of follow-up on outcomes

Many country studies have indicated that there are no mechanisms in place that safeguard the consideration of civil society's contributions to meetings and other participatory events. Opportunities for participation in accountability

mechanisms are often regarded as meaningless by CSOs, since there is little proof of their contributions being taken adequately into account by the government, or the government makes unrealistic promises.

In Afghanistan, in practice, neither NGOs and CSOs are involved in a meaningful way in the national accountability mechanism for SDG6 in Afghanistan. "Compliance with recommendations of the review can be strengthened."

"In Benin, the main gaps demonstrated by the study are: insufficient actions to assert political influence and insufficient involvement of CSOs in the accountability mechanisms."

In Bangladesh, accountability mechanisms do not create adequate space for the NGOs/CSOs (particularly from the grassroots) to make meaningful contributions. Government officials remain in the driving seat of these forums, where the other stakeholders get the opportunity to provide inputs in the form of suggestions. And the scope for generating critical reflection and feeding those back into national programming is more limited than it could be.

In Bhutan, "WASH sector initiatives are led by the governmental agencies but CSOs are generally consulted and engaged in the process. However, the influence and authorities of the CSOs in decision making and accountability are relative and subjective."

In Ghana, there is only "lip service by government in tackling sanitation issues. Government has over the years enacted laws and bye-laws at the local level to tackle sanitation (especially open defecation and indiscriminate littering) yet, enforcement of such laws is poor." "There is potential for a well functioning accountability mechanism with improved "responsiveness of sector ministry towards implementing recommendations." "There must be follow-up mechanisms to ensure that action points from the forums are implemented as there appears to be no ownership or leadership in that regard. The WASH sector is very big and needs wider participation of more NGOs to make a meaningful impact. CSOs must follow up to ensure that commitments are

adhered to, and to ensure that the sector ministry is responsive towards implementing recommendations."

In Maldives, "CSOs' voices are not being listened to, rather they are called to attend workshops and sit and listen to presentations and engage in exercises which do not carry a significant impact towards meaningful engagement in the decision process for issues that matter to them. Some of the participants in workshops who contributed to discussions were concerned that there is no way of knowing that their comments were taken seriously." In Maldives, "improved mechanisms need to be developed, or existing mechanisms need to improve stakeholder engagement by giving them roles to participate in ways that matter."

In Mali, "the mechanisms to be improved are the monitoring of the implementation of the panel's recommendations, the panel's temporary nature and its non-binding recommendations." "Among the mechanism's shortcomings are the absence of appropriate systems for following up on the implementation of recommendations, insufficient consideration given to recommendations - the result of consultation work on WASH policies - and the absence of mechanisms for evaluating the recommendations." "Limited incorporation of recommendations produced in the consultations on WASH policies. The recommendations arising from the consultation process should enable state actors to guide the implementation strategy for their policy, but this is unfortunately not the case. This prevents state actors from adapting their systems by incorporating the recommendations. To improve the implementation of WASH policies, recommendations should therefore be taken into account."

In Mexico, after CSOs finally managed to be consulted in meetings last year on proposed national indicators for measuring the SDGs and their targets, recommendations have not been followed up on by the government, and the meetings and working groups have not been convened since. "The government has

always systematically pursued and implemented a process that creates an illusion of being participatory.” “The development of the national strategy has been limited to consultation by means of regional dialogues with civil society. This consultation has largely been constrained by what the President’s Office decides since there has never been any discussion on how these dialogues could be organised to enable effective contributions to the national strategy, as has repeatedly been requested.” “The invitations from government to participate in forums were also mentioned as an accountability mechanism; however, matters discussed during these forums generally do not make it beyond this point. Sometimes they are noted in the minutes, but it has been very difficult to get civil society recommendations included in the final documents. Another mechanism mentioned was that of the catchment councils, which are intended to involve civil society; however, the plans and recommendations issued by the catchment councils are not taken into consideration by the catchment organism. It is the latter that develop the plans and allocate the budgets, without taking the users themselves who belong to these catchment councils, into account.”

In Niger, “there is no M&E framework for the commitments and recommendations arising from the mechanisms.” “The CNEA is the most broadly representative body and the highest political level in terms of water and sanitation sector management. The following improvements should therefore be made to ensure that the PANGIRE is implemented effectively: follow up recommendations more rigorously.”

The country study of Pakistan argues that declarations signed by the government at events like SACOSAN are not proved effective as these are mere ‘long wish lists’.

In Senegal, “CSO representatives’ input is rarely given due consideration, in particular because the information they provide is not properly codified for inclusion in national accounts or is often treated as unofficial.” “CSO input at meetings is not welcomed openly and there are no appropriate provisions for taking the information they provide into account.”

In Sri Lanka, country studies have indicated that outcomes by the committee (representing different stakeholders) lack formal acceptance among the different ministries that also participate in this committee.

In Togo, “the National Water and Sanitation Forum (FNEA) is an important accountability mechanism that is implemented by the Togolese government. However, there is no guarantee that the meetings will be held every three years, as it is not a structured or highly formalised mechanism. As there is no body to oversee its operation, there is no guarantee that it will be organised or that its recommendations will be followed.”



copyright: CONGAD Senegal



copyright: Afghanistan Civil Society Forum Organisation

Often, well-established procedures for civil society participation do exist on paper, but are not effectively realised in practice.

In Afghanistan, the official documents and policy papers strongly demand and recommend CSOs and private sector participation in the processes. Participation of CSOs is however very minimal, and most of the decisions within the sectoral work are taken in their absence.

In Bangladesh for example, national reports on sector progress need to involve some kind of consultation with CSOs, but rarely create real scope for CSOs to reflect and contribute to outcomes.

In Cameroon, "Decree No. 2001/161/PM, dated 8 May 2001, defining the duties, structure and operation of the National Water Committee, had been hailed by many actors as an effective means of increasing CSO involvement. However, unfortunately, not only were the CSOs not recognised as stakeholders on

the platform, but this committee has barely been operational. At best, it has only met once since its establishment in 2001."

In Mexico, for now, civil society does not have any effective involvement, although they have proposed various forms of participation over the last two years and the authorities have, on a number of occasions, said they would implement them.

In Senegal, a key shortcoming is that "the government has always tended to pay lip service to CSOs (in other words, the government is disinclined, of its own volition and outside its international commitments, to let CSOs play their role to the full or to recognise their role."

6.3 Financial resources dedicated towards SDG6 and corresponding accountability mechanisms are insufficient

Financing and budget allocations are often insufficient for the good functioning of accountability mechanisms, or the

viability of civil society organisations to effectively participate in accountability mechanisms.

A. Insufficient financing for SDG6 implementation and functioning of accountability mechanisms

Besides lack of resources dedicated to the participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms, country studies also indicated that states do not allocate enough budget

for SDG6 implementation or for the development of accountability mechanisms.

In Afghanistan, there is a need for increased budget allocations to achieve the annual targets on WASH services in the country by 2030 (i.e. coordination and advocacy with the parliament is required).

In Cameroon, one of the bottlenecks to participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms is the lack of funding which halts the operations of the National Water Committee.

In Bangladesh, it is considered a major gap that local government institutions at grassroots level do have in-built accountability mechanisms for SDG6 among others, but, those are not performing as expected due to a lack of resources among others.

In Tanzania, since accountability is wide; there are problems in financing plans and projects; they are not funded adequately and in a timely way, either by the government or even by development partners sometimes not releasing resources as agreed/promised or not on time.

In Benin, "the survey carried out among actors in the water sector in Benin identified the aspects where there are currently gaps in holding the government accountable for SDG6. These include, for example, low prioritisation of data collection activities for the development of the national report on SDG6 in the State's budget."

In Nigeria, "payment of counterpart funding by government: the need for government to pay counter funds in time for projects relating to SDG6."

In Bhutan, one of the major gaps that need to be addressed is the capacity and resources among the implementing agencies. Human resource capacity at all levels is a challenge in order to effectively plan, implement and monitor sanitation and hygiene initiatives. With the government now allocating 50% of the national budget to the local government in the 12th FYP, human resource capacity including availability of skilled personnel is a key constraint for the sector.

The Mexico country study recommends "budgeting and earmarking funds for creating and implementing adequate and timely information campaign, as well as training workshops on the scope of SDG6, both with the authorities and with state, municipal and local CSOs."

In Senegal, a key shortcoming is that the JAR process is under-resourced.

B. Insufficient funding for CSOs

Civil society has indicated too often that they face financial difficulties, which forms a barrier to effective participation in accountability mechanisms. Country studies indicate that the

government and development partners should invest more in funding civil society organisations so they are able to perform their roles adequately.

In Burkina Faso, aspects that need improvement include “improving CSO capacities (technical and financial support) to conduct citizen oversight of progress. Despite their goodwill, there are still many CSOs who have not fully mastered the processes and techniques for conducting citizen oversight of public actions. They also severely lack the financial resources necessary to undertake some initiatives. Thus, there is a need to consider establishing technical and financial support mechanisms for CSOs to support their participation in dialogue and consultation spaces, enabling them to monitor progress made.”

In Kenya, one of the main bottlenecks for CSO participation in accountability mechanisms is that CSOs meetings have cost implications, limiting their ability to periodically meet and deliberate on issues for effective engagement with the government agencies for accountability. One of the key areas for improvement of accountability mechanisms is to “secure adequate resources for effective engagement, involvement and improvement on deliverables, monitoring, reporting and accountability mechanisms strengthening.”

In India, there is huge scope for CSOs to participate at the local government level to create awareness on SDGs, build capacity and communicate behaviour change. However, the government does not provide any funding for these activities.

In Maldives, there is a “lack of resources for creation of an enabling environment for CSO engagement mechanisms. Allocation of government funds and facilitating access to technical assistance [is required] for creating an enabling environment for HR mobilisation, capacity building, mentoring and incentivising CSOs to take up effective roles for purposeful participation in the SDG monitoring and accountability process.”

In Nigeria, one of the conclusions of the country study is that “CSOs need funding to be able to engage in monitoring activity implementation at various levels.”

In Togo, “other factors also hinder CSOs from effectively participating in the various accountability mechanisms: lack of funding. This is another reason why the accountability mechanisms do not work properly, given that organising a multi-stakeholder workshop requires significant financial resources. Furthermore, communication also requires resources that are not always available to the existing platforms.”

In Senegal, a key shortcoming is that CSOs lack the financial resources to act autonomously and independently. “CSOs often find it difficult to participate because they receive minimal travel and accommodation expenses.”



C. CSOs struggle to fundraise and remain independent

A few country studies also indicate that organisations themselves should put more effort into fundraising

opportunities or that they should try to be more independent from international NGOs and governments.

In Mali, “significant gaps remain. These include the limited capacity for mobilising funding among CSOs.”

other donor partners for taking action. “Self-sustaining strategy is the prime gap for FEDWASUN and other sector based CSOs in Nepal.”

In Nepal, FEDWASUN is the core and very important network for wider representation of civil society as water user committees, some local NGOs and media persons are also active in the role of civil society in Nepal. But lack of stable financial resource is the major obstacle for them. They are dependent on INGOs and

Senegal recommends CSOs “constantly seek out funding so that CSOs can develop their own, appropriate accountability mechanisms, produce better written contributions and make more effective proposals”.

6.4 Barriers to meaningful participation in accountability mechanisms

A. CSOs and other organisations are not invited to key meetings

From many of the in-depth country-studies it emerges that participation in accountability mechanisms is by invitation only and there is often no room for smaller NGOs/CSOs and people

from marginalised groups to take part in consultations as they are not invited and do not have their voices represented.

In Afghanistan, only NGO members who are WASH service deliverers or project implementation partners are being invited to the official meetings.

In Bangladesh, involvement of CSOs in accountability mechanisms are limited mainly to a few national organisations, and many of the CSOs do not get such opportunity as they are either not invited, or not informed.

In Kenya, “during validation workshops, each of the CSOs participating need to be individually invited.”

In Mexico “in terms of the involvement of academia, the academic institutions surveyed and interviewed reported that they had not been invited to participate in the dialogue and, particularly in relation to this new report on SDG6, that they were currently unaware of any consultation mechanism.”

In Nepal, in the current practice, only a small circle of people are repeatedly taking part in these mechanism, new faces are not getting opportunity hence the system should break the circle to make opportunity for wider level sector actors.

In the Netherlands, “the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water (MoIE) is responsible for reporting to parliament, implementation and negotiation with provinces, municipalities, water authorities and private water companies. The latter is organised through a water steering body of the MoIE, which focuses on regular consultation events on water policy, implementation and monitoring with water boards, provinces, municipalities and private sector water companies. CSOs do not participate actively, but receive reports of meetings.”

In Pakistan, CSOs are not given timeslots nor invited to present voices of communities at events like “PAKOSAN (platform where provincial governments present WASH sector review).”

In Senegal, “the JARs offer limited opportunities because the organisers decide which CSOs to invite, based on criteria that are not shared with CSOs.” As for parliament being indicated as an accountability mechanism: “CSOs are still not welcome at National Assembly plenary sessions and, as such, have no opportunity to talk directly to members of parliament and government ministers.”

In Togo, “the CSOs are prevented from effective participation in the accountability mechanisms owing to a lack of communication about the mechanisms and the meetings, and the fact that not all stakeholders are invited, especially ‘small’ CSOs.”

B. Lack of information and transparency from the government as a barrier to accountability and participation

Most of the country studies indicate that the low level of awareness among the public and CSOs is due to lack of transparency and sharing of information by the government. By allowing stakeholders to view all plans and policies

regarding SDG6, as well as progress made by the government in reaching its targets, CSOs and other stakeholders will be better equipped to assist their government with provision of input, feedback and monitoring.

The study from Afghanistan concluded that transparency in the overall WASH sector should be enhanced and a clear information sharing mechanism is missing. The country study has indicated that standards and definition as well as the description of WASH indicators and targets must be better communicated to all stakeholders as a guideline for implementation, monitoring, reporting planning and statistical survey of WASH services at national level (i.e. what is potable water, clean toilet, open toilet, amount of water usage, demanded services, etc.). Furthermore, there is a lack of mechanism for information gathering for reviewing, monitoring and reporting on SDG6. In Afghanistan, access to information has become a real challenge and there is not public access to the information on sector achievements to media and public.

In Bangladesh, many of the CSOs do not get an opportunity to be involved in accountability mechanisms because they are not informed. Furthermore, sector events, in which the government gives account on progress in the sector, are not regularised and take place on a 'need-to-know' basis. The study also recommend that the government should share the draft SDG progress report with all sector stakeholders prior to finalisation, in such manner that creates adequate scope for the stakeholders to review and reflect on it. When CSOs are consulted, the process for documentation and dissemination of the discussion points and decisions also has further scope of improvement. And, one of the major difficulties in reporting on WASH is the absence of any sound mechanism for collection and dissemination of specific and authentic information, on time, comparing progress with commitments. For this, proactive disclosure of information on SDG6 to citizens by the government is pivotal through proper application and population of the SDG Tracker.

In Benin, "aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing improvement include: improve transparency in delivering activities, especially in terms of financial management; regularly publish data on water and sanitation on the Ministry of Water, Ministry of Health

and INSAE websites." "The survey carried out among actors in the water sector in Benin identified the aspects where there are currently gaps in holding the government accountable for SDG6. These include the weakness in the production of information and access to information to increase the accountability in the management of rural installations and insufficient transparency and access to information on the reform processes underway in the water and sanitation sector. In response to these limitations, the actors surveyed recommended improving access to information (explanations and justifications) and user participation in service planning, monitoring and management processes."

In Burkina Faso, "the main obstacles to CSO participation are: civil society's lack of knowledge of the dialogue spaces and of the participation possibilities established by the government; and, the failure to provide timely information."

The main gaps to be addressed include the "failure to provide timely information." Listed aspects of accountability mechanisms that need improvement include: "improve access to information via alert networks, for example, one of the issues restricting citizen participation is access to information. It is often very difficult for the average citizen to access information available from the state services and improvements are therefore needed. Information and communication technologies (ICT) could be used to disseminate alerts when necessary". And, "organise regular debates and lobbying in the media on situations being experienced. Progress has been noted over the last few years in terms of debates and lobbying on the issue of water and sanitation. Media debates need to be improved and systematised further to broaden the general public's understanding of the issues facing water and sanitation services and thus engage them in the good running of the sector. Create specialist media platforms for water and sanitation issues. In addition to the media debates, it is also important to encourage the development of specialist

media platforms, as their good understanding of the sector will help shape a water and sanitation culture among citizens.”

In Cameroon, one of the obstacles to participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms is that CSOs are not well informed about how the various platforms work.

In Costa Rica, “while there is a general understanding of this process among CSOs that are affiliated with the platform, outside this platform, information on the SDGs and their governance and mechanisms is lacking.”

In France, the use of data already collected to inform accountability on SDG6 suffers from limitations, including: “ data accessibility: if tools exist to make this data available, they are not always complete. For example, SISPEA data is sometimes fragmented or missing due to difficulties in reporting and sharing information; only 4,800 out of 13,000 communities have filled out the information that concerns them. In addition, much of this water-related data is not accessible on a single platform, nor is it presented in the language of the SDGs.” Aspects of accountability mechanisms that need improvement include: “clarification of the proposals and recommendations from civil society which are included in the HLPF report, through the creation of a report on the consultation workshops; and, better knowledge among CSOs of government plans for accountability on SDG6 and greater involvement in the consultation mechanisms.”

In Guinea-Conakry, poor dissemination and implementation of existing documents on policy, strategy and standards is considered a main obstacle for effective participation of CSOs in accountability platforms/mechanisms, as well as “little awareness-raising or dissemination of information to communities on their rights, responsibilities and governance of WASH aspects of interventions”.

In India, all large surveys are commissioned by MoSPI or line departments, and an adequate number of independent large surveys are not available, which is important to ensure transparency.

In Kenya, a major gap in accountability mechanisms is that “within the institutions and organisations taking part in the SDG6 forum, the information is only with the staff who attend the meetings and not the whole organisation, even those directly implementing water and sanitation programmes.”

In Kenya, one of the key areas for improvement of accountability mechanisms is to improve on both horizontal and vertical information sharing on SDG6 progress. “There is a particular need for greater transparency around the budgets, both from government departments and from development partners. Deliberate efforts to include budgets for water access improvements, water catchment protection, waste water quality, sanitation access and hygiene promotion in the counties and national government budgets need to be seen and actualised.” In Kenya, a major gap in accountability mechanisms is that “within the institutions and organisations taking part in the SDG6 forum, the information is only with the staff who attend the meetings and not the whole organisation, even those directly implementing water and sanitation programmes.”

“Maldives submitted a VNR in 2017 to HLPF for SDG and plans to report on SDG6 in 2018. None of the CSO respondents of this survey are aware of the process of reporting. Neither have they seen the previous report yet!” And “participants at the focus group workshop discussed the reluctance of governmental organisations to share data among themselves to demonstrate the hurdles which the CSOs are confronted with in accessing information for SDG monitoring under the current scenario, in spite of the enactment of the Right to Information Law in Maldives three years ago.”

In Mexico, “in a bid to address the lack of effective inclusion in the elaboration of the 2030 Agenda national strategy, it is very important that the completed document is circulated, that sufficient time is allocated for comments and contributions from non-state actors, and that these are taken into account.” Particularly on SDG6, “there is no clear or easily accessible information. It is impossible to find accurate information on most SDG6 indicators on the new government platform for SDGs. Moreover, “the existing government’s institutional platforms are a nightmare” when looking for specific data and information: “You can’t even find the information you are looking for through Infomex (specific platform for governmental information), as all government agencies

send only what they want or say that it is confidential.” It was noted that it is easier to find information for making major investments in the water sector than any information on the human rights aspect.

In Niger, “the CNEA is the most broadly representative body and the highest political level in terms of water and sanitation sector management. The following improvements should therefore be made to ensure that the PANGIRE is implemented effectively: disseminate the results of the government–TFP consultation framework meetings so that all stakeholders can play a full and active role, each in their respective capacities.”

In Nigeria, “although CSOs have recorded a good relationship engaging with some of these accountability mechanisms, due to accessibility, involvement in activities organised by both government and development partners, CSOs are dissatisfied at the level of coordination and openness by government agencies.” What needs to be improved is to “address institutional barriers: the need to eliminate bottlenecks within organisations that prevent information from being easily shared with CSOs due to government restrictions and oath of secrecy.”

In the Netherlands, the country study indicates that the potential of the mechanisms for more effective participation by CSOs includes more transparent communications to motivate larger participation of CSOs that now do not participate because of lack of capacity or knowledge of existing mechanisms. Also, what needs improvement is a “more centralised and simplified communication strategy to reach nationally-orientated CSOs and private sector with existing and potential new mechanisms for SDG6 and participation possibilities in reports and events.” And, “consulting and inviting both national and international stakeholders is important but if awareness of reporting on SDG6 and accountability mechanisms is low for both groups, it suggests that improving communication strategies around these is necessary as well. Mainly private sector organisations and NGOs reported not to be aware of the existence and functioning of the accountability mechanisms or of their reports. Only those organisations that pro-actively seek for participation and/or the reports are aware.” And, “a more centralised and simplified communication strategy to reach multiple stakeholders, with explicit efforts to reach nationally-orientated CSOs and private sector, along with existing and potential new mechanisms

for SDG6 and participation possibilities in reports and events is another point for improvement. Transparent communications motivates larger participation of CSOs that now do not participate because of lack of awareness or capacity.”

The Pakistan study indicated that the lack of information on plans is an obstacle for CSOs for their preparation in consultations. Also, generally, the reports are not shared with CSOs.

In Sri Lanka, there seems to be no active information sharing with civil society, as the study of Sri Lanka recommends improving on the “trickledown effect of information dissemination to grassroots level.” Further, there is a lack of up-to-date data available to the public: “since the next National Census will be conducted in 2021, the data and information on the informal water and sanitation particularly the population using protected wells, unprotected wells, tube wells and other sources will not be available until 2021.”

In Togo, among the aspects of accountability mechanisms that need to be improved is to “ensure there is more communication on action that has been taken and that information is disclosed” and to “facilitate access to the documents and information.” The country study moreover recommends that “CSOs working in the water and sanitation sector must keep informed and play an active role in decision-making” and “set up a website to publish information on progress made in the implementation of SDG6.” “There is a lack of communication from the government on what is being done to achieve the SDG6 targets, as stated by one survey respondent: ‘Political leaders should communicate with and include NGOs more in their policies to achieve SDG6’. This aspect should therefore be improved to enable all stakeholders to have a positive view of the government’s desire to achieve SDG6 by 2030. It is also necessary to disseminate relevant information. Access to documents and information on the progress that has been made should therefore be facilitated. ‘There is a lack of feedback from the state and access to documents’, highlighted one respondent.” “A further failing of Togo’s national accountability systems is the lack of communication about what is being done. The data is not accessible or publicised.”

C. Unequal opportunities to participate in accountability mechanisms

The level of meaningful participation in accountability mechanisms differs widely across different types of stakeholders. Generally, development partners have good access to the government. They also seem to play important roles in the development of indicator systems as well as provision of data for monitoring. Together with larger

(international) NGOs they play major roles in the organisation of sector events and are directly consulted by the government. Unlike national or local CSOs, these international organisations are most able to provide direct feedback, comments or advise the governments in their national reporting processes.

In Afghanistan, regular monthly WASH coordination meetings in different ministries are held, involving government representatives, NGO partners, UN agencies and international stakeholders. Through these meetings, a number of working groups are being established by UN agencies and handed over to the government. A range of civil society organisations and other organisations including NGOs - who are being supported by the international partners - are also involved in the processes. CSOs and particularly the ones with research and advocacy background are not involved in the accountability processes at all. Research has furthermore shown that participation in meetings consist of 55% of implementing partners (mostly NGOs and UN agencies), 40% government institutions and only 5% of the private sector, CSOs and research institutions. The last 5% only counts for participation in conferences and workshops, but not in consultative meetings.

In Bangladesh, "involvement of the CSOs in accountability mechanisms are limited mainly to few national organisations". At the events organised in Dhaka, the national CSOs get invited and participate accordingly in the process designed and directed by the respective institution of government.

In Burkina Faso, "apart from large groups, such as the Permanent Secretariat for Non-Governmental Organisations (SPONG), individual NGOs active in the sector are also included on the list of invitees (WaterAid, IRC, Eau Vive Internationale (International Running Water), etc.). Increasingly, however, they are consulting SPONG's Clean Water Supply, Hygiene and Sanitation (AEPHA) thematic group in order to expand this participation. It is mainly international CSOs and NGOs that participate, however, and there are insufficient local NGOs and associations participating in these bodies."

note that their involvement is based on commitments made in the context of state cooperation, which depend on their relationship with the state. Thus, the bilateral cooperation between Cameroon and UNICEF within the WASH framework necessitates a greater level of commitment and involvement from UNICEF. It is also UNICEF, as a technical and financial partner, that hosts the WASH meetings for the most part."

In India, "only national-level NGOs get the opportunity to participate in these platforms; grassroots organisations are excluded due to a lack of information as well as a lack of structural mechanisms to ensure their engagement and contribution to SDG processes." Only large international NGOs have the opportunity to participate in the above-mentioned national government platforms. There are multiple non-governmental platforms, where smaller CSOs are able to participate and contribute. Moreover, there is a general disconnect between national-level bigger NGOs and the smaller grassroots organisations, which results in low or no scope for the smaller NGOs to contribute and/or join the SDG consultation process.

In Maldives, it is still "foreign" to the government as well as the development partners to engage CSOs in bottom up accountability.

In Nepal, due to resource constraints, local NGOs are dependent on international NGOs and other donor partners for taking action and putting issues forward.

In the Netherlands, "CSOs are involved through the NGO platform Partos. This stakeholder list mainly consists of CSOs with an international focus. National CSOs were not separately approached by government for SDG6 data and are also not proactively asking for participation themselves." And "internationally active organisations which are part of communication



copyright: IRSP Pakistan

networks of Partos or NWP mention that small organisations that are not part of these networks are often left out of mechanisms.”

In Pakistan, JSRs were initiated by the federal government in collaboration with UNICEF. The ownership of this process by provincial government departments needs to be improved – the participation of more CSOs in the JSRs will improve it effectively. “A Working Group on WASH has been established which consists on the representatives from Ministry of Climate Change, Pakistan Council of Research on Water Resources, UNICEF, and 27 co-opted members from relevant ministries/stakeholders and provinces. There is, however, limited representation of national and local level CSOs.”

In Senegal, “CSOs do not enjoy the same level of participation in the JARs as other stakeholders.” “Only well-known CSOs, and those familiar with working

with technical directorates and national agencies, are invited to these meetings (other CSOs operating in the sub-sector are omitted). The consultation frameworks arising from these processes [initiated in the wake of these meetings] tend to be exclusive, with no effort to engage a broad base of CSOs.”

In Togo, “another gap to bridge is the lack of involvement of all stakeholders in the national accountability systems in the country. Some CSOs, especially small ones, other relevant organisations and above all grassroots communities are not invited to meetings nor involved in decisions taken to develop the water and sanitation sector. One person surveyed said: ‘The heads of these mechanisms issue reports without including stakeholders from the sector in upstream activities. These stakeholders do not agree with the way that some indicators are measured, such as the rate of access to water.’”

D. Difficult relationship between governments and CSOs

In a few countries, the space for CSOs is limited. Relationship between the governments and non-state actors are structured

in such a way that criticism can be taken as an assault – making it difficult for CSOs to provide their inputs and feedback.

In Afghanistan, “governments need to see civil society as a supporter rather than an opponent.”

In India, many times CSO inputs are perceived as criticism of government action, which is a barrier to regular CSO participation and for the ability of CSOs to present evidence in a constructive manner.

In Burkina Faso, with regards to “the lack of NGO/CSO accountability to the state: some NGOs/CSOs do not rigorously follow the legal provisions set out by the state for monitoring CSO/NGO action. For example, the requirement to provide an annual report to the government and to sign a partnership or cooperation agreement with the state services is not always followed. This weakens the CSO/NGO position in the dialogue with government. As for “inflexible and complex administration procedures, reticence with regard to some subjects, distrust of CSOs: state actors show a certain distrust of CSOs due to their degree of independence over their actions. This aspect forms a barrier to NGO participation in accountability mechanisms. This lack of cooperation could, however, result in the CSOs distributing inaccurate information and data, and thus cause damage to the sector.”

In Niger, the aspects of accountability mechanisms that need to be improved include “the government to be more willing to accept criticism and challenge from CSOs.”

In Guinea-Conakry, “the National Coalition on Action and Advocacy for Water (CNAPE) has brought civil society and community-based organisations (CSOs/CBOs) together to support the water and sanitation sector and improve performance, in conjunction with all stakeholders. Apart from this initiative, the government shows a lack of trust in CSOs and, as a result, shares only limited information with them.”

In Nigeria, “recently, a Deputy Majority Leader of the House of Representatives sponsored the NGO regulatory bill recommending the setting up of yet another government agency to be known as the NGO Regulatory Commission that is meant to issue licences to all NGOs which would require renewing of such licences every two years. In other words, if the Commission’s board declines to renew any group’s licence, the NGO would cease to operate in the country. If this bill goes through it will further restrict CSO freedom from participating in accountability mechanisms because if a CSO is found reporting contrary to government’s views on implementing SDG6, that CSO may be shut down which may also impact negatively on other CSOs demanding accountability.”

In Tanzania, it is recommended that “the government should pave the way for constructive criticism and challenge from outside.”



copyright: FANSA India

6.5 Government-level challenges to effective accountability mechanisms

A. Unclear allocation of responsibilities and lack of coordination form a barrier to accountability

Responsibilities for the implementation of SDG6-related targets are unclear and scattered among different government departments. In most countries, responsibilities for SDG6 are allocated across more than one ministry, and the allocation of responsibilities is often not clear. National level policies and responsibilities for service provision are often implemented

and allocated at the local levels. It appeared that there is little awareness on the allocation of roles and responsibilities in implementation and monitoring of SDG6 by government actors. As a result, CSOs are not aware whom to approach in order to establish dialogue or advocate on the issues important to the sector.

In Afghanistan, “still, some ministries are not fully aware of the reporting process on SDG6. Meanwhile, a lack of single validated data leads to flaws challenging the reporting process in Afghanistan. The role of parliamentarians and local authorities is still not clear, there is a lack of a specific mechanism to ensure meaningful participation of CSOs and the private sector as well.” Coordination among all relevant WASH stakeholders is direly needed for inclusiveness.

In Benin “actors in the sector have recommended: clarification of their roles and responsibilities.”

In Burkina Faso aspects that need improvement include “consolidate the Ministry’s powers by taking all aspects and uses of water into account: the Ministry of Water and Sanitation has thus far not been given responsibility for the whole remit of water and sanitation management. Some powers are entrusted to other ministerial departments. It is important to bring together and consolidate all powers that mobilise and manage water and sanitation resources under the Ministry of Water and Sanitation in order to facilitate the sector’s inclusive management.”

In Burkina Faso, “the main anticipated improvements are: increased understanding of SDG6 and all its targets on the part of all actors (government, CSOs, technical and financial partners (TFPs), local authorities) nationally and regionally.” “It can be seen that many actors: state, civil society and local government, have very little knowledge of the content of SDG6. There is a need for in-depth work to improve ownership of the eight SDG6 targets and their associated indicators in order to ensure efficient participation in the related accountability process.”

In France, aspects of accountability mechanisms that need improvement include: “the effectiveness of the inter-assembly parliamentary working group and the clarification of its role and mission, to enable a critical analysis of sectoral policies undertaken by ministries in their areas regarding the SDGs.” And, “awareness among parliamentarians regarding the issue of the SDGs so that they have a better understanding and integrate them into their parliamentary work.”

In Ghana, “lack of collaboration among government ministries and agencies on activities that lead to achieving SDG6.”

The Nepal study concluded that most government officials are confused about their roles towards progressing on the SDGs due to the recent restructuring of the political system.

In Nigeria, “although CSOs have recorded a good relationship engaging with some of these accountability mechanisms due to accessibility, involvement in activities organised by both government and development partners, CSOs are dissatisfied at the level of coordination and openness by government agencies.”

The study in Pakistan outlined one of the major gaps as follows: that, “at federal level, there is no dedicated ministry for WASH. The Ministry of Climate Change has been assigned this task. The ministry has recently established a WASH Cell which needs to be strengthened. At provincial level there is duplication of responsibility. There are different departments and agencies/companies responsible who have no coordination. Provincial departments are reluctant to involve CSOs in their mechanisms.”

B. Lack of interest or political commitment for SDG6 and corresponding accountability mechanisms

Some country studies have indicated that there is a lack of political interest that reduces the effectiveness and credibility

of existing accountability mechanisms.

In Bangladesh, due to lack of strong political commitment, consultation rarely creates real scope for the CSOs to reflect and contribute.

In Cameroon, all actors are in agreement that the National Water Committee plays an important role in better fulfilling SDG6. While some allude to a lack of financial means for making the committee operational, others believe that it is down to unwillingness from the decision-making body.

In France, “the lack of strong support and political leadership on the SDGs at the ministerial level remains an obstacle to the implementation of the SDGs. Most ministers do not address the issue or see it as an issue specific to the MTES.”

In Honduras, “the prioritisation process and the setting of criteria for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda has been undertaken by the Secretariat, using legislative decree 286-2009, which sets out the country vision and the national plan, as a basis. The prioritisation process takes into consideration 10 goals (SDGs 1 to 5 and 8, 9, 15 and 16), 50 targets and 66 indicators. This sidelines SDG6, which will require political will and efforts on the part of the National Drinking Water and Sanitation Council (CONASA) in order to be implemented.”

In Mexico, “the level of involvement extended to civil society reveals a significant lack of political will to establish effective and inclusive participation mechanisms both for implementation (developing strategies) and accountability.” The study uncovered many weaknesses, primarily based on a lack of trust in the government and sector institutions due to the lack of political will to develop a national and sectoral implementation strategy and accountability mechanisms for the Agenda in a truly inclusive and participatory way. And, “the study initially highlighted the significant lack of interest in, or knowledge of, SDG6 as set out in the 2030 Agenda, since 50% of

those invited to answer the survey – people active in the water and development sector – failed to do so.”

In the Netherlands; current gaps include “lack of baseline assessment by government about the awareness of nationally active water stakeholders (CSOs, private sector) regarding the added value of working within frameworks of SDG6. Government assumes that there is low interest in SDG6 because of the more extensive monitoring and accountability systems of other water sector mechanisms, but this assumption is not based on solid assessment. This limits national stakeholders and especially CSOs in evaluating for themselves whether holding governments accountable within the frameworks of SDG6 is desired.” And, “from examining the existing accountability mechanisms for SDG6 in the Netherlands, one of the most striking findings is the low percentage of national CSO involvement in these mechanisms, which suggests that accountability mechanisms for SDG6 do not hold a position of priority in government agendas for multi-stakeholder participation in water sector progress.”

In Niger, the forum with local authorities, listed as accountability mechanism in the country study, “is not fully representative because it is difficult to get sufficient numbers of mayors to attend.”

In Nigeria, one of the points for improvement of accountability mechanisms includes “political will: the need for improved political will to address WASH implementation gaps, for instance, the need for state government to pay counterpart funding for WASH projects in their states.”

In Pakistan, it is a general concern of many of the participants of accountability mechanisms that information is not widespread shared with the stakeholders and even government is not taking more serious interest in implementing SDG6 inclusively.

C. Not enough diversity of stakeholders: women and marginalised groups

Country studies have indicated that they find it important that a wider variety of stakeholders should take part in

accountability mechanisms and the voices of women and vulnerable groups need to be heard.

In Afghanistan, there is a lack of inclusive coordination among WASH stakeholders at national as well as approaches that are sensitive to vulnerable and marginalised groups including with regard to gender and disability.

One of the major gaps in Maldives is that effective platforms for marginalised stakeholder participation is lacking.

In Bangladesh, the existing practices have limitations in securing meaningful engagement of the stakeholders representing the key actors (i.e. CSOs, CBOs, political parties, local government institutions, media, research institutes, NGO network/alliances, national for-profit companies) of the sector from both national and grassroots level. Within the platforms, the existing practices have yet to improve in terms of inclusion of entities representing interests of the traditionally excluded groups (e.g. children, women, sexual minority, persons with disabilities, ethnic minority communities, Dalits, low income urban communities in slum areas and floating population), who have unfavourable socio-economic or physical characteristics that constrain their access to basic services including WASH.

In Mexico, “there are no existing mechanisms to collect more local and municipal information on community water management.” It is important to “fund qualitative data gathering and collect data that is currently missing, in order to have reliable information on population groups in most vulnerable conditions (indigenous, women, children, disabled and the elderly), who tend to be absent from the information collected by the government.” “The official statistics have traditionally focused on national averages and projections for the coming year. However, by their very nature, these averages hide inequalities and are therefore inadequate as the sole measure of progress.”

In Benin, improvements are needed to ensure “female participation and representation in the accountability frameworks”. “Actors in the sector have recommended improved user participation in the accountability mechanisms.” “Aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing improvement: women’s participation and representation at reporting sessions. Given a woman’s role in community life, as an educator with responsibility for fetching water, it is important that she is fully involved at the various levels of reporting. A woman plays the role of spokesperson for other women, within the administration and commune council, and also reports back to women on decisions taken for their benefit.”

In Senegal, “CSOs are poorly represented at JAR meetings in terms of number and diversity”. The country study recommends the government involves “more and more diverse CSOs in the JAR process and welcome useful contributions from CSOs in a spirit of partnership.”

In Tanzania, “for CSOs to have power to advise the government at all levels they must have reliable data from the grassroots.”

In India, transparency of data and real-time update of MIS at national and sub-national level must be improved, reflecting disaggregated data for marginalised communities. Also, “public consultations and community-based monitoring systems need to be constituted to ensure last-mile inclusion for marginalised people.”

In Togo, “the accountability mechanisms that are operational in Togo do not involve all stakeholders from the water and sanitation sector. To make these platforms more effective and dynamic, particular attention should be paid to the participation of all stakeholders involved in achieving SDG6. Several of the people questioned about this issue mentioned this, as shown in the following statements: “from now on, involve all stakeholders working to achieve SDG6 in the accountability mechanisms”; “improve the genuine participation of grassroots communities”; “involve stakeholders that are active in the sector and give them the opportunity to contribute.”

6.6 CSO level challenges for effective participation in accountability mechanisms

A. Lack of awareness, knowledge and capacity among CSOs on what monitoring implementation of SDG6 actually means

From many country studies, there is evidence of little awareness on SDG6 generally, as well as on the implementation and monitoring processes.

The study from Afghanistan concluded that there is little awareness of SDGs in Afghanistan at both the level of government and other actors. "It is not only the question of the GoIRA staff member on the capacity to understand and analyse SDG6 and its sphere of need but also lack of a similar understanding among CSOs and the private sector. This area needs to be deepened and better thought through in order to gain the objectives and the benchmarks in both the national plan and the international commitments."

In Bangladesh, limited awareness among citizens on government targets for SDG6, and national policy/plans in attaining those, is a major challenge for establishment of national accountability mechanism on the subject matter. For a stronger accountability mechanism to be in place, it is important for the CSOs to be capable enough to influence public policy process, collectively and efficiently.

The country study in Bhutan concluded that capacity within the sector in general and more so in the national accountability mechanisms both within the government agencies and CSOs/private sectors at all levels (national, districts, and local community levels) needs to be built.

In Burkina Faso, "the main anticipated improvements are increased understanding of SDG6 and all its targets on the part of all actors (government, CSOs, technical and financial partners (TFPs), local authorities) nationally and regionally." "It can be seen that many actors: state, civil society and local government, have very little knowledge of the content of SDG6. There is a need for in-depth work to improve ownership of the eight SDG6 targets and their associated indicators

in order to ensure efficient participation in the related accountability process."

In Cameroon, "CSOs also need to build their technical capacity regarding water-related issues. This is because, from the analysis carried out, it seems that the inefficiency crisis besetting national mechanisms is often a result of a knowledge imbalance between civil society actors and other experts."

In France; the country study recommends to CSOs to "strengthen the capacity of CSOs for better ownership of the SDGs and effective participation in sector dialogue forums." Main barriers identified for CSO participation in accountability mechanisms include "poor understanding among CSOs of government accountability plans for SDG6; lack of stakeholder involvement (apart from those that followed the SDG negotiations) and poor ownership on the subject by civil society working at the national level (in comparison with organisations involved at the international level)."

In Guinea, "poor motivation among CSOs in relation to WASH" is considered a main obstacle for effective participation of CSOs in accountability platforms/mechanisms.

In Kenya, the country study reported that for more effective participation of CSOs in accountability mechanisms, the capacity of the CSOs on SDG6 commitments must be built. And one of the major gaps is the lack of capacity (knowledge and financial) by CSOs to effectively engage and hold government accountable."

In Maldives, even though there is opportunity for CSOs to hold the government accountable, very few such CSOs are active in Maldives. Lack of matured CSOs is restraining a stronger role for CSOs holding the government accountable for sector progress. The study in Maldives also concludes “the participation of WASH stakeholders in this study was mild and below expectations. This indicates the importance of a new mindset and culture change among the stakeholders that is required to bring about the transformation needed to achieve SDG6.”

In Mali ,“in spite of the efforts made by both the authorities and CSOs, some significant gaps remain. These include: the inadequacy of research and development; the limited information about or awareness of the SDGs among stakeholders; the lack of proficiency in SDG planning/integration tools; the lack of understanding about the lessons that the water sector could learn from good accountability practices.”

The country study in Nepal concluded that there is little awareness on the SDG targets and corresponding implementation plans among the WASH sector actors. Building CSO’s capacity enhanced their dynamic leadership in stepping up advocacy for SDG6. SDG. Enhancing analysis and advocating capacity of sector actors and CSO is a crucial part for improving performance for accountability of the mechanism. “WASH sector actors including CSOs are unknown towards the national goal, targets and operationalisation process of the SDG6.”

In Niger, “all CSOs in the sector attend meetings on the accountability mechanisms relevant to them. There are numerous meetings, which are not mutually exclusive. The main barriers to CSOs using the mechanisms more effectively are: poor organisational capacity and advocacy skills.” Points for improvement

of accountability mechanisms include: to “ensure that stakeholders (especially CSOs) take ownership of the PROSEHA (SDG6) targets and indicators ahead of the next review.” And, “have NGOs prepare more thoroughly for the forthcoming meeting (ensure they fully understand the issues on the table) and have them self-assess the recommendations and commitments they made at the previous meeting.” “CSOs do not fully understand the PROSEHA targets and indicators, meaning they find it hard to hold the government to account. Addressing this issue would allow them to better monitor developments in the water and sanitation sector and challenge the government when appropriate.”

In Nigeria, “continuous building of CSO capacity in knowing how to engage with the accountability mechanism” is needed.

In Sri Lanka, staff turnover and the continuity of tasks in both the government and CSO sector needs improvement. Also, there needs to be a more continuous knowledge management on the sector activities institutionalised with CSOs.

In Togo, “some CSOs do not work specifically on WASH issues but address the subject in a cross-cutting way. As such, they are not effective in the sector. These CSOs do not have sufficient capacities to participate upstream of decisions taken in the sector but they are often approached downstream for the approval of outcomes.” Another issue includes “lack of technical and logistical resources: this factor should not be underestimated as it relates to the organisation of meetings and workshops for sharing information and expertise and generating recommendations on the national accountability systems.”

B. In some countries, among CSOs, there is lack of coordination and confusion about roles, responsibilities and mandates regarding SDG6.

In Benin “actors in the sector have recommended: clarification of their roles and responsibilities.”

The study from Bhutan has concluded that “a clear role and mandate of the CSOs in line with the SDG6 goals and targets are yet to be established and therefore, CSOs, at the moment, do not have a clear strategic plan to hold government accountable in implementing SDG6 goals and achieving the targets.”

In Burkina Faso “the main obstacles to CSO participation are: the inability of NGOs to organise their participation due to their poor structure.” “The main gaps to be addressed are as follows: the poor structure of CSOs, their problem of representativeness and credibility (lack of clarity and direction, opportunistic actions).” “Few CSOs have strategies or guidelines. Many act opportunistically, which does not help the clarity of their action or contributions to debates and public actions. Although there is some degree of acceptable consultation between the NGOs in the water sector, there is still no clear structure enabling them to participate in the sector dialogue.”

In Cameroon, the CSOs lack coordination in their actions on water-related issues: “the meeting of various actors from the water sector provides a good opportunity to exchange different approaches. Nonetheless, CSO involvement would be more relevant if their own actions on the ground were coordinated and integrated. By ensuring that there is a synergy between projects and planning instruments, and that CSO actions are coordinated, they should be able to assert more arguments within national accountability mechanisms.”

In Ghana, “greater and wider networking of CSOs is needed as CSOs in the WASH sector seem to be working in silos without collaboration and sharing of experiences. There is the need for CSOs to create a sharing platform through CONIWAS for improved access across board on what CSOs are doing nationwide.”

Research from Nepal concluded that “most of the sector stakeholders are confused about their roles towards progressing on the SDGs due to the recent restructuring of the political system.”

In the Netherlands, “currently used contact lists for participation in reporting or other mechanisms either only include internationally active organisations or the awareness of nationally active organisations is too low to initiate response. There is little clarity on how and which CSOs are or could be involved in existing mechanisms for SDG6 targets nationally.” “In current participatory mechanisms there is no clear distinction between the role of CSOs in national or international development. CSOs, such as environmental organisations with a focus on water in the national context are not involved in accountability mechanisms since the contact platforms used are orientated towards development cooperation.”

In Sri Lanka, CSOs have not had any discussion on monitoring SDG6. “Such a coordination process is important for the effective participation by CSOs.”

In Tanzania, there is “inadequate coordination and networking among CSOs, thus difficult for having one voice and harmonising activities.” The country study further recommends that CSOs should change their roles from a focus on infrastructure to a focus on advocacy. And, “CSOs should have a system to coordinate their activities properly to counter duplication and competition among themselves, which might create hostility. Here, a proper coordination system is required under a well-established and supported network.”

C. CSOs fail to be transparent, share information and to adequately represent voices from grassroots levels

In some countries, CSOs and CSO networks fail to give full representation to all stakeholders and exclude smaller organisations from discussions.

In Benin, “aspects of the accountability mechanisms needing to be improved: the quality of the civil society shadow report needs to be improved, by preceding it with field surveys and post-annual review outreach sessions.”

In Ghana, “there is the need for frequent meetings as well as funding to organise meetings of CSOs so as to share experiences and for actors to know what each individual CSO is doing at any given time.” “CSOs need to collaborate more with the media to ensure that WASH issues are highlighted more in the media for citizen participation.” “Besides, training and frequent research and engagement with academia will further enhance acceptability of CSO findings and recommendations to government. Evidence of research work should be better distilled, made concise and well-targeted for information sharing.”

In Guinea, “poor consultation between CSOs/CBOs in relation to WASH issues” is considered a main barrier for effective participation of CSOs in accountability platforms/mechanisms.

In Tanzania, “some NGOs are not transparent enough; the government would like to know exactly the amount of money which will have a direct impact on the community/villages. Some activities are not sustainable; they tend to vanish after the project closure; and, little or no succession plans are prepared in the course of project implementation.” “CSOs work independently to the point that some of them don’t even employ professional accountants or auditors. There is a

need for the government to monitor the process and make sure that an independent auditing system is in place to verify the use of funds among NGOs. This task can be properly handled by registration bodies by establishing a proper system to monitor activities of NGOs.”

In Togo, “sometimes CSOs do not research or seek out information. This also impedes their participation in the SDG6 accountability mechanisms.” Also, “lack of consultation between CSOs in the sector: the CSOs do not communicate among themselves on their activities, projects or platforms in the sector. This would enable others to obtain important information about existing accountability systems in the country as well as avoid duplicating activities.” “The national accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems in Togo are for the most part inactive. Nevertheless, those that are operational are not exclusive and provide opportunities for CSOs to contribute. As such, CSOs and other organisations working in the sector can participate if they wish. The key is to find the information and understand the procedure for joining. If a CSO has the same objective as the platforms, it can join them.” The country study therefore recommends: “CSOs/NGOs working in the water and sanitation sector should seek information and actively participate in decision-making. They should not always wait for information on accountability mechanisms to be given to them; rather, they should seek out these mechanisms and how to join them. They should share this information among themselves by creating, where possible, a cooperation framework between CSOs/NGOs in the water and sanitation sector.”

7

Recommendations generated by country studies

7. Recommendations generated by country studies

The participating countries to this study drafted detailed recommendations for the government, CSOs, and development partners. The listing below provides an overview of summarised recommendations that were similarly cited across more than three country reports. This means that the wording and content listed below do not exactly correspond with the individual country recommendations and the overview is by no means exhaustive. For more detailed country level recommendations, please refer to the country two-pagers and to the full reports available online.

7.1 For government

Responsibilities for SDG6 and effective implementation

- ⚙️ Ensure allocation of roles and responsibilities in a clear manner, ensuring transparency and furthering implementation and accelerating progress on targets under SDG6.
Afghanistan, Benin, France, India, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania
- ⚙️ SDG6 should be decentralised – with the necessary capacity building initiatives and resources invested to ensure knowledge and accountability on regional and local levels.
Benin, Cameroon, Ghana, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Togo
- ⚙️ Appoint a central body or institution in charge of implementation or monitoring of SDG6.
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Netherlands



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

Monitoring SDG6

-  Develop robust and harmonised indicators and monitoring frameworks in line with SDG6.
Benin, Bhutan, France, Ghana, Honduras, India, Kenya, Maldives, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria
-  Invest in citizen engagement in accountability mechanisms, including monitoring processes.
Afghanistan, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana, India, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo
-  Targets and corresponding indicators of the SDG6 should be qualitative and/or disaggregated and adjusted to fit the national and local situation and/or in order to be reached more effectively.
Afghanistan, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan

Governance

-  Increase transparency and access to information (in a timely and understandable manner) to all stakeholders by the government – including on plans, progress and reporting
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, India, Kenya, Mexico, Netherlands, Togo
-  Government should increase accountability mechanisms for all stakeholders (including grassroots and marginalised groups) in a formal and systemic manner, on a regular basis, while ensuring that stakeholders' contributions with regard to planning, implementing, monitoring and reporting on SDG6 are taken into account.
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Cameroon, Costa Rica, France, India, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Togo
-  Increase political interest and/or (financial and knowledge) capacity among government for SDG6 and create awareness on SDG6 and corresponding activities.
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, France, India, Kenya, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Togo
-  Promote inter-sectoral approach to implementation and monitoring of SDG6 (health, environmental, education, IWRM, etc).
Honduras, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria
-  Increase attention to other targets of the SDG6 next to 6.1 and 6.2.
Burkina Faso, Ghana, Nepal
-  Government must increase budget/financing for implementation of SDG6-related targets.
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Senegal, Mexico

Voice and inclusion

-  Increase variety of stakeholders in participatory accountability mechanisms and/or ensure representation of excluded/marginalised groups.
Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, France, Ghana, India, Kenya, Netherlands, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Togo
-  Increase accountability for discriminated against or excluded groups, and/or expanding monitoring approaches to include human rights-based monitoring.
Afghanistan, Benin, India, Kenya, Mexico



7.2 For CSOs and NGOs

- ⚙ Increase awareness among people and CSOs on the targets of SDG6 and corresponding policies and actions by the government – and on the existing mechanisms to hold the government to account on progress, including at the local levels.
Bangladesh, Bhutan, France, India, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Pakistan
- ⚙ Improved allocation of responsibilities among civil society organisations to increase coordination on roles in relation to implementation and progress monitoring for SDG6.
Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cameroon, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania
- ⚙ Increase identification, documentation and sharing best practices of effective accountability mechanisms.
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ghana, Maldives, Netherlands, Tanzania, Togo
- ⚙ Create stronger partnerships among CSOs, academia, development partners and/or media and meet regularly.
Afghanistan, France, India, Kenya, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Tanzania
- ⚙ Increase attention and listen to grassroots and marginalised groups to understand their needs and biggest challenges and use this in advocacy and consultations with the government.
India, Mexico, Nepal, Tanzania
- ⚙ Increase fundraising.
Senegal

7.3 For development partners

- ⚙ Support the government in establishing appropriate accountability mechanisms, including monitoring mechanisms.
Bangladesh, Bhutan, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania
- ⚙ Support sector stakeholders in holding the government to account for SDG6.
Burkina Faso, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Kenya
- ⚙ Increase financial support for SDG6 implementation and/or monitoring.
Afghanistan, Mexico, Nepal, Togo
- ⚙ Identify and focus on areas where gaps are greatest and people most in need reside.
Afghanistan, India, Mexico



copyright: FANMEX

8

Conclusion

8 Conclusion

Overall responsibilities for SDG6 are allocated at a high level in government among various ministries or dedicated special departments or committees, which are often chaired by high-level officials. In most countries, responsibilities for SDG6 are allocated across more than one ministry.

Conclusions from country studies generally paint a fragmented picture of monitoring and reporting practices for SDG6.

- ⚙️ Most countries in the study reported that they are still in the initial stages of developing a systematic process for monitoring and review that generates evidence on sector progress towards SDG6 and allows for multi-stakeholder involvement. Global monitoring instruments are often used for tracking progress towards SDG6 at national level.
- ⚙️ Some countries are still developing and mapping SDG6 baselines, indicators and targets and are in the process of developing new systems for data collection. Some country studies have indicated that governments have just finalised, or are in the process of conducting, a data gap-analysis to bring national monitoring mechanisms more in line with the 2030 Agenda.
- ⚙️ The SDGs emphasise that we must “leave no-one behind” and yet in most surveyed countries data is incomplete, inadequate and not disaggregated enough to allow for tracking progress on reaching the most marginalised groups (i.e. the poorest, indigenous groups, refugees and the elderly).
- ⚙️ The study indicates that government-led monitoring mechanisms in some countries serve as a platform for civil society to provide input and validate existing data, whereas in other countries civil society is excluded from monitoring practices.



copyright: SPONG Burkina Faso



copyright: IRC WASH

Many country studies indicate that national accountability mechanisms for SDG6 – or even generally for WASH – are not available or unknown to participants in the country studies. Most of the accountability mechanisms and tools brought forward in the country studies are standalone events and not part of a systematic structured approach to accountability. Where mentioned, accountability mechanisms in country studies are specified only for targets 6.1 and 6.2 and sometimes 6.3, and not necessarily aligned with all the indicators for these targets.

Accountability mechanisms implemented by governments include joint sector reviews, sector events and committees or independent bodies consisting of different stakeholders tasked with the responsibility for the implementation or monitoring of SDG6. In a number of countries, monitoring mechanisms established by the government are indicated to serve as a platform for civil society to provide input and validate existing data. Some country studies refer to political democratic

processes as a means to impose accountability. Only a few country studies referred to the possibility of holding the government accountable for progress on the SDG6 targets through complaint, grievance and enforcement mechanisms or other existing human rights mechanisms.²¹

Accountability tools established by civil society include conferences and events that allow for advocacy, coordination among participants, and sharing of learning and best practices. Shadow reporting and auditing exercises were considered a valuable accountability tool as they point government actors towards their commitments in line with corresponding budgets. **The role of traditional media** is often mentioned as an important and powerful accountability accelerator, as it can be used as an awareness creation tool and to put public pressure on the government to take responsibilities for its decisions with regard to water and sanitation.

Barriers to meaningful participation in accountability mechanisms

- ⚙ Country studies have reported on barriers to CSO participation in existing accountability mechanisms such as not being invited or meaningfully included.
- ⚙ Most of the country studies indicate that the low level of awareness among the public and civil society organisations is due to lack of transparency and sharing of information by the government.
- ⚙ The level of meaningful participation in accountability mechanisms differs widely across different types of stakeholders. Generally, development organisations and large international organisations have most potential to influence governments in their actions and policy direction.
- ⚙ In a number of countries, meaningful consultation is hindered due to the difficult relationship between government and CSOs.

Civil society level challenges

- ⚙ Among many CSOs there is confusion about their own role, responsibilities and mandates regarding SDG6.
- In many countries, stakeholders reported a lack of coordination and sharing of information and learning between sector CSOs and other relevant stakeholders.
- ⚙ There is a reported lack of knowledge among CSOs on the goal and targets of SDG6, and corresponding national plans and policies, limiting the possibilities for holding governments accountable.
 - ⚙ Challenges at the CSO level also include a failure to represent smaller organisations in their constituencies or voices from grassroots level.

²¹ Mechanisms may include national human rights institutions or commissions, ombudspersons, complaint mechanisms at regulatory bodies and submission of shadow reports under

international monitoring mechanisms including the Universal Periodic Review and special procedures of the Human Rights Council.

Government-level challenges

- ⚙️ Government-level challenges to accountability mechanisms include a lack of coordination and an unclear allocation of roles and responsibilities for SDG6 among government institutions. As a result, CSOs are not aware whom to approach in order to establish dialogue or advocate on the issues important to the sector. It is typically observed as a main challenge for CSOs to establish dialogue or advocate on the issues of importance to the sector, and therefore hinders the accountability of SDG6 generally.
- ⚙️ Some country studies reported a limited capacity within government to understand responsibilities with regards to SDG6.
- ⚙️ A lack of interest and political commitments for SDG6 at the level of government is indicated to reduce the effectiveness and credibility of existing accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙️ Furthermore, there is a lack of diversity of stakeholders and representation of women and marginalised groups in the mechanisms mentioned.
- ⚙️ Country studies call for increased access to information from the government. Access to information and transparency is key for CSOs to hold their government to account, as well as to assist their government with provision of input, feedback and monitoring.

Resources dedicated to accountability towards SDG6 and corresponding accountability mechanisms are insufficient

- ⚙️ A major challenge often referred to by many countries is that financing and budget allocations are often insufficient for the good functioning of accountability mechanisms, and states do not allocate enough budgets for SDG6 implementation. Some country studies indicate that governments should invest more in the development of effective, meaningful and inclusive accountability mechanisms.
- ⚙️ Civil society faces financial difficulties, which forms a barrier to or weakens the viability of CSOs to effectively participate in holding governments accountable to SDG6.

Challenges with regard to accountability mechanisms' foundation and functioning

- ⚙️ Challenges reported by country studies regarding the functioning and effectiveness of accountability mechanisms include the lack of a legal basis for existing mechanisms, the irregularity of the accountability processes, its voluntary nature and the limited extent of follow-up of outcomes from such processes.
- ⚙️ Opportunities for real influence are often based at the local level, where civil society can influence local politicians in a direct manner. The major obstacle for these avenues is that SDG6 is not being decentralised, and local governments do not possess the capacity or authority to provide for accountability for implementation of SDG6 targets.
- ⚙️ A missing link between SDG targets and national level policies hinder the functioning of accountability mechanisms.

Almost all CSOs and government officials consulted agreed that participation in accountability mechanisms for SDG6 has a positive impact when carried out in an effective, meaningful way.

Country studies indicated that participation in accountability mechanisms strengthens partnerships between civil society, government and other stakeholders and improves coordination of actions and allocation of roles and responsibilities. It also increases the responsibility of the government to be answerable regarding their actions and progress in reaching the targets of SDG6.

Country studies indicate that participatory accountability mechanisms have the potential to increase political attention and funding for SDG6. Moreover, it leads to capacity building within government for implementation of SDG6. Participation in accountability mechanisms can also lead to better and more effective ways for the collection of data and monitoring practices, which can successfully influence government policy making, and an increased attention on marginalised areas, grassroots communities, and vulnerable groups.



copyright: Juenes Verts Togo

Almost all CSOs and government officials consulted agreed that **participation in accountability mechanisms for SDG6 has a positive impact** when carried out in an **effective, meaningful** way.

Country studies indicated that **participation in accountability mechanisms strengthens partnerships** between civil society, government and other stakeholders and improves coordination of actions and allocation of roles and responsibilities. It also increases the responsibility of the government to be answerable regarding their actions and progress in reaching the targets of SDG6.

Country studies indicate that **participatory accountability mechanisms have the potential to increase political attention and funding for SDG6. Moreover, it leads to capacity building within government for implementation of SDG6.** Participation in accountability mechanisms can also lead to better and more effective ways for the collection of data and monitoring practices, which can successfully influence government policy making, and an increased attention on marginalised areas, grassroots communities, and vulnerable groups.

Country Summaries

Reporting progress on SDG6

Monitoring, reviewing and reporting on SDG6 progress is the responsibility of the Ministry of Economy (MoEc) in Afghanistan. In addition, the SDGs secretariat is responsible for coordination on reporting to the UN HLPF SDG6 progress at the country level. The SDGs secretariat includes eight sectoral ministries and seventeen subsectors.

The data for the overall reporting and the report preparation is gathered by the Afghanistan Central Statistics Organisation (CSO). CSO gathers the information through four main ministries of MRRD, MoPH, MOE and MUDH who are involved in WASH sector. In consultation with WASH members, the SDGs secretariat prepare the SDG6 progress report. Unfortunately, the lack of a mechanism to involve the private sector, media

and civil society organisations (CSOs) during the process of data gathering and report preparation is the barrier in the national accountability mechanism on SDG6. Documents show that it is only through national conferences and consultation workshops that CSOs and the private sector are being invited and involved. The situation on members' awareness of the sector is also unclear.

Most of the sectoral ministries and subsectors staff, including local authorities as well as NGO implementing partners, are not fully aware of the UN HPLF reporting process. The SDGs are still not a well-known programme in Afghanistan and there are no plans for public awareness raising on the SDGs.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Despite the fact that there is low awareness on the SDGs, there are a number of well-established accountability mechanisms relevant to SDG6 within government. In addition, there is a reasonable coordination with international stakeholders and donors. Four official documents create the national WASH policy: 'Afghanistan National Rural Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Revised Policy' (2016) for rural areas; the 'National Hygiene Promotion Strategy 2017-2020' (NHPS) and the 'Management of Structure and Plan for Urban Water Supply and Waste Water Sector (MSPUWW)' cover rural and urban areas, together with 'Hygiene and Sanitation Education Plan through Schools' demonstrate the national accountability mechanism for SDG6.

The strategies also bring the national sector plan in line with SDG6 goals and targets. Sometimes it looks like the accountability on WASH services is the responsibility of four sectoral ministries of rural development, public health,

education urban development. Regular monthly WASH coordination meetings in MRRD, MoPH, MUDH, MoE and MoEc are being held. The invitees include government ministries/entities, NGO partners, UN agencies and SDG6 international stakeholders. Through these meetings, a number of working groups are being formed.

All these groups are being established by UN agencies and handed over to the government. The Water, Sanitation Group (WSG), the Urban Sector Water Coordination Group (UWSCG), the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster (WASH cluster), the WTWG²¹, STWG²² and HTWG²⁴ are the recorded ones. A range of civil society and "community structure organisations"²⁵ such as NGOs, CDCs and DDCs supported by international partners are also involved in the process; however, the lack of a coordination mechanism is apparent. CSOs, particularly the ones with research and advocacy backgrounds, are not involved in the accountability processes at all.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The lack of a proper awareness raising mechanism hinders CSO's participation. Government bodies often refuse to share information due to concerns over media exposure. Only NGO members who are providing WASH services or project implementation partners are invited to official meetings. Official documents and policy papers strongly demand and recommend the CSOs and private sector (PS) participation.

These platforms could provide opportunities to private sector and civil society organisations to be informed about progress and WASH interventions at national and sub-national levels. They could also be a forum to share thoughts, plans and experiences on relevant issues in the sector. Official

documents (meeting participation lists and agendas) indicate low CSO and private sector participation in meetings and forums.

Participation lists show attendees are 55% implementing partners (mostly NGOs and UN agencies), 40% government institutions and 5% private sector organisations, CSOs and research institutions. The last 5% only attend conferences and workshops, not meetings. CSOs and the private sector complain that most decisions within the sector are taken in their absence. A clear information-sharing mechanism is also missing throughout the process.

Positive experiences of participation

1. Government, UN agencies and implementing partners are better coordinated on the project implementation and milestone deliverables of SDG6 targets.
2. They also have better forums to share comments and suggestion about approaches on SDG6 deliverables (milestones).
3. There is a common standard and coordination on WASH project implementation/approaches from the government side. However, it is not equally applied.

Main improvements needed

1. Lack of cohesive and inclusive coordination among WASH stakeholders at national level.
2. Lack of a single plan, monitoring framework, safety plan, GMIS system and humanitarian approach for WASH services at the national level (gender and disability sensitive approaches).
3. Lack of a precise mechanism for information gathering while reviewing, monitoring and reporting on SDG6.

Major gaps

1. Lack of cohesive and inclusive coordination among WASH stakeholders at national level.
2. Lack of a single plan, monitoring framework, safety plan, GMIS system and humanitarian approach for WASH services at the national level (gender and disability sensitive approaches).
3. Lack of a precise mechanism for information gathering while reviewing, monitoring and reporting on SDG6.

Recommendations

1. Enhanced transparency in the overall WASH sector for better service delivery and inclusivity. Focus on better demand driven services rather than desired driven deliverables to the beneficiaries.
2. Improve sector accountability to citizens through expanding social accountability approaches, monitoring human rights treaty obligations (gender and disability), partnerships with the media and oversight by CSOs.
3. Invest in citizen engagement to create citizen ownership of the programmes/project by bringing in grassroots partners such as CSO, media, local shuras and private sector.
4. Create strong partnerships with CSOs and media for lobby and advocacy during the budget approval session of the parliament.

²² This group exist in the official documents and on the MRRD website with a signal of coming soon. No further details.

²³ This group exist in the official documents and on the MRRD website with a signal of coming soon. No further details.

²⁴ This group exist in the official documents and on the MRRD website with a signal of coming soon. No further details.

²⁵ This expression is quoted here from the Afghanistan National Development Strategy (ANDS).

Reporting progress on SDG6

Bangladesh has not yet made any decision on reporting to HLPF in 2018 regarding progress on SDG6. The General Economic Division (GED) is the focal point of UNHLPF reporting.

The Division also performs as the Secretariat of the SDG Coordination Cell (responsible for monitoring national progress on SDGs) formed under the Prime Minister's Office (PMO).

However, there is a possibility that the GED may formulate a report for the Line Ministries on progress of SDGs. The government is in discussion on how to establish a process for reporting on SDG6, apart from the already established process to report on overall SDGs followed by GED during the preparation of the VNR report in 2017.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

No systematic accountability mechanism exists for holding the government accountable for progress on SDG6. However, there are platforms for CSOs to raise concerns about progress on SDG6 as per the government's annual targets. At a central level, the Local Consultative Group (LCG) Sub-Group on Water Supply and Sanitation is a space where issues and achievements related to the targets of SDG6 are raised infrequently.

The PMO has also established the SDG Tracker for measuring the progress towards attaining SDGs, which is also a tool for creating a better accountability mechanism. In addition, the National Forum for Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation (DWSS) (target 6.1 and 6.2), the National Sanitation Task Force (target 6.2) and the National Policy Review Committee (targets 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4) are the forums under the Local Government Division (LGD) where the government shares progress on relevant issues and CSOs can raise concerns.

At a local level, the opportunity for engagement exists in current local government processes such as open budget sessions. However, these local platforms are rarely used for

discussions around sector progress; when they do take place, discussions mainly cover targets 6.1 and 6.2.

Relevant departments/ministries set agendas and convene the consultations as needed (except the National Forum for DWSS that meets biannually) so the government can consult with sector actors. Apart from the government officials holding responsibility for the issues, other participants invited to offer input and suggestions generally include representatives of I/NGOs, CSOs, multilateral institutions, development partners, academia and media. From the perspective of CSOs, these consultations usually provide information and a sense of belonging.

Minutes of the meetings are usually prepared and shared among the participants; in case of important issues, relevant documents are produced and made available publicly through official websites. Results are not always followed-up in a structured manner; however, each forum meeting reviews the decisions of the last meeting and checks whether the relevant outcomes (if any) have been incorporated by the relevant department of the government.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Sector events, in which the government gives account on progress in the sector, are not regularised and occur more on a sporadic, 'need-to-know' basis.

At central events, national CSOs are invited. CSOs try multiple channels to both involve the government and enhance its accountability, including: collective advocacy through platforms such as the Citizen's Platform for SDGs; holding policy dialogues; conducting and disseminating policy research; lobbying, and providing guidance to grassroots communities on raising questions in local government forums, etc. WASH has no institutional home in the government, nor does it get any specific allocation in the national budget. Accountability for sector progress therefore lies across a range of ministries and departments.

This means it is challenging for CSOs to establish a dialogue or advocate on the issues of importance to the sector. When national documents on sector progress are prepared, some kind of consultation takes place with CSOs.

However, due to a lack of strong political commitment, such consultations rarely create real scope for the CSOs to reflect and contribute. In spite of these limitations, consultations can serve as vibrant knowledge sharing events by sharing critical reflection, and can facilitate the strengthening of governmental and CSO partnerships.

Positive experiences of participation

1. CSOs' participation in the consultation on the creation of the seventh five year plan of the government contributed to increased attention to issues related to water supply, sanitation and hygiene—as reflected in the final document.
2. CSOs' participation in the process of formulating and presenting separate action plans for each of the targets under SDG6 at the SDG coordination cell of the Prime Minister's Office. This led to the launch of target-specific prioritised actions.
3. Pre-budget consultation with the participation of sector actors including government officials which creates space for CSOs to convey sector demand from the grassroots to policy makers.

Main gaps

1. Existing accountability mechanisms at central level are non-obligatory for the government and are practiced irregularly. Mechanisms are weak in terms of coordination among stakeholders, and do not create adequate space for the NGOs/CSOs (particularly grassroots organisations) to make meaningful contributions.
2. Local government institutions do have inbuilt accountability mechanisms for SDG6 among others, but these are not performing as expected due to insufficient authority, lack of resources and absence of scope for negotiating with public service providers.
3. In the absence of a clear and common understanding among service recipients of the service standards, it becomes difficult for CSOs to engage them in tracking and providing feedback to the service providers in relation to the services covered by SDG6.

Main improvements needed

1. Regularity of the practice and effectiveness of the methods of CSO engagement.
2. Scope for generating critical reflection to feed back into national programming.
3. Ability of CSOs to influence public policy processes collectively and efficiently.

Recommendations

1. Sharing the draft SDG progress report with all sector stakeholders prior to publication by the government, in such a manner that creates adequate scope for stakeholders to review and reflect.
2. The government should adopt a systematic method of engaging CSOs (including grassroots organisations) in periodic reviews of sector progress, and confirm the incorporation of valid feedback in the public policy process.
3. It is essential to formulate and apply a structured framework of assessment for CSOs to monitor (collaboratively) the performance of the government in attaining national targets for SDG6.

Based on : Based on 30 responses to the survey questionnaire, nine organisations/institutions interviewed and 16 organisations/institutions present at validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Aware of the challenges involved, Benin started the process of implementing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) the day after they were adopted. To enable this, the country introduced a coordination, monitoring and evaluation mechanism. Its purpose is to ensure that the priority targets in the SDGs are embedded into Benin's national and/or sectoral planning framework, and then to report on Benin's progress in implementing the SDGs.

This mechanism comprises two bodies: the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee. In relation to SDG6, government bodies such as the General Directorate for Water (DGEau) and National Directorate of Public Health (DNSP), the National Association of Communes of Benin (ANCB), civil society organisations (CSOs) and the National

Institute for Statistics and Economic Analysis (INSAE) regularly provide data to the General Directorate for Coordination and Monitoring of the SDGs (DGCS-ODD). These data are used to prepare the annual report on implementation of the SDGs. The government bodies prepare annual reports for the water and sanitation sector, which also chart progress in implementing specific SDG targets. These reports are submitted for the annual review of the water and sanitation sector.

At the commune level, reporting is done through tools such as: activity reports, the administrative account, budget management activities, and implementation reports for the Annual Investment Plans (AIPs) arising from the Community Development Plan, which includes the management of water and sanitation installations.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The water and sanitation sector in Benin has two frameworks for reporting on progress towards the priority targets for SDG6. These are the Water and Sanitation Sector Group (GSEA) and the annual review of the water and sanitation sector.

The GSEA is a national forum bringing together government institutions, technical and financial partners (TFPs) from all bilateral and multilateral cooperation and agencies, the ANCB, international NGOs and some national CSOs working in the water sector in Benin. It meets at regular intervals (four times a year) to discuss activities undertaken and sector-specific issues, including the implementation of improvements for the sector recommended in the annual review.

The annual review is a flexible framework for coordinating donors, implementing a programmatic approach in the sector, and closely monitoring progress towards SDG6. It involves all the bodies and organisations – the DGEau, the DNSP, the National Water Company of Benin (SONEB), the Consultative Framework of Non-State Actors of the water and sanitation sector (CANEA) and the ANCB – preparing and submitting

activity reports to the organising committee, chaired by the Ministry of Water. By its nature, the review brings together all actors from the water sector, including the private sector. It is endorsed by a memorandum, jointly signed by the Minister for Water, the Minister for Health and the lead partner among the water sector TFPs.

In addition, it should be noted that there is a steering committee for projects and programmes in the hygiene and sanitation sector in the Ministry of Health where members report on their activities.

At the local level, there is the Water and Sanitation Sector Community Forum (CCEA). This brings actors from the sector together to help the commune authorities and administration to coordinate the actions of all those working in water and sanitation in the commune, and to overcome any challenges that may be impeding development of the sector. There are also thematic reporting sessions for water and sanitation, to record progress achieved in implementing the SDG.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

CSOs in Benin participate in the accountability mechanisms, platforms and systems through: participating in various workshops/reporting sessions on water and sanitation, preparing the civil society shadow report, contributing to the calculation of SDG6 indicators by government bodies, and contributing to the sector report. CSOs participate in the

accountability mechanisms for progress on SDG6 through several forums: CANEA, CWP Benin, the Consultative Framework for Civil Society Organisations on implementing the 2030 Agenda, the Citizens' Platform for monitoring public investments, and the Water Users' Associations (WUAs).

Positive experiences of participation

1. The development of the civil society shadow WASH report, which enables CSOs to confirm or refute progress and to evaluate governance of the sector and the creation of the annual review, which enabled the government to revise its approach in calculating the coverage rate for drinking water.

2. The activities of the GSEA.

3. Press briefings or media cafés.

At the commune level, positive experiences include:

1. Organising the reporting sessions or commune public hearings on water and sanitation themes.

2. Participation in the WUAs' general meetings.

3. Avoidance of duplication in the construction of installations.

Main gaps

1. Insufficient actions to assert political influence.

2. Insufficient involvement of CSOs in the accountability mechanisms.

3. A lack of transparency and synergy between the sector's actors.

Main improvements needed

1. Technical and financial assistance for organising reporting sessions. To sustain this approach, the government and decentralised local authorities must schedule regular reporting into their annual work plan.

2. Actors need to take better ownership, especially at the local level, of the annual review memorandum, while media cafés need to be more systematic.

3. The quality of the civil society shadow report needs to be improved, by preceding it with field surveys and post-Annual Review outreach sessions.

This will result in improvements to: female participation and representation in the accountability frameworks, citizen oversight within communes, consolidation of the supervisory role of the media, and the quality of data published in management reports.

Recommendations

Although Benin has accountability frameworks and mechanisms for the WASH sector at the national and local levels, their effectiveness is gradually declining. Capacity building for CSOs, and improved collaboration with the Water and Sanitation Parliamentary Network, would increase accountability and improve Benin's chances of achieving SDG6. Sector actors recommend:

1. Clarification of roles and responsibilities for sector actors.

2. Improved access to information and improved user participation in the accountability mechanisms.

3. The introduction of monitoring mechanisms at the sectoral level modelled on the DGCS-ODD.

Documentation: Completed questionnaires: 21; interviews conducted: three; people present at the approval meeting: 10.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Bhutan is still defining and establishing a clear process and allocating responsibilities for reporting on SDG goals. Bhutan's 12th five year plan (FYP) aligned the SDG goals in line with the national priorities and National Key Result Areas (NKRA).

However, the twelfth FYP (currently in draft stage) will only be endorsed and approved by the next elected government after elections in 2018. The current SDGs basic service levels is 63% according to JMP 2017 report. The Annual Health Bulletin 2017 reports rates of handwashing with soap of 90%. However, the

current SDGs basic service level is 80% according to JMP 2017 report. Currently, the two line ministries, namely the Ministry of Work and Human Settlement (MoWHS) and the MoH have aligned the WASH SDG indicators and the NKRA for the twelfth FYP from 2018-2023 to ensure reliable baseline data on WASH so that progress can be monitored and reported.

The concerned line agencies are expected to use JMP definitions and indicators will be adapted and integrated into the existing data collection tools and MIS.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

There are few platforms to raise concerns and issues with regards to SDG6. These platforms are not formally established and irregular. CSOs and the media play a crucial role in raising issues and concerns. Local government offices and elected representatives are channels to fix accountability.

The WASH cluster (B-WASH) is a multi-sectoral platform with representatives from various ministries, agencies, CSOs and development partners. However, it is not very formal, and formally established platforms are needed so as to hold any agencies accountable. The B-WASH cluster provides a forum to discuss and raise concerns from CSOs and others but does not necessarily have legal authority to hold any agencies accountable.

Examples of good accountability practices from other sectors

At the national level, the implementation of the FYP is being monitored through the national monitoring and evaluation system. Within this framework, the cabinet is the apex monitoring body that monitors the implementation of the plan and provide strategic direction, guidance and support by signing annual performance agreements with respective ministries, agencies and local government.

Work plans are prepared at the individual level by aligning with their agencies key performance indicators that will ultimately contribute to achieving national target (NKRA 15).

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The CSO sector is small, with few CSOs in the WASH sector. Most of the CSOs involved in working towards SDG6 are members of the B-WASH cluster and are represented through invitation and participation in the regular annual cluster meetings. CSOs are also consulted and involved during stakeholder consultations.

CSOs were closely involved in developing the national sanitation and hygiene policy (draft) for both rural and urban areas. WASH sector initiatives are led by the governmental agencies but CSOs are generally consulted and engaged in the process. However, the influence and authorities of the CSOs in decision-making and accountability are relative and subjective.

Positive experiences of participation

1. Participation of various stakeholders including CSOs in the sector policy consultation process has ensured more holistic and broader inclusive policy provisions and has played an important role in reaching out to the most vulnerable, neglected sections of society through data, information sharing and raising awareness and issues.
2. Smaller but more focused and targeted interventions have been mobilised.
3. Awareness and accountability have been improved by the use of social media and many other informal channels.

Recommendations

The two line ministries, namely MoWHS and MoH, have aligned the SDG6 indicators with NKRA for the draft twelfth FYP from 2018-2023.

1. PHED (as the focal point for SACOSAN) has mapped SDG6 stakeholders. This requires further discussion with the GNHC to ensure the endorsement and accountability of reporting.
2. CSOs' participation and their role in the achievement of the SDGs need to be strengthened and supported both technically (including capacity building) and financially by the government and donors.
3. Furthermore, the government's positive accountability platform for APA can also be applied to progress towards the SDGs among the different stakeholders, which can then be reviewed, analysed and reported at regular intervals in fora such as the B-WASH cluster meetings.

Main improvements needed

1. CSOs are working within their own mandates with reduced focus on SDGs. Alongside their own organisation's roles, responsibilities and mandates, CSOs should fit their activities within the SDG6 framework and implementation plans.
2. The Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC) should consider a mapping exercise for SDGs at a national scale, with identification of relevant line agencies for SDG6, as well as the required reporting frequency and accountability at national and regional fora like SACOSAN.
3. A strong national monitoring and reporting system (MIS) should also be considered to track the SDGs progress henceforth.

Reporting progress on SDG6

To ensure accountability for SDG6 implementation, the Ministry of Water and Sanitation drew up a National Water Policy (NWP 2016–2030) broken down into five operational programmes. Implementation of these five programmes enables the government to provide information on the indicators relating to SDG6. A performance report is thus produced annually and submitted to the actors and stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector.

Through the General Directorate for the Economy and Planning (under the Ministry of the Economy, Finances and Development), the government incorporates the data from this report into a global report produced annually on SDG implementation in Burkina Faso.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Different mechanisms are in place to ensure accountability for SDG6 implementation. A review of the National Economic and Social Development Plan (PNDES) takes place every six months and is conducted by the Permanent Secretariat of the PNDES, under the presidency of the Prime Minister.

It involves all actors from the country's 14 development planning sectors and examines and assesses PNDES' implementation performance. The review of the Sector Dialogue Framework for Water, Environment and Sanitation (CSD-EEA), is also

conducted every six months by the Ministry of Water and Sanitation as lead agency for this planning sector. It involves water, environment and sanitation actors from the public and private sectors, civil society and local groups.

Further accountability mechanisms and platforms include the review by the NWP National Steering Committee, the steering committees for the five operational programmes and the National Water Council (CNEau).

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The Ministry ensures formal participation of civil society organisations (CSOs) in these mechanisms by including civil society on the list of participants. The choice of civil society representatives does, however, depend on the government's awareness of the CSO actors in the sector.

Apart from large groups, such as the Permanent Secretariat for Non-Governmental Organisations (SPONG), individual non-governmental organisations (NGOs) active in the sector are also included on the list of invitees (WaterAid, the International Red Cross, Eau Vive Internationale etc). Increasingly, however, they are consulting SPONG's Clean Water Supply, Hygiene and Sanitation (AEPHA) thematic group in order to expand this participation. It is mainly international CSOs and NGOs that participate, however, and there are insufficient local NGOs and associations participating in these bodies.

The main bottlenecks to CSO participation are: civil society's lack of knowledge of the dialogue spaces and of the participation possibilities established by the government; the failure to provide timely information; as well as the inability of NGOs to organise their participation due to their poor structure.

Given the important role of CSOs in improving sector governance, there are nonetheless ever more places being reserved for NGOs and associations in the different consultation and dialogue frameworks. This is encouraging for the efforts being made by the NGOs and CSOs in the water and sanitation sector.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The constitutional enshrinement of the right to water and sanitation.
2. The incorporation of a strategic focus on citizen oversight into the Water and Sanitation Sector Governance Programme.
3. The prioritisation of water on the agendas of presidential candidates (source of the President's "zero water drudgery" commitment).

Main gaps

1. The poor structure of CSOs, their problem of representativeness and credibility (lack of clarity and direction, opportunistic actions).
2. The failure to provide timely information.
3. The lack of NGO/CSO accountability to the state.

Main improvements needed

1. Increased understanding of SDG6 and all its targets on the part of all actors (government, CSOs, technical and financial partners, local authorities) nationally and regionally.
 2. A citizen oversight mechanism is needed for the government's national and international commitments in the sector.
3. Support for the production of alternative CSO reports and their dissemination at all levels.

Recommendations

1. The government should accept the significant role of civil society in improving governance and promoting dialogue between the government and civil society, and put a funding mechanism in place to support CSO participation in the different spaces for interacting with the government and other stakeholders.
2. Development partners should open specific funding lines for CSO umbrella organisations in order to support their efforts to establish a dialogue with the government.
3. CSOs and NGOs should make the most of all opportunities to remind the government of its commitments and encourage accountability.

Documentation: 20 questionnaires completed; five bilateral interviews organised; 18 participants from 15 organisations and institutions at the validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

A programme has been introduced to contextualise the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is led by the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT).

The programme has adopted 46 priority targets, which will be included in its strategies, communal development plans, ministry programmes and the action plans of development partners. The government, with support from UNICEF, is currently developing specific indicators for water and sanitation

in line with SDG6. The national water policy document, which was validated in November 2017, incorporates the preliminary results of this collaboration.

The baseline situation of the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals is documented through the publication of an annual report of the Ministry of Water Resources and Energy (MINEE).

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The WASH coalition is the main forum for actors in the water sector. It is led by two main actors: the government, which handles coordination, and the Technical Secretariat via MINEE and UNICEF (the supporting organisation). Every quarter, a national three-day meeting is organised with all stakeholders from the water sector: the State, technical and financial partners, and civil society organisations (CSOs), with the same set-up planned at the regional level.

The National Water Committee is an interministerial advisory committee that aims to study all measures or actions seeking to ensure the conservation, protection and sustainable use

of water and propose them to the government. It issues a recommendation on water-related questions or problems that the government refers to it. It is formed solely of experts. The committee should hold two ordinary meetings each year. However, it has held only one session so far, on the day after it was established.

At the regional level, there is a six-monthly consultation framework that assembles mayors, CSOs, parliamentarians and decentralised state services. It includes an 'independent observation' component

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The WASH coalition enables all stakeholders to discuss, evaluate the existing level of commitment and capitalise on new approaches to water and sanitation. Only registered, well-known CSOs are listed as stakeholders, such as the Global Water Partnership and the 12 Million Consumers Association. The National Water Committee does not explicitly allow civil society representation. Within the regional consultation framework, the CSOs are free to critique actions and decisions that are taken.

Challenges include a lack of funding which hinders the operations of the National Water Committee. CSOs are not well informed about how the various platforms work and lack coordination in their actions on water-related issues.

CSO involvement could be improved with capacity building among the various stakeholders, ensuring the National Water Committee is operational and developing a standardised structure for the regional consultation framework and its implementation in regions without this framework.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The equality among stakeholders at WASH meetings is a major asset. Involvement in the WASH Coalition has resulted in the national WASH in schools strategy and the national community-led total sanitation (CLTS) strategy.
2. Recognition of the value of proposals and contributions from civil society to public policies in this sector, including its involvement in implementing the national liquid sanitation strategies, and its role in designing and approving the national water policy.
3. CSO involvement on the various platforms allows them to relay the reference points and populations' specific needs to the government, which can then be taken into account when planning.

Main gaps

1. The effective operation of the platforms (National Water Committee, WASH coalition).
2. Involving more CSOs in the regional consultation framework.
3. Technical capacity building and more funding for civil society.

Main improvements needed

1. Creation of a framework to capitalise on and follow up on recommendations made on the platforms.
2. The regularity of the existing platforms and the involvement of all stakeholders on them.
3. Coordination of CSO actions to ensure their effective and efficient involvement.

Recommendations

Government should:

1. Strengthen the functioning of existing platforms, make them more open to civil society organisations and take into account the recommendations in these spaces.
2. Strengthen the regional consultation framework mechanism and roll it out to other regions in the country.
3. Submit a national voluntary review on the implementation of the SDG6 to the UN High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

CSOs should:

1. Strengthen coordination between actors and intervention capacity.
2. Provide advocacy to refashion accountability frameworks, improve representation and implement recommendations.
3. Improve communication and exchange of good practices for accountability among other stakeholders.

Documentation: 27 questionnaires completed, seven organisations/institutions questioned during the interviews, nine organisations/institutions present at the validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

In September 2016, the presidents of the three state powers (executive, legislative and judicial) and the Supreme Electoral Court, with representatives of local government, the private sector, public universities and civil society signed the National Pact for the Advancement of the SDGs within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

In February 2017, the executive power issued Executive Decree No. 40203-PLAN-RE-MINAE, establishing the process for governance and implementation of the SDGs in the country and inviting all public institutions to work together towards achieving them.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The High-Level Council of the SDGs is the highest coordinating body for measures to comply with the 2030 Agenda through the establishment of national public policies and funding mechanisms.

The Technical Secretariat, led by the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Policy (MIDEPLAN), is responsible for producing the country reports for submission to the United Nations and other international and national bodies. Information on integrated water resources management

(IWRM) and access to services such as drinking water and sanitation is produced by the Interinstitutional Water Statistics Technical Committee. The Advisory Committee provides a space for consultation, dialogue and producing inputs for the implementation and production of reports.

The National SDG Forum is the public space for accountability regarding measures taken to achieve the SDGs in Costa Rica and is convened at least once a year by the Technical Secretariat.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The CSO for the SDGs was created in 2016 with support from the United Nations. The platform comprises more than 30 CSOs working in different areas or on different issues, including the environment, human rights, children, poverty and indigenous communities. Participation in the platform is voluntary.

As part of this platform, civil society representatives were elected for a two-year period to serve on the Advisory Committee, which is the mechanism by which civil society can propose ideas for implementing the SDGs and inputs for the country reports. It should be noted that all the mechanisms are new (established in February 2017), meaning there is a need to build up experience to identify opportunities for improvement.

Positive experiences of participation

The main experiences of participation and accountability mechanisms are related to the environment. The Regional Conservation Area Councils (CORACs) and the National Biodiversity Council are pioneering mechanisms. They were established by Organic Environmental Law No. 7554 in 1995 and have made it possible to build up experience developing this sort of mechanism.

The CORACs include representatives from various sectors of society, elected via sectoral assemblies and serving rotating two-year tenures.

The National Biodiversity Management Commission (CONAGEBIO), on the other hand, has a fixed structure with posts that do not change (unless the law is reformed), an aspect that limits the participation of other CSOs and could imply a risk of losing a participation mechanism if the organisation were to be dissolved.

In August 2017, the Citizens' Advisory Council on Climate Change (5C) was created by Decree No. 40616-MINAE as a public participation and consultation platform, seeking to collaborate in the design and application of national climate change policies for implementing the Nationally Determined Contribution submitted by Costa Rica to the Conference of Parties 21 in Paris, December 2015.

The 5C comprises representatives of community organisations (community aqueduct associations and development associations) and CSOs involved in many different areas (biodiversity and ecosystems, agriculture, livestock, forestry and fishing, industry and commerce, infrastructure and transport, indigenous affairs, women and labour organisations, and urban mobility and sustainability). In January and February 2018, the Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MINAE) invited the sectoral assemblies to elect their representatives on 5C for a two-year tenure.

Main improvements needed

1. Make the transition from consultation bodies to constructive bodies, where the decisions taken in participatory mechanisms are binding.
2. Improve the transmission of information and accountability for decisions and initiatives in these spaces to the other CSOs.
3. Adopt a bottom-up approach to decision-making i.e. from the local level to the national level.

Main gaps

1. There are no specific formal mechanisms for the drinking water and sanitation sector.
2. A new legal framework is needed that allows integrated, participatory and decentralised water management, where decision-making, the implementation of public policy, monitoring and accountability are carried out from the lowest levels of management, namely the hydrological units.

Recommendations

1. More cohesion is required among CSOs working on issues related to the SDGs.
2. While progress has been made developing public policy proposals, there has been a failure to create strong social mobilisation and exert pressure on decision makers to ensure proposals are transformed into laws or public policies.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The Interministerial Delegate for Sustainable Development coordinates the national implementation component of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in France, in connection with all the ministries. The delegate leads an interministerial steering committee: lead and associated ministries have been identified for each of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Ministry for Ecological and Inclusive Transition (MTES) is the lead for the SDG6.

Each year, France publishes a progress report on the SDG implementation for the United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF). The Directorate for Water and Biodiversity (DEB) is responsible for reporting on SDG6.

The National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) and the National Council for Statistical Information

(CNIS) formed an ad hoc working group that carries out statistical monitoring and sets indicators. This group seeks to advance the French statistical system in line with the 2030 Agenda.

Aside from the SDGs, very thorough reporting is already conducted by the government as part of its public water policies (for example, in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive). For the French government, these are priority accountability frameworks, which can even be binding (unlike the SDGs which are a voluntary commitment). A lot of data on water is collected via multiple channels, and most are open data. However, these data, sometimes incomplete, are not accessible on a single platform.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The main accountability mechanism is the regular official reporting on SDG implementation for the UN HLPF. France submitted a VNR in 2016. The next VNR is scheduled for the 2019 HLPF. In 2017 and 2018, France submitted an annual progress report.

These reports are discussed with civil society during consultation workshops on SDGs, organised by MTES and on an interactive digital platform. Another mechanism is the CNIS Working Group on Indicators, composed of diverse stakeholders, whose major objective is to publish 110 French national indicators for monitoring the SDGs.

Apart from the SDGs, France has a set of accountability mechanisms linked to its public water policies. First, there are the mechanisms which concern all public policies, in particular the parliamentary control (draft finance bill, voting on laws) and the evaluation of public policies by the Court of Auditors. Then, different mechanisms for consultation and stakeholder participation exist on every level of the organisation of water management in France (both for water resources and water and sanitation services): national (National Water Committee); water basins (basin committees); local (local authorities, local water commissions, local public services advisory commissions).²⁶

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Additional mechanisms are in the process of being set up. A high-level steering committee involving civil society is being structured to coordinate the development and follow-up of an SDG implementation roadmap for France. In addition, the government is committed to strengthening accountability towards the Parliament by putting in place budget performance indicators in line with the SDGs.

In parallel, France has set up mechanisms for mobilising civil society, considering that the SDGs are a shared responsibility among stakeholders and citizens. These main mechanisms are the SDG consultation workshops and awareness raising tools (e.g. MOOC, newsletter, hackathons).

²⁶ In overseas departments, these decentralised mechanisms may differ.

²⁷ See Article 21 of the Interministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development (CICID) statement of conclusions of 8 February 2018.

Positive experiences of participation

1. Inclusion of CSO recommendations in the national voluntary review for the 2016 HLPF.
2. Good structuring of water stakeholders (French Water Partnership, Coalition Eau etc.) identified as credible speakers on SDG6 and as message communication channels between CSOs and the state.

Main gaps

1. Lack of strong political leadership on the SDGs and delay in formulating a roadmap for implementing these SDGs: this situation limits civil society involvement and ownership.
2. Lack of clarity on the adequacy or discrepancy between the existing national indicators (used by INSEE) and the SDG6 indicators.
3. Poor understanding among civil society organisations (CSOs) of government accountability plans for SDG6; lack of stakeholder involvement (apart from those that followed the SDG negotiations) and poor ownership on the subject by civil society working at the national level (in comparison with organisations involved at the international level).

Main improvements needed

The representativeness of the organisations involved in the consultation workshops on the SDGs.

Recommendations

The government should:

1. Show a political leadership at the highest level of government and establish a roadmap for the implementation of the SDGs by France.
2. Implement on a short time frame the commitments made by the government on 8 February 2018:²⁷ use budget performance indicators in line with the SDGs and refer to the SDGs in the construction of the law.
3. Strengthen monitoring and accountability mechanisms by: structuring a space for regular dialogue with representatives of civil society; reporting to Parliament on the progress made; encouraging the integration of an SDG angle in the evaluations by the Court of Auditors; clarifying the adequacy or discrepancies between national and SDG indicators; setting up a platform for centralising water data and monitoring of the SDGs.

CSOs should:

1. Strengthen the capacity of CSOs for better ownership of the SDGs and effective participation in sector dialogue forums.
2. Advocate for an effective implementation of the SDGs by France and for rigorous, transparent and inclusive monitoring, by developing inter-SDG and inter-CSO cross-cutting advocacy.

Documentation: Completed questionnaires: 19; interviews conducted: 10; organisations present at the approval meeting: 11.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The state has set up an office within the Presidency to track and monitor the SDG targets. The President of Ghana has also been named as a Co-Chair of the UN Secretary-General's Eminent Group of Advocates on SDGs. The government is expected to prepare and submit SDG status reports annually. Its 2017 baseline indicator on SDG reports has already been drafted and shared with sector actors for inputs.

There is an ongoing discussion of sector progress since 2016 at the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources which has

been brought to the attention of CSOs. CSOs are required to contribute presentations. Ghana participated in the UN High Level Political Forum held in New York in July 2017.

The country will participate again and has commenced work with development of the SDG baselines in this vein. Also, the urban advisory committee regularly reports progress on SDG6 to CSOs. This information is included in the data roadmap of Ghana's efforts and reports. Some of the indicators and targets are also captured in Tier 1.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

A CSO Platform on SDGs has been formed by CSOs and there is a convener and a co-convener for sub-platform 6. The Coalition of NGOs on Water and Sanitation (CONIWAS) also plays an active role in bringing together CSOs in the WASH sector. The Intervention Forum is an ad hoc committee organised by CSOs to review and make inputs in policy issues

on WASH. The Mole Conference, the biggest WASH issues convener in Ghana, also brings together all WASH sector players including government agencies and other public institutions annually to look at government commitment and intervention to WASH and provide guides for a better WASH policy.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

CSOs are part of the platform that monitors SDG6 and works as consortium to support the government's agenda to ensure that SDGs are integrated into the national agenda. Budget tracking and stakeholder platform meetings also take place. WaterAid Ghana is a co-convener for SDG6 and participates in sessions organised by the SDG Philanthropy Platform.

The Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) Stocktaking Forum and the Mole Conference, the CONIWAS platform etc. are used to influence the sector and advocate for social change. The government relies on CSOs for advice and CSO-led platforms are used for accountability by the government. Where the government falls short on delivery, CSOs remind ministers of their commitments, especially through the media. One other important area CSOs are able to hold government accountable is through budget tracking of district assemblies (local authorities) through WASH budget tracking. This is done through assemblies' medium-term plans, composite budgeting

and actual expenditure tracking on WASH interventions. Unfortunately, there seems to be a low level of commitment and no actionable M&E plan for effectively monitoring the targets. CSOs need to enhance their capacities in respect of accountability mechanisms and build their skills to conduct effective budget tracking of WASH-related activities.

Civil society needs to undertake and publish independent research and engage government and agencies on the need to be accountable. The Local Governance Act (Act 936, 2016) provides for greater citizenship participation and CSOs must deepen engagement with local governments and citizens using the provisions of the Act. Predictable platforms for engagement between the platforms and relevant government bodies will be critical, especially the inter-governmental agency on SDGs recently inaugurated by the President – who is also at UN level the Co-Chair for SDG Advocacy. Greater and wider networking is also needed.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The existing framework of the Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Unit is good for coordinating government activities at the national level in terms of the SDGs. CSOs also constitute platforms to work with government and track progress.
2. Meetings are organised regularly to discuss the SDG6 targets with sector players.
3. Information is shared, there is improved engagement with government institutions, and strong links developed with the INGO Forum in Ghana.

Major gaps

1. A lack of collaboration among government ministries and agencies on activities that contribute towards achieving SDG6.
2. A lack of adequate data on SDG6 for developing deliverable indicators.
3. Lip service from government in tackling sanitation issues. Over years, the government has enacted laws and by-laws at the local level to tackle sanitation (especially open defecation and indiscriminate littering) yet enforcement of such laws is poor. Enforcing building regulations for mandatory toilets in every home is ineffective as people still build without toilets.
4. Sustainable funding in the sector.

Main improvements needed

1. The wider participation of more NGOs and increased participation of media and the private sector.
2. CSOs must provide leadership in demanding improved accountability. There is a need for regular meetings on achievements so far, reminding stakeholders of their roles.
3. The responsiveness of the sector ministry towards implementing recommendations. There is also the need to utilise these accountability mechanisms with adequate evidence from research. Representatives from academia should be engaged more and more frequently.
4. CSOs should follow up to ascertain if commitments are adhered to, seeking data and information from relevant government agencies. Evidence collected by CSOs should be better distilled, concise and well-targeted.
5. There should be increased information sharing between CSO and government and among CSOs, with an expansion of the data dissemination platform.

Recommendations

1. Deepen collaboration and partnerships.
2. Strengthen national policies and implementation policies on WASH.
3. The private sector needs more involvement and participation in SDG6.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Guinea-Conakry is one of the countries due to present its VNR at the High-level Political Forum under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in July 2018. This represents an opportunity for Guinea, which also has to provide a mid-term review of its Economic and Social

Development Plan (PNDES 2016–2020) in 2018. In view of this, the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MPCI) is responsible for development policies and for coordinating the SDGs.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

A mechanism has been established for monitoring and evaluating the PNDES: the institutional monitoring and evaluation mechanism (IMEM). The main aim of the IMEM is to formalise and facilitate dialogue with all stakeholders on the performance of the PNDES development actions, in accordance with the plan's guiding principles. The IMEM brings together five categories of actors: the consultation and coordination framework (CCC) between the government and development partners; the technical monitoring committee (CTS); the topical discussion groups (GTDs); the Ministries,

through the strategy and development bureaux (BSDs); and the regions and prefectures through their respective monitoring and evaluation units (CRSEs/CPSEs). In any year, the first six-monthly review will assess the implementation of actions during the previous year, and the second six-monthly review will look at the actions scheduled for the following year. The IMEM has access to three technical tools: the performance measurement framework (CMP), the annual performance report (RAP) and the annual programming document (DAP).

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The National Coalition on Action and Advocacy for Water (CNAPE) has brought civil society and community-based organisations (CSOs/CBOs) together to support the water and sanitation sector and improve performance, in conjunction

with all stakeholders. Apart from this initiative, the government shows a lack of trust in CSOs and, as a result, shares only limited information with them.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation

1. Poor dissemination and implementation of existing documents on policy, strategy and standards.
2. Limited collection of and access to WASH data for CSOs/CBOs.
3. Poor consultation between CSOs/CBOs in relation to WASH issues.
4. Little awareness-raising or dissemination of information to communities on their rights, responsibilities and governance of WASH aspects of interventions.
5. Poor motivation and capacity among CSOs in relation to WASH.
6. Poor implementation of functions delegated to public authorities involved in the supply of WASH services, at both the local and national level.
7. Poor integration of WASH aspects into the mechanism for disseminating official information to the community, during

Positive experiences of participation

The workshop to develop an action plan for the implementation and monitoring of SDG6 by CSOs.

Main improvements needed

1. Communication.
2. Transparency.
3. Consultation/coordination.

Main gaps

1. Limited human resources for WASH governance, at all levels.
2. Poor understanding of the concept of accountability, at all levels.
3. Disorganisation in WASH interventions.

Opportunities presented to improve participation by CSOs

There is currently very poor CSO participation in the sector, due to the lack of a framework for consultation between the stakeholders (public authorities, CSOs, TFPs, private sector and communities). In this context, the opportunities to enable effective participation by CSOs in the sector include:

1. Establishing a system for communicating WASH information from the local to the national level.
2. Holding consultation and community mobilisation days for CSOs, to increase engagement and commitment to transparency.
3. Lobbying partners (donors, NGOs and United Nations agencies) to support CSOs in producing information and awareness-raising materials on the accountability mechanism for SDG6, and making these available.
4. Introducing a standard template for harmonised community evaluation tools, to reflect the WASH actions planned by CSOs in the LDPs and AIP.
5. Organising awareness-raising sessions for CSOs/CBOs on participation in the budget process for financing the sector.

Recommendations

Government should:

1. Ensure effective communication from the local to the central level.
2. Mobilise financial, technical and human resources for the implementation and monitoring of SDG6.

CSOs should:

1. Advocate for the integration of SDG6 into the national development plan and LDPs, while mobilising the financial resources required to implement and monitor it.
2. Support actions in the PNDES related to SDG6.

The UN should support the government in developing an action plan for knowledge management and thematic learning in the water and sanitation sector in Guinea-Conakry.

The private sector should form groups of operators to improve collaboration between actors in the WASH sector.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The governance system for the implementation of the United Nations 2030 Agenda is led by the General Coordination Secretariat of the Government (SCGG) to ensure all levels of central government (sector-wide cabinets, secretariats of state and centralised and decentralised institutions) assume their respective responsibilities in order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Three structures were created to support the Secretariat. The high-level commission is a formal monitoring and decision-making forum for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda via public policies, plans, strategies, programmes and projects. The technical committee is responsible for devising the operational and functional system for analysis and for

developing proposals for decision-making. Specific working groups have been established for each goal or topic.

The process for prioritising and establishing criteria for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda has been undertaken by the Secretariat, using legislative decree 286-2009, which sets out the country's vision and national plan. The prioritisation process takes into consideration 10 goals (SDGs 1 to 5, 8, 9, 15 and 16), 50 targets and 66 indicators that are most closely linked to the objectives, guidelines and outcomes of the national plan. Two of the indicators relate to the percentage of the population with access to drinking water and sewage systems.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

There are a number of accountability tools for targets 6.1 and 6.2. The United Nations Joint Monitoring Programme uses input from INE household surveys. The Monitoring Country Progress on Drinking Water and Sanitation (MAPAS) is a regional initiative for evaluating and monitoring progress towards national drinking water and sanitation targets. The initiative is promoted by the Central America and Dominican Republic Forum for Water and Sanitation (FOCARD-APS)

through its Regional Technical Group on Information Systems, with the support of the World Bank's Water and Sanitation Programme. The results-based management system has the potential to link SDG6 to planning and budgets for measures to achieve the targets. The National Demographic and Health Survey (ENDESA) includes water-quality components, and basin councils are tasked with governing water resources in their territory.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The participation of civil society is structured around different levels. At a national level, AHJASA is the official representative of community water management organisations on CONASA. There is also a seat for end user representatives.

At a subregional level, there are two structures: the Basin Councils, which include two representatives of water users (although not necessarily of drinking water services), two representatives of environmental organisations and two representatives of the Water Administrative Boards; and

the Regional Development Councils, which include 10 representatives of the public (from different municipalities and villages) and five non-governmental organisation (NGO) representatives.

At a local level, municipal drinking water and sanitation commissions and local supervision and control units serve as additional mechanisms for public participation in the management of drinking water and sanitation services.

Main improvements needed

1. The production of information is partial and only covers data related to access to services, missing out on important aspects such as quality and service continuity.
2. There is also no information on specific issues relating to integrated water resources management (IWRM), such as the quality of surface and underground water bodies and the conservation of strategic water sources.
3. Information from the Rural Water and Sanitation Information System (SIASAR) system, managed by SANAA and ERSAPS, should be used by other institutions.
4. The results-based management platform used over the last six years should be expanded to SDG6. It is hoped that from 2019, SDG6 will be included in the SDG national agenda platform. Political will is required for the full adoption of SDG6, not just part of it.

Recommendations

1. Civil society needs to be more involved in developing policies and in planning and managing the sector. Although measures have been devised to ensure the human right of access to drinking water and sanitation, part of the agenda (related to IWRM) has been left out. It is therefore essential to reactivate the interinstitutional sector working meetings.
2. Sector institutions should be strengthened to ensure the government includes the drinking water and sanitation sector in the country's 10 priority areas.
3. A new cabinet should be incorporated into the current government structure, comprising CONASA, ERSAPS, SANAA, the Institute for Community Development, Water and Sanitation (IDECOAS), SESAL and MiAmbiente. These entities are currently divided and lack coordination, which hinders interinstitutional coordination and means there is no spokesperson to engage with the country's decision makers.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The National Institute for Transformative India Aayog, popularly known as NITI Aayog, is the leading policy think-tank of the government of India, designing strategic and long term policies and programmes. NITI Aayog acts as the nodal agency and driver for SDG implementation. Having presented its VNR to the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) in 2017 on seven goals (1,2,3,5,9,14 and 17), India does not intend to participate in HLPF in 2018; hence no VNR is being prepared. The report for the 2017 VNR was prepared internally by NITI Aayog and many expressed that it was a non-participatory

exercise. The report was posted on NITI Aayog's website a few days before the HLPF review for information sharing. NITI Aayog has mapped out line ministries and different flagship programmes/interventions of central government that contribute to the achievement of specific SDG commitments. Similar processes are being followed at state (province) level as per India's Federal governance system. WASH is the states' responsibility and the planning department of each state has to take the lead on driving the SDG agenda.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Government mechanisms: With SDG6 indicators still in draft stage, there are no formal accountability mechanisms for tracking progress on SDG6 as yet. NITI Aayog plans to undertake outcome-based monitoring on SDG implementation once indicators are final, and a dashboard is being prepared. The states are also in the process of developing implementation plans and monitoring indicators. Line departments/ ministries implementing the flagship programmes on water and sanitation track the progress on their programme targets through MIS, internal reviews, annual reports and periodic surveys (NSSO, NFHS, Census etc). The MIS data is available in public domain and easily accessible. However, for tracking of one specific SDG target, information may need to be collected from different line departments, the surveys conducted have 5-10 years periodicity and become old by the time they are published.

Non-governmental/third party initiatives: Wada Na TodoAbhiyan (WNTA), a coalition of different civil society organisations, academia and think-tanks began tracking SDG progress, undertaking a review of SDG implementation (including of SDG6) before the 2017 HLPF review and presenting a shadow CSO report²⁸ at a side event during

HLPF. WNTA plans to continue this work, publishing its report annually. Other such initiatives include a report on the status of toilet construction in rural India by WaterAid²⁹, on sanitation progress in urban areas by the Tata Energy Research Institute³⁰, and a brief on financial allocation and expenditures for rural SBM and its progress by the Accountability Initiative, Centre for Policy Research (CPR).³¹

Multi-stakeholder meetings/consultations: these are organised by the line departments annually as part of state action review/dissemination, or while planning new initiatives. NITI Aayog also convenes national multi-stakeholder meetings for the review and future action planning of specific SDGs in collaboration with nodal ministries and the Research and Information System for Developmental Countries (RIS), an autonomous think-tank and policy research institute. These meetings are not only information-sharing platforms for dissemination of government plans and good practice, but also provide space for sector actors to give critical inputs and influence government decisions. However, there are no follow-up mechanisms to ensure uptake of these suggestions. CSOs also organise consultation or dissemination meetings, providing a platform for government-CSO dialogue.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Only large CSOs working closely with the government are invited to participate in meetings. A lack of information, invitation and distance from the capital are barriers to participation for smaller CSOs.

There is no structural mechanism by which larger NGOs ensure participation of grassroots NGOs in SDG processes.

CSOs contribute to these meetings by bringing data and evidence but are not involved in decision making. CSO inputs are often perceived as criticism of government action, which can hinder regular CSO participation. There is an increasing perception among some CSOs that space for CSOs is shrinking and the government is not open to adverse opinions.

²⁸ <http://wadanatodo.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Civil-society-Report-on-SDGs.pdf>

²⁹ <http://wateraidindia.in/publication/quality-sustainability-toilets/>

³⁰ <https://urban-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/pbaah742.pdf>

³¹ http://accountabilityindia.in/sites/default/files/pdf_files/BudgetBrief_SBM-G_2017-18.pdf

Positive experiences of participation

1. Many high level government officials value and are open to input from civil society. They proactively assure reasonable presence of CSOs to share good practice and innovations.
2. Governments at central and state level are consistently engaged in SDG-related consultations and awareness of the SDGs is increasing among officials, who are making an effort to collate relevant data and make it available to the public.
3. The recognition of the value of ensuring participation of CSOs/NGOs in SDG preparatory processes at the state level eg: Sikkim, Himachal, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar.

Major gaps

1. No structured institutional accountability mechanism from the government – MIS reporting and internal reviews focus on the targets of flagship programmes but not on SDG6 indicators.
2. The number of independent representative surveys is inadequate; large studies are conducted by government departments and third party verification is not transparent. More quantitative studies are needed.
3. Local government institutions have not incorporated SDG targets into their formal, publicly available reporting mechanisms.

Main improvements needed

1. The transparency of data and real-time updates of MIS at national and sub-national levels, reflecting disaggregated data to ensure the inclusion of marginalised communities.
2. Public consultations and community-based monitoring systems need to be constituted to ensure last-mile inclusion.
3. Institutionalisation of robust indicators and a monitoring framework with formal provision for CSO participation.

Recommendations

1. Establish a national indicator and monitoring framework with formal participatory accountability mechanisms.
2. Build the capacity of state and local administrative units – gram panchayats (GPs) and urban local bodies (ULBs) – to integrate SDGs into action plans and monitoring mechanisms. GPs and ULBs should develop participatory review mechanisms to ensure no one is left behind. Third-party reviews from GPs should be transparent.
3. Capacity-building of CSOs at the state level to actively engage and contribute to strong accountability mechanisms through evidence-based advocacy. CSOs should work together to give constructive collective feedback to the government.
4. Develop IEC material in vernacular languages to popularise SDGs, and promote public awareness and demand for achieving SDGs.

Documentation: 32 online survey responses, 11 in-depth interviews from nine organisations/institutions, FGD with 15 participants, and review of third party reports.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Kenya was chosen by UN-Water for the baseline pilot voluntary reporting on SDG6 submitted in 2017 as part of preparation for the HLPF reporting in 2018. The National Steering Committee (NSC) was formed incorporating government ministries, bilateral-multilateral agencies, local and international NGOs, CSOs and the private sector. The NSC raised awareness at a national level and enhanced capacity in monitoring and

understanding of global level plans for monitoring SDG6 indicators. Data was therefore collected on the SDG indicators and validation workshops were held with stakeholders as part of the reporting process. A final pilot progress report on SDG6 (using the updated methodologies adopted by the UN) was submitted to the UN and the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW) in November 2017.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The NSC on SDG6 was convened by the Ministry of Water and Irrigation to coordinate and oversee reporting on SDG6. It has sub-committees responsible for monitoring and reporting on each of the six indicators. The Committee has 56 members from government institutions, academic institutions, NGOs, bilateral-multilateral agencies, CSOs and the private sector. Meetings and workshops have taken place but these focused on finalising the report to UN-Water. Members of the NSC collect data and metadata for the purpose of global reporting. So far the NSC has: identified SDG6 focal point and relevant policy and monitoring stakeholders; established an intersectoral monitoring team with technical teams for each target/indicator; identified linkages to existing policy and monitoring processes; and reviewed SDG6 monitoring methodologies, collected baseline data and finalised the progress report on SDG6 shared in 2017.

The Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) is an independent institution with the constitutional mandate to monitor, investigate and advise the nation on human

rights, including the right to water and sanitation. KNCHR is a member of the NSC for SDG6 reporting. KNCHR monitors progress towards the right to water and sanitation.

The Annual Water Conference week convened by the Ministry of Water brings together all water actors in Kenya to review progress and challenges in the water sector. The Inter-Agency Coordination Committee (ICC) holds quarterly meetings and there is an annual sanitation conferences convened by the Ministry of Health. These enable stakeholders to share experiences and new technologies in the water and sanitation sector.

The Kenya Water and Sanitation Civil Society Network (KEWASNET) acts as an accountability mechanism, checking the government's performance on delivering the population's rights to access to water and adequate sanitation. KEWASNET compiles an annual CSO sector report.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Under the NSC, CSOs are involved through KEWASNET. In annual or quarterly fora, the CSOs are involved individually

by attending the meetings, participating in the discussions, presentations, validations and policy influencing.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation

1. At the NSC, CSOs are represented by the mother organisation (KEWASNET) which consists of 30 CSOs. Sometimes this does not give full representation and feedback to members, thus limiting the capacity of individual CSOs to effectively participate in the process.
2. Meetings have cost implications for CSOs, limiting their ability to meet and deliberate on issues for effective engagement with government agencies for accountability.
3. Some CSOs are not members of KEWASNET and not all private sector players are part of Kenya Private Sector Association (KEPSA); their views and contributions are left out.

Positive experiences of participation

1. Government acknowledges, respects and engages with CSOs in a consultative manner since they form part of the accountability mechanism. CSOs participate in the planning, execution and reviews through open sharing and discussions among WASH sector partners with government.
2. Some CSOs are co-conveners of Technical Working Groups (TWGs) that feed into SDG6 reporting, while others are members of sub-committees for SDG6 indicators under the NSC, providing opportunities to engage with the government.
3. CSOs receive updates on developments in the sector and are challenged by the government institutions on their own involvement. This acts as a peer review mechanism.

Major gaps

1. Lack of a well-structured participation by the CSOs due to ad hoc meetings.
2. Lack of capacity (knowledge and financial) by CSOs to effectively engage and hold the government accountable.
3. Poor information sharing within the organisations taking part in the SDG6 forum. Information often retained only by staff who attend meetings.

Opportunities presented to improve participation

1. According to their strengths, individual CSOs could be incorporated into the sub-committees responsible for reporting on each indicator, to increase their ability to participate in the process.
2. KEWASNET could have periodic meetings scheduled to discuss SDG6 accountability with members. In such a forum, KEWASNET could give feedback on the NSC's progress, processes and get input from members to present in NSC meetings.
3. The capacity of the CSOs on SDG6 could be developed and CSO participation at county level strengthened.

Main improvements needed

1. County-based monitoring, reporting and accountability mechanisms need strengthening as SDG6 indicators are largely devolved in the Kenyan system of governance.
2. Both horizontal and vertical information sharing on SDG6 progress needs to be improved.
3. Adequate resources need to be secured for effective engagement and involvement; monitoring, reporting and accountability mechanisms need strengthening.

Recommendations

1. Build CSO capacity for effective participation at county level, to improve data acquisition, analysis and reporting to the NSC.
2. Improved dissemination of the processes, roles, responsibilities, timelines and outcomes of SDG6 implementation, with CSOs, the private sector and other development partners at county and national level.
3. The NSC, KEWASNET and other committees need structured, regular meetings to enable effective engagement and ownership among all stakeholders

Reporting progress on SDG6

Maldives has submitted a VNR³² on progress towards SDG6 for the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) in 2018. According to the latest information from the SDG division, Maldives will

be participating in the HLPF in 2018, but will not officially be reporting its VNR at the HLPF.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The government of Maldives has established an SDG department within the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE) resourced with five staff. The department is responsible for implementation, monitoring and reporting on the implementation process.

The national water policy has been developed in alignment with the SDGs and the MEE has conducted a number of workshops in Maldives to develop stakeholder awareness on SDG goals and related activities being planned. This policy allows space for CSO engagement in WASH monitoring, which will become a launch pad for feasible accountability activities.

The MEE is currently implementing water supply schemes in 49 islands under the Climate Adaptation Project. Over MVR 200 million has been budgeted for this work which is planned to be completed in 2018. Each of the 49 projects have a separate component for design and supervision consultancy, construction and operation, and service provision.

Each project starts with a community consultation, with an emphasis on socioeconomic, environmental and technical feasibility. Such activities are potential entry points for CSOs to engage in accountability dialogue with the government on progress towards attaining SDG targets.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

A number of CSOs and NGOs from different parts of Maldives participated in workshops held to create awareness about the SDGs. However, WaterCare, the only national level water CSO that has experience in working with development partners such as UNDP, UNICEF, WHO and MEE on SDG6-related projects,

was not invited to these workshops. WaterCare constantly engage with the MEE and several of the SDG partners (from the time of the Millennium Development Goals) on water and sanitation issues. Overall, it is positive that CSOs from different parts of the country are being introduced to the SDGs.

³² <http://www.environment.gov.mv/v2/en/types/publications?filter-department=3085>

Main improvements needed

1. Monitoring and accountability mechanisms are yet to be developed.
2. Cultural change is needed within government and development partners.
3. Improved mechanisms need to be developed or existing systems improved in order to facilitate meaningful stakeholder engagement. This will create incentives and provide opportunities for innovation to move SDG6 forward.

Major gaps

1. Effective platforms for marginalised stakeholder participation is lacking. CSO voices are not being listened to – they are simply invited to sit and listen to presentations. Some workshop participants who contributed to discussions expressed concerns over whether their input was taken seriously.
2. It is still foreign to the government, as well as many development partners, to engage CSOs in bottom up accountability. Much still needs to be done in preparation for reporting to the UN HLPF in 2018.

Recommendations

Government should:

1. Develop an SDG stakeholder partnership network which is continuously updated, promoting increased synergy.
2. Make use of existing technology and social media to promote the objectives of SDG6.
3. Innovate in stakeholder engagement. It is insufficient to continue inviting stakeholders to participate in traditional style workshops, where participants listen to presentations and sometimes engage in activities but with no further participation or continuity in policy development or their application. Ideally, CSOs need to be provided with opportunities to take up useful roles in the SDG attainment process, which requires defining roles, establishing CSO networks, capacity building, development programmes and the appropriate funding required for implementation.
4. Find ways to address gaps in the recent national water policy. Comparing the government's reporting on SDG6 for 2017 and the recent water policy illustrate these gaps.

CSOs should:

1. Widen networks so that non-water related NGOs also realise the essential need for water and sanitation services, delivered at the conflicting juncture of human rights and economic good. A relevant Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) model can address this. The IWRM model can be used to promote the inter-sectoral collaboration necessary to achieve SDG6.
2. Take an active interest in the SDGs and become proactive in pushing SDG6 forward.
3. Raise funds to support the development and implementation of a CSO strategy plan for monitoring and accountability roles towards SDG6. The funds will be used for CSO capacity building, strengthening networks and empowerment.

Documentation: online survey; semi-structured interviews with targeted participants and focus groups; secondary data collected from open sources.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Mali is demonstrating accountability for SDG6 through the creation of the Ministry of the Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development (MEADD). A national workshop on ownership and prioritisation of the SDGs has been organised, alongside parallel regional workshops. Sectoral reviews aimed at assessing the implementation of policies and indicators are

being undertaken, and a workshop to validate the roadmap on accelerating the implementation of the SDGs organised. The institutional framework for the implementation of the SDGs is being developed, meetings to report to members of Parliament organised, and consultation of water and sanitation stakeholders taking place.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

- The creation of the MEADD.
- The adoption of the Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development Framework (CREDD).
- A joint review of water, sanitation, the environment and state land undertaken.
- The National Water Council and local water councils to question members of the government through the Democratic Forum on the monitoring of water and sanitation issues.
- National workshops on the SDGs and high-level meetings between CSOs and water and sanitation departments organised.
- The organisation of discussion frameworks in relation to revising WASH legislation (including the Water Code, Water and Sanitation Policy).
- National fora on water and sanitation organised.

These groups are largely organised by the state through the water and sanitation network. Allstakeholders in the sector (civil society, technical and financial partners and the private sector) participate in preparing, facilitating and monitoring recommendations. These various frameworks allow non-state stakeholders to participate in these forums, which help accelerate the implementation of recommendations and increase the visibility of the sector year on year, as well as its funding.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

CSOs participate in different ways, depending on the type of system. This includes, for example:

- Participating in defining and validating the terms of reference.
- Acting as representatives on the preparatory, thematic and technical committees.
- Attending exhibitions.
- Presenting successful case studies through papers at meetings.
- Providing data.
- Supporting the organisation of roadshows, marches and petitions.
- Encouraging citizen participation in infrastructure management.
- Participating in debates.
- Formulating and monitoring recommendations.
- Assessing the road map on progress towards the Implementation of recommendations produced by the sectoral reviews.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation

1. The low level of CSO representation in these mechanisms.
2. The lack or absence of financial resources allocated to these frameworks.
3. The limited operation of some mechanisms.
4. The limited implementation of recommendations produced by these frameworks.

Opportunities presented to improve participation

1. The opportunity for a framework for stakeholders in the sector to discuss and share ideas on national interests.
2. Sharing experiences and reporting and monitoring mechanisms for the implementation of public policies.
3. Enhancing the visibility of the sector.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The joint sectoral review and annual consultation with water and sanitation stakeholders.
2. The Democratic Forum and local accountability groups in some communities.
3. Participation in the Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) process.

Main gaps

1. Funding and strengthening of the consultation frameworks.
2. Regular monitoring of recommendations produced by the frameworks.
3. CSO representation in the mechanisms.

Main improvements needed

1. The time-limited nature of the panel in the Democratic Forum.
2. The weakness of monitoring mechanisms due to the lack of financial resources.
3. The limited incorporation of recommendations produced during the consultations on water and sanitation policies.

Recommendations

1. Develop technical resources to accelerate harmonisation and data production processes for monitoring the SDGs.
2. Mobilise funding to implement Mali's SDG roadmap and build technical capacity among stakeholders in the sector.
3. Develop communications and share information with all stakeholders in the sector.

Documentation: 22 questionnaires completed; nine organisations/institutions surveyed; 15 organisations/institutions at the validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The evaluation process for SDG6 for the 2018 High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) is the responsibility of the President's Office, together with the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), which in turn coordinates with the National Water Commission (CONAGUA), custodian agency of all SDG6 targets.

Although the coordinating platform of CSOs for the 2030 Agenda (CSOMex2030) asked to be effectively involved

in the preparation of the country report to be presented at the United Nations High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) in July 2018 – a request made to both the President's Office and the General Directorate for CSO Coordination within the Foreign Office – sources interviewed stated that there is currently no intention to consult non-state actors in the production of this specific review on SDG6.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Set up by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) and the President's Office, the National Monitoring Platform for the SDGs is the official online platform for presenting government information on the SDGs (agenda2030.mx). Data on indicators for each SDG should be uploaded onto the platform, along with data disaggregated by state. However, there is no such disaggregation for water

and sanitation and the only SDG6 indicator for which there is data, is for indicator 6.3.1: "proportion of wastewater safely treated". When reporting on the enjoyment of the human right to water and sanitation recognised in the constitution (key for SDG6), the government is not reporting according to human right standards and indicators.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

On the 2030 Agenda, civil society does not have any effective involvement, either in developing the national or sectoral implementation strategy or in the monitoring platforms of the 2030 Agenda, in spite of proposing various forms of participation over the last two years and numerous declarations from the authorities that they would implement them.

However, CSO initiatives have delivered robust reports calling for accountability on progress on water and sanitation issues linked to human rights frameworks, particularly the examination of the UN Expert Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR) in March 2018 and for the Special Rapporteur on water and sanitation for his official visit in May 2017. These reports identified gaps, right violations, and challenges in realising the human right to water and sanitation and offered draft recommendations reflecting the complex reality in Mexico in terms of access to water and sanitation.

In 2016, the CSOMex2030 coordinating platform included its recommendations for the report to the HLPF as an annex

to Mexico's first voluntary report, identifying the need to: "Formalise a mechanism for dialogue around the 2030 Agenda between civil society and government, which will enable the design of a national strategy for monitoring, establishing and evaluating the SDGs, as well as developing an ownership strategy, with an emphasis on discriminated groups.

" Almost two years have passed, and there are still no formal mechanisms. The development of the national strategy has been limited to consultation by means of regional dialogues with civil society. The consultation has been limited, as no discussion took place on how best to enable effective contributions. Addressing the lack of effective inclusion in the creation of the 2030 Agenda national strategy will require sharing the strategy with sufficient time allocated for comments and contributions from non-state actors, and assurances that these will be taken into account. This should take place before the national council for the 2030 Agenda validates the strategy.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation

The level of involvement extended to civil society post adoption reveals a significant lack of political will to establish effective and inclusive participation mechanisms both for implementation (developing strategies) and accountability. This has led to frustration among the academic and CSO participants involved in this study since the Agenda was adopted. Civil society continues to present alternative reports to reveal Mexican water and sanitation realities through different mechanisms.

Main improvements needed

1. Create inclusive mechanisms and frameworks with a human rights approach and make existing ones truly participatory to improve institutional credibility.
2. Improve, verify and update the quality and scope of data on water and sanitation, with a focus on the importance of acquiring disaggregated data for vulnerable communities.
3. Increase ownership of the Agenda by disseminating its content to all stakeholders, particularly on the significance and implications of SDG6 at local levels.

The present study uncovered many weaknesses, primarily based on a lack of trust in the government and sector institutions due to the absence of an independent regulatory and auditing body for CONAGUA, as well as a lack of reliable, up-to-date and accessible data, and a lack of political will to develop a national and sectoral strategy for the Agenda in a truly inclusive and participatory way.

Recommendations

For the government:

1. Ensure the inclusive and participatory approach required for implementing, monitoring and reporting on each SDG in the 2030 Agenda aligns with human rights principles and standards.
2. Create a sectoral mechanism with an interdisciplinary approach to gather disaggregated accessible and current data on the SDG6 indicators for monitoring and reporting on progress towards SDG targets. Create a regulatory body to validate this data.
3. Fund and create an information campaign for different audiences, as well as training workshops on the scope of SDG6, for both subnational and local CSOs and state, municipal and local authorities.

For CSOs:

1. Create interdisciplinary alliances (environment, health, energy, women, indigenous communities, education) between NGOs and CSOs to ensure an integrated agenda and implementation.
2. Create alliances with intergovernmental and development partners to gather qualitative data on marginalised groups (indigenous, women, children, disabled and elderly).
3. Conduct a risk analysis on the implications of the international agenda for the most vulnerable communities.

For development partners:

1. Build alliances to design and fund inter-sectoral mechanisms to gather disaggregated local data and evidence for marginalised communities, retaining the interconnectivity of the SDGs.
2. Generate international pressure and advocate in government platforms to enable effective participatory mechanisms that include CSOs and academia in decision-making on the implementation and accountability mechanisms for the 2030 Agenda.
3. Co-finance participation mechanisms and capacity building for civil society and academia engagement on accountability mechanisms. Review and reassess continuing to fund analysis, training and advocacy programmes in middle-income countries where the highest levels of inequality exist, to identify and reduce this inequality gap with regard to water and sanitation targets.

Based on: 18 completed surveys, six organisations and institutions interviewed, eight organisations and institutions present at the validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Nepal is currently in the transitional phase of a new political system. The new constitution (2015) restructured the country's political system as a Federal Democratic Republican State with seven provincial and 756 local government structures. The government of Nepal (GoN) has prioritised framing and establishing new structures, establishing institutional arrangements, systems, policies, human resources, the formulation of laws and bylaws. All ministerial, departmental and sub-departmental structures are being established to fit the newly federal administrative system. The same process at provincial and local level has not yet started.

The government has not yet decided whether to report to the HLPF in 2018. The Economic Management Division (EMD) of the National Planning Commission (NPC) is the focal point for preparing any such report. The EMD was unable to supply

information on the convening and reporting of the HLPF in June 2018. In reporting processes to date, it has used various data sources: national survey reports such as the National Living Standard Survey, the Demographic Health Survey, the Annual Report of the Health Department and current publications of UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) of GoN. The government monitor the water and sanitation sector's activities through the National Management Information Program (NMIP) based within the Ministry of Water Supply and Sanitation (MoWSS). Recent data generated by this system will be used in any report.

The NPC has established a system to perform consultation with key stakeholders to review sector progress, report preparation and policy finalisation. All draft and final reports are available online.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The NPC is accountable for overall planning and progressing the SDGs. Three high-level committees have been formed to help achieve the SDGs. A steering committee is chaired by the Prime Minister; a coordination committee is chaired

by the Vice Chairman of the NPC and nine thematic committees are headed by NPC members. SDG6 is part of the urban development thematic committee's remit.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Nepal has made significant progress on engaging wider sector actors in progressing WASH after the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) initiatives. The National Hygiene and Sanitation Master Plan (NHSP) 2011 was instrumental in creating CSOs' mechanisms for holding government accountable, which supported progress towards the MDGs. The plan established WASH Coordination Committees (WASHCCs) at national, regional, district and local levels, in which CSOs and other actors participate.

The WASHCCs promote collaborative efforts and local ownership, and have contributed to the creation of a social movement around improved sanitation. The Joint Sector Review was another effective mechanism for promoting the participation of CSOs and other stakeholders in joint planning,

reviewing sector performance, planning future actions and building a common consensus among sector actors. Other major events with CSOs' involvement include the WASH conference, review meetings and workshops, joint monitoring, and a national day of celebration.

WASH sector initiatives see a high level of CSO participation. The Federation of Drinking Water and Sanitation Users (FEDWASUN), community-based organisations, NGOs, political party workers, teachers and children's clubs take part. Occasionally, international NGOs organise issue-based information sharing events or review and reflection events. Minutes are documented and shared. Since 2014, however, most of these mechanisms have been inactive, which poses a significant challenge to the sector.

Positive experiences of participation:

There are many positive experiences and significant outcomes of participation in the WASH sector. The creation of the social movement around improved sanitation is one such successful outcome. When sector actors meet frequently (up to two or three times a month at local levels) at all levels of the WASHCCs, they analyse the context and issues, develop action plans and act in partnership. This helps to build mutual trust and confidence among sector actors and harmonise operational actions. Within a short period of time, this approach has been successful, with a higher (92%) percentage of sanitation coverage. The second joint sector review brought the attention of sector stakeholders to critical issues of WASH. The review programme concluded with 34 declarations, with the policy issues now addressed in the sector development plan (SDP).

Main gaps

There is an information gap between the NPC and other sector actors on progress towards the SDGs. Most CSOs and other sector actors do not know the status of the SDGs in Nepal. Most government officials and sector actors are confused about their roles in making progress towards the SDGs due to the recent restructuring of the political system.

Main improvements needed

All the established WASH sector mechanisms have been inactive over the past three years, contrasting with the high level of activity seen between 2011 to 2014. Reactivation of these mechanisms is now a priority. Most CSOs are not clear on their functional roles. Clearly defined roles are essential, to improve and strengthen capacity and analyse the critical issues facing the field. Enhanced capacity among CSOs is essential to polish their dynamic leadership in achieving contextual requirements of the SDG. There is a need to reframe existing mechanisms to align with the newly restructured federal system. The lack of a self-sustaining strategy is problematic for CSOs in Nepal.

Recommendations

1. The government should develop a plan to reactivate all existing mechanisms/structures, supporting them to function and engage wider sector actors.
2. The government should open comprehensive discussions with sector actors on strategies and plans for localising SDG targets and enhancing operational action.
3. The government and development partners should plan for institutional capacity building and sustainability of CSOs.
4. CSOs should have defined roles. CSOs should undertake contextual analyses of the issues facing the sector to educate government and sector partners, advocating and supporting them to achieve the SDG targets.
5. FECOFUN and NEFSCUN are resource organisations established to develop the functionality of local issues-based groups. The knowledge these organisations have developed should be replicated in the WASH sector with drinking water and sanitation user groups.

Reporting progress on SDG6

While there is no overall SDG implementation strategy, reporting mechanisms include:

1. The first annual SDG report was presented to Parliament in May 2017 and submitted as a VNR to the High Level Political Forum (HLPF). The 2018 report will not be submitted to the HLPF. Annual reports are published online.
2. In 2017 the National Auditor General reported on how the country is tackling and reporting on the SDGs.

3. In 2016, the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) published its first statistical report on SDG progress, with brief reflections on 6.1 - 6.4. Its second more detailed update was presented in 2018, identifying good progress on 6.1 and 6.2, with more progress needed on 6.3, 6.4 and 6.6.

4. The Netherlands is contributing to and funding the SDG6 synthesis report (UN-Water, 2018). This will include information on the Netherlands and offer recommendations to the HLPF.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Water sector progress is monitored in more detail than SDG6 through pre-existing systems and accountability is well organised around national water policies (e.g. the 2009 Water Act, the Regional Water Authorities Act, the Delta Programme), the EU Water Framework Directive/Kaderrichtlijn Water and through different water boards and private sector companies.

The Ministry of Infrastructure and Water (MoIE) reports to Parliament on implementation and negotiation with provinces,

municipalities, water authorities and private water companies. Negotiation is organised through a water steering body of the MoIE, with regular consultation events.

CSOs do not participate, but receive meeting reports. The Overlegorgaan Infrastructuur en Milieu (OIM) is another consultative platform of the MoIE for a wider group of stakeholders, CSOs included, with regular events to advise the government.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

There is either low awareness of SDG6 mechanisms, or the perception that mechanisms around SDG6 offer little added value above existing processes. Multi stakeholder participation in national SDG6 accountability mechanisms includes:

1. The MoIE's SDG6 monitoring system was established after events in which Jordan, Netherlands, Peru, Senegal, and Uganda participated, coordinated by the National IHP-HWRP Committee.³³ Government agencies, knowledge institutions and UN organisations took part but there was no CSO or private sector participation.

2. Existing mechanisms were used for most targets in the UN-Water SDG6 synthesis report.

3. The annual SDG report for Parliament uses a multi stakeholder approach (including municipalities, CSOs, academia, private sector and youth). It uses CBS and Rijkswaterstaat³⁴ data. UVW, coordinated by VNG International³⁵ also provides input. CSOs (mainly internationally focused) are involved through Partos³⁶, the NGO platform.

4. The CBS report uses a multi stakeholder approach, but for SDG6 existing CBS and Rijkswaterstaat data was used. No third party validation of data was arranged by CBS.

5. SDG Charter: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) established a voluntary platform for action on the SDGs, including SDG6. Partos invites CSOs, meaning national CSOs/private sector organisations are generally unaware of the charter.

³³ The Committee is a platform of Dutch scientists, policy-makers and practitioners focused on water. Together, the Committee members define the Dutch position regarding the water programmes of UNESCO (IHP) and WMO (HWRP). See <http://ihp-hwrp.nl> for more.

³⁴ Implementing entity of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Water.

³⁵ International Cooperation Agency of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities.

³⁶ Dutch membership body for organisations working in international development.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation:

While national progress is needed on SDG6, such as 6.3 and 6.4, current participatory mechanisms offer no clear distinction between the roles of CSOs in national or international development. Contact platforms are oriented to development cooperation. It is important for CSOs and the government to determine which CSOs to involve in accountability for national SDG6 targets.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The approachability of water experts within the government results in positive interactions.
2. The willingness to focus on SDG17 demonstrates openness to apply a multi stakeholder approach for annual reporting or through the SDG charter to connect different stakeholders with government.

Main gaps

1. The lack of an assessment by government about awareness among water stakeholders (CSOs, private sector) of the value of working within SDG6 frameworks. The government assumes that low interest in SDG6 is due to the more extensive monitoring and accountability in other water sector mechanisms, but this is evidence-based. This limits national stakeholders and CSOs in evaluating whether it is desirable to hold the government accountable within SDG6 frameworks.
2. Existing platforms used to contact CSOs largely consist of internationally oriented organisations.
3. Effective involvement of the private sector. More criteria from government required to comply with SDGs.

Potential of the mechanisms for more effective participation

1. Transparent communications would encourage participation of more/different CSOs.
2. Larger pool of data to fill existing gaps.
3. Water stakeholders can strengthen the progress of other SDGs.

Main improvements needed

1. Distinctions between CSO and other stakeholders involved in national and international progress.
2. Centralised and simplified communications for national CSOs and the private sector providing existing and potential new mechanisms for SDG6 and participation in reports/events.
3. The interconnectedness of SDG6 with other SDGs needs clarification from the government in communications and invitations for multi-stakeholder participation.

Recommendations

1. The government should conduct research among nationally active water stakeholders to understand their willingness to participate in SDG6 accountability mechanisms.
2. The government and other stakeholders should create a database of all water-related organisations and provide coordinated communications on SDG6, for example, a website or open source data system. Smaller organisations could participate and exchange good practice. Clear distinctions between national and international targets and participation would be needed.
3. CSOs should take responsibility for their role in existing accountability mechanisms and share clear explanations and information about progress on SDG6 with the public. Geographical differences within Netherlands should be explained to avoid misinterpretations and make civil society participation easier and more valuable for influencing decision making.

Based on: 32 questionnaires answered, 13 organisations interviewed, 14 people of 11 organisations present at validation meeting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Following the adoption of the SDGs by the international community, Niger's Ministry of Water and Sanitation (MHA) adopted two plans/programmes in May 2017 with a view to attaining SDG6 – the Water, Hygiene and Sanitation Sector Programme (PROSEHA) 2016–2030 and the National Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Management (PANGIRE) 2017–2030. These documents, which cover all SDG6 targets, have been widely disseminated across the sector. A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide has been adopted for the PROSEHA.

The MHA's Directorate of Research and Programming and Directorate of Statistics are tasked with monitoring progress towards SDG6 and reporting to the UN and Niger will report on progress towards SDG6 at the High-Level Political Forum in July 2018. The country intends to set up a committee comprising representatives from all stakeholder groups, as it did for the high-level meetings for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Water and sanitation sector review: This annual review covers all SDG6 targets and extends to the entire water and sanitation sector. A committee comprising representatives of the government, technical and financial partners (TFPs), donors and NGOs prepares for the review meeting. This includes a presentation of the annual activity report (including the financial component) and a report on the indicators.

All participants are given an opportunity to critique the presentations. All stakeholders, in their respective capacities – ministries involved in the sector, TFPs, CSOs, local authorities and the private sector – present their concerns regarding their activities. The review also includes a political dialogue between relevant ministries of the government and TFPs, chaired by the Prime Minister or his representative. At the end of the meeting, a general report is drafted, accompanied by the resolutions and recommendations from the review, and the commitments made by the government and TFPs. These recommendations and commitments are subsequently reviewed at government–TFP consultation framework meetings, and a progress update is given at the next sector review meeting.

The National Water and Sanitation Commission (CNEA): The CNEA is the advisory and consultation body for the entire water and sanitation sector. It helps set the general aims and objectives of Niger's national water and sanitation policy. The CNEA is made up of seven institutional panels: government; local authorities; NGOs and associations; private commercial companies; users of the sector; national and regional specialist organisations; and development partners. The CNEA is supposed to meet every six months. Unfortunately, over the past five years, it has become dormant and is no longer meeting regularly. It may be revived through implementation of the PANGIRE, for which it acts as the lead entity.

Government–TFP consultation framework: Consultation framework meetings bring the government (led by the MHA) face to face with TFPs active in the sector. Other stakeholders do not attend these meetings. The framework is active and

meets every two months. At the end of each meeting, commitments are made on both sides and a report is drafted, but the outcomes of the meetings are not shared outside government and donor circles.

Government-NGO consultation framework: The government-NGO consultation framework provides an opportunity to discuss water and sanitation programme aims and implementation modalities, and to coordinate the work of NGOs active in the water and sanitation sector (using joint programming, M&E and research tools). The platform brings together the government, NGOs and development associations active in the sector.

These NGOs and associations are organised into a WASH cluster for emergency humanitarian operations, and into a national WASH coalition for development activities, led by a lead partner. Both entities comprise representatives of UNICEF, the government and NGOs. Community-based organisations are not represented. The framework meets every three months. While only established two years ago, the meetings are dynamic and regular, meaning NGOs and CSOs are likely to see their influence grow as time passes. CSOs seem to hold greater sway over local authorities, in all likelihood because this is where much of their funding comes from.

Forum with local authorities: The MHA arranges this forum once a year to demonstrate accountability for its activities to local authorities. This is an extremely important framework, as the participants are elected community representatives. The MHA provides an update on progress in the water and sanitation sector and outlines future programming.

The discussions are a chance for local authority representatives to learn about their role as the contracting authority for public water and sanitation services, and to raise their concerns on this issue. The platform has two weaknesses. First, it is difficult to bring together enough mayors to make the meeting truly representative of the country as a whole. And second, the outcomes of the meeting are not widely disseminated.

Other mechanisms:

- At regional level: An annual meeting, attended by all stakeholders (including CSOs), is held in each region. At these meetings, stakeholders provide progress updates on their interventions. Sectoral progress reports are also presented at Regional Council meetings.
- At the communal level: Consultation frameworks, Municipal Council meetings.

- Niger's National Water Day, organised by the Water Solidarity Programme (pS-Eau): The events take place annually in Lyon, France, with a large Nigerien delegation in attendance (Members of Parliament, mayors, government representatives, private sector, CSOs) alongside the French contingent (elected representatives, NGOs and decentralised cooperation partners). Delegates present and discuss the water and sanitation sector, which gives rise to an advocacy session to mobilise funding and technical assistance.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The CSOs and TFPs are well organised. Lead representatives share comprehensive information and documents about mechanism meetings with their members. All CSOs in the sector attend meetings on the accountability mechanisms

relevant to them. The main barrier to CSOs using the mechanisms more effectively lies in their limited ability to challenge the government, due to their poor organisational capacity and advocacy skills.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The MHA's annual review includes achievements by NGOs and associations.
2. The MHA has established the government–NGO consultation framework.
3. The WASH Parliamentary Network (REPEHA) and the WASH Journalists' Network (REJEA) have been set up through lobbying and support from CSOs.

Main improvements needed

1. Ensure that all stakeholders take ownership of the SDG6 targets and indicators.
2. Secure a stronger political commitment by giving CSOs more involvement in, and greater accountability for, monitoring SDG targets and citizen oversight.

Main gaps

1. Dormancy of some accountability mechanisms.
2. Failure to disseminate meeting outcomes widely.

Recommendations

1. For the government: Ensure all stakeholders take ownership of PROSEHA targets/indicators.
2. For the government and TFPs: Support CSOs with capacity-building on advocacy/lobbying.
3. For the government, TFPs and CSOs: Ensure that respective commitments are upheld.
4. For TFPs and CSOs: Be active in funding and implementing the PROSEHA and the PANGIRE.

Documentation: Completed questionnaires: 27; interviews conducted: nine; organisations present at the validation meeting: 43.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Reporting on SDG6 is undertaken by SDG Desk Officers within Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) who collate all MDA interventions and report them using an SDG national reporting framework developed by the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs). OSSAP-SDG office also carries out inter-governmental coordination, strategic communications and advocacy around

the SDGs agenda, planning, multi-stakeholders' partnership and involvement as well as resource mobilisation. This process of reporting on Goal 6 also incorporates activities from CSOs, organised private sector and the academia through the various coordination umbrella committees who also feed into the SDG National Reporting Framework.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The National Council on Water Resources: The council invites stakeholders working on SDG6 to attend annual meetings. The Council also develops and circulates a template for submission of memoranda on issues stakeholders want the Council to address.

The National Task Group on Sanitation (NTGS): All stakeholders working on SDG6 are represented at monthly meetings. Stakeholders present reports of work done, activities to be conducted, challenges in implementation of SDG6 and discuss how best to achieve SDG6.

National Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS): A round table conference bringing together WASH stakeholders to discuss achieving CLTS. Government agencies interact with CSOs and development partners to measure achievements and the government is held accountable on shortfalls.

The Network of Water and Sanitation (NEWSAN): A coalition of CSOs working on SDG6 who also serve as a pressure group on government.

The National Roadmap Towards Eliminating Open Defecation: Developed by the Federal Ministry of Water Resources, this document contains targets and guidance on implementation to end open defecation by 2020. The government can be held accountable against these targets.

Donor Partners Group: The group consists of INGOs which partner with the government on SDG6-related activities, as well as part funding projects and monitoring progress.

National stakeholder consultation meetings/workshops: These track the government's progress on SDG6.

The Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Information Management System (WASHIMS): This system tracks the progress and implementation of the ODF/Total Sanitation Certification Protocol and monitors value for money of SDG6 activities.

The Inter-ministerial Committee on National Environmental Sanitation: The Committee brings together stakeholders on environmental issues which are linked to implementation of SDG6.

WASH Ambassador: The Ambassador advocates to the government on achieving SDG6 targets.

The Network for Water and Sanitation (NEWSAN): A coalition of NGOs with representation in all states. NEWSAN is represented by the National Coordinator at the NTGS. The coalition undertakes monitoring and evaluations, conducts advocacies, participates in government activities and serves as a pressure group on government.

The CSO Advisory Group on SDGs: Established by the Office of the Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs). CSOs participate in reporting on the implementation of SDG6. The government is held accountable through shadow reporting by CSOs.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

Positive experiences of participation:

1. Government openness: Participatory approach of the government, involving multiple actors in SDG6.
2. OSSAP – SDG office: Providing coordination for all stakeholders to report on SDG6.
3. National Task Group on Sanitation (NTGS): Involvement of stakeholders including CSOs in the NTGS.
4. CSO Advisory Group on the SDGs: The development of a CSO platform at national collating and reporting level that brings CSOs together to contribute to reporting on SDG6.
5. National Council on Water Resources: The Council provides opportunity for stakeholders working on SDG6 to participate, contribute and submit issues.
6. The dissemination of the results of a baseline survey on the status and utilisation of WASH facilities in schools: An activity conducted by the Federal Ministry of Education involving other stakeholders to measure education sector targets on SDG6.
7. Partnership for Expanded Water Supply and Sanitation and Hygiene (PEWASH) (2016 – 2030): A document prepared with participation from CSOs/stakeholders to achieve SDG6.
8. Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS): The involvement of CSOs in monitoring and reporting achievement of CLTS progress in Nigeria.

Main gaps

1. Leave no one behind: The need to build capacity of CSOs and broaden CSO involvement at all levels with evidence-based reporting. This will decentralise accountability mechanisms, moving them closer to grassroots level, allowing more participation, wider input, critiques, evidence-based learning and M&E.
2. Legislation and political will: It is necessary to adopt and implement legislation that will promote CSO participation in SDG6, addressing gaps and challenges for CSOs.
 3. Improve opportunities/mechanism: Holding the government accountable through budget monitoring, project implementation and reporting.
 4. CSO funding: Increased funding to support CSO participation in regional and international meetings for peer learning and engaging with other CSOs on SDG6.
 5. Payment of counterpart funding by government: The need for government to pay counterpart funds in time for projects relating to SDG6.
6. Coordination: The need for improved coordination between stakeholders.
7. Lack of data: To improve data collection, management and sharing.
 8. Institutional strengthening: Institutions need to be strengthened to improve accountability mechanisms.

Recommendations

1. A smart way of data generation, monitoring, reporting and accountability for results should be developed. This will require the strengthening of national and sub-national capacities for data generation and processing.
 2. Collaboration among development partners and international M&E bodies should be explored to build the capacity of CSOs for locally based monitoring activities and reporting.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Pakistan was the first country to adopt the SDGs agenda through a unanimous resolution of Parliament. The Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform is responsible for overall reporting on the SDGs to the UN High Level Political Forum

(HLPF). The Pakistan Bureau of Statistics has been assigned the task of preparing country level data. The Ministry of Climate Change is the technical/ line ministry responsible for reporting on SDG6.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

A working group on WASH has been established which consists of representatives from the Ministry of Climate Change, the Council of Research on Water Resources, Unicef, and 27 co-opted members from relevant ministries/stakeholders and provinces. There is, however, limited representation of national and local level CSOs. The Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurements (PSLM) survey provides regular indicators of social and economic progress. The PSLM, previously held annually, focuses on 13 targets of WASH similar to the SDGs.

The Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MICS) acts as another accountability mechanism. Targets 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4 have been adopted by the MICS following the recommendation of the working group on WASH. A monitoring/reporting tool for SDG6.1 and 6.3, prepared by the WHO, is being tested and adapted by the Ministry of Climate Change for future use.

The government of Pakistan achieved a milestone with the formulation of base lines for SDG6 targets using international

definitions. JMP 2017 published these baselines. Since 2017, a government-led Joint Sector Review (JSR) has been initiated in all provinces to set targets for SDG6. WASH Bottleneck Analysis Tools (WASHBAT) and the SDG6 Costing Tool is used. The process will lead to practical and locally appropriate commitments from provincial WASH sector stakeholders participating in JSRs.

All stakeholders participate in JSRs but by invitation only. At federal level, the Pakistan Conference on Sanitation (PAKOSAN) sees provincial governments meet biannually to report/share progress on the SDGs. The South Asian Conference on Sanitation (SACOSAN) acts as another platform for action planning and target setting at regional level. Recently, SDG support units/cells have been established at provincial level by the government with the assistance of UNDP to support and monitor provincial line departments for achieving SDGs targets.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

There is CSO representation on the working group on WASH at federal level. CSOs, academics and other stakeholders participate in PAKOSAN. CSOs make significant contributions to action planning and target setting for SACOSAN.

At a provincial level, CSOs participate in the JSRs, GLASS and Sanitation and Water for All. However, in reality there is

limited opportunity for CSOs to participate effectively in these mechanisms/ platforms. No forums are held to discuss MICS or PSLM reports. Another challenge is that presentations/plans are not made available in advance to help CSOs prepare. Reports are not usually shared with CSOs.

Positive experiences of participation

1. Participation in the JSRs at provincial level was a very positive experience for CSOs, as all stakeholders were there. Relevant departments including P&D, PHED and local government presented their progress, targets and plans. CSOs played an important role in identifying gaps in the plans and progress reports.
2. WASH clusters at provincial level are effective platforms for CSOs to hold provincial government departments accountable to their plans.
3. As a regional platform, SACOSAN is more effective for CSOs. FANSA, the CSOs network, raised communities' issues/concerns and the WASH needs of marginalised groups at SACOSAN. The preparation and presentation of a traffic light paper on progress made by national governments towards previous SACOSAN commitments proved very successful as a way of holding national governments accountable.

Main gaps

1. At federal level, there is no dedicated ministry for WASH. The Ministry of Climate Change has been assigned this task. The Ministry has recently established a WASH cell, which needs to be strengthened. At provincial level, there is duplication of responsibility, with different departments and agencies/companies holding responsibility but with no coordination. Provincial departments are reluctant to involve CSOs in their mechanisms.
2. A lack of planning and monitoring at district/ local level for the SDGs.
3. Academia and the private sector are not involved in existing monitoring mechanisms.

Main improvements needed

1. JSRs held this year were initiated by the federal government in collaboration with Unicef. Provincial government departments need to take ownership of this process. The participation of more CSOs in JSRs will improve their efficacy. Continuity is a challenge as it takes time for the government to fully take ownership of processes initiated by international development partners.
2. PAKOSAN is another platform where provincial governments present WASH sector reviews. The Federal government presents country previews of WASH status, localising SDG targets and strengthening country processes for planning and monitoring SDG targets 6.1 & 6.2. CSOs were not given the opportunity to present the voice of local communities. There was no representation from the private sector.
3. Declarations signed during previous SACOSANs were found to be ineffective, as they were simply long wishlists. Declarations should be limited to targets that national governments can achieve within two years. Furthermore, the declarations should align with SDGs targets.

Recommendations

1. The government should focus on using one information system and mutual accountability platforms to streamline planning and monitoring processes. Provincial finance departments and the Federal Ministry of Finance should be encouraged to publish dedicated financial reporting around spending on WASH SDGs.
2. All stakeholders should be assigned clear roles.
3. The provincial governments should conduct regular JSRs, with a biannual JSR at national level to track progress.
4. Small targets to be achieved in shorter
5. The SDG support units that have been established recently at provincial level need to be strengthened.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The country reports through the Harmonised Public Policy Monitoring Framework (CASE), which was created by the government in 2015, with reference to the Emerging Senegal Plan (PSE) and covering the 2030 and 2063 agendas. The VNR for the UN High-Level Political Forum is managed through the CASE, which is extended to encompass various sections of civil society, researchers and sector stakeholders (including technical ministries). An ad hoc committee has

been created. In addition, the water and sanitation sector monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework was created under the Global Environmental Management Initiative (GEMI) for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6. It is spearheaded by the Millennium Drinking Water and Sanitation Programme (PEPAM) Unit and includes river development directorates, agencies and organisations.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

Parliament: During plenary sessions, Members of Parliament can put oral questions to the government on matters of national importance (during government-led sessions or the annual budget debate and vote).

Government: Diverse civil society stakeholders are invited to participate in the Joint Annual Review (JAR) on public policy (covering all policy areas) via the CASE, giving them an opportunity to attend the report presentation meetings and make their opinions heard.

The Ministry of Water and Sanitation (MHA): Sector CSOs are invited to participate in the water and sanitation JAR, organised by the PEPAM Unit, in order to monitor progress in the sector.

Local level: Dialogue and discussion forums for civil society stakeholders and national directorates/agencies take place, touching on practical issues around improving people's living and working conditions.

Non-governmental organisation (NGO) level: Civil society has set up the National Blue Book Committee and other monitoring frameworks for all SDG6-related civil society organisations (CSOs). The Committee produces SDG6 progress monitoring reports.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

CSOs are not directly involved in plenary sessions in Parliament. Large CSOs are invited to attend one-day meetings to contribute to the JAR process. The dialogue and discussion forums, which meet periodically, are citizen platforms created by community-based organisations (CBOs) and NGOs. Large organisations and CSOs are involved in the National Blue Book Committee and other monitoring frameworks.

CSOs do not enjoy the same level of participation in the JARs as other stakeholders. CSO representatives' input is rarely given due consideration. This is because the information they

provide is not properly codified for inclusion in the national accounts or is treated as unofficial. The JARs offer limited opportunities for participation because the organisers decide which CSOs to invite, based on criteria that are not shared with CSOs. CSOs may participate in citizen platforms in much greater numbers, but they are rarely represented by decision makers. A wide selection of stakeholders is involved in reflection and discussion around the Blue Book, but the National Blue Book Committee has remained dormant since the end of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) process due to scarce funding.

Positive experiences of participation

1. CSOs are involved in the GEMI implementation process and the NGOs that attended the workshop made contributions and learned about the ongoing process.
2. CSOs attend the national SDG progress report presentation workshops. The Council of Non-Governmental Organisations for Development Support (CONGAD) is responsible for organising these workshops, which are attended by a wide selection of CSOs.
3. CONGAD has set up a CSO working group for monitoring the SDGs in Senegal (2018–2020). The working group focuses on SDG6 and there are plans to organise thematic, national and decentralised meetings.

Main gaps

1. The government has always tended to pay lip service to CSOs. The government is disinclined to let CSOs play their role to the full or to recognise their role, outside its international commitments.
2. The JAR process is under-resourced.
3. CSOs lack the financial resources to act autonomously and independently.

Main improvements needed

1. JAR meetings, which should be annual, are not held regularly.
2. CSOs are poorly represented at JAR meetings in terms of number and diversity.
3. Dialogue and discussion forums tend to disband when the corresponding project comes to an end.
4. The Blue Book is not produced every year.

Recommendations

1. The government should involve more and more diverse CSOs in the JAR process and welcome useful contributions from CSOs in a spirit of partnership.
2. CSOs should constantly seek out funding in order to develop their own, appropriate accountability mechanisms, produce better written contributions and make more effective proposals.
3. Local authorities should facilitate and support the creation of citizen platforms for monitoring public policies, programmes, reforms and projects.

Documentation: Questionnaires completed: 14; organisations interviewed: four; organisations present at the validation meeting: 10.

Reporting progress on SDG6

Sri Lanka has committed to achieve the SDGs by 2030 and has established a monitoring mechanism with the establishment of a dedicated Sustainable Development and Wildlife Ministry.

The Ministry has produced a roadmap for achieving the SDGs following a consultative process. A parliamentary select committee has also been established to monitor progress. In addition, a Presidential Expert Committee was appointed in 2017 to prepare a national policy on the achievement of the SDGs. The Committee's draft report was presented to President Maithripala Sirisena in November 2017. Having achieved the MDGs on water and sanitation, Sri Lanka is in a strong position to refocus the sector on SDG6, targets 6.1 and

6.2, and raise service levels for safely managed water and sanitation. The Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply is the lead agency for SDG6.

The Ministry has mainstreamed SDG6 among sector partners and taken the lead role in knowledge management and proposals to establish a monitoring mechanism. Additional building blocks for progress include the UN working group assisting the response to global monitoring through JMP, GLAAS and GEMI (Global Evaluation of Monitoring Indicators). National key performance indicators and benchmarks for WASH have been agreed for SDG6, targets 6.1 and 6.2.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The National Water Supply and Drainage Board, based in the Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply, leads implementation of activities related to SDG6. Sector performance is monitored by the national statistical system operated by the Department of Census and Statistics (DC&S).

Having achieved the MDGs on water and sanitation, Sri Lanka is in a transitional stage from the MDGs to the SDGs. The Ministry of City Planning and Water Supply chairs the National Water and Sanitation Coordination Forum, a platform for all stakeholders to engage in dialogue, with an inclusive approach to maximise synergies and achieve goals.

The process also helps to disseminate information about achievements and validate progress. The key ministries of the government (Water, Education, Health), local government,

donor agencies, national and international NGOs and the private sector attend the Forum (known as WATSAN), where accountability for policy, strategy and resource mobilisation for sector development is shared across all stakeholders.

Special task forces comprising specialists are appointed by the Forum to deal with issues related to policy, institutional and operational aspects. For the above coordination mechanism (WATSAN), a committee was established during monitoring of the MDGs to agree on indicators for the national census survey which is carried out every 10 years. The last national census was conducted in 2012, which formed the basis of the MDG final reports in 2014. A subgroup appointed by the National Coordination Forum is working on matters related to SDG6.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The national WATSAN committee includes members of the FANSA Sri Lanka, represented by CEJ, Plan International, Lanka Rainwater Harvesting Forum, Net Water, and small water supplier associations. They have been partners of both development and emergency WASH responses since the

tsunami response mechanism in 2004, as well as collaborating in Sri Lanka's participation in SACOSAN. During focus group meetings, it was suggested that a discussion should take place on SDG6 accountability mechanisms and monitoring, which is important for effective participation by CSOs.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The current National Water and Sanitation Coordination Forum was established to coordinate the emergency WASH response during the the tsunami recovery phase. The transformation from emergency coordination into regular development coordination was smooth, with CSO roles in the WASH sector recognised. The Forum is of great help for the government when dealing with emergency WASH support.
2. It allowed for effective response on emergency situation and resource mobilisation and also maximised the synergies among stakeholders.
3. Collaborative partnerships for regional and international responses have been established; they have participated in high-level dialogue.
4. Effective interventions in the rural sector have avoided duplication and clearly identified priorities.

Main gaps

1. There is a high staff turnover and lack of continuity both in government and CSOs.
2. Continuous knowledge management on sector activities is not institutionalised within CSOs.
3. The WATSAN committee lacks formal acceptance among different ministries that participate.

Main improvements needed

1. There is a need to strengthen the government's capacity to facilitate the Forum.
2. Meetings need to be conducted on a more regular basis.
3. District level WATSAN coordination forums need to be strengthened.

Recommendations

1. The accountability process, indicators and definitions should be agreed among sector partners.
2. More transparent and participatory consultative mechanisms need to be established to improve representation from marginalised groups and the private sector among others.
3. Coordination between the Ministry of Sustainable Development and the line ministries should be a more formal and thorough mechanism.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The Ministry of Finance and Planning (MoFP) holds responsibility for the SDGs and prepared four frameworks for implementation, namely: the research agenda, localisation, an SDG communication and dissemination strategy and a framework on monitoring and evaluation.

The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) prepared an SDG roadmap; in the process, the data ecosystem in Tanzania was reviewed, the SDG indicators linked with the FYDP II, the national data gap assessed. The mapping and domestication of SDGs indicators is ongoing as well as the data validation and multi-stakeholder engagement to strengthen routine data collection systems to fill the data gaps from the surveys. The baseline report on the SDGs was prepared which will form the basis of the SDG annual report.

The WASH sector is guided by the National Water Policy (2002) and the National Water Sector Development Strategy (2007 – 2025). The Ministry of Water and Irrigation is the

lead ministry, in collaboration with those responsible for health, education, local government and finance. There have been efforts to mainstream SDG6 – for targets 6.1 and 6.2 under the support of Water and Sanitation for All (SWA); 6.5 is supported by the Global Water Partnership (GWP) and Tanzania is preparing for target 6.5.

Survey data produced by the NBS and routine data collected by ministries, departments and government agencies were the main data sources used in the report for the UN High Level Political Forum.

For SDG6, routine data are produced by the ministries, departments and agencies responsible for water, sanitation, finance, planning, education, health, local government authorities, agriculture and natural resources. Routine data is sometimes collected and disseminated by development partners, international NGOs, CSOs and the private sector as well.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

The accountability mechanisms mainly used in the sector is dialogue mechanisms; it is emphasised in the process of implementing the Water Sector Development Programme.

Accountability mechanisms include: the Technical Working Groups (TWG) which meets quarterly; the Joint Water Sector Review (JWSR) which meets annually; the Joint Supervision Mission (JSM) which meets twice a year and the Joint Annual Sector Review. Monitoring tools include water management information systems, the National Sanitation Information System and independent reports from CSOs. Using these mechanisms and tools, the government, development

partners, CSOs, the private sector and other stakeholders meet and plan, endorse, assess, share and evaluate sector progress. The government convenes and facilitates the TWG, JWSR and JSM.

Other accountability mechanisms include: adherence to the required procedures in procurement, consultations and contracting; policies and strategies; the FYDP II; monitoring tools and international and regional treaties. In a nutshell, there are established accountability systems in Tanzania to be used by civil society to hold the government accountable. However, there is the need to do more to improve its effectiveness.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

CSOs and other organisations participate effectively in sector accountability mechanisms through the TWG, JWSR and JSM. Attending meetings and forums provides an opportunity to hold the government accountable by sharing comments, progress and opinions backed with evidence.

Opportunities for CSOs to hold the government accountable include: a favourable legal and regulatory framework, freedom to conduct research and studies. The government makes use of valid data and information from the CSOs.

Challenges facing CSOs in holding the government accountable include the different systems and regulatory bodies to register NGOs. CSOs are not centrally registered or mapped, making it difficult to unite them.

Other challenges include: insufficient competent and qualified staff; inadequate coordination and networking among the CSOs; inadequate resources for conducting research and lack of organisational transparency.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The formation of the Community Water Supply Organisation (COWSO) to replace the Water User Committee.
2. The initiation of the National Water Development Fund.
3. Freedom in data collection and supplying the government with data, information and design plans.
4. Participation of the private sector in construction and installations.
5. Participation in various meetings and dialogues such as JWSR.

Main gaps

1. Coordination among CSOs and with the government.
2. Inadequate resources, skills and manpower.
3. Dependence on outside support is relatively high.
4. Hygiene is not a priority in the ministry responsible for health.

Recommendations

1. The Ministry of Finance and Planning should formalise coordination mechanisms for the SDGs by assigning responsibilities to divisions/departments/units. Currently the Division of Poverty Eradication is responsible, but only because it was responsible for the MDGs.
2. The government should strengthen the office of the registrar of NGOs to ensure effective monitoring, including of financial management and adherence to the rules and procedures down to the grassroots. This should include the capacity to map NGOs/CSOs and their activities nationwide.
3. Appropriate coordination and sharing of skills and experience among NGOs/CSOs is required in order to be able to offer evidence-based research to advise the government.

Main improvements needed

1. Improvement in governance, financial management and research for evidence-based advice to the government;
2. The government should be receptive to criticism and challenge.
3. The government should design appropriate feedback mechanisms with CSOs.
4. An impartial system is required during evaluation of implementation of the targets.
5. The government and CSO should share objectives, plans and programmes.
6. More serious dialogue is required at grassroots level, as TWG, JWSR and JSM operate at national level.
7. There should be a change of mindset among CSOs, so that they offer not only service delivery but advocacy and the development of projects to demonstrate good practice.
8. CSOs should coordinate activities to curb duplication, competition and hostility.

Reporting progress on SDG6

The Ministry of Development Planning in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Water (MAEH) are responsible for drafting Togo's report on SDG6 for the UN High-Level Political Forum (HLPF). At the HLPF in 2017, Togo submitted a VNR on SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 and 14. This year, it plans to submit another review, which will take SDG6 into account. However, the process of drafting the report or review has not yet begun.

Information will be derived from data collected by departments of statistics and technical and financial partners (TFPs), as well as from reports by departments of water, among others.

A large workshop open to the main stakeholders will also be organised to gather their input using questionnaires that follow the UN template. Further consultations will also be carried out with these stakeholders. The interim and final reports will be made available to participants in order to obtain their comments and suggestions.

The main concern in the preparation for the UN HLPF is the lack of a clear timeline for partners and stakeholders and the delay in launching the review process. An initial meeting to meet the stakeholders took place in March 2018.

National accountability mechanisms for SDG6

At the community level, accountability rests with village borehole management committees. Communities elect representatives responsible for managing water resources and equipment, who represent their views to local government, manage the infrastructure and disseminate information provided by the prefectural or regional department of water and sanitation services back to the village. At the administrative region level, a framework for cooperation between stakeholders in the WASH sector has been set up in each region.

This framework covers the operational status of progress towards implementing all SDG6 targets at the regional level. The Regional Department of Water, an administrative service decentralised to regional level which handles the provision of drinking water and water resources management, chairs the committee that oversees the framework.

At the national level, accountability mechanisms include: The National Water and Sanitation Forum (FNEA): The FNEA is held every three years. Its primary aim is to establish a framework for dialogue, expertise and information sharing, and conciliation that brings together stakeholders working in WASH. All SDG6 targets are considered.

Thematic meetings on World Water Days: These are organised every year by the MAEH to coincide with World Water Days. All SDG6 targets are discussed at the workshops, with a focus on targets 6.1 and 6.2.

Basic Sanitation Collaborative Council in Togo (CCABT): This platform has been set up by WASH CSOs to improve work on sanitation, which is a marginalised issue in the country. It focuses on target 6.2 of SDG6.

Other mechanisms: The institutional mechanism for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating development policies (DIPD) as part of the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Employment Promotion (SCAPE) of the Department of Development Planning; the National Action Plan for the Water and Sanitation Sector (PANSEA) 1 and 2; and the National Development Plan (PND). These mechanisms are not operational as the consultation workshops are not taking place while the PND is currently being drafted.

CSOs' participation in the accountability mechanisms

The terms of reference and invitation notes from meetings organised by Ministry Water and Agriculture have been produced and shared with stakeholders, setting the date and location

of the meetings. Some CSOs working in the WASH sector in Togo who are invited to the meetings of the accountability mechanisms do take part.

Main bottlenecks restricting effective participation

1. The lack of communication about the mechanisms and meetings.
2. The failure to invite all stakeholders, especially small CSOs.
3. The lack of knowledge on SDG6 among CSOs.
4. The shortage of funding.
5. The lack of technical and logistical resources.
6. The lack of dialogue between CSOs.

Main gaps

1. Lack of communication.
2. Failure to update mechanisms, policies, programmes and laws, which are often obsolete.

Recommendations

1. Create an institutional framework to provide accountability for SDG6 at the national level, uniting all the principal stakeholders working in the sector.
2. Finalise the decentralisation process in order to delegate power to local leaders, to enable close monitoring and a high level of accountability on progress at the community level.
3. Publish the results of consultation meetings to ensure all stakeholders have the same information.

Positive experiences of participation

1. The provision of more information and resources for advocacy work.
2. The meetings provide all stakeholders with detailed guidance on the amount of equipment to install and where it should be installed, so they can set up projects accordingly.
3. Mechanisms also provide a means of holding the government to account on the progress towards the implementation of recommendations made in this respect.

Main improvements needed

1. Improve the participation of all stakeholders in the mechanisms.
2. Increase communication on the actions carried out and make this information available.
3. Improve the frequency of data updates.

Documentation: 47 questionnaires completed; seven institutions surveyed; 18 people at the validation meeting.

GLOBAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS FOR SDG6



Between October 2017 – March 2018, a study was conducted on national accountability mechanisms for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6. This research was led by partners and members of organisations including Coalition Eau, End Water Poverty, Watershed Programme, the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council with the support of Sanitation and Water for All.

The study results are based on more than 1,000 surveys, interviews and validation meetings with key stakeholders in 25 countries. This research evaluated the nature of existing national accountability mechanisms as well as the challenges and opportunities, identified gaps and made specific recommendations to different stakeholders to reach SDG6.

This is the start of a crucial and in-depth conversation in the pursuit of reaching the Sustainable Development Goals for future generations; leaving no one behind.

**For enquiries, please contact
research@endwaterpoverty.org**