



House of Commons
International Development
Committee

Sanitation and Water

Sixth Report of Session 2006–07

Volume I

Report, together with formal minutes

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 17 April 2007*

International Development Committee

The International Development Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for International Development and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

Malcolm Bruce MP (*Liberal Democrat, Gordon*) (Chairman)
John Battle MP (*Labour, Leeds West*)
Hugh Bayley MP (*Labour, City of York*)
John Bercow MP (*Conservative, Buckingham*)
Richard Burden MP (*Labour, Birmingham Northfield*)
Mr Quentin Davies MP (*Conservative, Grantham and Stamford*)
James Duddridge MP (*Conservative, Rochford and Southend East*)
Ann McKechin MP (*Labour, Glasgow North*)
Joan Ruddock MP (*Labour, Lewisham Deptford*)
Mr Marsha Singh MP (*Labour, Bradford West*)
Sir Robert Smith MP (*Liberal Democrat, West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine*)

John Barrett MP (*Liberal Democrat, Edinburgh West*) was also a member of the Committee during this inquiry

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/indcom

Committee staff

The staff of the Committee are Carol Oxborough (Clerk), Matthew Hedges (Second Clerk), Anna Dickson (Committee Specialist), Chlöe Challender (Committee Specialist), Ian Hook (Committee Assistant), Jennifer Steele (Secretary), Alex Paterson (Media Officer) and James Bowman (Senior Office Clerk).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the International Development Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 1223; the Committee's email address is indcom@parliament.uk

Footnotes

In the footnotes for this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number. References to written evidence are indicated by the page number as in 'Ev 12'.

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
Background and acknowledgements	5
1 Introduction	6
Current inequality, future scarcity	6
DFID's response	7
Our visit to Ethiopia	9
The structure of this report	9
2 The sanitation crisis	10
The scale of the crisis and barriers to progress	10
A distinct and neglected sector	11
The demand side of sanitation	13
Rethinking sanitation expertise within DFID	15
The sanitation challenge in slums	17
DFID—a global champion for sanitation?	19
3 Financing and aid instruments for sanitation and water	20
DFID's proposed Global Action Plan	20
Aid predictability and budget support	21
The human right to water	24
Multilateral institutions and sanitation and water	25
The World Bank and the United Nations	25
Financing water-supporting infrastructure	26
Maximising benefits from the EU Water Initiative	27
The EU Water Facility	28
The African Development Bank's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative	29
4 Supplying water	31
Finding the right role for the private, public and informal sectors	31
The private sector's role as a contractor	32
NGO-delivered and community-managed water services	32
The informal sector	33
Locally appropriate solutions to water supply	33
Strengthening public utilities	34
Water governance	35
Boosting local capacity and technical expertise	37
DFID's advisory capacity in the water sector	39

5	Water resources management and climate change	42
	Integrated Water Resources Management: barriers to progress	43
	Major infrastructure projects	47
	Climate change and water resources management	48
	Conflict over water resources	50
6	The inter-sectoral dimensions of sanitation and water	52
	The interface between health, sanitation and water	52
	The intersection of water, sanitation, gender and education	54
	The links between water and agriculture	56
7	Conclusion	59
	Recommendations	61
	List of acronyms	68
	Annex 1: The Committee’s visit programme, Ethiopia 1-8 February 2007	69
	Annex 2: The Millennium Development Goals	72
	Formal minutes	74
	Witnesses	75
	Written evidence	76
	List of unprinted written evidence and papers	78
	Reports from the International Development Committee since July 2005	79

Summary

Without concerted global action, the world risks missing not just the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets to halve the number of people without access to sanitation and water, but all eight Goals.¹ Sanitation and water sit at the heart of development. Proper sanitation and water provision vastly reduces global disease and brings children, especially girls, into school; women are released from the wretched daily burden of fetching water; and the supply of food increases with adequate irrigation

Almost one in two people in the developing world lacks access to sanitation. Sanitation gets far less attention than water in DFID's policies and this imbalance needs urgent correction. On current trends the MDG target will not be met until 2076. This is a hidden international scandal that is killing millions of children every year. DFID should become a global champion for sanitation. New approaches and new staffing configurations are needed to tackle the entrenched stigma and poor understanding that keep demand for sanitation low and disease levels high.

DFID has now refocused on sanitation and water after diverting its attention in recent years. It has doubled its aid to Africa for this purpose, and will double it again to £200 million a year by 2010–11. The Department has recognised that money alone will not provide toilets and taps—nor drive demand, create political will, strengthen capacity or institute behaviour change—and has proposed a Global Action Plan to put the structures in place to ensure aid for sanitation and water is spent as effectively as it can be. It is imperative that DFID secures urgent international agreement to the Plan.

Realising their right to water currently remains outside the reach of over one billion people, including half of all Africans. There are as many solutions to water supply as there are problems: DFID's ultimate goal must be supporting governments to find locally appropriate solutions and ending the fundamental inequality that the poor pay the most for their water. This will involve a package of measures including strengthening public utilities, boosting governance and the crucial task of building local capacity to expand and maintain access to clean water.

Climate change, economic and population growth and urbanisation are increasingly putting decisions about how water resources are allocated and managed into sharp focus. DFID needs to scale up its work on water resources management. It should work with other donors to seek a reaffirmation of the failed 2005 global target to have national water management plans in place.

With an expanding budget and decreasing staff headcount, DFID needs to use its funds for sanitation and water efficiently, without compromising the quality of its aid. Central to the efficiency of DFID's investments will be: the effective deployment of DFID's own advisory

¹ The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are a set of targets for human development established by the international community at the Millennium Summit in 2000. The eight MDGs and their linked targets are set out in Annex 2 of this report.

capacity; reforms to multilateral aid mechanisms; the ability to work at the interface between the key basic social services of health, education, sanitation and water; and efforts to build capacity at local level to target and spend DFID funds effectively.

Clean water and adequate sanitation meet essential needs. DFID must maximise its crucial investment in sanitation and water.

Background and acknowledgements

In July 2006, the International Development Committee announced an inquiry to examine how DFID is fulfilling its increasing commitment to sanitation and water, and to assess multilateral efforts to secure progress.

Around 50 stakeholders contributed to a substantial volume of written evidence, representing a wide range of development actors, including multilateral aid organisations; development banks; the national and multinational private sector; the research community; professional bodies; non-governmental organisations (NGOs); international partnerships; public utilities, and trade unions. We are grateful to all those who submitted written evidence, and to those who supplied us with background papers.

We would like to thank the individuals and organisations who gave oral evidence during five evidence sessions in Parliament between November 2006 and February 2007, and during one joint session in November 2006 with the Communities and Local Government Committee focusing on the World Urban Forum III.

We are particularly grateful to those organisations and individuals from developing countries, and/or with close links to developing countries, who took the time to engage with the inquiry. We greatly value their input and look forward to more input from developing countries in future inquiries.

We visited Ethiopia in February 2007 to observe the work being done by the Department for International Development (DFID) on sanitation and water. We were impressed with the work we saw and would like to thank the staff of DFID and representatives from other organisations who made it such a worthwhile and interesting visit (see Annex 1 for the programme for the visit).

We would like to thank our Specialist Advisers, Belinda Calaguas, Head of Policy at WaterAid, and Dr Andrew Cotton, Senior Programme Manager at the Water, Engineering and Development Centre at Loughborough University, for their assistance throughout this inquiry.

We would also like to thank those who took part in informal discussions with the Committee, including Richard Carter, Professor of International Water Development at Cranfield University, David Hall, Director of the Public Services International Research Unit at the University of Greenwich and Valerie Curtis, Director of the Hygiene Centre at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

1 Introduction

Current inequality, future scarcity

1. The inter-connecting nature of development targets is often highlighted by development actors, including the Department for International Development (DFID). However, Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 7, Target 10, which seeks to halve the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation, has a strong claim to being the most integral to the other targets' success. 1.1 billion people are deprived of access to clean water and face a daily struggle to access and transport it. Women and girls tend to bear the burden of fetching water, trading valuable hours that could be spent at work and in school for arduous and often unsafe journeys to the nearest water source. An even greater problem faces people in accessing adequate sanitation: 2.6 billion people lack access to 'improved sanitation'—which itself is a low marker of adequate provision and could be as basic as a shared pit latrine.

2. Achieving the sanitation and water targets would catalyse the attainment of all eight MDGs. Relieving women and girls of their water-fetching burden would help to promote gender equality (MDG3) and boost school enrolment rates (MDG2). In turn, girls who have been educated have improved maternal health (MDG5) and are twice as likely to stay safe from AIDS (MDG6).² Improved access to clean water would reduce diarrhoea and water-borne diseases, and the transition from unimproved to improved sanitation is accompanied by a 30%-plus reduction in child mortality (MDG4).³ Irrigation accounts for 70-90% of water use in the developing world, and links closely with the MDG1 target seeking to reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. The sanitation and water targets' positioning within MDG7 makes explicit the link with environmental sustainability. Developing and strengthening international networks for sanitation and water would contribute towards the attainment of MDG8, seeking a global partnership for development.

3. But despite its pivotal importance, progress on the sanitation target, in particular, is lamentable: on current trends the target will not be met until 2076. Whilst the water target is on-track to be met by 2015 in most areas—a significant exception being sub-Saharan Africa—the rate of progress has slowed considerably.⁴ Whichever markers are used, the scale of the problem is huge: as Kevin Watkins, Director of the UN Development Programme's *Human Development Report* told us, "I do think there is a very real sense in which we need to stop treating water and sanitation as a problem in development and start treating it as a crisis in development because it is a crisis on a grand scale."⁵

2 Barbara Herz and Gene B. Sperling, *What Works in Girls' Education: Evidence and Policies from the Developing World* (Council on Foreign Relations, 2004); and Global Campaign for Education, *Missing the Mark: A School Report on rich countries' contribution to Universal Primary Education by 2015* (2005).

3 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.115.

4 Ev 228 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

5 Q1 [Kevin Watkins]

4. Whilst the current water crisis is driven more by inequality and poverty than by scarcity, availability will increasingly become a major problem, sharpening inequalities in access and raising the spectre of conflict over water resources.⁶ It is clear that the world's climate is changing and that developing countries, more reliant on subsistence agriculture and often dependent on natural resources, are likely to be hit the hardest by climate change. Indeed, the impact is already being felt in Africa, for example, where water availability decreased substantially between 1975 and 1995—a trend that is likely to continue with increasing drought, desertification and extreme weather events.⁷ Water resources are also under increasing pressure from population increase, urbanisation and rising demand due to economic growth.

DFID's response

5. DFID is frank in admitting that it “took its eye off the ball” in recent years in relation to sanitation and water.⁸ Dr Darren Saywell of the International Water Association identified “A major watershed, in my opinion, in 2002 just after the World Summit on Sustainable Development when DFID restructured itself, and a lot of the impetus and momentum that went into water and sanitation was lost at that time.”⁹

6. DFID is now looking to re-establish its leadership role on sanitation and water. The 2006 White Paper identified sanitation and water as one of four essential public services for the MDGs. The Department followed this up by doubling its aid to Africa for sanitation and water, with a pledge to double it again to £200 million a year by 2010.

7. However, money alone will not provide toilets and taps—nor drive demand and the behaviour change necessary for sustainable uptake—for the billions of people who currently lack access. A series of other measures are required to transform funding promises into action, including: the generation of global political will; international aid instruments that are fit for purpose; well-resourced, coherent and effective multilateral mechanisms; and the effectiveness of DFID's organisational capacity to support sanitation and water. Capacity at local and national level to implement scaled-up efforts on sanitation and water is a particular source of concern. As we were told in written evidence from Dr Andrew Cotton of Loughborough University, “It is arguable that lack of institutional, organisational and individual capacity in the sector is a more serious constraint than lack of finance.”¹⁰

8. Clearly, improving access to water goes hand-in-hand with managing water resources efficiently.¹¹ Water Resources Management (WRM) involves decisions over who needs water, how to get water to those who need it, and what happens to water once it has been used.¹² Climate change is making WRM more important than ever—yet the global

6 Ev 168 [WaterAid]

7 Ev 242 [Good Earth Trust]

8 Q 225 [Hilary Benn]

9 Q 110 [Dr Darren Saywell]

10 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

11 Q 189 [John Chilton]

12 Ev 211 [WWF-UK]

community has already comprehensively failed to meet a target seeking to ensure that all countries had national Integrated Water Resources Management Plans and Water Efficiency Plans in place by 2005.¹³ WRM has had insufficient attention from donors—including DFID—despite its inseparable relationship with increased water supply.¹⁴

9. Close attention must therefore be paid to DFID’s ability to translate its high-level funding promises for sanitation and water into programme delivery.¹⁵ Increasing financial inputs does not guarantee the required outputs. The current climate of civil service efficiency savings—which entail a DFID staff headcount reduction of 10%—brings this imperative into yet sharper focus. A key question emerging is how easy it is to actually spend money on what is needed for sanitation and water at the scale required whilst maintaining the quality of DFID’s aid.¹⁶ Answering this question requires attention to a range of issues, a number of which we raised in our report on DFID’s Departmental Report 2006—notably “doing more with less” by using strategies such as outsourcing, raising contributions to multilateral institutions and increased use of Poverty Reduction Budget Support.¹⁷

10. These efficiency issues are relevant to all areas of DFID’s work, but particularly to aspects of the water sector and even more so to sanitation. Sanitation is a complex sector: demand is often not clearly articulated due to stigma and lack of awareness; building physical infrastructure will only be effective up to a point—behaviour change is equally, if not more, important—and sanitation tends to have no institutional ‘home’, meaning that multi-faceted programme strategies and disbursements are likely to be fragmented across a variety of ministries and levels of government. As Dr Andrew Cotton noted in his evidence, “If you want an easy way to disburse large amounts of money, then you don’t do sanitation—or at least not sanitation that targets the poor in countries that are most off-track.”¹⁸ Neither is it easy to spend quickly and easily on the water sector, which also suffers from institutional fragmentation, and requires substantial technical expertise and sensitive interventions attuned to specific contexts.

13 A survey of 95 countries published earlier in 2006 by the Global Water Partnership found that only 20% of countries have Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) plans in place. IWRM seeks to “promote the co-ordinated development and management of water, land and related resources, and so maximise the resulting economic and social welfare in an equitable manner, without compromising the sustainability of ecosystems” (Ev 5 [DFID]).

14 Q 186 [John Chilton]

15 Ev 181 [WaterAid]

16 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

17 First Report from the Committee, Session 2006-07, *Department for International Development Departmental Report 2006*, HC 71.

18 Ev 228 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

Our visit to Ethiopia

11. We visited Ethiopia in February 2007 to observe DFID's work on sanitation and water in practice. We saw a country with a desperate need—Ethiopia has almost the lowest sanitation coverage in the world (13%) and is one of most off-track African countries in meeting the MDG targets on sanitation and water—and huge potential: the country has abundant water resources but only a tiny proportion are currently used.¹⁹

12. Levels of UK development assistance in Ethiopia are rising, from £60 million in 2004–05, to £90 million in 2005–06, and to £130 million in 2007–08—to make Ethiopia DFID's largest aid programme in Africa. A new DFID water supply, sanitation and hygiene programme for Ethiopia was approved by the Secretary of State, Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, in September 2006. This envisages that DFID will provide a total of up to £100 million over the five year period 2007–12, making DFID one of the lead donors on sanitation and water within the country.

13. DFID Ethiopia has a strong team, with innovative approaches to deploying its sanitation and water expertise, including an adviser seconded into the Ministry of Water Resources. However, we saw DFID's headcount restrictions beginning to exert real pressures in practical terms: we were led to ask how, even with increased expenditure through multilateral channels, a budget that was more than doubling over the course of three years could be spent effectively without putting unsustainable pressure on staff.

The structure of this report

14. As is evident from the report title, we have chosen to reverse the conventional situating of sanitation as an adjunct to water, and will address sanitation first (in Chapter 2) as a separate sector requiring distinct strategies to address the current dismal progress towards the MDG target. Chapter 3 will explore current financing and aid instruments for the two sectors, looking at the respective roles of—and co-operation between—governments, bilateral and multilateral donors, NGOs and the private sector in financing sanitation and water. Chapter 4 will look at how DFID can help facilitate equitable water service delivery across both rural and urban contexts. Chapter 5 will address Water Resources Management (WRM) and the impact of climate change on strategies towards this. Chapter 6 will focus on the nexus between sanitation, water and other basic services, particularly health and education, as well as the close link between water and agriculture.

¹⁹ UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*. Statistics are for 1994. Only Chad and Eritrea have lower coverage, both at 9%. The other three most off-track countries in Africa are DRC, Nigeria and Sudan.

2 The sanitation crisis

The scale of the crisis and barriers to progress

15. Today, almost one in two people in the developing world lacks access to improved sanitation—a shocking indication of the scale of this under-recognised emergency.²⁰ “Improved sanitation”—according to the UN Development Programme’s definition—requires access to “adequate excreta disposal facilities, such as a connection to a sewer or septic tank system, a pour-flush latrine, a simple pit latrine or a ventilated improved pit latrine. An excreta disposal system is considered adequate if it is private or shared (but not public) and if it can effectively prevent human, animal and insect contact with excreta.”²¹

16. Across the world, sanitation provision lags far behind access to water. Sanitation is one of the most off-track MDGs, with the crisis focused on Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, both of which have 37% coverage. South Asia’s rates of progress, which have doubled since 1990, give some cause for optimism, although much remains to be done—one in three unserved people lives in China. But Africa is the major source of concern: coverage has risen by only 5% since 1990 and this has been outstripped by population growth, so that the number of unserved people has actually increased by 111 million over the period.²²

17. The UNDP’s *Human Development Report 2006* focused on water and sanitation. The report sets out six interlocking barriers which retard progress on sanitation: national policy, behaviour, perception, poverty, gender and supply (see Figure 1). We saw a number of these barriers operating in practice during our visit to Ethiopia, where no national sanitation policy exists and where latrine hardware is generally too costly to supply and maintain.²³ Evidence we have received highlighted the absence of sanitation in national planning instruments such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the problem of women’s voices being too weak to articulate demand for sanitation as factors contributing to these barriers.²⁴

20 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.111.

21 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p. 409

22 Ev 228 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

23 Kevin Tayler and Jim Winpenny, WELL Resource Centre, *Options for DFID support to the water and sanitation sector in Ethiopia: Pre-appraisal report*, p.1.

24 Ev 273 [Jon Lane] and Q 112 [Professor Sandy Cairncross], Ev 229 [Dr Andrew Cotton] and Q 130 [Laura Webster], Ev 171 [WaterAid]

Figure 1 UNDP Human Development Report: the six barriers to progress on sanitation

The national policy barrier	Sanitation seldom features prominently on national political agendas – even within countries that have had success in expanding access to water such as South Africa and Morocco.
The behaviour barrier	Research shows that people attach a higher priority to water than sanitation. People often see sanitation more as a public rather than household issue e.g. the health benefits of building a latrine may be compromised by excrement in nearby streets.
The perception barrier	Health is not the primary motivation for people seeking improved sanitation: factors such as prestige and convenience often rank above disease prevention. This makes sanitation less likely to be viewed as a public good.
The poverty barrier	Even low-cost technology will be beyond the reach of the 1.4 billion unserved people who live on less than \$2 a day. This is borne out in Vietnam, where rapid progress on rural sanitation has left the poorest households far behind.
The gender barrier	Evidence suggests that women place a higher value on sanitation than men – yet women tend to have the weakest voice within the household and outside, hence demand remains low.
The supply barrier	The oversupply of inappropriate technologies, or products that are difficult to maintain, is a problem.

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006 - Beyond Scarcity: Power, poverty and the global water crisis*, pp.118-120.

A distinct and neglected sector

18. The sanitation target within the MDGs was set belatedly, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, rather than at the Millennium Summit in 2000 with the majority of the other targets. DFID played a leading role in securing the target.²⁵ Whilst its inclusion in the MDGs was an enormous step forward, the target's late arrival gave it a disadvantage from the outset, with fewer years left till the target deadline of 2015 and the risk of being viewed as an 'add-on' rather than an integral part of MDG7.²⁶

19. Sanitation tends to be viewed as an adjunct to water and is thus neglected as a sector.²⁷ From a historical perspective sanitation and water have been linked together by governments, and for the last few decades development practice has tried to ensure that water, sanitation and hygiene are integrated in the same projects. This has had some advantages: "piggy backing" sanitation on to the political demand for water supply has brought attention and funds to the sector.²⁸ DFID has conformed with this practice and treats sanitation and water as one integral sector, in line with its multi-disciplinary approach to development.²⁹ **The links between sanitation and other social sectors, particularly water, health and education, are self-evident. We commend a multi-disciplinary approach to the sanitation sector.**

25 Ev 187 [WaterAid]

26 Q 190 [Dr David Tickner]

27 Ev 273 [Jon Lane]

28 Marion W. Jenkins and Steven Sugden, *Rethinking Sanitation – Lessons and Innovation for Sustainability and Success in the New Millennium* (2006), p.7.

29 Ev 109 [DFID]

20. The multi-disciplinary approach becomes problematic if one sector is marginalised, as is the case with sanitation. The reasons for the neglect of the sector are manifold. One problem is that sanitation is often shrouded in stigma and embarrassment. Sanitation itself is a euphemism for managing defecation.³⁰ Tearfund recommended that DFID could help address the taboos around sanitation by using lessons from the successes in tackling the stigma around HIV and AIDS.³¹ A variety of interventions, including information awareness campaigns and community sensitisation, have been successful in changing attitudes and beliefs in relation to HIV and AIDS. **DFID needs to be proactive in tackling the stigma around sanitation and should draw on lessons from the successes in tackling the stigma around HIV and AIDS.**

21. Another factor in its marginalisation is that less is understood about how to make rapid progress on sanitation than on water.³² ‘Doing sanitation’ is quite different from ‘doing water’, largely because sanitation is more about the ‘softer’ issues of raising demand and instituting behaviour change, rather than infrastructure provision.³³ Demand for water is well-articulated whereas for sanitation it is often hidden and needs to be voiced before systems are designed and implemented. Timescales differ between the sectors: a new water supply can be installed very quickly, whilst sanitation requires long-term behaviour change.³⁴ Women suffer the most from inadequate sanitation: journeys to public latrines or defecating in fields, especially at night-time, bring security risks, and women are likely to bear responsibility for caring for children and relatives suffering from disease caused by poor sanitation.³⁵ Yet women have the weakest voices in planning and decision-making and hence their need for improved sanitation fails to impact upon the political agenda.³⁶

22. Assessing the scale of the need for sanitation in financial terms is difficult because the OECD and DFID currently aggregate the amount of aid which goes to sanitation and water.³⁷ Much of DFID’s support for sanitation is through multilateral organisations, which makes it even harder to measure. However, the World Health Organisation (WHO) and UNICEF estimated in 2000 that sanitation attracts only one-eighth of the funding that water gets.³⁸ **We recommend that DFID make its sanitation investments more transparent by disaggregating funding given to the sanitation and water sectors, and by encouraging the multilateral institutions to which it contributes funds to do the same.**

30 Jenkins and Sugden (2006), p.6.

31 Ev 158 [Tearfund]

32 Q 241 [Greg Briffa]

33 Ev 228 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

34 Jenkins and Sugden (2006), pp.6-8.

35 Ev 170 [WaterAid]

36 Ev 157 [Tearfund]

37 Ev 157 [Tearfund]

38 Ev 157-158 [Tearfund]

23. There is evidence that DFID currently neglects the sanitation sector. Professor Sandy Cairncross from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine told us that DFID tends to think of sanitation as an adjunct to water: “If you look at [DFID’s] Water Action Plan [...] the word ‘sanitation’ [...] always appears as the second half of ‘water and sanitation’.”³⁹ Laura Webster of Tearfund concurred with this view and noted that DFID’s health strategy also neglects sanitation: “If you look at the latest target strategy on health, sanitation seems to be very much missing from that. The joined-up thinking seems to be missing.”⁴⁰ DFID’s neglect of the sector is borne out by the fact that no formal sanitation strategy exists—the current relevant policy document for sanitation is the Water Action Plan, the title of which speaks volumes, and which is weak on sanitation.⁴¹ Without a distinct sanitation strategy, budgetary and policy objectives for sanitation are unclear. **A multi-disciplinary approach to sanitation and water will only work if the two sectors are given equal attention. Sanitation is currently neglected within DFID. The complex, distinctive challenges inherent in reaching the sanitation MDG target require proactive measures on DFID’s behalf to raise the profile of sanitation within its work on sanitation and water, including the creation of a separate sanitation strategy.**

The demand side of sanitation

24. As Professor Sandy Cairncross told us, the crux of sanitation policy is working out what drives demand.⁴² Often, health is not the primary reason that people want latrines—research has found that households often rank factors such as prestige and convenience higher than avoiding excreta-related disease (see Figure 1). Once the drivers of demand have been identified via market research, Professor Cairncross believes, a consumer-driven social marketing strategy needs to be carried out, so that the need for latrines is sold to the poor—“disseminated in the same way as double glazing or conservatories”.⁴³ For reasons of sustainability, it is important that latrine designs respond to people’s needs rather than to engineers’ pre-conceptions.⁴⁴ In Ethiopia, this seemed to be working in practice: regional health officials in the Southern Nations region⁴⁵ told us they opt not to provide any sanitation hardware, due to both sustainability problems and cost, and we observed that households were using local materials such as rocks to build their latrines.

25. Social marketing campaigns have been successfully used for hygiene promotion. An example is the Public-Private Partnership for Handwashing in Ghana, through which government, donors, universities and soap companies are trying to prevent the 9 million episodes of diarrhoea which account for a quarter of child deaths in Ghana each year.⁴⁶ Prior to the Partnership’s inception in 2002, handwashing with soap after using the toilet

39 Q 111 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

40 Q 111 [Laura Webster]

41 Ev 158 [Tearfund]

42 Q 112 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

43 Q 111 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

44 Jenkins and Sugden (2006), p.16.

45 Southern Nations, Nationalities, and People’s Region (SNNPR)

46 Global Public Private Partnership for Handwashing with Soap, <http://www.globalhandwashing.org>

stood at just 4%.⁴⁷ Following the marketing campaign—which used methods ranging from car stickers to television advertisements—reported rates increased by 13% after using the toilet and by 41% before eating. The national evaluation found that 71% of target mothers could describe the television advertisement and 48% could sing the campaign song.⁴⁸

26. Another highly successful example of socially-driven behaviour change can be found in the Community-Led Total Sanitation Scheme (CLTS). Pioneered by WaterAid and the Village Education Resource Centre in Bangladesh, CLTS uses community self-help to stimulate behaviour change and community action to end the practice of open defecation, which is widespread in rural South Asia, as well as other parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. CLTS does not seek to provide latrine infrastructure but facilitates self and community analysis of defecation habits. Empirical evidence has shown that when individuals understand the health risks of open defecation, disgust and shame tend to provoke communities into a collective decision to reject the practice.⁴⁹ Community success is then broadcast on billboards outside the villages. Through CLTS, Bangladesh will—on current trends—meet the MDG target for sanitation. Coverage is reported to have increased from 33% in 2003 to 70% in 2006 and is set to reach 100% by 2010.⁵⁰

27. In Ethiopia, we saw a CLTS-influenced approach to sanitation in the Southern Nations region, where local sanitation committees, supported by women health extension workers, were using advocacy and health education to promote latrine construction and usage. Virtually all dwellings in the village in Misha *woreda* (district) that we visited had their own latrine: across the region, latrine ownership has risen from 13% in 2003 to 78% in 2006.⁵¹ We were told that health, especially amongst children, has improved considerably following the programme, with diarrhoea and skin and eye infections falling out of the top five reported diseases over the last four years.

28. A number of written submissions highlight CLTS's potential for replicability.⁵² Like Ethiopia, a number of countries, including Indonesia and Cambodia, have initiated schemes influenced by CLTS.⁵³ The Water and Sanitation Programme, closely associated with the World Bank but also supported by DFID and other donors, is working with the Government of India to share lessons about CLTS from Bangladesh, and the scheme is currently being rolled out in the states of Maharashtra, Punjab and Northwest Frontier Province.⁵⁴

47 Dr Valerie Curtis, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine: in informal discussions with the Committee, 23 November 2006.

48 Scott B., Schmidt W., Aunger R., Garbrah-Aidoo N. and Animashaun R., *Marketing Hygiene Behaviours: The Impact of Different Communication Channels on Reported Handwashing Behaviour of Women in Ghana*, Health Education Research (forthcoming).

49 Ev 220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies]

50 Ev 323 [World Bank]

51 WSP-AF Ethiopia, *Southern Region State: Where sanitation was everyone's problem but is now everyone's responsibility* (2006), p. 1.

52 Ev 188 [WaterAid], Ev 299 [Social, Technical and Ecological Pathways to Sustainability Centre, University of Sussex], Ev 219-220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies], Ev 322-323 [World Bank]

53 Ev 322-323 [World Bank] and Ev 220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies]

54 Ev 322-323 [World Bank]

29. DFID is funding research at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) into how and where CLTS is working.⁵⁵ DFID expressed hesitation to us, however, about the replicability of CLTS: “There are certainly elements of CLTS work in Bangladesh and India that make it work particularly well in those continents. Transferring it elsewhere we will probably look at which of those elements makes sense.”⁵⁶ **DFID’s support for research into the replicability of the Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) scheme is important and should continue along with support to other promising approaches such as social marketing. The widespread success of CLTS in Bangladesh and emerging lessons from uptake elsewhere suggest that there are huge potential gains from the scheme.**

30. WaterAid’s submission suggests that DFID should consider moving beyond initial financing to mainstream the CLTS approach in its programme design and monitoring and evaluation systems.⁵⁷ Robert Chambers and John Thompson from the IDS suggested that “DFID probably has more experience of CLTS than any other agency except the World Bank, and so is exceptionally well placed to help other organisations like UNICEF learn.” As they went on to point out, however, raising the profile of CLTS within its programmes would have staffing implications for DFID: “To do this well [...] will require more staff who understand and are committed to the need for sensitive restraint in providing the conditions for the spread of CLTS.”⁵⁸ The development of such skills—which include advocacy techniques and community sensitisation, also useful for social marketing strategies—will require specialist training. **The growing uptake of the Community-Led Total Sanitation scheme and social marketing approaches will require DFID staff working on sanitation to be adequately trained in the techniques needed for these approaches, so that they can advise governments and other development partners on how to design and invest in such programmes.**

Rethinking sanitation expertise within DFID

31. This leads on to a wider issue of sanitation expertise within DFID. Sanitation expertise is currently provided by the same staff who advise on water—that is, a cadre of infrastructure advisers, 23 of whom work on sanitation and water across DFID’s country programmes. In some country programmes, non-infrastructure advisers—including livelihoods advisers (in 11 cases) and environment advisers (in four cases)—lead the DFID contribution to the water sector, but this will be on a part-time basis: typically one day a week or less.⁵⁹ The other cadres of advisory staff (economics, governance, social development, health and statistics) can in theory provide input on sanitation but in practice it is overwhelmingly the responsibility of infrastructure, environment and livelihoods advisers to take forward work on sanitation and water.⁶⁰

32. The obvious issue here is that the expertise of staff working on sanitation and water is overwhelmingly focused on water, rather than sanitation. Health advisers and social

55 Ev 220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies]

56 Q 243 [Greg Briffa]

57 Ev 188 [WaterAid]

58 Ev 220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies]

59 Ev 109-111 [DFID]

60 Ev 110 [DFID]

development advisers, who logically would seem most qualified to work on the behaviour change and health aspects of sanitation, provide very little input. Furthermore, sanitation expertise within DFID’s Policy and Research Division’s Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team comes from water, environment and governance advisers—there are no health or social development advisers within the team. It is also telling that, until late 2006, the name of the team was the Water, Energy and Minerals Team—sanitation did not feature. This seems extraordinary given the priority that DFID claims to attach to sanitation and the obviously specialist nature of the skills required for the sector.

33. In their paper *Rethinking Sanitation*, Marion Jenkins and Steven Sugden of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine summarise a major problem inherent in deploying staff on integrated sanitation and water projects:

“Different skill sets are required [...] The water sector has been dominated by engineers who feel comfortable with technical problems and tend to lean towards technical solutions. Sanitation requires softer, people-based skills and takes engineers into areas where they feel uncomfortable and unfamiliar. As a result, project staff in integrated projects naturally prefer water supply provision and tend to neglect sanitation.”⁶¹

34. Professor Sandy Cairncross told us: “I was talking recently to the DFID Senior Health Adviser who agreed that sanitation was important but did not see it at all as a function of the health sector; but felt that within DFID it is for the water people to deal with.”⁶² Professor Cairncross expressed a preference for a separate cadre of sanitation advisers:

“DFID can potentially play a central role in transforming the sanitation sector, but only if the staffing problem is confronted head on, so that DFID is able to station full-time water and sanitation advisers (preferably, sanitation advisers) in the principal countries where it seeks to influence sector performance.”⁶³

35. The Secretary of State and Greg Briffa, Head of DFID’s Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team, were clear that they didn’t consider a separate cadre of sanitation advisers a sensible strategy.⁶⁴ DFID’s multi-disciplinary approach and its headcount restrictions make the creation of a new staff cadre infeasible. But a reconfiguration of DFID expertise on sanitation is both practicable and necessary. Greg Briffa accepted that DFID needs to link its water, sanitation and health advisers more closely.⁶⁵

36. But, as important as this is, we believe the problem runs much deeper than a need to improve inter-sectoral linkages. **Different skillsets are required for the sanitation and water sectors: the former requires people-based skills and health and social development expertise, as opposed to the more technical solutions needed for water supply.** DFID therefore needs fundamentally to rethink the situating of sanitation expertise within its infrastructure advisory cadre. The skillsets needed for sanitation require a multi-

61 Jenkins and Sugden (2006), p 8

62 Q 114 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

63 Ev 140 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

64 Q 240 and Q 241 [Hilary Benn]

65 Q 242 [Greg Briffa]

disciplinary approach including health and, to a lesser degree, social development advisers. Infrastructure advisers still have a significant role to play in DFID's sanitation strategy—clearly, collaboration between the advisory cadres will support a multi-disciplinary approach—but sanitation must become an integral part of health advisers' work, both within country programmes and in Policy Division.

37. Greg Briffa told us that a review of sanitation policy, including the creation of an action plan, will be carried out over the next six months, in collaboration with a team of experts including Professor Cairncross.⁶⁶ **We welcome DFID's decision to carry out a review of its sanitation policy. Under the review, we recommend that DFID reconfigure its sanitation expertise. Sanitation must become an integral part of health advisers'—and, where possible, social development advisers'—work within country programmes. Within DFID's Policy and Research Division, the Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team should contain health and social development advisory capacity.**

The sanitation challenge in slums

38. Addressing staffing issues, as outlined above, would be one step forward to making progress on sanitation. However, there is another area in which DFID needs to act if it is to become a—much-needed—global champion for sanitation: sanitation provision in informal urban settlements.

39. Historically, the challenge in delivering sanitation and water has been rural, but in 2007 more people will be living in cities than rural areas for the first time in history, creating new and growing challenges in providing sanitation to poor urban dwellers. DFID's sanitation focus reflects the historical challenge and is very much focused on rural provision. The World Bank reverses this prioritisation—about 85% of its support to sanitation and water goes to urban projects—and DFID's support to the Bank ensures that at least some DFID funds contribute to urban provision.

40. But, as towns and cities continue to grow unstoppably, DFID needs to look ahead and ensure its prioritisation of rural over urban support adapts accordingly. Around 70% of urban dwellers in Africa and 60% in South Asia live in slums, and it is estimated that almost half a billion people who require sanitation and water services will be added to urban populations in Africa alone within the next 25 years.⁶⁷

41. Sanitation provision in urban areas gives rise to a series of challenges. The responsibility for sanitation tends to be fragmented across a number of government agencies and departments, making lines of responsibility and accountability blurred.⁶⁸ Most urban dwellers live in informal settlements with insecure land tenure. David Satterthwaite from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) used the example of Kibera in Nairobi—Africa's largest slum—to illustrate the difficulty of laying sewers and building latrines where land rights are not clear.⁶⁹ It is often not obvious

66 Q 241 [Hilary Benn]

67 UN-Habitat, *State of the World Cities* (2006); and Ev 95 [DFID]

68 Ev 184 [WaterAid]

69 Q 17 [David Satterthwaite]

if or by whom plots are owned, and it may be difficult to clear space to lay pipes and sewers due to the sheer concentration of people. Residents of informal settlements tend not to have effective access to political influence and their demands are often unheard. **Sanitation provision in slums is constrained by institutional fragmentation, insecure land tenure and residents' lack of political influence. We recommend that DFID revisit its prioritisation of rural over urban support as the global urbanisation process continues. The Department needs to work with governments to raise the issue higher up the political agenda, seek solutions to provision in informal settlements that are appropriate to and designed in consultation with local communities and create an institutional home and effective co-ordinating mechanisms for urban sanitation provision.**

42. The movement of human waste through sewerage systems is a costly and difficult process in informal urban settlements, partly because sewers are dependent on water supply.⁷⁰ Alternative sanitation provision includes pit latrines and composting toilets, but more research is needed into low-cost sanitation solutions and treatment of wastewater within informal settlements and other urban areas.⁷¹ The World Health Organisation (WHO) highlighted that wastewater is often used for agriculture in both urban and rural areas, and so for public health reasons it must be properly treated.⁷² DFID has supported the revised WHO Guidelines on Safe Use of Wastewater, Excreta and Greywater in Agriculture and Aquaculture and this is to be commended.⁷³

43. One successful example of low-cost sewer provision is the Orangi Project.⁷⁴ Orangi is an informal settlement in Karachi, the largest city in Pakistan. In 1980 a group of Orangi's citizens and a local NGO formed the Orangi Pilot Project to address the dire sanitation situation, which meant that only one-sixth of the sewage generated by the city's population of 10 million was collected. Through dialogue and awareness-raising, residents of Orangi formed groups to build low-cost sewers to collect household waste. Eventually the municipal authority agreed to finance a trunk sewer to channel the collective waste away from the community. As a result, infant mortality rates have fallen from 130 deaths per 1000 live births in the early 1980s to fewer than 40 today.⁷⁵

44. As David Satterthwaite pointed out in relation to the Orangi Project, the key to community provision is “demonstrating new ways of doing things.”⁷⁶ It is crucial that lessons from successful initiatives in urban sanitation such as the Orangi project are widely promoted.⁷⁷ **We recommend that DFID support the wide promotion of lesson-learning about successful low-cost urban sanitation schemes such as the Orangi Project in Pakistan.**

70 Ev 184 [WaterAid]

71 Ev 184 [WaterAid]

72 Ev 335-336 [WHO]

73 DFID and WHO worked in cooperation with FAO and UNEP on this third edition of the Guidelines, available online at http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/wastewater/gsuwww/en/

74 Q 3 [David Satterthwaite]

75 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.121

76 Q 20 [David Satterthwaite]

77 Ev 184 [WaterAid]

DFID—a global champion for sanitation?

45. The doubling and re-doubling of DFID’s water and sanitation programme in Africa by 2011 offers the Department what Professor Cairncross called “a historic opportunity to take a bold lead with new thinking and practices on sanitation”.⁷⁸ There can be no illusions about the difficulty of making progress on sanitation: a dichotomy exists between achieving a culturally sensitive approach to behaviour change at the micro-level whilst moving with sufficient speed and scale to address the hugely off-track MDG target, which, on current trends, will not be met until 2076. Sanitation is a highly cost-effective route towards attaining all the MDGs: we heard that, whilst money for the sector is still a priority, sanitation is not necessarily about “MDG big budget thinking” but about breaking down taboos, raising demand and helping determine strategies for success so that governments accord the sector the priority it deserves.⁷⁹ However, this is not to say that funding is not essential to both the marketing approach—education campaigns, publicity materials and the necessary staff all come at a cost—and to urban infrastructure construction including sewers and water treatment plants. **Sanitation needs international champions to reverse decades of neglect—and, with some re-prioritisation and staff reconfiguration, DFID could and should be one of these champions. We recommend that DFID act now to push sanitation far higher up the global political agenda. If progress towards the sanitation Millennium Development Goal target is not rapidly stepped up, the attainment of all the other MDGs will be compromised.**

78 Ev 141 [Professor Sandy Cairncross]

79 Ev 220 [Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies]; and Q 111 [Dr Darren Saywell]

3 Financing and aid instruments for sanitation and water

46. The financing gap for achieving the sanitation and water MDG target is huge: an annual average of \$7 billion per annum.⁸⁰ The weaknesses in the international aid architecture for the sectors—insufficient donor co-ordination, poor targeting of aid and a multiplicity of actors and structures—compound the financial shortfall. DFID admits that: “The [water and sanitation] system as a whole, from local to international level, is beset by institutional and market failures.”⁸¹

47. This combined financial and aid architecture deficit has prompted DFID into a double-pronged response which pledges *more* aid for the sector—a doubling of support in Africa to £95 million a year by 2008 and a re-doubling to £200 million a year by 2011—and *more effective* aid, through improved accountability, sharper focus on the inequalities that inhibit access, scaled-up political will and improved governance.

DFID’s proposed Global Action Plan

48. In November 2006, DFID proposed a Global Action Plan that would help ensure more, and more effective aid, for the sanitation and water sectors. The Plan has three basic aims: to increase global funding (especially for “donor orphans”⁸² within the sectors); to ensure that money is spent effectively and fairly (longer-term, more predictable and co-ordinated funding and capacity-building at local and regional levels) and to put the right structures in place to make progress. Towards this third objective, DFID has proposed “the Five Ones”: one annual UN monitoring report; one high-level global meeting; one national water and sanitation plan per country; one water and sanitation co-ordinating group per country; and one lead UN body for water and sanitation.⁸³

49. DFID has followed its proposal of the Plan with the publication of an update to its Water Action Plan and other awareness-raising materials including a survey of UK attitudes to water usage on World Water Day 2007 (22 March). We welcome these publications and hope our inquiry has helped spur this renewed activity in relation to sanitation and water.

50. When we asked the Secretary of State in February 2007 about progress in securing international agreement to the proposed Global Action Plan, he was cautiously optimistic, saying the Plan had, “struck a bit of a chord [...] I think it is as good a time as we have had for some years to make progress.” He reported that: a side event on the Plan was scheduled for the annual International Monetary Fund and World Bank Spring Meetings to be held in Washington in April 2007; discussions with UN Water about the production of an

80 The financing gap is the most recent estimate from the UN MDG Taskforce on Water and Sanitation of the total global cost of achieving the water and sanitation MDG targets; and Ev 89 [DFID].

81 Ev 90 [DFID]

82 The term “donor orphans” refers to countries that currently receive too little donor funding, in this case for water and sanitation.

83 DFID, *Why We Need a Global Action Plan on Water and Sanitation*.

annual report had elicited “some interest”; and discussions were ongoing with UNICEF about a lead UN body for each country and with national governments about national plans and co-ordinating groups.⁸⁴

51. However, the scale of the proposed Plan requires urgent action on DFID’s part. To ensure the “Five Ones” are implemented in time for them to have a significant impact on progress towards the MDG deadlines in 2015, DFID should aim to secure agreement and launch the Plan by the end of 2007. **DFID deserves credit for the leadership it has demonstrated through its proposed Global Action Plan for water and sanitation. We were pleased to hear that some progress has been made on securing international agreement to the Plan. We exhort DFID to continue with urgency its high-level engagement on the Plan to ensure that the five objectives are agreed and launched by the end of 2007, to ensure sufficient progress is made towards meeting the MDG targets by 2015.**

Aid predictability and budget support

52. **Whilst pursuing global progress on the effectiveness of financing for sanitation and water, DFID must at the same time ensure that its own house is in order when it comes to providing long-term, predictable and co-ordinated financing to the sectors. Predictability of financing is particularly important for the water sector, where a reliable source of funds is needed to build and maintain infrastructure.**⁸⁵ Yet DFID was criticised by WaterAid and Nepal Water for Health (NEWAH) for suddenly and substantially cutting back its water and sanitation programme in Nepal during 2006.⁸⁶ DFID’s expenditure on rural sanitation and water in Nepal has been cut from around £4 million in 2003/4 to £1.9 million in 2007/8.⁸⁷ DFID attributes the cutback to “the difficult operating environment [...] the takeover by the King in February 2005, autocratic rule and the intensification of conflict” which seriously constrained its objectives.⁸⁸ The Department believes that the Peace Accord signed in Nepal in November 2006 provides a “new window of opportunity” for scaling programmes back up.⁸⁹ However, the unpredictable nature of DFID’s aid has already taken its toll: NEWAH told us that they were prevented from reaching 10,000 poor people with water supplies in 2006 due to DFID’s cut-back.⁹⁰

53. We asked the Secretary of State whether the current political instability in Bangladesh might compromise DFID’s support to sanitation and water in that country. He told us that, as far as he is aware, it would not: “The situation is difficult there but we are getting on with the business notwithstanding.”⁹¹

84 Q 234 [Hilary Benn]

85 Ev 92 [DFID]

86 Ev 194 [WaterAid] and Q 47 [Umesh Pandey]

87 2003/4 expenditure is actual, 2007/8 is planned. Ev 117 [DFID]

88 Ev 116 [DFID]

89 Ev 116 [DFID]

90 Q 47 [Umesh Pandey]

91 Q 256 [Hilary Benn]

54. During our visit to Ethiopia, we saw how DFID’s aid predictability had been affected by the decision to withdraw Poverty Reduction Budget Support (PRBS), first by the UK and then by other donors, in January 2006 in response to concerns about political governance and human rights abuses following the 2005 elections. Ethiopia, unlike Nepal, did not see its programme cut back as a result, but funds were re-channelled through the replacement for PRBS, the £94 million Protection of Basic Services Grant, which seeks to maintain and expand primary schooling, basic health care, water supply and sanitation and agricultural extension. In practice, the Grant is simply another form of budget support. Funds are not earmarked for specific sectors: it is left to the discretion of regions and *woredas* (districts) to allocate funds from the federal block grant for the different sectors based on need. We were told during our visit that, whilst funds disbursed under the Grant have almost reached the level provided under budget support, the Ethiopian Government lost \$1.5 billion in 2006 because the planned scaling-up in donor aid scheduled for the year did not happen.

55. Clearly, the UK Government saw changes to UK aid as a way of communicating an important political message to the governments of Ethiopia and Nepal. But DFID’s Draft Ethiopia Country Assistance Plan for 2006-10 admits that mistakes were made in the way in which donors suddenly withdrew PRBS: “The implications of the donors’ decision to suspend direct budget support were not made sufficiently explicit when the decision was first announced, and since donors had not planned for this contingency new instruments had to be created under intense time and political pressure.”⁹²

56. In our report on DFID’s Departmental Report 2006, we recommended that DFID examine the long-term viability of budgetary support before it is introduced in order to reduce the likelihood of withdrawal. We recommended that in case, as a last resort, it is necessary to withdraw budget support, DFID should put contingency plans in place prior to PRBS being withdrawn.⁹³ In the Government Response to our report, DFID said it would ensure that when it assesses the expected benefits that budget support may deliver, the likelihood of delivering predictable resources will be taken into account.⁹⁴ Furthermore, **where decisions to withdraw planned aid are made, DFID needs to ensure it is accountable to poor people by being fully transparent about decisions and by publicly announcing to parliamentarians and civil society the reasons for changes in policy and the planned remedial course of action. We recommend that DFID ensure that its aid to sanitation and water is predictable. Any rapid scaling-back of aid should be a last resort, but where it is unavoidable—for example following political events that are beyond its control—DFID should publicly communicate changes to its policies to civil society and parliamentarians to ensure proper accountability. We reiterate the recommendation we made in our report on DFID’s Departmental Report 2006 that DFID should examine the long-term viability of Poverty Reduction Budget Support before it is introduced and put contingency plans in place prior to PRBS being withdrawn.**

92 DFID Ethiopia Country Assistance Plan 2006-10: Consultation Draft, p.13.

93 First Report from the Committee, Session 2006-07, *Department for International Development Departmental Report 2006*, HC 71, paragraph 47.

94 Third Special Report from the Committee, Session 2006-07, *DFID Departmental Report: Government Response to the Committee’s First Report of Session 2006-07*, HC 328.

57. The arguments in support of budget support are well-rehearsed: it assists the strengthening of national plans and budgets, and facilitates a high-level policy dialogue with partner governments.⁹⁵ However, concern has also been expressed about the potentially negative implications of budget support generally, and specifically for sanitation and water. Firstly, because responsibility is often spread across different ministries, the sanitation and water sectors can have a weaker voice in claiming their share of budget support compared to other sectors with clearer institutional homes such as health, education and transport.⁹⁶

58. Secondly, capacity on sanitation and water is often very weak at local government level. In countries with decentralised governments, decisions on spending on sanitation and water are taken at the regional, rather than federal, level. This system applies in Ethiopia, where regional and *woreda* (district) level capacity is a major concern, with limited planning and design capacity, inadequate staffing levels and poor facilities and equipment.⁹⁷ Given that Ethiopia's Protection of Basic Services Grant is, in practical terms, simply an alternative form of budget support, the lack of capacity at regional and local level risks national priorities failing to translate at local level, due to misunderstandings and competing priorities. WaterAid found that, despite a doubling of spending by the Ethiopian Government between 1999 and 2004, regional spending only increased by 50% in the same period.⁹⁸

59. Ensuring that aid delivery mechanisms enhance the capacity of local government, which bears the responsibility for service delivery, is a key concern for the sanitation and water sectors.⁹⁹ In parallel, it is crucial that parliamentarians and civil society are able to track spending, scrutinise national and local budgets and effectively articulate demand for sanitation and water. Only with sufficient transparency and the political space for civil society to enter a dialogue with government will accountability mechanisms function.¹⁰⁰ DFID has included such a strategy within its Protection of Basic Services Grant in Ethiopia: Component 4 of the Grant pledges to provide funds directly to civil society groups to help them to hold local officials to account for the delivery of basic services. However, we were told informally by NGOs in Ethiopia that there had been little progress in implementing this Component.

60. For budget support to work effectively as an aid mechanism for the sanitation and water sectors, DFID needs to assist the 'voice' of the sectors by helping to strengthen the 'institutional homes' for sanitation and water and support the building of capacity at local government level. This is especially true for countries with decentralised government where spending decisions are made by regional and local officials. We recommend that DFID support a complementary strategy to strengthen the role of

95 Ev 94 [DFID]

96 Ev 312 [UK National Committee for the International Hydrological Programme of UNESCO]

97 Kevin Tayler and Jim Winpenny, WELL Resource Centre, *Options for DFID support to the water and sanitation sector in Ethiopia: Pre-appraisal report* pp.v-vi; Tearfund, *Making Every Drop Count: Financing water, sanitation and hygiene in Ethiopia*, 2006.

98 WaterAid, *Ethiopia: National Water Sector Assessment* (undated)

99 Ev 177 [WaterAid]

100 Ev 177 [WaterAid]

parliamentarians and civil society in scrutinising budgets and policies and articulating demand for sanitation and water services effectively.

The human right to water

61. On the same day that DFID proposed its Global Action Plan (9 November 2006), the UK announced that it had decided to recognise the human right to water, a statement that UK campaigning groups had been demanding for a number of years.¹⁰¹ Whilst the UK's recognition of water as a basic human right sets a good example and underlines the UK's commitment to the sector internationally, ascertaining what recognition of the right means in practical terms for the 90 countries that have recognised it is quite difficult. As Kevin Watkins, Director of the UNDP's Human Development Report, told us, "Just calling something 'human rights', just putting it in the constitution without any operational vehicle or financing mechanisms for the realisation of that right, does not really help anybody."¹⁰² In many countries, the right to water already exists in law, but this is not public knowledge. DFID could thus pursue a complementary strategy of increasing demand for water services by helping to raise public knowledge of existing entitlements, as well as shortcomings in legislation and provision.

62. Kevin Watkins of UNDP gave the example of South Africa which has made recognition of the right to water meaningful by quantifying and legislating for the right: each citizen is entitled to 25 litres per day. This obliges the water provider to meet that right, which in South Africa has resulted in people taking utilities to court. Successfully legislating for water in this way is rare, however, and Kevin Watkins believes it relies upon countries having the necessary political structures through which people can claim their entitlement.¹⁰³ What countries also need is the financial and technical ability to deliver this, as well as there simply being enough water to go round. Without this, the 'right' to water could be considered a somewhat meaningless aspiration.

63. A rights framework by no means solves the conundrum of how to ensure universal access to water, but it does serve as a powerful moral claim and a trigger for poor people to mobilise around their entitlements.¹⁰⁴ **The UK's recognition of the human right to water is a positive first step. However, DFID should encourage developing countries to go beyond recognition to quantify and legislate for the right to water. Only then can citizens hold their providers accountable for their entitlement to water. This should include a complementary strategy of increasing demand for water services by helping to raise public knowledge of existing entitlements, as well as of gaps in legislation and policies.**

101 DFID, *Why We Need a Global Action Plan on Water and Sanitation*.

102 Q 15 [Kevin Watkins]

103 Q 15 [Kevin Watkins]

104 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.61.

Multilateral institutions and sanitation and water

64. DFID is increasingly channelling sanitation and water financing through multilateral institutions, particularly the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks, including the Asian and African Development Banks. The Secretary of State told us it was not possible to specify at the current stage what proportion of DFID's expanded funding for sanitation and water would go through multilateral channels.¹⁰⁵ Currently, the overall proportion of DFID funds channelled through multilateral institutions is 39%.¹⁰⁶ Given DFID's plans to increase sector expenditure on the one hand and pressures to reduce staffing levels on the other, it is likely that the proportion and level of financing channelled through multilateral institutions will continue to increase.¹⁰⁷

65. WaterAid emphasised that DFID must ensure it has adequate oversight and influence over the multilateral institutions to which it gives funds, and which may not always share the same objectives as DFID. Stephen Turner, Deputy Director of WaterAid, told us that the impact of Asian Development Bank lending policies on India, Bangladesh and Nepal had been shown to exclude the poor from connecting to water services, an obviously divergent outcome to that which DFID would seek from its funding of the Bank.¹⁰⁸ Given that DFID is increasing its funding of the African Development Bank (see paragraphs 78–79), it is important to ensure common objectives. WaterAid suggested that DFID should push pro-poor objectives during multilateral organisations' planning and design stages and during replenishment rounds.¹⁰⁹

66. The following four sub-sections will look at specific multilateral efforts within the sanitation and water sectors, and explore how DFID can seek to exert influence and oversight and maximise its investments, as WaterAid recommends.

The World Bank and the United Nations

67. The International Financial Institutions (IFIs) are key players in the sanitation and water sectors. The World Bank is the leading financier for the sectors: the Bank's contribution has increased rapidly from \$600 million in 2001 to a projected \$2 billion for the current financial year.¹¹⁰ DFID is currently making its largest ever contribution to the World Bank following its record £1.43 billion replenishment of the International Development Association, the Bank's concessional lending arm. DFID is a leading donor to the Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP), a multi-donor partnership closely associated with the World Bank. DFID has made total pledges of \$33 million over the last five years.¹¹¹ In its written evidence, the Bank stated that a valued aspect of DFID's

105 Q 231 [Hilary Benn]

106 First Report from the Committee, Session 2006-07, *Department for International Development: Departmental Report 2006*, HC 71, paragraph 28.

107 Ev 178 [WaterAid]

108 Q 105 [Stephen Turner]

109 Ev 178 [WaterAid]

110 Q 54 [Mark Lowcock]

111 Ev 321 [World Bank]

involvement in the WSP is “the coordinated and effective approach between the Policy Division and country programmes that intersect with WSP.”¹¹²

68. Mark Lowcock, DFID’s Director General for Policy and International, highlighted that an area of concern for DFID was the Bank’s spending bias towards sanitation and water in urban, rather than rural, areas.¹¹³ About 85% of the Bank’s spending on sanitation and water is focused on urban settlements.¹¹⁴ DFID also pointed out in its written evidence that over half of the World Bank’s investments in sanitation and water are focused on middle-income countries.¹¹⁵

69. The UN is not a major provider of financial resources for sanitation and water and it has a fragmented and un-coordinated approach to the sanitation and water sectors.¹¹⁶ 23 separate UN bodies work on sanitation and water, with no assigned lead agency. UN-Water was established in 2003 to improve co-ordination between this assortment of agencies but no lead agency has yet been identified, nor were sufficient resources allotted to the initiative.¹¹⁷ DFID contributes core funding to UN-Water.¹¹⁸ The Secretary of State recognises the need for reform of the UN’s fragmented approach: he told us that “the UN [...] needs to get their act together” on sanitation and water.¹¹⁹

Financing water-supporting infrastructure

70. DFID contributes to international multi-donor infrastructure facilities, which aim to help finance the large infrastructure investments—piping, bridges, dams, roads—that are vital for the water sector. DFID contributed about £35 million in 2005-06 to infrastructure facilities, although only around £5 million of this went to specific sanitation and water projects, and these are largely focused on advisory or technical assistance. They include the World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP), Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) and the Public Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility (PPIAF).¹²⁰

71. The World Development Movement has criticised DFID for funding PPIAF, an initiative they believe pushes the water privatisation agenda in developing countries.¹²¹ But the aim of leveraging in appropriate levels of private sector finance is a legitimate one: the nature of the current infrastructure challenge overwhelmingly concerns financial resources. The Commission for Africa recommended that, in order to address the full scale of services needed in Africa, a doubling of infrastructure spending is required—expenditure of US\$10 billion a year up to 2010 and, subject to review, a further increase to

112 Ev 321 [World Bank]

113 Q 54 [Mark Lowcock]

114 Ev 102 [DFID]

115 Ev 102 [DFID]

116 Ev 104 [DFID] and Ev 160 [Tearfund]

117 Ev 160 [Tearfund]

118 Ev 104 [DFID]

119 Q 225 [Hilary Benn]

120 Ev 103 [DFID]

121 World Development Movement, *Down the drain: how aid for water sector reform could be better spent* (November 2006).

US\$20 billion a year in the following five years.¹²² **DFID needs to engage with other donors to ensure that the Commission for Africa’s recommended donor spending on infrastructure of US\$10 billion a year up to 2010 (and, subject to review, a further increase to US\$20 billion a year in the following five years) is secured.**

Maximising benefits from the EU Water Initiative

72. The EU Water Initiative (EUWI) was launched at the 2002 World Summit for Sustainable Development as a political rather than a financial initiative. It seeks to reinforce political commitments, improve co-ordination and target national water governance through Multi-Stakeholder Country Dialogues (see paragraphs 74–75). There has been much criticism of the EUWI and DFID is currently leading a review to create a more defined focus and to give greater priority towards delivery.¹²³ Tearfund and WaterAid perceive there to be a number of inherent problems within the EUWI, including: a lack of commitment by EU member states; an absence of accountability; the omission of developing country governments from dialogue, and an unfocused approach which fails sufficiently to target the most off-track countries. For example two of the EUWI’s four working groups are focused on regions that are on-track for the sanitation and water targets.¹²⁴ Antonio Garcia-Fragio from the European Commission (EC) admitted that Africa, in particular, does not get the attention it should within the EUWI.¹²⁵ The EUWI’s Africa Working Group is therefore a priority area of engagement for DFID so that gaps and overlaps in funding to sub-Saharan Africa can be identified and funding prioritised accordingly. **We recommend that DFID prioritise engaging with the EU Water Initiative’s Africa Working Group so that gaps and overlaps in funding for sanitation and water in Africa can be addressed.**

73. The EUWI was created primarily to co-ordinate EU donors’ support to sanitation and water.¹²⁶ Yet there is little evidence that co-ordination has improved because of the initiative. Mark Lowcock, DFID Director General for Policy and International, told us that “a big, big prize for us” would be for the EUWI to contribute more effectively to co-ordination.¹²⁷ A major factor in this poor co-ordination is insufficient engagement with the EUWI by EU member states. Antonio Garcia-Fragio from the EC identified engagement with inactive member states as the most helpful thing that DFID could do for the EUWI, because of its position as a leader within the Initiative, its large presence in Africa and its influential relationship with the World Bank, which could assist with tools for leveraging finance into African countries.¹²⁸ **DFID has shown leadership on the EU Water Initiative from the outset. It now needs to use this position to seek more active participation from**

122 Commission for Africa Report (2005), p.234.

123 For example, see Ev 160 [Tearfund], Ev 179 [WaterAid] and WaterAid/Tearfund, *An Empty Glass: the EU Water Initiative’s contribution to the water and sanitation Millennium Targets*, p.3, where five reasons for failure are set out.

124 WaterAid/Tearfund, *An Empty Glass*, p.3.

125 Q 97 [Antonio Garcia Fragio]

126 Q 95 [Antonio Garcia Fragio]

127 Q 82 [Mark Lowcock]

128 Q 96 [Antonio Garcia Fragio]

other donors so that improved co-ordination of EU member states' aid to sanitation and water can be facilitated.

74. Another primary objective of the EUWI is to improve national water governance through a lead EU donor and an individual government working together on political and financial strategies for reaching the sanitation and water targets (in what it calls a Multi-Stakeholder Country Dialogue). Ethiopia was selected to become one of ten pilot countries and its Dialogue was launched in November 2005. Country Dialogues have attracted criticism internationally and have failed to get off the ground in all but a few countries.¹²⁹ However, there is general agreement amongst sector experts that the Ethiopian Dialogue has been the most successful to date. This is attributed to commitment from the Government of Ethiopia, the support of donors and a strong financing strategy.¹³⁰

75. Ethiopia's EUWI Taskforce brings together the four sector ministries, the main donors to sanitation and water and NGOs: a successful Multi-stakeholder Forum was held in October 2006 and a Financing Roundtable, funded by DFID, will take place in the first quarter of 2007. We were told in Ethiopia that DFID was playing "an essential role" in the Country Dialogue, and that the secondment of a DFID adviser into the Ministry of Water Resources under the Dialogue had been central to its success. EUWI Taskforce officials were hopeful that effective donor co-ordination would reassure donors and lever in scaled-up finance for sanitation and water in Ethiopia. DFID should work thorough the EUWI Africa Working Group to promote lessons from the Ethiopia Country Dialogue and to persuade other donors to strengthen their participation in Country Dialogues. **DFID has played an essential role in the first successful EU Water Initiative (EUWI) Country Dialogue in Ethiopia. It should proactively share lessons learned with other pilot countries so that the effective factors within the Ethiopian Dialogue can be emulated elsewhere. The Department should encourage other donors within the EUWI Africa Working Group to increase their involvement in Country Dialogues.**

The EU Water Facility

76. The EU Water Facility (EUWF) is a challenge fund set up in 2004 with a €500m contribution from EU member states. EUWF funding, for which countries bid on a competitive basis, has since funded 97 water and sanitation projects, which will bring access to water to an estimated 10 million people, and sanitation to about five million people over the next four years.¹³¹ However, WaterAid and Tearfund suggest that the distortionary risks of the EUWF are so high that it should be scrapped once its present application round is completed so that resources and efforts can be redirected towards bilateral support for national budgets: "The EUWF has actually had a negative effect by distracting hard-pressed officials. They have focused on submitting proposals [...] rather than, for example, on lobbying their own Governments to prioritise the water and sanitation sector"¹³²

129 Ev 178-179 [WaterAid]

130 *Options for DFID support to the water and sanitation sector in Ethiopia: Pre-appraisal report*, p.22.

131 Ev 105 [DFID]

132 WaterAid/Tearfund, *An Empty Glass* .

77. DFID's proposed Action Plan for water and sanitation advocates that the Facility should be reformed and better linked to the EU Water Initiative.¹³³ The tenth round of the European Development Fund will be finalised in 2007 for the 2008-13 period, and provides a window of opportunity to reform the EUWF.¹³⁴ The EUWF's first bidding round was 15 times over-subscribed and the Secretary of State acknowledged that potentially the bidding process could act as a distraction to government time and capacity for in-country work on sanitation and water.¹³⁵ Greg Briffa, Head of DFID's Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team, agreed and pointed out the importance of integrating financing into national planning.¹³⁶ **We agree with DFID's view that the EU Water Facility should be reformed and better linked to the EU Water Initiative so that it is more strongly integrated into national and local planning. The tenth round of the European Development Fund, to be finalised in 2007, provides a window of opportunity for DFID and other donors to seek the reform of the EU Water Facility.**

The African Development Bank's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative

78. DFID's engagement with and support for the African Development Bank (AfDB) has grown considerably over the past five years, particularly in Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Mozambique. At the end of 2006, DFID committed £6 million to a technical assistance project which will support the AfDB's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI), the largest initiative of this kind. The RWSSI focuses on rural areas with a target of reaching 32 million rural dwellers by 2015 (an 80% access rate).¹³⁷ The total estimated cost of the RWSSI is huge, at around US\$14 billion.

79. Sering Jallow, Acting Manager of the AfDB's Water and Sanitation Department, emphasised to us that local government capacity in rural areas is often:

“A huge problem [...] You need to build capacity within the decentralised local authorities, you need to build capacity of the communities who will be responsible for maintenance of these [water and sanitation] facilities [...] It is not a question of building capacity now and coming later to do investments; we need to do both together.”¹³⁸

Whilst the RWSSI does include an objective of capacity-building for decentralised government bodies, this is just one strand of a multi-pronged strategy which includes awareness-raising, mobilisation of funds, hygiene and health promotion and appropriate technology promotion, and the risk exists that the vital capacity-building objective will be subsumed within these other aims. A further concern relates to the AfDB's own capacity to disburse finance effectively at the scale required.¹³⁹ DFID needs to help support the Bank's

133 DFID, *Why We Need a Global Action Plan on Water and Sanitation*, p.3.

134 The European Development Fund (EDF) is the main instrument for European Community aid for development co-operation in the African Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries and the Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT).

135 Q 235 [Hilary Benn]

136 Q 235 [Greg Briffa]

137 Ev 103 [DFID]

138 Q 93 [Sering Jallow]

139 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

own capacity to target and spend funds where they are needed most. **DFID's support to the African Development Bank's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI) is important. In order to maximise this investment and the success of the RWSSI, we recommend that DFID engage with the Bank to ensure that capacity-building of rural local government bodies is a major priority for the Initiative, and does not become subsumed amongst the RWSSI's competing priorities. DFID should also support the Bank's own capacity to target and spend funds effectively.**

4 Supplying water

80. For many poor people globally, the daily struggle to access water seriously depletes energy, health, money and time. Inequalities based on wealth and location, together with flawed policies, mean that poor people pay the most and travel the furthest for water. Achieving even the basic minimum standard of access to water—20 litres per day of clean water from an improved source within one kilometre of the home—remains a huge challenge, with 1.1 billion people, including half of all Africans, unable to meet this basic requirement.¹⁴⁰

81. Accessing an ‘improved’ source entails acquiring water from an in-house connection, standpipe, pump or protected well—not a vendor, water truck or stream.¹⁴¹ Bringing an improved source to within one kilometre of every single home worldwide is an enormous responsibility for governments and donors, but one that cannot be shirked if the full range of MDG targets are to become a reality. Working out the mechanisms by which clean water can be delivered to all is thus a policy imperative for DFID.

Finding the right role for the private, public and informal sectors

82. The question of whether the public or private sector should supply water tends to be given disproportionate attention in international dialogues around water provision. Simplistic public versus private debates miss the point: as the UNDP’s Human Development Report states, “The criterion for assessing policy should not be public or private but performance or non-performance for the poor”.¹⁴² However, it would be irresponsible to ignore the lessons of the 1980s and 1990s: an over-reliance on the private sector to deliver water equitably and affordably to the poor does not work.¹⁴³ In the 1990s, donors—especially the World Bank—promoted privatisation as a means to deliver finance for investments, efficiency improvements, and better governance in the water sector. Yet the expected benefits never arrived: research by the University of Greenwich has found that since 1990, only about 600,000 households have been connected as a result of investment by private water operators in sub-Saharan Africa, south Asia, and east Asia (outside China), representing less than 1% of the people who need to be served in those regions to meet the MDGs.¹⁴⁴

83. Simultaneous to donor realisation that private sector involvement would be no panacea for expanding water access, and that they had oversold its merits, the large private water companies found far fewer opportunities to invest. Accordingly, they retrenched. Companies realised that the available returns often failed to compensate for the political and regulatory risks involved in developing country water investments.¹⁴⁵

140 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, pp. 80-81.

141 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, pp. 80-81.

142 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.10.

143 Ev 253 [David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, PSIRU, University of Greenwich]

144 Ev 253 [David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, PSIRU, University of Greenwich]

145 Ev 222 [Christian Engineers in Development]

The private sector's role as a contractor

84. Following the privatisation experience and the retrenchment of the private sector, attention has turned to finding the right role for the private sector: one that will simultaneously expand poor people's access to water and pull in much-needed funds for infrastructure, in particular. Limited transfers of responsibility to the private sector including service and management contracts are widespread in Africa. These arrangements can work well, depending on how they are operated.¹⁴⁶ As Aquafed, the International Federation of Private Water Operators, pointed out in their written evidence, management contracts between experienced private operators and their local partners—public utilities—can be an effective way of building capacity.¹⁴⁷ It is crucial, however, that such contracts contain specific pro-poor requirements, with implementation of these clauses monitored, and that transparency of contracting procedures is built into the process so that performance targets are publicly known.¹⁴⁸ **Limited service and management contracts can be mutually beneficial for the private sector and public water providers, but only if contracting procedures are transparent, include provision for training and capacity building within local communities, performance targets are publicly known and contracts include effectively monitored pro-poor requirements.**

NGO-delivered and community-managed water services

85. As well as advocating and raising public awareness about inadequate sanitation and water, NGOs also serve as water providers, particularly in un-networked areas. Often communities themselves manage water services, without the involvement of a formal NGO, but with wide user participation including water and sanitation committees. Both forms of provision can work highly effectively in improving access for poor people. For example, the NGO Nepal Water for Health (NEWAH) supports 50-60 projects a year across Nepal and uses its Gender and Poverty Approach to promote equitable access to water.¹⁴⁹

86. Yet even successful NGO and community schemes need to work within a government framework so that they are sustainable and so that, for example, schemes are legally registered and therefore accountable in cases of poor standards or corruption. Cooperation between community providers and the government also ensures that the creation of parallel structures is avoided. During our visit to Ethiopia, we saw an example of an NGO provider working successfully in this way. WaterAction has implemented 34 water and sanitation programmes, helping 600,000 people, since it was established in 1995 by Ethiopian professionals with the assistance of WaterAid UK. In Alaba, a small town in a water-stressed area in the Southern Nations region, we saw how women's journeys to collect water—previously around six hours' walk—had been greatly reduced by the provision of 14 borehole schemes and 59 water points, which have increased water coverage from 12% to 35%. We were told that before this scheme was introduced, forced abductions and women giving birth during the long journey had been frequent

146 Ev 87 [DFID]

147 Ev 124 [Aquafed]

148 Ev 92 [DFID]

149 Ev 153 [Nepal Water for Health]

occurrences. WaterAction puts the responsibility on communities to manage their needs: water and sanitation committees are established at the outset of any project and are involved throughout the process, facilitated by community mobilisers who are usually women. The committees set tariffs, so that water is charged for at levels affordable to even the poorest in the community (10 cents for a 20 litre can). Regional and *woreda* (district) level government is also involved from the start: stakeholder workshops, which include government representatives, are held at the beginning of a project and construction of boreholes and wells is done in co-ordination with the authorities.

87. NGOs and communities themselves are important water providers, but to work effectively they must operate within government frameworks so that legitimacy and sustainability are ensured. We recommend that DFID encourage partner governments to engage in NGO and community schemes so that co-ordination and sustainability of water provision schemes can be maximised.

The informal sector

88. For many poor people, the small-scale, informal private sector—including water vendors, kiosks and trucks—will be the only or, at least, the most important water supplier. In Nairobi, Kenya, for example, 60% of the urban poor are supplied by informal providers. The key problem with informal private suppliers is that they fall outside regulatory frameworks and thus quality and price controls.¹⁵⁰ Water obtained from vendors is often 10-20 times more costly than water delivered through a utility.¹⁵¹ Kevin Watkins from the UNDP emphasised the importance of proper regulation of private vendors in slum areas, and the need to license vendors so that poor people in slums are not paying more than people in high-income suburbs.¹⁵² Informal suppliers perpetuate the harsh reality that the poorest tend to pay the most for their water. Block tariff systems—which raise the price in line with the volume of water acquired—mean that middle men, buying water in bulk subsequently to sell on to poor households, charge high rates. Households connected to the utility would pay far less per unit, but given that connection fees are generally prohibitively high for poor people—in urban Kenya connection costs approximately six months' income—poor people remain locked into obtaining water informally.¹⁵³ This, as Kevin Watkins told us, is a fundamental inequality and results in situations like that in the Kibera slum of Nairobi, where a totally privatised water market exists because of informal provision.¹⁵⁴

Locally appropriate solutions to water supply

89. The answer to addressing this inequality, we were told, lies in support for locally appropriate solutions to water supply. David Satterthwaite from the International Institute for Environment and Development suggested, “you have to go down to each locality and

150 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.11.

151 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.83.

152 Q 13 [Kevin Watkins]

153 UNDP, *Human Development Report 2006*, p.10.

154 Q 6 [Kevin Watkins]

ask who is providing what and who is capable of improving provision.”¹⁵⁵ Will Day from Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor agreed, saying that communities should be “supported in such a way that they can have a proper engagement and voice in the process and the capacity to deliver water in such a way that it is locally affordable and environmentally sound.”¹⁵⁶

90. The vision of a locally appropriate, government-supported solution to water supply that reduces inequalities in access is an appealing one—but making this happen at the scale required is a huge challenge for governments and donors. Ultimately, achieving this ideal solution is likely to involve working concurrently towards a combination of outcomes, including: strengthening public utilities; boosting governance within the water sector; building local capacity and technical expertise; and ensuring that DFID’s own advisory capacity is of high quality, in order to support in-country partners effectively. The remainder of this chapter will examine each of these objectives, to assess how donors can provide a package of support that redresses the fundamental inequalities that currently impede water service delivery to poor people.

Strengthening public utilities

91. Public water utilities are mandated by government to supply water to a designated area. The public sector is responsible for more than 90% of the piped network in developing countries. The performance of many public utilities has been lamentable in terms of quality of service—for instance, hours of supply and water quality—and extension into urban poor areas. However, there are a number of success stories which show that public utilities can work extremely well. In 1993, Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, saw a process of utility reform begin, and since then quality of service has greatly improved, staffing inefficiencies have disappeared, meters have been installed for all connections and most bills are paid. Most importantly, provision has been pro-poor: by the end of October 2006 the utility had arranged nearly 14,000 connections for poor households and service now covers 90% of the city.¹⁵⁷

92. Strengthening and reforming utilities requires identifying the sources of weakness, which include poor governance, infrastructure that is not fit for purpose (with leaking pipes a major problem) and poor revenue collection. Failing to enforce bill payment, setting tariffs too low to recover even operation and maintenance costs, and loss of water from leaking pipes, lead to large deficits which cause utilities to struggle to provide regular supplies to those with existing access, let alone to extend services.¹⁵⁸

93. DFID supports several international programmes that aim to strengthen public operators. It has provided around £1 million to the International Benchmarking Network for Water and Sanitation Utilities, which is managed by the World Bank and seeks to increase the transparency of utility performance and monitor their efficiency. DFID has

155 Q 2 [David Satterthwaite]

156 Q 6 [Will Day]

157 World Development Movement, *Going public: Southern solutions to the global water crisis* (March 2007), pp.52-62.

158 Ev 87 [DFID]

also given just under £0.5 million to Building Partnerships for Development, an informal network that uses research to demonstrate the use of partnerships for local operators.¹⁵⁹

94. Sharing good practice between public utilities is something that DFID acknowledges it should do more of.¹⁶⁰ ‘Public-public partnerships’ (PUPs) offer one mechanism by which utilities can share knowledge and learn from each other’s successes.¹⁶¹ PUPs enable a public utility which is strong in one area of performance to be linked with another utility that is keen to gain knowledge and experience in that particular area. The UN Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation has included Water Operators Partnerships—a similar notion to PUPs—as one of the six key objectives in its Compendium of Actions.¹⁶² Vicky Cann of the World Development Movement told us that DFID should support PUPs, because they promote the sharing of “south-south” knowledge and can address a wide range of issues, from the technical detail of, for example, particular types of pump or treatment systems, to becoming more accountable to users.¹⁶³ **Public utilities are responsible for the vast majority of service delivery. Reform of public utilities is essential if they are to operate more effectively and efficiently and increase service coverage for poor people. We recommend that DFID investigate the promotion and funding of ‘public-public partnerships’ between public water operators, which can help utilities in developing countries support each other, share knowledge and learn from each other’s successes.**

Water governance

95. Water governance is an integral part of strengthening public utilities. Successful utilities are those which are accountable and transparent to users, efficient in their operations, deliver according to clear performance standards and targets and which recycle the revenues generated to make ongoing improvements to the service they provide.¹⁶⁴ Water governance represents the systems and processes—whether social, institutional, ecological or economic—which society sets in place to manage its water resources and deliver water services.¹⁶⁵ Governance of the water sector has tended disproportionately to benefit affluent sectors of society: poor people bear the burden of unregulated private providers, inadequate public provision, corruption and insecure land tenure.

96. As in many other sectors, tackling corruption is an important part of securing good governance.¹⁶⁶ Two major areas for concern are corrupt relations between utilities and their customers, and between utilities and their contractors.¹⁶⁷ Several witnesses noted that a primary way of tackling corruption was paying water staff a decent wage.¹⁶⁸ Vicky Cann

159 HC Deb, 19 February 2007, cols 71W-72W. BPD and IBNET have been funded since 2002.

160 Q 247 [Hilary Benn]

161 Ev 170 [WaterAid]

162 UN Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation, Compendium of Actions (March 2006).

163 Q 180 [Vicky Cann] and Ev 200 [World Development Movement]

164 Ev 197 [World Development Movement]

165 Ev 196 [Water Research Group, Bradford University]

166 Q 143 [Professor Tom Franks]

167 Q 34 [Jack Moss]

168 Ev 254 [David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, PSIRU, University of Greenwich] and Q 149 [Professor Tom Franks]

from World Development Movement cited evidence from Dhaka in Bangladesh and Phnom Penh in Cambodia, where prioritising wages has been a significant factor in tackling low-level corruption.¹⁶⁹ **Tackling corruption is of core importance to improving governance of the water sector. Corruption is less likely if utility employees do not need to supplement their pay through bribes. We recommend that DFID encourage partner governments and the private sector to prioritise paying water sector staff a decent wage.**

97. But witnesses warned that addressing corruption would by no means solve all governance problems in the water sector.¹⁷⁰ Building accountability is a pivotal part of securing good governance, so that governments, utilities and the private sector include poor people, especially women, in water policy design, implementation and monitoring processes.¹⁷¹ This should be a two-way process so that donors simultaneously help build accountability mechanisms with water providers whilst supporting civil society's capacity to articulate demand for an improved and transparent service.

98. Antonio Miranda Neto, Director for International Affairs for the Brazilian Association of Municipal Water and Sanitation Public Water Operators, told us of his experience of successfully reforming the public utility in Recife, Brazil, where top-down decision-making frameworks had been replaced with more democratic, community-based processes including multi-stakeholder supervisory committees: "Ordinary people are not engineers, are not biologists, but they can play a very important role in asking essential questions and they have the sense of reality that many times our experts do not have."¹⁷² Mr Miranda Neto suggested that the International Financial Institutions should replace the conditionalities they use for lending to certain water projects with requirements for accountability, transparency and democratic decision-making processes.¹⁷³

99. Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP), an international multi-stakeholder initiative established in 2004, aims to provide water supply in poor urban areas building on the central working relationship between the water supplier, the local service provider and the community. WSUP contends that the sustainability of projects seeking donor funding is compromised by current donor tender funding cycles: they take too long, with protracted feasibility assessments and consideration periods. This lengthy funding cycle, WSUP believes, precludes sustained engagement between a capacity-building partner and the community and makes the establishment of mutual trust difficult.¹⁷⁴

169 Q 147 [Vicky Cann]

170 Q 145 [Professor Tom Franks and Antonio Miranda]

171 Ev 169 [WaterAid]

172 Q 146 [Antonio Miranda]

173 Q 144 and Q 161 [Antonio Miranda]

174 Ev 163 [Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP)] and Michael Thompson and Sam Parker, *New Funding Mechanisms Required for Urban Poor Water and Sanitation Projects*, February 2006.

100. WaterAid highlighted experiences in Latin America of successful citizen-led accountability mechanisms—for instance, citizen councils scrutinising the investments and performance of the utility in Caracas, Venezuela and Porto Alegre, Brazil.¹⁷⁵ During our visit to Ethiopia, we visited the town of Alaba, where the NGO WaterAction had set up water and sanitation committees to promote, build and maintain reliable water supply. Under the initiative, women are encouraged to assume leadership and decision-making roles, often by working as village hygiene communicators and chairing committees. **We recommend that DFID work to ensure that improved accountability and transparency mechanisms are built into national decision-making processes. This will facilitate a clearer voice for consumers and civil society, and help to ensure that water systems are based on the realities of poor people’s needs. This should include looking at the length of donor funding cycles which, if too protracted, can compromise the mutual trust that should be at the heart of the supplier-provider-community relationship.**

Boosting local capacity and technical expertise

101. In our view, the lack of institutional, organisational and individual capacity at the national and local level is a more serious constraint on the water sector than lack of finance, particularly within decentralised governments where the responsibility for sanitation and water lies at the municipal, regional and district level.¹⁷⁶ The competency shortfall manifests itself in a number of ways, including weak diagnostic, scientific, technical, monitoring and analytical capacity.

102. A primary issue relates to poor educational opportunities and a resulting deficit of technical knowledge for designing, implementing and maintaining water systems. John Chilton from the British Geological Survey told us that there has been a “terrible decline” in postgraduate education for water professionals, and that the consequent decline in national water resource capacity in, for example, Malawi was nothing short of “heartbreaking”.¹⁷⁷ Even for the fortunate few who train at postgraduate level, the content of courses is often outdated and inappropriate. Dr Darren Saywell of the International Water Association told us, “If you look at the engineering curricula in parts of Africa, it is still based upon Western European modes of engineering [which are] completely inappropriate.”¹⁷⁸

103. DFID has cut back on funding the training of water professionals.¹⁷⁹ The British Geological Survey’s written evidence told us that, “Post-graduate training of hydrological, hydrogeological and irrigation professionals seems almost to have disappeared.”¹⁸⁰ David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, from the University of Greenwich, stated in their submission:

“[During the] 1990s, the World Bank and other donors—including the UK, France and Finland—cut back on their aid for training water workers in developing

175 Ev 183 [WaterAid]

176 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton] and Q 126 [Dr Darren Saywell]

177 Q 190 [John Chilton]

178 Q 126 [Dr Darren Saywell]

179 Ev 231 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

180 Ev 144 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

countries. One aid official explained that training had become ‘unfashionable’. Technical institutions in countries such as Kenya and Tanzania, which were formerly flourishing as training centres, have become run-down as donor resources dried up.”¹⁸¹

DFID officials told us that the Department now prefers to focus on “learning within the project and programmes”—that is, building up local institutions and strengthening community capacity—rather than risk training individuals who may then chose to work for other organisations.¹⁸² But DFID could support national water professionals without the need to fund individuals: by negotiating a quota of funds from budget support or other form of assistance that is ringfenced for water professionals’ training and salaries, DFID could simultaneously support training and help to mitigate the ‘brain drain’ of professionals from developing to developed countries.

104. One route that DFID could take to strengthen capacity at professional and technician level, whilst managing the risk of funding individuals’ training, is to offer more support to regional centres of excellence.¹⁸³ Elwyn Grainger-Jones, Head of DFID’s Sustainable Development Group, told us that DFID has supported resource centres on sanitation and water in Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh and India.¹⁸⁴ This support was offered for five years, from 2001-06. The Department also supports UK-based resource centre schemes for DFID staff and programmes to call on for professional knowledge.¹⁸⁵ Increased support to local resource centres could greatly assist regional, national and sub-national level officials in developing locally appropriate solutions. The key is identifying solutions that have worked elsewhere and modifying and applying them in particular institutional and social contexts. Resource centres need to be set up in a way that is sustainable and allows them to attract business and function as financially viable entities.¹⁸⁶ **We recommend that DFID do more to strengthen capacity in sanitation and water to provide policy support and technical advisory services for national governments and development partners. One route towards this would be increased support to regional, national and sub-national resource centres in Africa and Asia. The centres could support knowledge transfer, develop appropriate training courses, provide policy advice and encourage the development of locally appropriate solutions to sanitation and water. Centres should be established in a way that is sustainable and allows them to attract business and function as financially viable entities.**

105. Dr Darren Saywell of the International Water Association suggested that another way in which DFID could help address capacity constraints was by brokering expertise, so that countries suffering from a particular technical problem within their water systems could be linked—possibly through professional associations—with experts or practitioners with experience of solving similar problems. Twinning and mentoring are key ways to facilitate this sharing of experience, and are already being used amongst system providers in Africa

181 Ev 255 [David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, PSIRU, University of Greenwich]

182 Q 230 [Ian Curtis and Greg Briffa]

183 Ev 145 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

184 Q 230 [Elwyn Grainger-Jones]

185 Ev 145 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

186 Ev 231 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

and Asia.¹⁸⁷ The multi-stakeholder Partners for Water and Sanitation initiative has facilitated demand-responsive twinning relationships with in-country partners that provide support through short-term, clearly focused inputs. In South Africa, for example, a British water company has twinned with a municipality and provides long distance support and advice.¹⁸⁸ Dr Saywell told us that DFID does make use of professional associations but on a rather informal basis, and that “a more positive engagement [...] would allow a ripple effect to go across the water and sanitation sector and its professionals.”¹⁸⁹ **DFID should build a more formal relationship with professional water associations, which can assist in brokering expertise between countries experiencing similar technical problems in their water systems, using methods such as responsive twinning and mentoring to provide support for water operators in developing countries.**

106. A linked area of concern relating to building capacity is hydrometric data collection. Data on the hydrological cycle—precipitation, river flows, lake levels, groundwater levels, water quality and so on—must be collected and analysed by adequately trained personnel so that water access needs can be assessed, water resources can be managed efficiently and the impacts of climate change accurately measured. The British Geological Survey identified a decline in the necessary expertise for data collection and analysis and the Institution of Civil Engineers highlighted the risks this poses for the poor design of water supply schemes (see Chapter 5 for further detail about the importance of accurate data collection). Both organisations believed that DFID should do much more to address the data deficiency and associated capacity constraints.¹⁹⁰ **DFID should encourage partner governments to boost staff numbers and develop training programmes to improve the collection of accurate hydrological data, which is essential to pinpointing water access and management needs.**

DFID’s advisory capacity in the water sector

107. A final issue in assessing how to ensure that water supply is pro-poor and locally appropriate concerns DFID’s own capacity to advise and assist in-country partners. Part of this centres on DFID’s research capacity in the water sector. The Secretary of State told us that, as part of the doubling of DFID’s overall research programme, an £18 million water and sanitation research department has been agreed.¹⁹¹ This is a much-needed step: witnesses expressed concern that DFID’s research capacity for water has weakened. Dr Darren Saywell told us that, in the past, DFID had very large knowledge and research programmes that have subsequently declined.¹⁹² The UK National Committee for the International Hydrological Programme of UNESCO discerned an “imbalance within DFID towards social sciences, at the expense of the physical sciences [...] too few DFID staff have physical sciences backgrounds, which has resulted in an apparent bias in policy

187 Q 122 [Dr Darren Saywell]

188 Ev 288 [Partners for Water and Sanitation]

189 Q 123 [Dr Darren Saywell]

190 Ev 146 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey] and Ev 271 [Institution of Civil Engineers]. See also paragraph 103 on the need for DFID to support training of national water professionals.

191 Q 229 [Hilary Benn]

192 Q 111 [Dr Darren Saywell]

implementation.”¹⁹³ DFID officials were clear that their own research capacity was only half of the equation: Mark Lowcock said, “One of the big issues on research is uptake, who gets it and the capacity of local institutions to use [research].”¹⁹⁴ The Secretary of State said, “It is not [...] that we lack for knowledge about what can work in the right circumstances, it is how you get people to apply that knowledge and make it happen on the ground.”¹⁹⁵ **DFID’s decision significantly to boost its own research capacity on water and sanitation is welcome. We particularly support the focus on building local capacity for research. The Department needs a clear strategy for deciding in which areas research is required and how findings will be communicated and used within partner countries.**

108. DFID focuses water expertise within its cadre of infrastructure advisers, and, following a drop in 2005, the headcount of this grouping has recently grown again.¹⁹⁶ However, the impact of civil service efficiency targets—which are likely to entail a 10% headcount cut for DFID—and the expansion of the water and sanitation budget by 2011 will place substantial pressure on DFID’s advisory capacity. A National Audit Office audit of DFID’s support to the water sector in 2003 stressed the need for DFID to “balance its new resource requirements with the retention of appropriate technical expertise, to maintain sufficient knowledge of the country’s sectoral needs and to facilitate policy dialogue in individual sectors”.¹⁹⁷ A number of written submissions articulated the concern that there is a significant lack of in-house technical expertise within DFID—and there was further disquiet that DFID is trying to manage an expanding aid budget with a limited complement of technical staff.¹⁹⁸ Fewer advisers will be handling more money and responsibilities: this potentially compromises DFID’s ability to service in-country partnerships and communicate knowledge within the Department—especially between Policy Division and country programmes.¹⁹⁹

109. Given the overall lack of capacity within the water sector, these constraints on DFID’s own specialist expertise are worrying, especially given that DFID has channelled its advisory capacity innovatively and with good results in recent years. A particular success has been the secondment of two infrastructure advisers into ministries to work on national water and sanitation strategies: in Uganda the secondment of DFID’s Simon Kenny into the Ministry of Finance “had beneficial impacts on the water programme out of all proportion to the cost”²⁰⁰ and in Ethiopia we heard from a number of in-country partners, including the EU Water Initiative, that the secondment of Mark Harvey into the Ministry of Water Resources was proving very helpful in improving co-operation within the water sector.

193 Ev 311 [UK National Committee for the International Hydrological Programme of UNESCO]

194 Q 78 [Mark Lowcock]

195 Q 229 [Hilary Benn]

196 Ev 110 [DFID]. In 2004, there were 41 infrastructure advisers. This dropped to 36 in 2005 but increased again to 44 in 2006.

197 National Audit Office, *DFID: Maximising Impact in the Water Sector* (2003) http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/02-03/0203351.pdf

198 Ev 271 [Institution of Civil Engineers] and Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

199 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

200 Q 191 [John Chilton]

110. Issues around DFID's need to do "more with less" are discussed in Chapter 2 in relation to sanitation and in Chapter 3 in relation to channelling more funds for sanitation and water through multilateral institutions. Mark Lowcock, DFID's Director General for Policy and International, called the headcount-resource expansion dilemma "the biggest challenge we face" and said that the Department will have to use partnerships "much better" in order to ensure adequate coverage of the water sector.²⁰¹ But beyond this smarter use of partnerships, no coherent strategies were offered when we pressed officials on the subject.

111. When we asked the Secretary of State how many infrastructure advisers DFID plans to have in place by 2011 to accompany the massively increased budget for the sanitation and water sectors, we were astonished to be told that they did not know and that no needs assessment had been carried out. We were told that capacity would only increase by "one or two" people by 2011.²⁰² This reflects a worrying tendency in DFID, on which we have commented before, to focus too heavily on financial inputs—how much it is spending—rather than on ensuring it has the necessary personnel and structures in place to provide certainty that increasing funds are spent effectively.²⁰³ **While money is part of the solution to reaching the sanitation and water MDGs, and we very much welcome the increase in DFID's allocation, it is not sufficient on its own. Developing countries have an urgent need for technical advice and capacity building in the water sector, which will require increased human resources within DFID. DFID must address its own tendency to focus too heavily on financial inputs without adequately assessing the necessary human resource requirements for efficient expenditure of funds.**

112. DFID's staff reductions come at a time when other donors are also having headcounts capped, so DFID cannot necessarily rely on others stepping into the breach.²⁰⁴ DFID gave us no evidence that it has thought about how to fill the inevitable void in in-country sanitation and water advisory capacity that will result once headcount restrictions begin to bite. A comprehensive needs assessment of DFID staffing requirements that covers the full period of programme expansion up to 2011 and a strategy for a co-ordinated response to potentially weakening in-country donor advisory capacity, given other donors' potential retrenchment from the water sector, are two urgent priorities for DFID. As we stated in paragraph 103, DFID should also support the training and salaries of national water professionals as there is no substitute for sustainable, appropriate, local knowledge. **Headcount restrictions—within DFID and other donors—risk leaving a void within in-country donor advisory capacity just at the time when progress is urgently needed on the sanitation and water MDG targets. We recommend that DFID urgently carry out a needs assessment of staffing requirements until 2011 and work on a strategy for a co-ordinated response to the possible weakening of in-country donor advisory capacity.**

201 Q 59 [Mark Lowcock]

202 Qq 259-261 [Hilary Benn and Ian Curtis]

203 First Report from the Committee, Session 2006-07, *Department for International Development Departmental Report 2006*, HC 71, paragraphs 14-15.

204 Ev 230 [Dr Andrew Cotton]

5 Water resources management and climate change

113. We consider that the need for Water Resources Management (WRM) goes hand-in-hand with expanding access to sanitation and water, simply because improved provision will lead to increased usage and demand for water.²⁰⁵ WRM refers to how the quality and quantity of water resources are managed. A useful definition of WRM is, “Decisions about who needs water, how to get water to those who need it, and what happens to water once it has been used”.²⁰⁶ In Africa, only 3% of renewable water resources are “managed”—for instance, stored, treated or used as a source of renewable energy—compared to 80% in the USA and 40% in Asia.²⁰⁷

114. Managing water resources efficiently will become increasingly urgent as urbanisation, population expansion, economic growth and climate change constrain the availability of water. That the world’s changing climate will constrain water availability is already evident in Africa, where water availability substantially decreased between 1975 and 1995.²⁰⁸ The recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report projects that, by 2020, between 75 and 250 million people in Africa will be exposed to an increase of water stress due to climate change. In Asia, it predicts that available fresh water will decrease due to climate change which, coupled with increased demand and population growth, could mean more than a billion people will be adversely affected by the 2050s.²⁰⁹ The impact of climate change on water availability will not only obstruct people’s rights to water but could impede economic growth and concomitant poverty reduction: in Ethiopia, a single drought episode can cut growth potential by 10% over an extended period, as the country’s economic growth and development are closely tied to rainfall.²¹⁰

115. It is clear to us that, despite its inseparable relationship with increased water supply, WRM has had insufficient attention from donors—including DFID.²¹¹ Mark Lowcock, DFID’s Director General for Policy and International, called WRM “a bit of a Cinderella issue” and admitted that “probably we need to increase what we do”.²¹² Dr David Tickner from WWF-UK told us that even compared to sanitation, WRM gets “scant attention” and that there are few leaders within the donor community in this area.²¹³ The global target to have Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plans and Water Efficiency Plans

205 Q 189 [John Chilton]

206 Ev 211 [WWF-UK]

207 Q 74 [Mark Lowcock]

208 Ev 242 [Good Earth Trust]

209 Working Group II Contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report; Summary for Policymakers, p 10, April 2007

210 ‘Water Problems, Poverty Linked’, World Bank press release, 17 March 2006, World Water Forum. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTWRM/0,,contentMDK:20856041~menuPK:2643819~pagePK:64020865~piPK:149114~theSitePK:337240,00.html>

211 Q 186 [John Chilton]

212 Q 74 [Mark Lowcock]

213 Q 185 [Dr David Tickner]

in place by 2005 was reached by only one-fifth of all countries.²¹⁴ In this chapter we explore why donors have neglected WRM and what can be done to bring about far better co-operation and a sense of urgency about the issue.

Integrated Water Resources Management: barriers to progress

116. Recognition of the importance of WRM was enshrined in a new international target set at the first Earth Summit in 1992 and reconfirmed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002. The target sought to ensure that all countries had national Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plans and Water Efficiency Plans in place by 2005. The basis of IWRM is that the different uses of water are interdependent and that management of water should be co-ordinated across different sectors, from agriculture to health.²¹⁵ It is worth noting that the very use of the WRM and IWRM acronyms probably acts as a barrier to implementation: both clearly are “good things” but communicating why and how is difficult to pin down and using two pieces of terminology that refer essentially to the same principle can only confuse matters further.²¹⁶

117. A number of barriers have stood in the way of progress on the WRM target. The first is poor co-ordination within national governments. Achieving the transformation from unmanaged to sustainably and equitably managed water resources requires a number of stages, from producing a new water policy, to the reform of water law, to implementing practical solutions such as increasing water storage in reservoirs. Responsibility for the process is likely to be spread across a number of ministries, for instance, water, finance, agriculture and forestry. This institutional fragmentation complicates the process of assessing the different water requirements for each sector and ministry—yet determining these requirements is a crucial component of allocating resources equitably.²¹⁷ Water resources management needs more emphasis in Poverty Reduction Strategies so that co-ordinated national planning is prioritised.²¹⁸ The BOND UK Water Network of NGOs called for DFID to reaffirm the WRM target and set a series of actions, including the establishment by governments of “appropriate institutional processes [...] to ensure cross-sectoral and stakeholder co-ordination.” BOND also suggests that monitoring and reporting mechanisms for the achievement of the target are set up.²¹⁹ **We recommend that DFID encourage the global community to reaffirm the missed 2005 target for all countries to have Integrated Water Resources Management Plans and Water Efficiency Plans in place. As part of this reaffirmation, national-level co-ordination mechanisms, with appropriate monitoring and reporting components, should be established so that countries can put robust water resources management strategies in place within a set time period.**

214 Ev 88 [DFID] and Global Water Partnership, *Setting the Stage for Change: Informal survey* (February 2006). Integrated Water Resources Management seeks to “promote the co-ordinated development and management of water, land and related resources, and so maximise the resulting economic and social welfare in an equitable manner, without compromising the sustainability of ecosystems”.

215 Ev 88 [DFID]

216 Q 190 [Dr David Tickner]

217 Q 207 [Dr Declan Conway]

218 Q 190 [Dr David Tickner]

219 Ev 216 [BOND UK Water Network]. BOND is the British Overseas NGOs for Development network.

118. A second barrier has been insufficient engagement and poor co-ordination on WRM by donors. The wide-ranging and long-term nature of implementing WRM and the institutional fragmentation make the process difficult for one donor to take on single-handedly.²²⁰ Yet attempts at co-ordination have been poor. The Global Water Partnership (GWP), made up of over 1000 organisations, is the only international grouping focused solely on WRM. It was set up by the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme and SIDA, the Swedish government development agency, in 1996 partly as a response to poor national-level co-ordination. The Partnership aims to provide a neutral platform to bring together people from water use sectors.²²¹ DFID is the largest donor to GWP, providing £1.8 million per year.²²²

119. Dr David Tickner from WWF-UK said that DFID’s support to the GWP has been useful and that its toolkits have become “the closest thing that there is to some sort of global standard” for WRM.²²³ But the GWP’s impact has been patchy, at best, and as John Chilton from the British Geological Survey pointed out, there is no evidence as to how the information disseminated by the Partnership has been used.²²⁴ The GWP was criticised at the recent World Water Summit in Mexico by the World Bank and others for being ineffective to date.²²⁵ Whilst the GWP has gone some way to promoting high level multi-stakeholder dialogue, it does not have the resources to pull together the necessary degree of concerted donor action for water resources management: its annual core funding is relatively small, given the scale of the problem, at around \$10 million plus further small amounts raised regionally.²²⁶ DFID and other donors are commissioning an independent evaluation of GWP’s operations.²²⁷ **As the only international partnership on Water Resources Management (WRM), the Global Water Partnership needs to do more than promote dialogue: it must develop clear strategies for donor co-ordination and support countries’ development and implementation of WRM plans. DFID should work with other donors to ensure that this change takes place. If the forthcoming evaluation suggests the Partnership cannot fulfil this role, a new and far better resourced global mechanism needs to be established by donors as a matter of urgency.**

120. Multilateral donor efforts on WRM are poor, but bilateral approaches are also lacking. CIDA and DANIDA, the Canadian and Danish government development agencies, were identified as the only agencies that stand out historically for being proactive in supporting initiatives on Integrated Water Resources Management.²²⁸ DFID told us that, “Something like 20% of our programmes are on water resources management-type issues.”²²⁹ DFID has worked successfully with some countries on water management, including China where it

220 Q 190 [Dr David Tickner]

221 Ev 113 [DFID]

222 Ev 113 [DFID]

223 Q 193 [John Chilton]

224 Q 193 [John Chilton]

225 Ev 270 [Institution of Civi Engineers]

226 Ev 113 [DFID]

227 Ev 114 [DFID]

228 Q 187 [Dr David Tickner]

229 Q 74 [Mark Lowcock]

supported the 2002 Water Law promoting more sustainable use of water.²³⁰ DFID has also supported work on trans-boundary river management (see paragraphs 136-137). However, WRM can only be said to constitute 20% of DFID programmes if other, linked, areas of work are aggregated with specific WRM interventions: DFID's written evidence states that water sector governance reform and institutional strengthening contribute to its work on WRM.²³¹ The British Geological Survey said that DFID has defended its "own very limited activity in this area" by pointing to their support for the Global Water Partnership.²³² However, with its funding at just £1.8 million per year, DFID cannot pretend this modest support to the GWP is a sufficient contribution to work on WRM.

121. During our visit, we saw a country where the management of water resources is of critical importance. 80% of Ethiopia's water resources are located in the west of the country but only 20% of the population live in this region. The frequency of drought and flooding make water resources management even more important for Ethiopia. Yet DFID admitted that its involvement in WRM in Ethiopia has so far been limited: support to the transboundary Nile Basin Initiative has been the only major area of activity. Ethiopia falls into the 80% of countries that did not have a WRM plan in place for 2005, and has taken only initial steps in this process.²³³ Ethiopia and countries in a similar position need bilateral donors to support them in developing WRM and water efficiency plans, embedding them in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and setting up monitoring mechanisms.

122. A new DFID-funded research consortium launched in 2006 and focused on Ethiopia and the Nile Basin will help widen DFID's support to water resource management in the region. RiPPLE (Research-inspired Policy and Practice Learning in Ethiopia and the Nile Region) is a £3.82 million five-year research project aimed at advancing evidence-based learning and strengthening capacity on water supply and sanitation. The Programme is one component of the new £18 million DFID Water Research Programme. The consortium is led by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and core partners are WaterAid Ethiopia, the International Water Research Centre (IRC-Netherlands) and the University of Addis Ababa.²³⁴ DFID's ability to use and disseminate the lessons learned under RiPPLE will be crucial to maximising its investment in the research consortium.

123. Given the increasing constraints on water resources, it is imperative that DFID substantially scales up its limited work on Water Resources Management (WRM). DFID's funding of the Research-inspired Policy and Practice Learning in Ethiopia and the Nile Region programme has been a positive step. The Department now needs to ensure that knowledge developed under the programme is used and communicated widely. In conjunction with other bilateral donors under a reformed global partnership for WRM, clear processes of support must be established to help countries develop Water Resources Management Plans and Water Efficiency Plans, which should be

230 Ev 97 [DFID]

231 Ev 97 [DFID]. DFID's Memorandum states that WRM is included in its work on water sector governance reform and institutional strengthening.

232 Ev 145 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

233 *Setting the Stage for Change: Informal survey*, Global Water Partnership, February 2006.

234 Ev 112 [DFID]

embedded within Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and include monitoring mechanisms.

124. A further barrier to progress on WRM is the dwindling professional capacity in the water sectors of many developing countries, as we have discussed in Chapter 4.²³⁵ Insufficient capacity to collect and analyse data is of particular concern for WRM. The submission by the British Geological Survey (BGS) states: “The availability of basic data on water from hydrological [...] networks has declined dramatically [...] This often makes the marshalling of an effective argument for improved management of water resources very difficult”.²³⁶ As John Chilton from the BGS told us, accurate data is needed not just to evaluate progress but to “tell stakeholders the impacts of doing nothing.”²³⁷ He was concerned that moves by donors away from project-based approaches towards budget support have reduced the collaborative day-to-day working between donors and professionals in developing countries that can assist capacity building in techniques like data collection.²³⁸

125. James Dent, an independent consultant, highlighted that hydrological observation networks, meteorological technologies and computer modelling—all crucial for information provision on rainfall, groundwater levels and weather patterns—are subject to capacity and quality deficits in most developing countries.²³⁹ Dr Declan Conway from the University of East Anglia pointed out the importance of data collection for measuring climatic change and said that volume of data was less important than obtaining the right types of data: identifying “a certain minimum baseline of information” that will assist both WRM and scientific research would be sensible.²⁴⁰ Dr. Conway pointed out that satellite technology can be used to deliver certain data sets, particularly quantitative measurements such as lake level changes, but that these need to complement *in situ* observations rather than replace them.²⁴¹ **As part of an increasing package of support to Water Resources Management (WRM), donors should ensure that professional capacity to measure availability of water and collect data on hydrological and meteorological patterns is adequately supported. DFID should look for opportunities with other donors to support research into identifying a minimum set of data that could act as a series of basic indicators on WRM and climate change.**

235 See paras 92-97.

236 Ev 145 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

237 Q 190 [John Chilton]

238 Q 201 [John Chilton]


239 Ev 231-232 [James Dent]

240 Q 201 [Dr Declan Conway]

241 Q 202 [Dr Declan Conway]

Major infrastructure projects

126. Major infrastructure projects—including dams, hydropower projects, desalination plants and irrigation schemes—are a vital part of managing water efficiently, whether they assist storage, are a source of renewable power or support agricultural output.²⁴² Climate change will increase the need for water storage and the need to use renewable energies such as hydropower, so the number of large infrastructure projects is likely to increase.²⁴³ Increasing water storage in Africa is a major priority, as Sering Jallow from the African Development Bank highlighted to us: storage in the UK is likely to be over 3,000 cubic metres per person; in the USA it is about 6,000; in Australia it is about 5,000; in Africa it is less than 50 (see Graph 1).²⁴⁴



127. The planning of infrastructure projects, which are often large in scale, needs to take account of potential impact—whether social or environmental—on downstream users. WWF-UK’s submission notes that, “Dams and hydropower development afford well recorded opportunities for mismanagement and corruption, sometimes with very significant adverse social consequences.”²⁴⁵ The World Commission on Dams, a global, multi-stakeholder process established in 1998, has produced a set of Guidelines for dam-building. Several organisations, including HSBC, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, have implemented projects influenced by the guidelines.²⁴⁶ WWF-UK felt that DFID, in conjunction with other UK Government departments such as the Department of Trade and Industry and the Export Credits Guarantee Department, could do more to encourage UK stakeholders, including industry, to use the Guidelines—perhaps by organising a multi-stakeholder forum on the Guidelines.²⁴⁷ **We recommend**

242 See Chapter 6 for further discussion of irrigation schemes.

243 Q 210 [Dr David Tickner]

244 Q 93 [Sering Jallow]

245 Ev 211 [WWF-UK]

246 Q 210 [Dr David Tickner]

247 Q 210 [Dr David Tickner]

that DFID work with other UK government departments, including the Department of Trade and Industry and the Export Credits Guarantee Department, to increase UK stakeholders' adherence to the World Commission on Dams' Guidelines for Dam-building. Organising a multi-stakeholder forum on the Guidelines would help promote the participation of industry and other relevant actors.

Climate change and water resources management

128. Helping developing countries to develop robust water management strategies is one of the best ways to help them cope with, and adapt to, climate change.²⁴⁸ It is often assumed that water scarcity is outside human control. Currently, this is not the case: water scarcity is almost always caused by inequalities in access and bad governance.²⁴⁹ According to the United Nations Environment Programme, 14 countries in Africa are currently subject to “water stress or water scarcity” and a further 11 countries will join this category in the next 25 years.²⁵⁰

129. Estimating the impact of climate change on developing countries—and especially on water availability—is only belatedly receiving attention and hence predictions of specific impacts are uncertain. This uncertainty is compounded by major gaps in hydrometric data collection, as discussed in the previous sub-section and in Chapter 4.²⁵¹ Finding new sources of water is becoming increasingly important: improved understanding of techniques for locating and developing groundwater is needed, as well as efforts to control the levels of natural contaminants such as fluoride.²⁵² The use of appropriate technologies is also essential if constrained water resources are to be maximised. One particular technology highlighted in written evidence is Interlocking Stabilised Soil Block Technology, which compresses subsoil with small amounts of cement into building blocks which are cheaper, stronger and more durable than fired bricks. The blocks can be shaped into interlocking curves that can be used to build tanks to hold ground or roof-harvested rainwater, which can then be safely stored before use.²⁵³

130. Key water-related ‘symptoms’ in developing countries that will develop or be exacerbated by climate change include: coastal erosion; flooding; subsidence; disruption to rain-fed agriculture; and prolonged drought. The Working Group on Climate Change and Development believe these effects could conspire to cause a “domino effect” on water availability:

“First there is a drop in water level in reservoirs or rivers in areas where rainfall drops. Then the quality of water goes down because sewage and industrial effluents

248 Ev 159 [Tearfund]

249 Ev 159 [Tearfund], Ev 168 [WaterAid] and Ev 298 [Social, Technical and Ecological Pathways to Sustainability Centre, University of Sussex (STEPS)]

250 UNEP Vital Water Graphics, available online at <http://www.unep.org/vitalwater/21.htm>

251 Ev 271 [Institution of Civil Engineers] and Ev 146 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

252 Ev 143-144 [Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey]

253 Ev 238 [Good Earth Trust]

become more concentrated, thereby exacerbating water-borne diseases and reducing the quality and quantity of fresh water available for domestic use.”²⁵⁴

131. Dr Declan Conway from the University of East Anglia said that the development community has undergone a “sea change” and is accepting the need to go beyond emergency responses to natural disasters and move towards supporting adaptation to climate change.²⁵⁵ Climate change adaptation refers to activities aimed at responding to the effects of climate change, as opposed to mitigation which seeks to slow and prevent the process of climate change, for instance, by reducing greenhouse gases. The recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report emphasised the need for adaptation and said that, for developing countries, “availability of resources and building adaptive capacity are particularly important”.²⁵⁶ Elwyn Grainger-Jones, Head of DFID’s Sustainable Development Group, told us that DFID wants “a big push” on adaptation to climate change. He said the Department is keen to strengthen the World Bank’s and the international system’s capacity to work with countries on the increasingly urgent need for water resources management triggered by climate change.²⁵⁷ DFID leads the adaptation element of the UK Government’s Climate Change Strategy and Elwyn Grainger-Jones said that DFID would be looking at the costs of supporting developing country adaptation in the context of the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review.²⁵⁸

132. DFID is also supporting research into climate change and WRM and is giving £24 million over the next five years to the Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Programme, administered by the International Development Research Centre in Canada.²⁵⁹ Elwyn Grainger-Jones told us that WRM in relation to climate change will be a key part of DFID’s £18 million research programme on sanitation and water and that internal policy work on this topic would take place during 2007, drawing on country programme work on climate change.²⁶⁰ DFID is working towards implementing a climate development programme in Ethiopia, together with the African Union, the African Development Bank and the UN Economic Commission for Africa.²⁶¹

133. DFID’s work on climate change adaptation in relation to Water Resources Management is relatively new and we received no evidence on the impacts of its work so far. But it is clear that DFID is putting the foundations in place to move forward its own and development partners’ work on climate change adaptation. The vital next step must be translating international dialogue and support to research into practical policies within national governments so that developing countries can respond quickly to the impact of climatic variations on water availability and supply. **We are greatly encouraged**

254 Working Group on Climate Change and Development, *Up in Smoke: the Second Report from the Working Group on Climate Change and Development*, p.13.

255 Q 212 [Dr Declan Conway]

256 Working Group II Contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report: Summary for Policymakers, p 18, April 2007

257 Q 276 [Elwyn Grainger Jones]

258 Q 276 [Elwyn Grainger Jones]

259 Ev 270 [Institution of Civil Engineers]

260 Q 86 [Elwyn Grainger Jones]

261 Q 86 [Ian Curtis]

by DFID’s leadership on climate change adaptation in relation to water resources management, internationally and across Whitehall, and its support for research on this subject. We expect to see DFID translate this leadership into substantive policies and frameworks for action in the near future. The importance of DFID’s work in this area must be recognised and properly funded under the Comprehensive Spending Review process.

Conflict over water resources

134. With many water resources shared between countries, there is increasing concern that, as availability becomes constrained, the spectre of ‘water wars’ will be raised. 263 river basins are shared by two or more nations and thus collaboration over access and management across state boundaries is of paramount importance. WWF-UK’s submission described how a number of WWF-UK programmes have experienced conflict resulting from inequitable access to water resources, with, for instance, conflict between competing water users on the Great Ruaha River in Tanzania turning violent at times.²⁶² Concern Universal Malawi’s submission also observed growing conflict over water resources, influenced in Malawi by continuing population growth and the pressures on land.²⁶³ As Dr David Tickner from WWF-UK pointed out, whilst water probably has been an underlying factor in some inter-state conflicts, at the current time conflict over water is more evident at the sub-state level, in particular between different user groups.²⁶⁴

135. Another major potential source of conflict is industry use of water. The last few years have seen the soft drinks manufacturers Coca Cola and Pepsi under strong pressure to withdraw from local markets in India due to their heavy use of communities’ limited groundwater resources to run their manufacturing plants.²⁶⁵ The process of global economic growth is only going to increase the risk of such conflicts over industrial use of water. Coca Cola and Pepsi could follow the example of other companies who have acted upon the recognition that management of water resources is an important responsibility for the multinational private sector. For instance, Nestlé has recently published a Water Management Report which sets out how it approaches water use internationally.²⁶⁶

136. Working out strategies to pre-empt and defuse conflict over water resources must be a major priority for governments and donors.²⁶⁷ Dr Tickner suggested that one route to initiating collaboration over water resources is hydrometric monitoring. This has worked in the Danube River Basin, where 14 countries, many of whom have recently been in conflict with one another, share access to the Danube River. In 1994, a trans-national monitoring network was set up under the first convention for the protection of the river, which—with EU and UNDP support—has been successful in promoting dialogue, using a relatively uncontroversial issue (compared to more emotive WRM developments such as

262 Ev 211 [WWF-UK]

263 Ev 227 [Concern Universal (Malawi)]

264 Q 205 [Dr David Tickner]

265 Q 207 [Dr David Tickner] and ‘Cola companies told to quit India’, BBC Online, 20 January 2005. Available online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4192569.stm

266 *The Nestlé Water Management Report* (2007).

267 Q 279 [Hilary Benn]

dam-building) as a lever to begin dialogue between countries.²⁶⁸ Dr Tickner said the process “is a really good example of how external donor agencies and external governments can really facilitate a very strong and sustainable process which can help to reduce conflicts and prevent them.”²⁶⁹

137. The Nile Basin Initiative (NBI), supported by DFID and other donors, is another example of trans-boundary management of shared water resources. Formally launched in February 1999, the NBI is a regional partnership between the ten countries of the Nile Basin and seeks the long-term development and management of the Nile waters.²⁷⁰ The Initiative is a transitional arrangement until a permanent framework is put in place. We were pleased to meet members of the Nile Basin Initiative in Addis Ababa during our visit to Ethiopia. The Secretary of State told us that DFID would like to see a similar process set up in the Congo Basin, which has 30% of Africa’s precipitation but no trans-national process in place, partly because of conflict and instability in the region.²⁷¹

138. DFID has also been involved in projects on equitable water sharing between Israel and Palestine. Since 1967, Israel has drawn much of its water from the Occupied Territories whilst restricting Palestinian access. We referred to the negative impact of inequalities in Israeli use of water resources in our recent report, *Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian Territories*.²⁷² DFID supported a three-year programme in the West Bank and Gaza that aimed to build the technical capacity of the Palestinian Water Authority (PWA) to manage the Western Aquifer, which the Palestinian Territories share with Israel. In its written evidence, DFID told us that although the project is now complete, the PWA “continues in a strengthened role based on a platform of evidence-based policy development and negotiations over this shared resource.”²⁷³ John Chilton from the British Geological Survey told us that a process of dialogue between water professionals from the Occupied Territories and Israel was not achieving much in terms of “actual physical agreement” but was at least preventing “things from getting worse [...] it has maintained a constructive dialogue at times when you might have expected that dialogue to fail”.²⁷⁴ **As water availability becomes constrained, the risk of conflict over water resources is growing. Donors can help pre-empt such conflicts by supporting joint hydrometric monitoring of shared rivers and trans-boundary river commissions. DFID’s funding of the Nile Basin Initiative has been important, and we recommend that the Department continue to support the development of the current transitional arrangement into a permanent framework. DFID should continue to look at the viability of establishing a similar initiative within the Congo Basin.**

268 Q 199 [Dr David Tickner]

269 Q 207 [Dr David Tickner]

270 The ten countries of the Nile Basin are: Burundi, DRC, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda.

271 Q 275 [Hilary Benn]

272 Fourth Report from the Committee, Session 2006-2007, *Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian Territories*, HC 114, Paragraph 45.

273 Ev 98 [DFID]

274 Q 208 [John Chilton]

6 The inter-sectoral dimensions of sanitation and water

139. As is indicated by the 2006 White Paper’s emphasis on the inter-relationship between sanitation, water, education and health, DFID has moved away from seeing basic services as individual sectors towards treating them as a package of essential social services for achieving the MDGs.²⁷⁵ The need for donors to strengthen the linkages between these basic services was emphasised repeatedly in the evidence that we received.²⁷⁶ Paragraph 2 of this report describes how sanitation and water sit at the heart of the MDGs, with integral links to achieving all eight Goals. In this chapter we return to looking at how central sanitation and water are in progress towards development targets, particularly those relating to health and education.

140. In addition, this chapter will explore the integral links between water and the agricultural sector. Irrigation accounts for 70–90% of water usage in developing countries, and thus improving water productivity can assist food security, nutrition, and rural livelihoods.²⁷⁷ The final sub-section of the chapter will briefly assess how effectively DFID and other donors link their work on water and on agriculture.

The interface between health, sanitation and water

141. More than half of the world’s hospital beds are filled with people suffering from water-related diseases, illnesses that directly kill more than five million people each year.²⁷⁸ Improving access to sanitation and clean water will have a significant impact on the global disease burden: improving a person’s access to clean water reduces cases of diarrhoea by 25% and hygiene education including handwashing promotion reduces cases by 45%.²⁷⁹ Young children tend to be the most vulnerable to the ill-effects of unsafe and insufficient water and poor sanitation and more than 1.5 million children under the age of five die from diarrhoea every year.²⁸⁰

142. Diarrhoea is by no means the only water-related disease that kills. Malaria, which is responsible for over one million deaths per year, is classed by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as a “water-associated vector-borne disease” whose transmission could be interrupted through improved water resources management. The WHO lists other significant water-borne diseases as intestinal nematode infections (e.g. hookworm), lymphatic filariasis, trachoma and schistosomiasis. Improvements to water and sanitation are by far the most sustainable solutions to these diseases, not least because of problems of

275 DFID, *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Governance Work for the Poor*, Cm 6876, July 2006, paras 6.3-6.4 and Ev 71 [DFID].

276 For example, Ev 170 [WaterAid], Ev 250 [Halcrow Group Ltd], Ev 258 [David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, PSIRU, University of Greenwich] and Ev 272 [Institution of Civil Engineers].

277 Ev 88 [DFID]

278 Ev 158 [Tearfund]

279 Ev 158 [Tearfund]

280 Ev 289 [Plan UK]

drug resistance and affordability.²⁸¹ Water-related mortality is by no means confined to communicable diseases, with drowning the cause of around 280,000 preventable deaths each year and water contamination the cause of numerous negative health impacts.²⁸²

143. In most societies women have primary responsibility for obtaining household water and using it in food production and preparation, personal and family hygiene, washing, cleaning and caring for the sick. The average distance that women in Africa and Asia travel to collect water is six kilometres. Carrying heavy loads over long distances can lead to physical damage to the back and neck, and raises security risks of assault and rape.²⁸³

144. DFID works at several levels to help mitigate the health risks associated with unclean and insufficient water, from high level support to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria to funding an Arsenic Support Programme Unit to address the naturally occurring arsenic problem in Bangladesh's water.²⁸⁴ Central to the effectiveness of these interventions is how well DFID links its work on the health and water sectors. In paragraph 23 we questioned how "joined up" DFID's sanitation and health strategies are, pointing out that sanitation was neglected in the last DFID target strategy on health. In paragraph 37, we recommended that DFID reconfigure its sanitation expertise so that sanitation becomes an integral part of health advisers' work within country programmes, and that DFID's Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team in Policy Division should contain health advisory capacity.

145. Similarly, for DFID's multi-disciplinary approach to work effectively, far closer links will need to be built between DFID advisers working on water and those working on health. As we said in paragraph 32, there is currently no health adviser within Policy Division's Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team. This raises questions about how an issue that relates closely to both the health and water sectors—say, the promotion of hand-washing—can be dealt with effectively within DFID. The links between water and health do not require actual staff reconfiguration in the way that sanitation-health links do, but the building of stronger co-working structures between water and health advisory cadres is a key priority. The Secretary of State assured us that both water and sanitation would be mainstreamed into the new DFID health strategy, to be published later in 2007.²⁸⁵

146. WaterAid were anxious that DFID should increase recognition that water and sanitation are essential public services as much as health or education are, both within country programmes and within the international aid architecture.²⁸⁶ Their written evidence emphasised that to realise the linkages between the three sectors, DFID must ensure that cross-references to water and sanitation appear throughout health programming at country and international levels.²⁸⁷ **For DFID's multi-disciplinary approach to work effectively, closer links will need to be built between DFID advisers**

281 Ev 333 [WHO]

282 Ev 333 [WHO]

283 Ev 171 [WaterAid]

284 Ev 99 [DFID]

285 Q 264 [Hilary Benn]

286 Ev 181 [WaterAid]

287 Ev 169 [WaterAid]

working on water and those working on health. We recommend that water and sanitation be mainstreamed across DFID’s new health strategy to be published later in 2007, underpinned by explicit strategies to promote co-working between advisers working on water and advisers working on health.

The intersection of water, sanitation, gender and education

147. Sanitation and water are crucial determinants of the quality and quantity of education that children, especially girls, receive. There are several dimensions to this issue. The first of these concerns the time that women and girls spend collecting water. In many developing countries the responsibility for household water provision tends to be given to women and girls. There is a significant opportunity cost associated with this burden: in Ghana, for example, an estimated 700 hours per person per year is spent collecting water.²⁸⁸ Water-fetching has a direct impact on girls’ education: either they will have to fit their water tasks around schooling—making the journey very early or very late, bringing risks of walking alone in the dark and affecting girls’ energy levels whilst at school—or they will become one of the estimated 44 million girls not in school.²⁸⁹ Water-collecting limits the economic productivity of women and this perpetuates the wider gender inequalities which lead families to de-prioritise girls’ education: a vicious circle is created.²⁹⁰

148. A second dimension to the intersection between water, sanitation and education is water-related illness: the WHO has estimated that 443 million school days are lost annually worldwide due to diarrhoeal disease.²⁹¹ Hygiene education in schools helps children understand and carry out potentially life-saving practices such as hand-washing after using the toilet.²⁹² A third concerns the presence of running water and toilets in schools. Girls who have reached menstrual age may be deterred from attending school if secure single-sex toilets and running water are unavailable, meaning that many girls across developing countries miss school for one week out of four.²⁹³ WaterAid Bangladesh found that a school sanitation project with separate facilities for boys and girls helped to boost girls’ school attendance by 11% per year, on average.²⁹⁴

149. By addressing sanitation and water, governments and donors can not only ensure that millions more children have their rights to education fulfilled, but can also make progress towards a wide range of development outcomes and significantly boost economic growth. Every year of lost schooling represents a 10-20 per cent reduction in girls’ future incomes; children of mothers who receive five years of primary education are 40 percent more likely to live beyond age five and women with education are better able successfully to resist

288 Ev 171 [WaterAid]

289 UNESCO, *Education For All Global Monitoring Report 2007*, p.269.

290 Ev 171 [WaterAid]

291 Ev 158 [Tearfund]

292 Ev 216 [BOND UK Water Network]

293 Ev 171 [WaterAid]

294 Ev 171 [WaterAid]

debilitating practices such as female genital cutting, early marriage and domestic abuse by male partners.²⁹⁵

150. It is significant that the group hit the hardest by lack of sanitation and water are the least well-educated and therefore the most silent—poor women and girls.²⁹⁶ Stephen Turner, Deputy Director of WaterAid, believed that governments must urgently respond to this silent majority by recognising the intersection of gender, water, sanitation, health and education, and using a more holistic response: “It might mean that the starting point is not water in the community—it might be water in the schools or sanitation in the schools.”²⁹⁷

151. Donors have a pivotal role in helping governments implement this holistic response. WaterAid’s submission states that, “DFID has not given sufficient consideration to the impact of water fetching labour and the precedence it is given in household priorities over school attendance and that this burden falls overwhelmingly on girl children.”²⁹⁸ This is borne out by DFID’s recent strategies on, firstly, education, and secondly, girls’ education, both published in 2005. The first, a joint paper with HM Treasury called *From G8 Commitment to Action: Education*, makes no mention of water and sanitation whatsoever.²⁹⁹ The second, *Girls’ Education: Towards a Better Future For All*, makes a commitment to promote improved school sanitation and water facilities, but ignores the issues of water-carrying and education about water and sanitation.³⁰⁰ Further evidence of DFID’s lack of joined-up thinking is shown in the Government Response to our report on DFID’s Departmental Report 2006, in which we expressed concern about DFID’s work on gender and education, notably the deficient response to the missed 2005 MDG target to ensure equal enrolments of girls and boys in primary school.³⁰¹ In the section of the Government Response dealing with our concern, DFID does not mention water or sanitation in its description of its current gender and education strategies.³⁰² This is astonishing given the importance that DFID professes to attach to the intersection of the three basic social services.

152. We were pleased to see that DFID’s new Gender Equality Action Plan, published in March 2007, does raise the issue of women and girls’ water-fetching in connection with missed educational opportunities.³⁰³ However, the fact that DFID’s education strategies barely mention water and sanitation, and when they do, focus on school facilities to the exclusion of water-fetching and hygiene and sanitation education, indicates that DFID’s

296 Barbara Herz and Gene B Sperling, *What Works in Girls’ Education: Evidence and Policies from the Developing World*, Council on Foreign Relations (2004), pp.3-6.

296 Ev 168 [WaterAid]

297 Q 107 [Stephen Turner]

298 Ev 170 [WaterAid]

299 Excepting a brief reference in a country case study box, in Joint DFID and HM-Treasury paper, *From G8 Commitment to Action: Education* (September 2005), p 23.

300 DFID, *Girls’ Education: Towards a Better Future for All* (January 2005).

301 First Report from the Committee, Session 2006-2007, *Department for International Development Departmental Report 2006*, HC 71, paragraph 80.

302 Third Special Report from the Committee, Session 2006-2007, *DFID Departmental Report: Government Response to the Committee’s First Report of Session 2006-07*, HC 328, p.10. See also Q 265 [Hilary Benn].

303 DFID, *Gender Equality at the Heart of Development: Why the role of women is crucial to ending world poverty* (March 2007), p.1.

multi-disciplinary approach contains substantial discrepancies. Mainstreaming water and sanitation across education strategies would promote collaboration between education advisers and advisers working on water and sanitation.

153. When we asked the Secretary of State whether DFID promotes the inclusion of sanitation and water in the curriculum, he told us that whilst DFID “certainly encourages schools” to ensure this, “DFID does not control the curriculum” in countries where it works.³⁰⁴ We believe “encouragement” is not sufficient in ensuring that school-children take home crucial health messages about hygiene, clean water and sanitation and that DFID should work with education ministries to promote the embedding of these issues in curricula. **DFID’s education strategies do not do enough to stress the importance of sanitation and water promotion within schools. This needs to change if DFID is to deliver a properly integrated sanitation and water strategy. DFID should also work with education ministries on curriculum development and teacher training so that curricula include a water, sanitation and hygiene component.**

154. When DFID produces its next update on its education strategy, it is vital that the issue of girls’ water-fetching is addressed. DFID needs to develop strategies to tackle these issues including the wider gender inequalities in society that perpetuate the burden on women and girls of water-carrying as well as practical measures such as flexible school timetabling that allows girls to fit in water-related tasks in daylight hours and without being exhausted during lessons. Of course, expanding water supply and thereby reducing the journeys women and girls make to collect water will go hand-in-hand with these strategies. Involving women and girls in social service strategies from the start will help ensure that they are gender-sensitive. Finally, **DFID’s multi-disciplinary approach should ensure that water, sanitation, gender and education issues are mainstreamed across DFID’s forthcoming health strategy.**

155. **DFID has not given adequate attention to the impact of women and girls’ water-fetching burden in its education strategies. The Department needs to help governments develop strategies addressing the time burden associated with collecting water that keeps girls out of school. These should encompass tackling wider social inequalities that perpetuate women and girls’ water-fetching burden, expanding water supply so that journey times are reduced and practical school-based strategies such as flexible timetabling.**

The links between water and agriculture

156. Agriculture is the biggest consumer of water in developing countries: irrigation accounts for 70-90% of water consumption in these countries. Yet just 3.7% of arable land in sub-Saharan Africa is irrigated, compared to 26% in India and 44% in China.³⁰⁵

157. As water availability becomes increasingly constrained due to climate change and global economic and population growth, many countries will have to face difficult decisions about the way water is used and prioritise how much water they can afford to use

304 Q 268 [Hilary Benn]

305 Ev 88 [DFID]

for agricultural purposes. This clearly points to the need for efficient water resources management and for donors to help build the capacity and institutions that underpin the equitable allocation of water between different sectors.³⁰⁶ Professor Franks from the University of Bradford highlighted that urbanisation will also increase the constraints on rural water use: towns and cities will use increasing amounts of water as they grow. This, Professor Franks said, makes it all the more important for DFID to focus on water and land use.³⁰⁷

158. We were concerned to see that DFID’s water strategy does not substantially address agriculture, and equally that DFID’s agriculture strategy makes little mention of water.³⁰⁸ In its 2003 publication, *DFID: Maximising Impact in the Water Sector*, the National Audit Office highlighted that DFID’s assistance to the water sector has “focused predominantly on improving access to water and sanitation, and other sub-sectors, such as water for food, have received less attention.”³⁰⁹

159. Whilst we are supportive towards DFID remaining highly focused on sanitation and water, it is important that the use of water for agriculture is mainstreamed across the Department’s water and sanitation strategies. Expanding water supply cannot be considered without addressing water for agriculture because the two go hand-in-hand: making progress on water availability will also improve food security, nutrition and rural livelihoods.

160. The Commission for Africa recommended that, as part of a wider set of measures to promote agricultural and rural development, donors must increase funding of irrigation by 50% before 2010: this should double Africa’s arable land under irrigation by 2015.³¹⁰ Ian Curtis, Senior Adviser on Growth in DFID’s Africa Policy Department, highlighted that DFID is involved in some policy work on securing good irrigation investments through the Comprehensive African Agricultural Programme.³¹¹ However, irrigation is not a major area of financing for DFID.³¹²

161. Addressing irrigation does not necessarily just involve large-scale agricultural development such as infrastructure: Dr. David Tickner from WWF-UK was concerned that donors should not focus on large projects at the expense of addressing efficient water use at community level—the micro-level decisions that people make daily about how to use their water.³¹³ In South Africa, a micro-level project of this kind has managed also to create social benefits. A joint government and civil society initiative called ‘Working for Wetlands’ has addressed the problem of invasive vegetation, such as acacia and eucalyptus trees, which extract large quantities of water from the ground. The project trained

306 Q 207 [Dr Declan Conway]

307 Q 178 [Professor Tom Franks]

308 DFID, *Water Action Plan* (2004) and Ev 312 [UK National Committee for the International Hydrological Programme of UNESCO].

309 NAO, *DFID: Maximising Impact in the Water Sector* (2003), p.5. http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/02-03/0203351.pdf

310 *Commission for Africa Report*, Chapter 7 (pp. 237-238).

311 Q 88 [Ian Curtis]

312 Q 88 [Mark Lowcock]

313 Q 189 [Dr David Tickner]

unemployed rural poor people to remove this invasive vegetation and to restore wetlands, simultaneously addressing water resources management and unemployment.³¹⁴

162. We are concerned that DFID’s water strategy does not sufficiently address agriculture, and equally that DFID’s agriculture strategy makes little mention of water. DFID’s focus on achieving the sanitation and water MDG should not be to the exclusion of focusing on water for agriculture, an essential component of meeting MDG1 which seeks to halve the number of people suffering from hunger. Strategies for promoting the productive use of water for food, including irrigation, should be pursued both through high-level donor engagement—particularly seeking the achievement of the Commission for Africa’s recommended increase in funding of irrigation by 50% before 2010—and through national water resources management strategies which encourage the efficient use of water at the community level.

7 Conclusion

163. We are pleased that DFID has brought sanitation and water back into focus after “taking its eye off the ball” in recent years. The doubling and re-doubling of funds for sanitation and water in Africa by 2011 is a proportionate reaction to the scale of the problem that faces millions of poor people in finding clean water and adequate sanitation every day. But extra money will not automatically ensure universal access to these basic human requirements. Capacity at local and national level to implement scaled-up efforts on sanitation and water is a particular source of concern: training far more water professionals who understand local needs and can design and maintain systems, as well as carry out the crucial task of collecting data on progress, is of signal importance to ensuring new aid money is invested sustainably and efficiently.

164. Sanitation is currently very much the poor relation of water within DFID and this imbalance needs urgent correction. The MDG sanitation target faces decades of delay unless governments and donors wake up to the need to alert and educate people about this major public health issue. Intersecting barriers such as entrenched stigma and poor understanding of the links between sanitation and health lock out public attention to this undeclared global crisis.

165. Improving latrines and managing human waste links closely with interventions on water, health and education and a multi-disciplinary approach is sensible. But, within this, sanitation is a distinct sector that needs discrete strategies such as raising demand and social marketing. Such techniques require different skillsets to the technical and engineering solutions required in the water sector. DFID needs to reconfigure its staff expertise to reflect this: the current system whereby infrastructure advisers, rather than health or social development advisers, have primary responsibility for sanitation is illogical and inefficient. DFID should step up as a global champion on sanitation and push it right to the top of the global MDG agenda.

166. There is a fundamental inequality in that poor people currently pay the most for their water and this must be addressed quickly and sustainably. The answer lies in finding locally appropriate solutions to bringing taps and showers close to people’s homes, whether they live in a Delhi slum or a remote mountain village. Making this happen will require donors and governments to work on a package of measures including strengthening public utilities, boosting governance and building local capacity.

167. Central to the success of this package will be DFID’s own advisory capacity. Our visit to Ethiopia showcased high quality staff deployed innovatively. Yet civil service headcount reductions could compromise DFID’s capacity to spend its much-needed extra funds efficiently. DFID has no strategy in place to match its human resources to its expanding financial resources for the sanitation and water sectors. This reflects a worrying tendency within the Department, on which we have commented before, to focus on financial inputs at the expense of determining linked human resource requirements to achieve the desired outcomes.

168. Decisions about how the quality and quantity of water is managed will be put into increasingly sharp focus as climate change, population and economic growth and urbanisation all constrain availability. Despite its inseparable relationship with increased water supply, Water Resources Management receives insufficient attention from donors. DFID should work with other donors towards a reaffirmation of the 2005 target seeking to ensure that countries have water resources management plans in place, and as part of this should support countries to introduce time-bound, co-ordinated plans with monitoring mechanisms attached.

169. Sanitation and water sit at the heart of achieving the MDGs, but the intersection with health and education targets is particularly sharp. Just as sanitation work needs to be aligned more closely with health expertise within DFID, water and health advisers need to collaborate far more. The same is true for education: it is astonishing that DFID's recent education strategies barely mention either the need to educate children about sanitation and water, or the huge time burden—and concomitant educational cost—faced particularly by girls in collecting water daily. The intersection of water, sanitation, education and health as development targets requires some concentrated thinking on DFID's behalf about how to facilitate collaboration across the sectors: both staff deployment and sector strategies must provide the multi-disciplinary approach that is so crucial to making progress on all the MDG targets.

170. By making access to sanitation and water a reality for millions of people worldwide, DFID could secure a series of development 'wins', from a vastly reduced global disease burden to large-scale enrolments of girls in school. DFID has shown its recognition of sanitation and water's position at the heart of the development nexus through its proposed Global Action Plan. It now needs—urgently—to secure international agreement to the Plan, and to ensure the necessary personnel and organisational resources are in place to support its implementation. Only then will the development 'wins' be truly won.

Recommendations

1. The links between sanitation and other social sectors, particularly water, health and education, are self-evident. We commend a multi-disciplinary approach to the sanitation sector. (Paragraph 19)
2. DFID needs to be proactive in tackling the stigma around sanitation and should draw on lessons from the successes in tackling the stigma around HIV and AIDS. (Paragraph 20)
3. We recommend that DFID make its sanitation investments more transparent by disaggregating funding given to the sanitation and water sectors, and by encouraging the multilateral institutions to which it contributes funds to do the same. (Paragraph 22)
4. A multi-disciplinary approach to sanitation and water will only work if the two sectors are given equal attention. Sanitation is currently neglected within DFID. The complex, distinctive challenges inherent in reaching the sanitation Millennium Development Goal target require proactive measures on DFID's behalf to raise the profile of sanitation within its work on sanitation and water, including the creation of a separate sanitation strategy. (Paragraph 23)
5. DFID's support for research into the replicability of the Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) scheme is important and should continue along with support to other promising approaches such as social marketing. The widespread success of CLTS in Bangladesh and emerging lessons from uptake elsewhere suggest that there are huge potential gains from the scheme. (Paragraph 29)
6. The growing uptake of the Community-Led Total Sanitation scheme and social marketing approaches will require DFID staff working on sanitation to be adequately trained in the techniques needed for these approaches, so that they can advise governments and other development partners on how to design and invest in such programmes. (Paragraph 30)
7. Different skillsets are required for the sanitation and water sectors: the former requires people-based skills and health and social development expertise, as opposed to the more technical solutions needed for water supply. We welcome DFID's decision to carry out a review of its sanitation policy. Under the review, we recommend that DFID reconfigure its sanitation expertise. Sanitation must become an integral part of health advisers'—and, where possible, social development advisers'—work within country programmes. Within DFID's Policy and Research Division, the Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport Team should contain health and social development advisory capacity. (Paragraphs 36–37)
8. Sanitation provision in slums is constrained by institutional fragmentation, insecure land tenure and residents' lack of political influence. We recommend that DFID revisit its prioritisation of rural over urban support as the global urbanisation process continues. The Department needs to work with governments to raise the issue higher up the political agenda, seek solutions to provision in informal settlements that are

appropriate to and designed in consultation with local communities and create an institutional home and effective co-ordinating mechanisms for urban sanitation provision (Paragraph 41)

9. We recommend that DFID support the wide promotion of lesson-learning about successful low-cost urban sanitation schemes such as the Orangi Project in Pakistan. (Paragraph 44)
10. Sanitation needs international champions to reverse decades of neglect—and, with some re-prioritisation and staff reconfiguration, DFID could and should be one of these champions. We recommend that DFID act now to push sanitation far higher up the global political agenda. If progress towards the sanitation Millennium Development Goal target is not rapidly stepped up, the attainment of all the other MDGs will be compromised. (Paragraph 45)
11. DFID deserves credit for the leadership it has demonstrated through its proposed Global Action Plan for water and sanitation. We were pleased to hear that some progress has been made on securing international agreement to the Plan. We exhort DFID to continue with urgency its high-level engagement on the Plan to ensure that the five objectives are agreed and launched by the end of 2007, to ensure sufficient progress is made towards meeting the MDG targets by 2015. (Paragraph 51)
12. Whilst pursuing global progress on the effectiveness of financing for sanitation and water, DFID must at the same time ensure that its own house is in order when it comes to providing long-term, predictable and co-ordinated financing to the sectors. Predictability of financing is particularly important for the water sector, where a reliable source of funds is needed to build and maintain infrastructure (Paragraph 52)
13. Where decisions to withdraw planned aid are made, DFID needs to ensure it is accountable to poor people by being fully transparent about decisions and by publicly announcing to parliamentarians and civil society the reasons for changes in policy and the planned remedial course of action. We recommend that DFID ensure that its aid to sanitation and water is predictable. Any rapid scaling-back of aid should be a last resort, but where it is unavoidable—for example following political events that are beyond its control—DFID should publicly communicate changes to its policies to civil society and parliamentarians to ensure proper accountability. We reiterate the recommendation we made in our report on DFID's Departmental Report 2006 that DFID should examine the long-term viability of Poverty Reduction Budget Support before it is introduced and put contingency plans in place prior to PRBS being withdrawn. (Paragraph 56)
14. For budget support to work effectively as an aid mechanism for the sanitation and water sectors, DFID needs to assist the 'voice' of the sectors by helping to strengthen the 'institutional homes' for sanitation and water and support the building of capacity at local government level. This is especially true for countries with decentralised government where spending decisions are made by regional and local officials. We recommend that DFID support a complementary strategy to strengthen

the role of parliamentarians and civil society in scrutinising budgets and policies and articulating demand for sanitation and water services effectively. (Paragraph 60)

15. The UK's recognition of the human right to water is a positive first step. However, DFID should encourage developing countries to go beyond recognition to quantify and legislate for the right to water. Only then can citizens hold their providers accountable for their entitlement to water. This should include a complementary strategy of increasing demand for water services by helping to raise public knowledge of existing entitlements, as well as of gaps in legislation and policies. (Paragraph 63)
16. DFID needs to engage with other donors to ensure that the Commission for Africa's recommended donor spending on infrastructure of US\$10 billion a year up to 2010 (and, subject to review, a further increase to US\$20 billion a year in the following five years) is secured. (Paragraph 71)
17. We recommend that DFID prioritise engaging with the EU Water Initiative's Africa Working Group so that gaps and overlaps in funding for sanitation and water in Africa can be addressed. (Paragraph 72)
18. DFID has shown leadership on the EU Water Initiative from the outset. It now needs to use this position to seek more active participation from other donors so that improved co-ordination of EU member states' aid to sanitation and water can be facilitated. (Paragraph 73)
19. DFID has played an essential role in the first successful EU Water Initiative (EUWI) Country Dialogue in Ethiopia. It should proactively share lessons learned with other pilot countries so that the effective factors within the Ethiopian Dialogue can be emulated elsewhere. The Department should encourage other donors within the EUWI Africa Working Group to increase their involvement in Country Dialogues. (Paragraph 75)
20. We agree with DFID's view that the EU Water Facility should be reformed and better linked to the EU Water Initiative so that it is more strongly integrated into national and local planning. The tenth round of the European Development Fund, to be finalised in 2007, provides a window of opportunity for DFID and other donors to seek the reform of the EU Water Facility. (Paragraph 77)
21. DFID's support to the African Development Bank's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI) is important. In order to maximise this investment and the success of the RWSSI, we recommend that DFID engage with the Bank to ensure that capacity-building of rural local government bodies is a major priority for the Initiative, and does not become subsumed amongst the RWSSI's competing priorities. DFID should also support the Bank's own capacity to target and spend funds effectively. (Paragraph 79)
22. Limited service and management contracts can be mutually beneficial for the private sector and public water providers, but only if contracting procedures are transparent, include provision for training and capacity building within local communities, performance targets are publicly known and contracts include effectively monitored pro-poor requirements. (Paragraph 84)

23. NGOs and communities themselves are important water providers, but to work effectively they must operate within government frameworks so that legitimacy and sustainability are ensured. We recommend that DFID encourage partner governments to engage in NGO and community schemes so that co-ordination and sustainability of water provision schemes can be maximised. (Paragraph 87)
24. Public utilities are responsible for the vast majority of service delivery. Reform of public utilities is essential if they are to operate more effectively and efficiently and increase service coverage for poor people. We recommend that DFID investigate the promotion and funding of ‘public-public partnerships’ between public water operators, which can help utilities in developing countries support each other, share knowledge and learn from each other’s successes. (Paragraph 94)
25. Tackling corruption is of core importance to improving governance of the water sector. Corruption is less likely if utility employees do not need to supplement their pay through bribes. We recommend that DFID encourage partner governments and the private sector to prioritise paying water sector staff a decent wage. (Paragraph 96)
26. We recommend that DFID work to ensure that improved accountability and transparency mechanisms are built into national decision-making processes. This will facilitate a clearer voice for consumers and civil society, and help to ensure that water systems are based on the realities of poor people’s needs. This should include looking at the length of donor funding cycles which, if too protracted, can compromise the mutual trust that should be at the heart of the supplier-provider-community relationship. (Paragraph 100)
27. We recommend that DFID do more to strengthen capacity in sanitation and water to provide policy support and technical advisory services for national governments and development partners. One route towards this would be increased support to regional, national and sub-national resource centres in Africa and Asia. The centres could support knowledge transfer, develop appropriate training courses, provide policy advice and encourage the development of locally appropriate solutions to sanitation and water. Centres should be established in a way that is sustainable and allows them to attract business and function as financially viable entities. (Paragraph 104)
28. DFID should build a more formal relationship with professional water associations, which can assist in brokering expertise between countries experiencing similar technical problems in their water systems, using methods such as responsive twinning and mentoring to provide support for water operators in developing countries. (Paragraph 105)
29. DFID should encourage partner governments to boost staff numbers and develop training programmes to improve the collection of accurate hydrological data, which is essential to pinpointing water access and management needs. (Paragraph 106)
30. DFID’s decision significantly to boost its own research capacity on water and sanitation is welcome. We particularly support the focus on building local capacity for research. The Department needs a clear strategy for deciding in which areas

research is required and how findings will be communicated and used within partner countries. (Paragraph 107)

31. While money is part of the solution to reaching the sanitation and water MDGs, and we very much welcome the increase in DFID's allocation, it is not sufficient on its own. Developing countries have an urgent need for technical advice and capacity building in the water sector, which will require increased human resources within DFID. DFID must address its own tendency to focus too heavily on financial inputs without adequately assessing the necessary human resource requirements for efficient expenditure of funds. (Paragraph 111)
32. Headcount restrictions—within DFID and other donors—risk leaving a void within in-country donor advisory capacity just at the time when progress is urgently needed on the sanitation and water MDG targets. We recommend that DFID urgently carry out a needs assessment of staffing requirements until 2011 and work on a strategy for a co-ordinated response to the possible weakening of in-country donor advisory capacity. (Paragraph 112)
33. We recommend that DFID encourage the global community to reaffirm the missed 2005 target for all countries to have Integrated Water Resources Management Plans and Water Efficiency Plans in place. As part of this reaffirmation, national-level co-ordination mechanisms, with appropriate monitoring and reporting components, should be established so that countries can put robust water resources management strategies in place within a set time period. (Paragraph 117)
34. As the only international partnership on Water Resources Management (WRM), the Global Water Partnership needs to do more than promote dialogue: it must develop clear strategies for donor co-ordination and support countries' development and implementation of WRM plans. DFID should work with other donors to ensure that this change takes place. If the forthcoming evaluation suggests the Partnership cannot fulfil this role, a new and far better resourced global mechanism needs to be established by donors as a matter of urgency. (Paragraph 119)
35. Given the increasing constraints on water resources, it is imperative that DFID substantially scales up its limited work on Water Resources Management (WRM). DFID's funding of the Research-inspired Policy and Practice Learning in Ethiopia and the Nile Region programme has been a positive step. The Department now needs to ensure that knowledge developed under the programme is used and communicated widely. In conjunction with other bilateral donors under a reformed global partnership for WRM, clear processes of support must be established to help countries develop Water Resources Management Plans and Water Efficiency Plans, which should be embedded within Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and include monitoring mechanisms. (Paragraph 123)

36. As part of an increasing package of support to Water Resources Management (WRM), donors should ensure that professional capacity to measure availability of water and collect data on hydrological and meteorological patterns is adequately supported. DFID should look for opportunities with other donors to support research into identifying a minimum set of data that could act as a series of basic indicators on WRM and climate change. (Paragraph 125)
37. We recommend that DFID work with other UK government departments, including the Department of Trade and Industry and the Export Credits Guarantee Department, to increase UK stakeholders' adherence to the World Commission on Dams' Guidelines for Dam-building. Organising a multi-stakeholder forum on the Guidelines would help promote the participation of industry and other relevant actors. (Paragraph 127)
38. DFID's work on climate change adaptation in relation to Water Resources Management is relatively new and we received no evidence on the impacts of its work so far. But it is clear that DFID is putting the foundations in place to move forward its own and development partners' work on climate change adaptation. We are greatly encouraged by DFID's leadership on climate change adaptation in relation to water resources management, internationally and across Whitehall, and its support for research on this subject. We expect to see DFID translate this leadership into substantive policies and frameworks for action in the near future. The importance of DFID's work in this area must be recognised and properly funded under the Comprehensive Spending Review process. (Paragraph 133)
39. As water availability becomes constrained, the risk of conflict over water resources is growing. Donors can help pre-empt such conflicts by supporting joint hydrometric monitoring of shared rivers and trans-boundary river commissions. DFID's funding of the Nile Basin Initiative has been important, and we recommend that the Department continue to support the development of the current transitional arrangement into a permanent framework. DFID should continue to look at the viability of establishing a similar initiative within the Congo Basin. (Paragraph 138)
40. For DFID's multi-disciplinary approach to work effectively, closer links will need to be built between DFID advisers working on water and those working on health. We recommend that water and sanitation be mainstreamed across DFID's new health strategy to be published later in 2007, underpinned by explicit strategies to promote co-working between advisers working on water and advisers working on health. (Paragraph 146)
41. DFID's education strategies do not do enough to stress the importance of sanitation and water promotion within schools. This needs to change if DFID is to deliver a properly integrated sanitation and water strategy. DFID should also work with education ministries on curriculum development and teacher training so that curricula include a water, sanitation and hygiene component. (Paragraph 153)

42. DFID's multi-disciplinary approach should ensure that water, sanitation, gender and education issues are mainstreamed across DFID's forthcoming health strategy. (Paragraph 154)
43. DFID has not given adequate attention to the impact of women and girls' water-fetching burden in its education strategies. The Department needs to help governments develop strategies addressing the time burden associated with collecting water that keeps girls out of school. These should encompass tackling wider social inequalities that perpetuate women and girls' water-fetching burden, expanding water supply so that journey times are reduced and practical school-based strategies such as flexible timetabling. (Paragraph 155)
44. Whilst we are supportive towards DFID remaining highly focused on sanitation and water, it is important that the use of water for agriculture is mainstreamed across the Department's water and sanitation strategies. (Paragraph 159)
45. We are concerned that DFID's water strategy does not sufficiently address agriculture, and equally that DFID's agriculture strategy makes little mention of water. DFID's focus on achieving the sanitation and water Millennium Development Goal should not be to the exclusion of focusing on water for agriculture, an essential component of meeting MDG1 which seeks to halve the number of people suffering from hunger. Strategies for promoting the productive use of water for food, including irrigation, should be pursued both through high-level donor engagement—particularly seeking the achievement of the Commission for Africa's recommended increase in funding of irrigation by 50% before 2010—and through national water resources management strategies which encourage the efficient use of water at the community level. (Paragraph 162)

List of acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
BGS	British Geological Survey
CLTS	Community-Led Total Sanitation
DFID	Department for International Development
EUWI	European Union Water Initiative
EUWF	European Union Water Facility
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICE	Institution of Civil Engineers
IDC	International Development Committee
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IFIs	International Financial Institutions
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NAO	National Audit Office
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NEWAH	Nepal Water for Health
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPIAF	Public Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility
PRBS	Poverty Reduction Budget Support
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PUP	Public-Public Partnership
RWSSI	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	The United Nations Children's Fund
WHO	World Health Organisation
WRM	Water Resources Management
WSP	Water and Sanitation Programme
WSUP	Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor

Annex 1: The Committee's visit programme, Ethiopia 1-8 February 2007

The group consisted of:

Malcolm Bruce (Chairman)	Mr Quentin Davies
John Barrett	James Duddridge
John Battle	Ann McKechin
Hugh Bayley	Joan Ruddock
John Bercow	Mr Marsha Singh
Richard Burden	

Accompanied by: Carol Oxborough (Clerk), Chlöe Challender (Committee Specialist)

FRIDAY 2 FEBRUARY 2007

Addis Ababa

Briefing from Department for International Development and Foreign & Commonwealth Office officials

Meeting with Prime Minister Meles Zenawi

Reception with donors, parliamentarians, NGOs and water and sanitation experts

SATURDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2007

Addis Ababa

Meeting with Women & Children Development Organisation

Field visits to slum in Old Airport area and municipal tip, and meeting with community groups

Visit to biogas community and meeting with user group

Working lunch to discuss water resources management with:

- Alan Nicol, Director of Research Inspired Policy and Practice Learning in Ethiopia and the Nile Region (RiPPLE)
- Ato Teferra Beyene, Nile Basin Initiative
- Ambassador Girma Amare, Nile Basin Initiative
- Dr Solomon Abate, Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office
- Ato Paulos SHEMELES, Unicef

Meeting with Ato Tadesse Meskela, General Manager, Oromia Coffee Farmers Co-operative Union

Meeting with Ato Getachew Mengiste, Director General, Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office

MONDAY 5 FEBRUARY

Butajira, Southern Nations region (SNNPR)

Visit to sanitation and water projects and meeting with Women for Justice NGO

Hoseana, Southern Nations region (SNNPR)

Meeting with Ato Jemal Reshid Head of the Regional Water Bureau, SNNPR and Dr Shiferaw Teklemariam, Head of the Regional Health Bureau, SNNPR, and zonal water and health staff

Misha woreda, Southern Nations region (SNNPR)

Visit to government-funded sanitation and water schemes

TUESDAY 6 FEBRUARY

Kulito, Alaba, Southern Nations region (SNNPR)

Meeting with WaterAction and water and sanitation committees

Visit to see WaterAction's work in a water-stressed area, including water point with fluoride treatment system

Addis Ababa

De-briefing dinner with DFID and FCO staff

WEDNESDAY 7 FEBRUARY

Addis Ababa

Meeting with Ato Asfaw Dingamo, Minister for Water Resources and Dr Kebede Worku, State Minister for Health

Meeting with EU Water Initiative Task Force

Meeting with Ato Mekonnen Manyazewal, Minister of State for Finance and Economic Development

Working lunch with representatives of donor Development Assistance Group:

- Fidele Sarassoro (United Nations Development Programme)
- Monique Angers (CIDA, Canadian government development agency)
- Pierre Seya and Iskender Alemseged (African Development Bank)
- Ishac Diwan (World Bank)
- Nicola Delcroix (European Commission)
- Antti Rautavaara (Embassy of Finland)
- Hein Winnubst (German Embassy)
- Andrea Senatori (Italian Cooperation)
- Glenn Anders (USAID)
- Hans Docter (Netherlands Embassy)
- Paulos Semeles (Unicef)

Meeting with parliamentary committees dealing with natural resources and environment/infrastructure

Meeting with Opposition MPs

Annex 2: The Millennium Development Goals

The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were agreed at the United Nations Millennium Summit in September 2000. Nearly 190 countries have subsequently signed up to them. The Goals were created to encourage concerted action by the international community to achieve progress on human development by 2015.

Alongside the eight Goals, a series of 18 targets were established to set out a number of tangible steps that the international community should achieve within a set time period.

DFID has made the MDGs the overall aim of its Public Service Agreement (PSA).

The Millennium Development Goals and linked targets

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

Target 1: Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day.

Target 2: Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

Target 3: Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling.

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015.

Goal 4: Reduce child mortality

Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds the mortality rate among children under five.

Goal 5: Improve maternal health

Target 6: Reduce by three-quarters the maternal mortality ratio.

Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

Target 7: Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Target 8: Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources.

Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.

Target 11: Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020.

Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

Target 12. Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system, which includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction—both nationally and internationally.

Target 13. Address the special needs of the least developed countries, to include: tariff and quota-free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous Official Development Assistance (ODA) for countries committed to poverty reduction.

Target 14. Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states.

Target 15. Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term.

Target 16: In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth.

Target 17: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries

Target 18: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications.

Formal minutes

Tuesday 17 April 2007

Members present:

Malcolm Bruce, in the Chair

John Battle	James Duddridge
Hugh Bayley	Ann McKechin
John Bercow	Joan Ruddock
Richard Burden	Mr Marsha Singh
Mr Quentin Davies	

Draft Report (Sanitation and Water), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 170 read and agreed to

Summary agreed to.

Annexes agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Sixth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 134.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House.

Several papers were ordered to be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Tuesday 24 April at 10.00 am.]

Witnesses

Thursday 30 November 2006

Page

Will Day, Chairman of the Board, Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor, **David Satterthwaite**, Senior Fellow, International Institute for Environment and Development and **Kevin Watkins**, Director, UN Development Programme Human Development Representative

Ev 1

Jack Moss, Aquafed (International Federation of Private Water Operators) and **Umesh Pandey**, Nepal Water for Health

Ev 10

Tuesday 5 December 2006

Mark Lowcock, Director General for Policy and International, **Elwyn Grainger-Jones**, Head, Sustainable Development Group, Policy and Research Division, **Greg Briffa**, Team Leader, Water, Energy and Transport, Sustainable Development Group, and **Ian Curtis**, Senior Adviser on Growth, Africa Policy Department, Department for International Development

Ev 17

Antonio García Fragío, Directorate General for Development, European Commission, **Sering Jallow**, Principal Sanitary Engineer and Acting Manager, Water and Sanitation Department, African Development Bank, and **Stephen Turner**, Public Policy and Education Director, WaterAid

Ev 27

Tuesday 12 December 2006

Professor Sandy Cairncross, Professor of Environmental Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, **Dr Darren Saywell**, Development Director, International Water Association and **Laura Webster**, Senior Policy Officer, Tearfund

Ev 34

Professor Tom Franks, Water Resources and Development, University of Bradford, **Vicky Cann**, Campaign Policy Officer, World Development Movement and **Antonio Miranda**, Director, International Affairs, Brazilian Association of Municipal Water and Sanitation Public Water Operators

Ev 41

Tuesday 16 January 2007

John Chilton, Principal Hydrogeologist, Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey, **Dr Declan Conway**, Senior Lecturer, School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, and **Dr David Tickner**, Head, Freshwater Programme, WWF-UK

Ev 52

Tuesday 20 February 2007

Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, Secretary of State for International Development, **Elwyn Grainger-Jones**, Head of Sustainable Development Group, Policy and Research Division, **Greg Briffa**, Team Leader, Water, Sanitation, Energy & Transport, Sustainable Development Group, Policy and Research Division and **Ian Curtis**, Senior Adviser on Growth, Pan-African Strategy Department, Department for International Development

Ev 67

Written evidence

Written evidence submitted by witnesses who also gave oral evidence:

1. Department for International Development	Ev 84; Ev 109; Ev 114
2. African Development Bank	Ev 117
3. Aquafed	Ev 121; Ev 130
4. Professor Sandy Cairncross	Ev 140
5. Directorate General Development, European Commission	Ev 141
6. Groundwater Programme, British Geological Survey	Ev 143; Ev 146
7. International Water Association	Ev 147
8. Nepal Water for Health	Ev 152
9. Tearfund	Ev 156
10. Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor	Ev 162
11. WaterAid	Ev 168
12. Water Research Group, Bradford University	Ev 195
13. World Development Movement	Ev 197; Ev 208
14. WWF-UK	Ev 210

Other written evidence:

15. John Banyard	Ev 212
16. BOND UK Water Network	Ev 215
17. Robert Chambers and John Thompson, Institute of Development Studies	Ev 219
18. Christian Engineers in Development	Ev 221
19. Concern Universal (Malawi)	Ev 222
20. Dr Andrew Cotton, Loughborough University	Ev 227
21. James Dent	Ev 231
22. Global Water Partnership	Ev 233
23. Good Earth Trust	Ev 237; Ev 240
24. Gram Vikas	Ev 243; Ev 245
25. Tom Grieve	Ev 248
26. Halcrow Group Ltd	Ev 249
27. David Hall and Emanuele Lobina, Public Service International Research Unit, University of Greenwich	Ev 251
28. HelpAge International	Ev 262
29. Dr Rob Hope, Oxford University	Ev 266
30. Institution of Civil Engineers	Ev 267
31. Jon Lane	Ev 273
32. John Meadley	Ev 274
33. NERC Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	Ev 275
34. Nestlé UK Ltd	Ev 276
35. Professor Nina Laurie, Newcastle University	Ev 280
36. NGO Forum for Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation	Ev 282

37. Partners for Water and Sanitation	Ev 287
38. Plan UK	Ev 289
39. Safe Water for Africa Community Initiative	Ev 295
40. Social, Technical and Ecological Pathways to Sustainability Centre, University of Sussex	Ev 297
41. Dr Suresh, Tamil Nadu Water Supplies and Drainage Board	Ev 301
42. UK National Committee for the International Hydrological Programme, UNESCO	Ev 310
43. UNISON	Ev 313
44. United Utilities plc and Manila Water Company	Ev 315
45. Water and Environmental Unit, Nigeria	Ev 317
46. World Bank	Ev 320
47. World Business Council for Sustainable Development	Ev 328
48. World Development Group in Sheffield Water Group	Ev 331
49. World Health Organization	Ev 332

List of unprinted written evidence and papers

Additional papers have been received from the following and have been reported to the House but to save printing costs they have not been printed and copies have been placed in the House of Commons Library where they may be inspected by Members. Other copies are in the Parliamentary Archives and are available to the public for inspection. Requests for inspection should be addressed to The Parliamentary Archives, Houses of Parliament, London SW1A 0PW (Tel 020 7219 3074). Hours of inspection are from 9:30am to 5:00pm on Mondays to Fridays.

Unprinted memoranda:

Anthony Wilson
Global Rescue Missions

Other papers:

Orangi Pilot Project: the expansion of work beyond Orangi and the mapping of informal settlements and infrastructure, Arif Hasan, Karachi

Rethinking sanitation – lessons and innovation for sustainability and success in the new millennium, UNDP HDR2006 – Sanitation Thematic Paper, Marion W Jenkins and Steven Sugden, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, January 2006

Low-cost Water Supply and Sanitation Technologies: Too Low-Cost for Adoption?, Duncan Mara, School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, 30 November 2006

Contributing Towards Total Sanitation, Annual Report July 2004-June 2005, Nepal Water for Health (NEWAH), Kathmandu, Nepal

Water Resource Management, Supply and Sanitation Assessment in Kenya, Network for Water and Sanitation International (NETWAS), Nairobi – assessment report submitted to the Institute of Economic Affairs, Nairobi, May 2006

Water Discipline: Water, the State and the Unrecognized Villages in the Negev, Orly Almi, Project for the Unrecognized Villages of the Negev, Physicians for Human Rights–Israel, May 2006

Access for all: securing older people's access to water and sanitation, Bridget Sleep, Help Age International, 2006

Compendium of Actions, UN Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation, March 2006

An empty glass: the EU Water Initiative's contribution to the water and sanitation Millennium targets, WaterAid and Tearfund report, December 2005

New funding mechanisms required for urban poor water and sanitation projects, Michael Thompson and Sam Parker, Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor, February 2006

The Case for Marketing Sanitation, Water and Sanitation Program, August 2004

Applying the principles of integrated water resource and river basin management – an introduction: report to WWF-UK prepared by Tim Jones, Peter Newborne and Bill Phillips, June 2006.

Reports from the International Development Committee since July 2005

The Government Responses to International Development Committee reports are listed here in brackets by the HC (or Cm) No. after the report they relate to.

Session 2006–07

First Report	DFID Departmental Report 2006	HC 71 (HC 328)
Second Report	HIV/AIDS: Marginalised groups and emerging epidemics	HC 46-I & II (HC 329)
Third Report	Work of the Committee in 2005-06	HC 228
Fourth Report	Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian Territories	HC 114 (HC 430)
Fifth Report	EU Development and Trade Policies: An update	HC 271

Session 2005–06

First Report	Delivering the Goods: HIV/AIDS and the Provision of Anti-Retrovirals	HC 708-I&II (HC 922)
Second Report	Darfur: The killing continues	HC 657 (HC 1017)
Third Report	The WTO Hong Kong Ministerial and the Doha Development Agenda	HC 730-I&II (HC 1425)
Fourth Report	Private Sector Development	HC 921-I&II (HC 1629)
Fifth Report	Strategic Export Controls: Annual Report for 2004, Quarterly Reports for 2005, Licensing Policy and Parliamentary Scrutiny	HC 873 (Cm 6954)
Sixth Report	Conflict and Development: Peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction	HC 923 (HC 172)
Seventh Report	Humanitarian response to natural disasters	HC 1188 (HC 229)