



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Technical Brief 8

HUMANITARIAN – DEVELOPMENT COHERENCE IN WASH OR WRM PROGRAMS

USAID Water and Development

TECHNICAL SERIES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this technical brief is to provide an overview of actions to enhance the coherence between humanitarian, stabilization, and development approaches to water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) or water resources management (WRM) programming in shock-affected contexts. The brief is intended for humanitarian, stabilization, and development actors both within and outside of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and proposes actionable steps and practical programming ideas to support the design and implementation of WASH or WRM programming in countries prone to natural disasters, affected by conflict, and/or political instability. The brief is aligned with the USAID Water and Development Plan under the [U.S. Global Water Strategy](#), the [Agency's Resilience Policy](#), and the [U.S. Strategy to Prevent Conflict and Promote Stability](#).

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **Develop a common understanding of the mandate, priorities, and geographic areas where WASH or WRM actors are working.** Anyone motivated can jumpstart this first step; however, an influential broker is eventually needed to play an ongoing, facilitative role that would ideally include joint analysis and planning, as well as harmonized advocacy that takes advantage of each actors' comparative advantages.
- **There is not a one-size-fits-all approach** and opportunities may range from implementing complementary, yet separate programs in the same geographic area to achieve mutually agreed objectives, to implementing integrated programs that blend humanitarian, stabilization, and development approaches within a single activity.
- **Promote development approaches that can facilitate emergency response when needed.** In shock-affected areas, development approaches are still possible, but development actors will need to build flexibility into activities and adaptive management will be essential.
- **Create an enabling environment for long-term development when addressing shocks.** When feasible, humanitarian interventions should be complementary to and reinforce existing or nascent WASH services and WRM authorities and approaches.

THE CONTEXT

USAID seeks to support partner countries to develop and use robust systems to plan, finance, and implement solutions that ensure sustainable and equitable water resources management and deliver water and sanitation services for all. However, some 80 percent of the places where USAID works are in acute crisis, recovering from disaster, or experiencing smaller-scale upheaval.¹ The average humanitarian crisis now lasts more than nine years² and the duration of displacement (either externally as a refugee or as an internally displaced person) averages between 17-20 years.³ In order to strengthen sustainable WASH services or WRM within these complex environments, more deliberate and purposeful coordination is required across relief, development, and stabilization activities. More resilient and responsive approaches to WASH and WRM programming are vital to prevent excess mortality, minimize disruptions in WASH service delivery, or negative environmental impacts, particularly in countries confronted with shocks (e.g., natural disasters, conflict, and/or political instability) that exceed the government's response capacity.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Numerous opportunities exist to increase the complementarity and integration between humanitarian response, development programming, and stabilization interventions in WASH or WRM, despite roadblocks that are bound to arise in these challenging, shock-prone contexts.

COORDINATION

The lack of coordination between humanitarian, development, and stabilization donors, government offices, and implementers has long been cited as one of the key challenges to coherent relief and development programming. Humanitarian and development coordination platforms are often separate, with humanitarian actors participating in WASH Cluster (national WASH coordination platform for humanitarian response) meetings and development partners participating in sector working groups, while stabilization coordination may occur outside of WASH or WRM sector platforms. Often the same host country government water ministry coordinates both formal bodies, with some overlap in participation from development partners (albeit different offices).



Participants of the 9th Annual WASH Multi stakeholder forum on Tuesday, 12 June 2018. © UNICEF Ethiopia/2018/Mulugeta Ayene.

¹ USAID. (2019). *Journey to Self-Reliance Policy Framework*

² UN OCHA. (2019). *Global Humanitarian Report 2019*

³ UNHCR. (2020). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2019*.

However, despite these separate platforms, there are opportunities to bring actors together. For instance, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) suggests developing practical shared priorities for WASH between humanitarian and development actors in order to break down existing silos.⁴ Priorities could include a common agreement on geographic areas where WASH or WRM interventions need to be strengthened to mitigate the impact of or prepare for shocks. Should identifying shared priorities prove too high a bar, other opportunities for coordination include periodic, thematic discussions at the national or subnational levels, preferably led by the relevant line ministry. In the early stages of coordination, the focus should be on identifying practical, low, or no cost actions that can be quickly implemented to demonstrate the benefits of coordination and increase engagement across stakeholders. In some countries, governments will need support from another actor or group. An implementing partner with dual emergency and development mandates could organize such meetings to address specific topics or changes in the local context. USAID is also well placed to provide support to governments that continue to operate in shock-affected areas.

It is critical that all actors provide support for the government to create opportunities for dialogue and coordination among organizations and donors working to advance WRM or WASH. Where it is impossible for different response actors to hold face-to-face meetings given potential sensitivities (e.g., some stabilization actors may not be able to participate in humanitarian coordination platforms), stakeholders should seek alternative ways of sharing programming information in order to prevent duplication (at a minimum) and ideally to promote complementarity in interventions.

COORDINATION IN ACTION IN KENYA

USAID/Kenya's [Partnership for Resilience and Economic Growth \(PREG\)](#) links and coordinates 31 USAID-funded humanitarian and development partner activities working in shared geographies with the Kenya National Drought Management Authority to improve livelihoods and governance; strengthen livestock value chains; enable access to water sources and WASH services; increase conservation measures; address conflict; and promote inclusiveness and gender responsiveness. The PREG is designed to build resilience in this highly drought-prone region. Humanitarian and development water activities under the PREG have focused not only on extending services, but also on managing water resources and ensuring critical infrastructure remains available during emergency periods. PREG's strategy for collective impact rests on a common agenda, shared measurement and learning, mutually reinforcing activities, and continuous communication. This level of coordination requires significant resources. Twenty-one USAID staff members participate from seven offices in a structure that cascades down to the subnational level, with secretariats established in both the national capital and in each of the nine PREG focal counties. A funded backbone organization staffs the secretariat, bringing partners, USAID, and government counterparts together for joint work planning, workshops, continuous learning, and improvement.

⁴ Mason, N., Mosello, B. (2016). [Making Humanitarian and Development WASH Work Better Together](#). Overseas Development Institute.

FUNDING

Funding is also consistently noted as a challenge in humanitarian, development, and stabilization interventions working together more coherently. Countries may have completely separate funding streams and limited to no coordination among the various humanitarian, development, and stabilization stakeholders, while others have a single, shared WASH or WRM sector strategy (accompanied by flexible funding) describing each stakeholder's role in responding to or mitigating the impacts of shocks on WASH services or WRM. Key stakeholders such as the host country government or sector coordination platforms should begin identifying practical actions to increase the integration of development and humanitarian WASH or WRM donor funding. For example, in Burkina Faso, where violent extremism and internal displacement is on the rise, UNICEF facilitated a dialogue between the WASH Cluster and the development coordination platform to develop a common understanding of the country's new WASH needs and geographic hotspots. This dialogue led development partners to make a multi-million dollar commitment to respond to needs in these hotspots. However, because funding silos are likely to remain in the short-term, partners will need to be creative in how they can program separate, yet complementary funding streams.

RESILIENCE IN THE SAHEL II (RISE II)

RISE II is a USAID regional resilience program focused on Burkina Faso and Niger that seeks to help vulnerable populations more effectively manage shocks and stresses, and ultimately, lift people out of poverty. A central approach to RISE II is layering and sequencing development activities with humanitarian interventions through co-creation and ongoing dialogue. For WASH and WRM, RISE II emphasizes joint planning, together with counterpart governments, and subsequent action among development activity, [TerresEauVie \(TEV\)](#), and USAID humanitarian programs in overlapping geographies according to each actor's mandate. TEV seeks to improve water security and land management policy, build the capacity of local commune governments to do multi-stressor contingency planning, and manage water and land resources and WASH services. Additionally, TEV coordinates and fills gaps in USAID humanitarian WASH activities that work mostly at the village level to improve access to basic drinking water and sanitation services. When needed, TEV is able to pivot its programming to address shocks through a built-in [crisis modifier](#). For example, in response to increases in internally displaced people within the RISE II implementation zone, TEV activated a crisis modifier to pivot programming to support and augment humanitarian delivery of drinking water and to support local governments to meet increased demand for water and sanitation services, which if not addressed, would erode hard-won progress on water security.

INSECURITY



Direct attacks against aid workers and targeting of water infrastructure have increased in recent years and has resulted in many international actors adopting a risk averse posture. Local NGOs and entities may be well placed to implement programming in insecure contexts, given their deep knowledge of the local context and trusted status among communities and combatants. Engaging stabilization actors will also be important to consider in areas where basic water and sanitation services have been disrupted, where there are large-scale infrastructure needs that must be addressed to facilitate the return of displaced populations and/or where disputes over water-use are driving armed conflict. In order to maximize engagement with non-traditional and stabilization partners, all WASH and WRM actors need to consider ways to safely engage with these partners—without asking them to take undue risks in conflict-affected areas. Coordinated data collection on incidents against implementing partners and joint advocacy are also areas of opportunity to mitigate insecurity against WASH or WRM partners and their programming.

COMPLEMENTARY APPROACH IN ACTION IN YEMEN

In 2018, USAID provided funding to two partners in Yemen to restart development WASH and WRM programming after a pause in funding due to the conflict in the country. Coordination between USAID/Middle East Bureau and USAID/Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) was an enabling factor in ensuring that development programming would complement ongoing humanitarian response interventions and prevent duplication of efforts. While humanitarian programming focused on emergency interventions such as WASH in camps, water trucking, and distribution of non-food items (e.g., soap, water containers), development programming focused more on integrating livelihood opportunities with water and sanitation service delivery, including local production of WASH products, and piloting “smart-irrigation” techniques to promote agricultural water management on farms. As a result of the complementary programming approach, capacity building for local water service providers to support operations and maintenance was more systematic than in traditional humanitarian programs. It is important to acknowledge that local level issues, such as a program suspension in the north, lengthy government approval processes, and conflict-related challenges (fuel crisis, currency fluctuation) have had an adverse impact on program implementation. This underscores the importance of flexibility and adaptive management on the part of both implementing partners and donors alike.

GEOGRAPHY

Limited geographic overlap is also a common, but by no means universal challenge. Humanitarian partners implement programming in conflict affected areas or disaster zones. Development partners generally work in areas that remain relatively stable. Specific efforts should be made to expand development WASH or WRM programs to less stable areas within a country, given the duration of most humanitarian crises and the cyclical nature of many climatic shocks. This provides significant opportunities to learn from challenges and refine implementation approaches to meet the needs of vulnerable populations. In places where co-location is unlikely due to geo-political issues or USAID Mission priorities, efforts should be focused on achieving complementarity in the short-term and laying the foundation for development work or emergency response in the long-term, as needed. (See Complementary and Integrated Programming section for illustrative examples.)



Legend: Shading indicates the degree of geographic convergence between USAID humanitarian (BHA), development (Missions), and stabilization (Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stabilization) programming from low (1 bureau/operating unit type of funding and programming stream) to high (3). Stabilization programming is sector agnostic and not specific to WASH or WRM.

Note that country convergence does not mean that activities necessarily overlap geographically at the sub-national level.

FIGURE 1: FY20 GEOGRAPHICAL CONVERGENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF USAID WASH OR WRM HUMANITARIAN, STABILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING

USAID RESILIENCE FOCAL COUNTRIES

USAID has identified 14 resilience focus countries—including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Sudan, and Uganda that are also High Priority Countries under the Water for the World Act of 2014—where the Agency is working together with relevant stakeholders to contribute to a sustainable reduction in vulnerability and promote more inclusive growth, largely focused on food security and nutrition. In a number of resilience focal countries, a backbone organization has been funded to coordinate USAID-funded activities across sectors within a given geography together with the local government (e.g., USAID/Kenya’s PREG). This has been an effective, but time-intensive way to layer, sequence, and integrate humanitarian and development activities within a geography through joint work planning, field visits, and collective outcome monitoring. WASH and WRM in some instances are part of the multisectoral coordination bodies.

PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS

When seeking to increase complementarity or integration among humanitarian, development, and stabilization WASH or WRM interventions, stakeholders should explore how the following programming considerations apply to their context.

Differing mandates should not limit technical approaches or coordination opportunities. One of the common challenges for humanitarian, development, stabilization actors are the differing mandates and the associated implications for how programmatic decisions are made. *While humanitarian actors will continue to follow humanitarian principles, and stabilization and development actors may be more focused on supporting the priorities of governments, this doesn’t mean that the technical approaches that are used have to be different.* For example, increasing the engagement and role of the private sector or using market-based approaches, while ensuring the needs of vulnerable populations—including sexual and gender minorities and persons with a disability among others—are met, can be a part of any actors’ tool-box. Differing mandates may also limit the types of coordination platforms that USAID and/or their WASH or WRM partners may be able to engage in. While direct participation in a WASH Cluster meeting may not be feasible for a stabilization partner (given the non-neutral nature of stabilization programming), informal coordination channels become important in settings such as this and all actors should commit to share basic information such as timelines, geographies, and scope.

Strengthening local systems is needed even in shock affected contexts. Development activities focused on developing and strengthening water and sanitation service delivery systems are also necessary in shock-affected areas. While there can sometimes be a tendency to bypass weak institutions or market systems to allow for rapid response to challenges, outcomes are unlikely to be equitable or sustained without simultaneous investments in [governance](#). These can be an important complement to the one-off approach that some humanitarian actors may use, e.g., training of Water User Committees. However, the systems and policies that support it will likely need to be adapted to reflect the specificities of shock-affected areas. Practically this could mean working to ensure service provider budgets include line items for disaster response, sector consumption subsidies target shock-affected populations, and incentives are put in place for service providers to expand access to reach internally displaced populations.

Create opportunities. Harmonizing humanitarian, development, and stabilization programming is complex, so there is not a one-size fits all approach. There is also not a single actor, entity or institution that is solely responsible for promoting integration or complementarity of programming in shock-affected areas. Any WASH or WRM actor can identify practical actions to promote coordination and harmonization whether it is at the implementation, technical, policy, or funding level. However, to operationalize these initial steps, it will be necessary to include a broker that has the required level and type of sectoral legitimacy to continue the process.

Leverage flexibility where you already have it. Some types of programming, award agreements, and funding sources are inherently more flexible than others and require less upfront planning and approvals. For example, humanitarian activities can be nimble in responding to urgent, life-saving WASH or WRM (e.g., river flooding) needs by deploying funds and setting up new programs quickly. For development WASH or WRM activities, a variety of options are available. Certain [pivots and redirections](#) might be within scope and are therefore easy for partners to implement, while still achieving their activity objectives. A variety of additional adaptive management approaches can be incorporated during the work planning phase using USAID's [Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting](#) (CLA) approach, including building in “pause and reflect” opportunities such as after-action reviews and collaborative workshops that focus on challenges and successes in implementation to-date, changes in the operating environment or context that could affect programming, and opportunities to better collaborate or influence other actors.


LEVERAGING EXISTING ACTIVITIES IN MOZAMBIQUE TO RESPOND TO CYCLONE IDAI



Cyclone Idai made landfall in Mozambique on March 14, 2019, damaging the water network that supplies Beira and Dondo cities, including the water intake facility. As a result, water production halted for approximately one week to a city of over half a million people, which was one of the few major centers above water in the days following the cyclone's landfall. In response, USAID-funded development partner, UNICEF, pivoted programming to support cyclone response and recovery in two critical ways. First, efforts focused on assisting the government restart and rehabilitating the Beira water supply system: restoring the power supply to the water treatment plant, repairing network infrastructure, and providing water treatment chemicals. Second, the activity redoubled its efforts on water quality in response to a cholera outbreak. Together with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and various Mozambican authorities, the activity supported, developed, and administered, a mobile phone-based water quality monitoring and reporting program. The emergency water quality monitoring program helped expedite efficient response by identifying locations in the network with potential line breaks, areas where water availability was limited, issues with consistent daily chlorine treatment, and zones where chlorination could be improved with the installation of booster chlorine stations. Finally, to help bridge to long-term development programming, USAID funded a new component of the existing activity focused on post-cyclone WASH recovery.


COMPLEMENTARY AND INTEGRATED PROGRAMMING APPROACHES

Opportunities for complementary or integrated approaches can vary according to the context and type of shock, for example whether or not it is a rapid onset emergency such as a natural disaster, or a protracted crisis. The examples included below are illustrative and reflect both types of contexts and in some cases are aspirational. Complementary approaches can be no or low cost and easy to integrate into current programs or future projects. Integrated approaches will require more conscious program development efforts and engagement with host-country governments and donors, including through joint analysis and design. In some countries, it is also important to recognize that host governments and/or the private sector have the resources to implement integrated approaches. However, they may need technical support from humanitarian, development, or stabilization actors to conduct assessments, analyze findings, and adapt operations.

For example, development actors may already be using these approaches, however they may not be implemented in shock-prone or shock-affected locations. It is also important to note that in some locations these silos will continue to remain due to geo-political issues beyond the control of WASH or WRM sector actors. In these types of contexts, applying complementary approaches and avoiding potentially conflicting approaches are the primary options to increase resilience or responsiveness of water and sanitation services or WRM. The following table provides examples of complementary interventions and integrated approaches for WASH and WRM.

SUB-SECTOR	COMPLEMENTARY INTERVENTIONS		INTEGRATED APPROACHES IN SHOCK-AFFECTED AREAS
 <p>DRINKING WATER SERVICES IN FRAGILE CONTEXTS</p>	<p>HUMANITARIAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitate existing water networks in coordination with local authorities in areas affected by displacement. Integrate user fees in water supply interventions, in alignment with vulnerability analyses. Direct contracting with water truckers/vendors or distribution of cash/ vouchers for households to purchase water. 	<p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help service authorities conduct asset inventories and update information management systems. Help authorities establish cost-recovery tariffs or user fees, including special provisions to reach vulnerable populations in shock-affected areas. Support service providers to prioritize infrastructure repair/ rehabilitation post-disaster through analysis of needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a preventive maintenance model for shock-affected areas and identify specific actors (NGO, private sector, social enterprise, government, etc.) responsible for operations and maintenance. Support social enterprises, the private sector or NGOs structure performance-based contracts with service providers to reach vulnerable populations. Provide technical support to service providers, regulators, and local governments to develop business continuity plans or build rapid response capacity, including budgets, contingency plans, and personnel to manage proactively and respond to acute shocks and restore water services. Work with service authorities to develop quality control standards for trucked water (e.g., chlorination) that ensures private water truckers deliver safe water to shock-affected areas. Support business improvement plans, large-scale repairs at water pumping stations and treatment plants, and rehabilitate sections of the network that serve vulnerable populations.

SUB-SECTOR	COMPLEMENTARY INTERVENTIONS		INTEGRATED APPROACHES IN SHOCK-AFFECTED AREAS
 <p>WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>HUMANITARIAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install ground water monitoring equipment. Provide training and material support to enable government authorities to maintain databases. • Facilitate dialogue with communities and local authorities regarding common disaster risks in the area and ensure water and sanitation infrastructure is adapted to common risks, e.g., hand pumps and sanitation facilities in flood prone areas. • Through cash-for-work activities, restore and conserve degraded land through practices such as water conservation measures to strengthen water source protection. 	<p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop national or basin level policies for groundwater and surface water management and protection. • Support government or local authorities to improve water storage, conservation and water demand management to account for climate-driven changes in supply and demand. • Work with government and utilities to protect upstream forested watersheds through payment for ecosystem service schemes to mitigate downstream costs for utilities on water treatment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen or develop groundwater mapping and monitoring systems and policies based on displacement patterns and water usage or disaster impacts. • Build capacity of watershed management authorities to address climate-driven shocks and stressors, including by strengthening or building disaster management systems in coordination with local government and other donors.
 <p>SANITATION SERVICES</p>	<p>HUMANITARIAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide latrine materials to vulnerable households and train/hire local masons to construct latrines. • Ensure sludge disposal adheres to local procedures, including use of official dumping sites and is supplemented if required, e.g., provision of protective equipment.. 	<p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support community-led total sanitation (CLTS), provide targeted subsidies, and/or develop and strengthen market-based sanitation products and services. • Strengthen local fecal sludge management operators and national government policy and regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide smart-subsidies to shock affected households. Adapt the CLTS triggering approach to reflect the specific context for the shock/crisis affected population. • Adapt and expand market-based sanitation (slab production, soap production, super-structure materials, etc) to shock affected areas, including promoting human-centered design. • Develop new sludge disposal sites or upgrade existing ones based on population numbers, which include displaced populations. Restore wastewater treatment operations in areas affected by protracted crises.

SUB-SECTOR	COMPLEMENTARY INTERVENTIONS		INTEGRATED APPROACHES IN SHOCK-AFFECTED AREAS
 <p>HYGIENE AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR CHANGE</p>	<p>HUMANITARIAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use existing research from development actors and integrate the findings on barriers/triggers for behavior change.⁵ Provide hygiene kits (or cash/vouchers) that include menstrual health and hygiene (MHH) supplies, soap, and other key items. 	<p>DEVELOPMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct formative research on the factors that drive or hinder behavior change and design interventions to address the identified determinants—going beyond communications. Support local manufacturers produce, market, and distribute menstrual hygiene and hand hygiene supplies for profit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify key behaviors post-shock and conduct formative research, particularly in protracted displacement contexts or recurrent natural disasters. Identify and train local factories and sales agents in crisis/shock affected areas to manufacture and sell MHH products, including soap and hand sanitizer. Engage youth or women as influencers or demand activators.

COMPLEMENTARY APPROACH IN ACTION IN NIGERIA

Over the last five years, violent extremists and military campaigns have driven a rural exodus to small towns in northeast Nigeria where populations have soared, increasing pressure on under-sized or low-performing water systems. Rampant borehole drilling has become commonplace with little understanding of the impact on groundwater levels and water quality. In response, USAID/BHA funded Action Against Hunger to take a structured approach to groundwater monitoring through the identification of strategic monitoring points and support to the local authorities to begin collecting and monitoring the findings, which has, since its inception, expanded into a multi-partner effort, including strategic support from the WASH Cluster. The groundwater monitoring initiative has highlighted several opportunities for development actors to implement complementary actions, such as defining the legal basis and policy framework for monitoring water resources and the creation of a State Water Regulatory Board.

PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE

Moving beyond humanitarian and development silos to implement programming that ensures the availability and sustainable management of safe water and sanitation while also responding to the acute and complex WASH or WRM challenges of shock-affected populations requires coordinated planning, analysis, flexibility, and measurement.

JOINT PLANNING AND ANALYSIS

Coordinating humanitarian, development, stabilization programming is complex due to the many stakeholders involved and a dynamic operating environment, so it is critical to identify strategic entry points. **That starts with having a common understanding of the lay of the land—who is working where and with what mandate.** Then it requires concerted joint planning and analysis.

⁵ Wash Em is an example for handwashing behavior change in emergencies.

Below are five tools WASH or WRM partners can use to identify entry points, inform initial designs, annual work planning (if relevant), and CLA processes. While development partners are likely to be funded to conduct any number of the following analyses throughout the program cycle, humanitarian actors should consider incorporating rapid or “lite” versions, particularly when implementing needs assessments and designing response interventions. Regardless of funding levels, these analyses and planning processes should be implemented jointly by all actors, if feasible, considering humanitarian principles.

- **Stakeholder Mapping:** Stakeholder mapping is used to pinpoint which actors are operating within a given geographic area and with what type of mandate(s). This is a critical first step to increase the coherence between humanitarian, development, and stabilization actors and need not be complex. Stakeholder mapping can be as simple as reaching out to the existing coordination platforms and using existing data to create a map or spreadsheet that enumerates where WASH or WRM actors are working and their main sectoral interventions.
- **Stakeholder Analysis:** Stakeholder analysis is used to identify the actors and relationships that influence project outcomes. Understanding the relationships between the range of actors in a shock-affected setting is an important step to establishing and leveraging relationships with key stakeholders. While there are many tools to perform stakeholder analysis, informal mapping of system actors and influences through a facilitated workshop, social network analysis, and power mapping are tools to consider. (See the [Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Governance Technical Brief](#) for additional tools and information related to systems diagnostics.)
- **Scenario Planning:** Scenario planning systematically looks at existing and emerging trends. By working through scenario planning collectively, stakeholders are able to identify risks, opportunities, challenges, and likely shocks so as to design work plans with responsive complementary or integrated programming elements.
- **Gender and Protection Analyses:** Given differing roles and decision-making dynamics among genders in WASH and WRM, as well as the potential for increased vulnerability for sexual and gender minorities and persons with a disability in shock-affected contexts, a gender analysis will help identify opportunities that at a minimum do no harm and promote equal participation and inclusivity. Similarly, protection issues should be analyzed using context specific tools to inform programmatic approaches and service delivery models. (See the [Gender Equality in WASH Technical Brief](#) for additional information on gender analysis.)
- **Conflict Analysis:** Conflict analysis identifies potential risks from facilitating increased engagement between communities and government or local authorities. Development actors especially need to incorporate considerations related to vulnerability and conflict into their policy and systems work with governments and local authorities. USAID’s [Water and Conflict Toolkit](#) provides guidance, as well as a rapid appraisal guide, to support the identification and evaluation of the conflict risk and peacebuilding potential of water programming.

COORDINATION BODIES

Because no single body within a host country’s government or the UN system is typically responsible for coordinating activity across the humanitarian, stabilization, and development divide within the WASH and WRM sectors, somebody will need to step up and potentially be funded to do so. Whether it is a government official, donor or implementing partner, that leader will need energy first to jumpstart and galvanize conversation, and then to promote greater coherence and coordination between these groups. In all likelihood, there will not be an official “ask” to get this dialogue started. Instead, someone or some entity will need to animate the discussion and show, by doing, the value of the ongoing exercise. Eventually, a neutral broker will need to play a facilitative role between different stakeholders.

MEASURING PROGRESS

Measuring improvements in humanitarian and development coherence in WASH or WRM is not always straightforward, and needs to be particularly flexible in shock-affected areas. Given the complexities, results at first are more likely to be process-oriented rather than impact-oriented and outcomes-driven—until integrated programming is pursued and/or a formal body is stood up to coordinate action and measure outcomes, such as averted humanitarian spending. However, measuring even process and output indicators that show progress would be an important step. An illustrative output and outcome indicator follows as examples:

- **OUTPUT:** Number of joint WASH or WRM maps developed documenting humanitarian, development, and stabilization actor presence.
- **OUTCOME:** Increase in WASH system’s resilience (expressed as the relative strength of the local WASH system to respond to shocks). Potentially measured as water system downtime during acute shock or desludging occurring during acute shock.

In countries where a formal coordinator or body is established, quantifiable and measurable **collective outcomes** that humanitarian, stabilization, and development actors want to achieve to increase the resilience of WASH or WRM services could be developed for all complementary or integrated programs. (See the [USAID Resilience Capacity Measurement](#) for practical guidance to develop relevant custom output and outcome indicators.)

CONCLUSION

USAID recognizes that there is still a significant amount of work required in the WASH and WRM sectors at all levels and by all actors to break down the silos that separate humanitarian, development, and stabilization programming. However, the opportunities to improve sustainable access to WASH or WRM in vulnerable communities compel us to continue to improve programming across humanitarian response, recovery, risk reduction, and development to build long-lasting resilience.

SELECTED RESOURCES

De Waal, Dominick, et. al. (2017). “[Water Supply: The Transition from Emergency to Development Support: Evidence from Country Case Studies in Africa.](#)”

Mason, Nathaniel and Beatrice Mosello. (2016). “[Making Humanitarian and Development WASH Work Better Together.](#)” Overseas Development Institute.

Tillett, Will, Joanna Trevor, David DeArmev and Juliane Schillinger. (2020). “[Applying WASH Systems Approaches in Fragile Contexts: A Discussion Paper.](#)”

UNICEF. (2019). “[Water under Fire: Emergencies, development and peace in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.](#)”